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Abstract

This dissertation examines mission museums established by Catholic mission congregations in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland from the 1890s onwards. The aim is to provide the first extensive study on these museums in a way that contributes to current blind spots in mission history, and the history of anthropology and museology. In this study I use Angela Jannelli’s concept of small-scale and amateurish museums to create a framework in order to characterise the museums. The dissertation focuses on the missionaries and their global networks, their “collecting” in the mission fields overseas, and the “collected” objects, by looking at primary sources from mission congregations’ archives. In the middle section of the dissertation the findings of an analysis of the compiled list of thirty-one mission museums are presented. This presentation focuses on their characteristics (for example, the museum surroundings, the opening and closing dates, the role of the curators, and type of objects). From this list of thirty-one museums three case studies were selected for in-depth analysis: (1) three “Africa museums” of the Missionary Sisters of St. Peter Claver (SSPC) in Salzburg, Maria Sorg and Zug, (2) an ethnographically oriented mission museum of the Society of the Divine Word (SVD) in the mission house St. Gabriel near Vienna, and (3) a mission museum of the Sacred Heart Missionaries (MSC) in Hiltrup-Münster. This study reveals the reasons for opening mission museums by presenting a list of ten intentions. Then I propose a conclusive definition of a European Catholic mission museum. Finally, short descriptions (“portraits”) in the appendix present and analyse all thirty-one mission museums. In presenting the broad diversity of these museums, the thesis contributes to the understanding of missionary congregations’ development in the late 19th and 20th century and their impact on the material and immaterial exchange between German-speaking Catholic Europe and overseas.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Wendel SVD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Xaver SVD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Augustin SVD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Museum Haus Völker und Kulturen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary Sisters of St. Peter Claver</td>
<td></td>
<td>SSPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg SSPC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrikamuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zug SSPC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrikamuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benediktbeuern SDB</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dachsberg OSFS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariannhill Missionaries (CMM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Würzburg CMM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riedegg CMM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrikamuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiltrup MSC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liefering MSC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritans (CSSp)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knechtsteden CSSp</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate (OMI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hünfeld OMI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethlehem Mission Society (SMB)/Bethlehem Mission Immensee (BMI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregation of the Franciscan Missionary Brothers (CMSF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamberg CMSF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secular Institute Schönstatt Sisters of Mary (S MS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schönstatt in weiter Welt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menzingen</td>
<td></td>
<td>MISSIONSMUSEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionaries of the Holy Family (MSF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werthenstein MSF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Madagaskarmuseum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMI</td>
<td>Bethlehem Mission Immensee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMM</td>
<td>Mariannhill Missionaries (Congregatio Missionarium de Mariannhill)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMSF</td>
<td>Congregation of the Franciscan Missionary Brothers (Congregatio Missionaria Sancti Francisci)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPS</td>
<td>Missionaries of the Precious Blood (Congregatio Missionariorum Pretiosissimi Sanguinis Domini Nostri Jesu Christi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS</td>
<td>Mariannhill Sisters/Missionary Sisters of the Precious Blood (Congregatio Pretiosi Sanguinis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSp</td>
<td>Spiritans/Holy Ghost Fathers (Congregatio Sancti Spiritus sub tutela Immaculati Cordis Beatissimae Virginis Mariae)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOK</td>
<td>Deutsche Ordensobernkonferenz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDNSC</td>
<td>Daughters of Our Lady of the Sacred Heart (Filiae Dominae Nostrae a Sacro Corde)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMM</td>
<td>Franciscan Missionaries of Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMSA</td>
<td>Franciscan Missionary Sisters for Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNA</td>
<td>Historical Network Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNR</td>
<td>Historical Network Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICOM</td>
<td>International Council of Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS</td>
<td>London Missionary Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSC</td>
<td>Missionary Sister of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus (here: MSC Sisters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSF</td>
<td>Missionaries of the Holy Family (Missionarii a Sacra Familia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFM</td>
<td>Franciscans (Ordo Fratrum Minorum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFMCap</td>
<td>Capuchins (Ordo Fratrum Minorum Capuccinorum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMI</td>
<td>Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate (Congregatio Missionarum Oblatorum Beatae Mariae Virginis Immaculatae)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>Benedictines (Ordo Sancti Benedicti here: Missionary Benedictines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSF</td>
<td>Franciscan Sisters (Ordo Sancti Francisci here: Franciscan Sisters of St. Mary’s Abbey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSFS</td>
<td>Oblates of St. Francis de Sales (Institutum Oblatorum Sancti Francisci Salesii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWG</td>
<td>Pontifical Mission Societies (Päpstliches Werk der Glaubensverbreitung)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S MS</td>
<td>Schönstatt Sisters of Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>Pallottines/Society of the Catholic Apostolate (Societas Apostolatus Catholici)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI/SCJ</td>
<td>Priests of the Sacred Heart of Jesus/Dehonians (Sacerdotum Cordis Jesu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDB</td>
<td>Salesians of Don Bosco (Societas Sancti Francisci Salesii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>Society of African Missions (Societas Missionarum ad Afros)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMB</td>
<td>Bethlehem Mission Society (Societas Missionum Exterarum de Bethlehem in Helvetia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSPC</td>
<td>Missionary Sisters of St. Peter Claver (Sodalitas Sancti Petri Claver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSpS</td>
<td>Holy Spirit Sisters (Congregatio Missionalis Servarum Spiritus Sancti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSpSAP</td>
<td>Sister-Servants of the Holy Spirit of Perpetual Adoration (Congregatio Servarum Spiritus Sancti de Adoratione perpetua)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVD</td>
<td>Divine Word Missionaries (Societas Verbi Divini)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VKM</td>
<td>Ethnographical Museum Vienna (Völkerkundemuseum)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Introduction

Haben Sie eventuell auch ein etwas grösseres Krokodil für unser Museum?³

“Do you have, perhaps, a somewhat larger crocodile for our museum?” the missionary Ferdinand Altnöder writes to his confrere, Imre Nagy, located in Madang, Papua New Guinea, in 1976. The peculiar museum they are referring to where a crocodile, hopefully a big one, should become part of, is a mission museum. That is a museum founded and operated by missionaries in Europe.

The study at hand approaches the phenomenon of Catholic mission museums in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland from the late 19th century to the present time. The first mission museum covered in this study was opened in 1896, the last one in 2016. The study seeks to address the role of missionaries in the operating of mission museums (such as for example, Altnöder and Nagy in the quotation above). It presents where these museums were located and when they were founded and closed.

The goal is to learn more about the equipping of the museum and to discover if this sort of “ordering” by letter to a confrere was typical of how the missionaries stocked their museums with thousands of exhibits. The study examines how a missionary like Imre Nagy could get access to such an animal as a crocodile or any other object that found its way into European mission museums. The focus is on the networks that the missionaries established, as in the example correspondence between Altnöder and Nagy. Finally, this study asks why an object such as a stuffed crocodile was exhibited in a mission museum. To answer these questions regarding the motives behind the museums presenting such objects as crocodiles to visitors in Germany, Austria or Switzerland, this thesis discusses the intentions of the missionaries.

“Behind the metal door, a different world opens up. It’s the world to faraway countries, as it was mainly in the first half and around the

³ Altnöder, Letter Altnöder to Nagy (27.4.1976), AMEM.
⁴ In this study the standard meaning of the term mission is in accordance with Joseph Schmidlin (1876–1944) and the Münster School of Catholic missiology. According to his theorising, mission has two meanings. First, it is mission work in a wider sense. And second, mission has a narrower sense. Mission is activity, with the aim to spread the Christian faith and to plant and to preserve Churches. It is the activity among non-Christians and is also called foreign mission. Anekwe Oborji, “Catholic Missiology 1910-2010: Origins,” in A century of Catholic mission, 136. I use the term mission in the second meaning, the strategically planned activity to spread Christianity.
middle of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century"\textsuperscript{5}, says an article in the Catholic Sunday paper in Würzburg, in 2014. The faraway countries are in other ways very close, directly accessible through an institution called mission museums. Behind the metal door, the European visitor encountered crocodiles, masks, or Madonnas, to name typical objects in mission museums. Madonnas represent Christian art, the masks ethnographic objects, and the crocodile stands for natural history objects. Africa, Asia, Oceania, North and Latin America are the geographical regions that were mainly represented in the collections. These institutions, Catholic mission museums in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland are the object of investigation.

The mission museums of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century had predecessor institutions. Some basics that I discuss in this study were already created in the 17\textsuperscript{th} and 18\textsuperscript{th} centuries. For elaborating on this, a brief overview of the topic of missionaries as global networkers and scholars is necessary. From the beginning of the practice of sending European missionaries abroad and especially since the

\textsuperscript{5} “Hinter der Metalltür tut sich eine andere Welt auf. Es ist die Welt der Mission in fernen Ländern, wie sie sich vorwiegend in der ersten Hälfte und um die Mitte des 20. Jahrhunderts darstellte.” (my translation) Kupke, “Zebra und Leopard friedlich”.  

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{Left: Corpus Christi and Madonna with Child in Schweiklberg OSB. Right: Staging in the Afrikamuseum Riedegg CMM. Photo credit R. Loder-Neuhold.}
\end{figure}

17
start of evangelising in the New World, networks between missionaries overseas and in Europe were established.

Especially the Jesuits are exemplary here. Through their perfected internal communication system, missionaries from overseas reported about their experiences and observations. They communicated this back to Europe, where it was analysed, processed and compiled. Jesuits in Europe sent instructions and demands for what they were interested in. Knowledge spread globally through Jesuit communication channels. And it was not just an exchange between the mission fields and Europe or Rome (“Centre-periphery-model”), but missionaries were also in a direct exchange with other missionaries in other mission fields. These two issues taken together give the context to the fact that in the 17th century, the Chinese emperor Kangxi was healed from fever with quinine from Latin America. It was French Jesuits who had brought the quinine to China first in the form of the knowledge and secondly the quinine itself used the intercontinental networks of the Jesuits.⁷

This shows that not only immaterial exchange happened: Also objects found their ways through these channels. Plants, animals, and artefacts were sent by the missionaries. These objects ended in special places: It was the time of the *Kunst- und Wunderkammer*, the cabinets of curiosities.⁸ The fundamental difference between them and museums is that they were not open to the public but just enjoyed by their owners and their guests. High clergymen established such cabinets, for example, Cardinal Flavio Chigi (1631–1693) founded the Museo Chigi. For this private museum, Jesuits in the Americas “collected” and sent objects. But the most important of these forerunners of the later mission museums was the Museo Kircheriano, founded by Athanasius Kircher SJ (1602–1680). He was a German polymath, whose interests included Egyptian hieroglyphs, Sanskrit and Chinese studies as well as mathematics and physics. He taught at the Collegio Romano, the Jesuits’ centre for education in Rome. He had a massive correspondence network with (secular) scholars such as for example Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. Over 2,100 letters to Kircher still exist. Kircher was the centre of a network of Jesuits in the mission fields who reported to him and “collected” for him.

In the Collegio Romano, Kircher set up his *Wunderkammer*. It was established at about 1651⁹ and later named after him. Besides Kircher’s science

---

⁶ Harriet Völker describes this model, where the Western scholar in the centre is responsible for the interpretation of the data and the “collector” overseas is just seen as the supplier. This model changed in the 1880s. Völker, “Missionare als Ethnologen,” in *Sammeln, Vernetzen, Auswerten*, 174.

⁷ For more on this event see Wendt, “Des Kaisers wundersame Heilung”.

⁸ For a description of these *Kunst- und Wunderkammern* see for example te Heesen, *Theorien des Museums zur*.

⁹ The collection moved in 1651 to new rooms inside the Collegio, therefore the museum was established at this time. In 1678 the first catalogue was compiled. When Kircher died in 1680, the museum was almost forgotten, and objects disappeared. In 1698, another Jesuit was engaged for the museum and it flourished again. In 1709 the second catalogue was written. When the
collection, there were the same kind of objects that the mission museums later also had on display: flora and fauna objects, ethnographical objects and artwork, even first Christian artwork from overseas. Typical of the baroque period was the juxtaposition of different categories of objects. The objects came from the Americas, Asia, and Africa. The first catalogue was written in 1678, in Kircher’s lifetime. As an example of an “exotic” object at that time, the catalogue lists and depicts a stuffed crocodile. The private visitor of the Museo Kircheriano could encounter a broad range of objects, from animals like this crocodile to a Mexican hammock, Egyptian mummies and scriptures and even a piece of chocolate. Interestingly, both catalogues from these early times (1678 and 1709) do not only indicate the missionary deliveries separately but also refer to some “collectors” by name. As I show later, it seems that the source information of a mission collection from the 17th century can be better than that from a mission museum of the 19th and 20th century.

On the one hand, I observed that some scholars in the field of mission history speak of mission museums of the 19th and 20th century as if they were well-known and thoroughly researched institutions. On the other hand, at the beginning of this research journey stands the short note by Rebekka Habermas that there are mission museums in Germany which have not yet been studied. It has so far not been established how many mission museums existed, in Europe as well as in German-speaking countries. There has been no reliable information about when they were established or closed down and how many are still open to the public. Therefore, this study will provide a complete list of permanent mission museums in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, and with that close the gap in our knowledge regarding their number, historical developments, geographical distribution, etc.

Some research is available on mission museums/exhibitions/collections in the British and Anglo-American context. However, the phenomenon of Catholic and Protestant mission museums in the German-speaking countries is

Jesuits were dissolved, the museum suffered as well. It was never restored. In 1870 finally, all collections were confiscated by the Vatican and the objects were given to different museums. Moser, “Neues Wissen für Europa,” in *Sammeln, Vernetzen, Auswerten*, 60–61.

10 Alexandro Favian announced to send from Mexico a portrait of Saint Athanasius which was made out of feathers. Moser, 58.

11 Much has been written on Athanasius Kircher and Moser’s article is a good start in regard to his vast network and the Museo Kircheriano. Moser.

12 For example at a conference in June 2016, “New approaches in Mission History”, University of Fribourg, Switzerland.

13 “Mission museums are still largely unexplored, and, like ethnographic shows and ethnographic museums, they have probably made a considerable contribution to communicating the non-European world.”; “Both [mission festivals and museums, RLN] are completely unexplored by research to date.” (my translation) Habermas, “Mission im 19. Jahrhundert,” 642–43.
little researched. This was noted in 1997\textsuperscript{14}, as well as twenty years later in 2017.\textsuperscript{15}

Looking closer, there is no consensus on the definition of such a mission museum that would differentiate between the categories of a museum, exhibition, or collection. Most of the literature groups these three concepts together usually as a consequence of the common interchangeable labelling at the time and therefore in the primary sources.\textsuperscript{16} This study seeks to disentangle these three aspects of these institutions and focuses on permanent museums which were open to the public.

Therefore, one goal of this thesis is to create and present basic knowledge of the phenomenon of mission museums. It establishes a basis for further research, either in the form of research into individual mission museums/exhibitions/collections or comparative studies. But there has also been previous research for which my study is relevant.

This study seeks to answer all the basic questions regarding mission museums for the Catholic sphere in German-speaking countries. This is because, at the beginning of my investigation, it became clear that indeed there are shorter studies of individual Catholic mission museums (or exhibitions and collections) in Germany and Austria. Two examples, both from the field of anthropology\textsuperscript{17} can be named: One diploma thesis has been written about a mission museum near Cologne, run by the Spiritans (Knechtsteden CSSp), another dissertation was published about a mission museum near Salzburg (Liefering MSC).\textsuperscript{18} An overarching study, which also works out the specifics about this museum type, is missing. There is, however, a diploma thesis from 1997 by Gerrit Schlegel which approaches Catholic and Protestant mission museums in Germany from a museological standpoint.\textsuperscript{19} Schlegel’s thesis is impressive

\textsuperscript{14} Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland,” 2; 72.
\textsuperscript{15} Holthausen, “Die besondere Situation missionsgeschichtlicher,” in Missionsgeschichtliche Sammlungen heute, 53.
\textsuperscript{16} For example, the Evangelical Missionary Museum at the Exposition Universelle in Paris 1867 was called a museum, but it was open for only six months. In this thesis it would be categorised as an exhibition, not a museum. For more about this case see Jensz, “Collecting cultures: Institutional motivations,” 68.
\textsuperscript{17} The terms anthropology, ethnography, and ethnology are tricky when writing in English about the German-speaking context. Therefore, I follow the example of Rainer F. Buschmann: “While the expression ‘anthropology’ is in common use in English-speaking countries, the term generally refers to biological/physical anthropology in the German context. […] Völkerkunde encompasses both ethnography – the descriptive study of a particular culture – and ethnology, the comparative study of, generally, non-European cultures.” Buschmann therefore uses anthropology when referring to the discipline as a whole. Buschmann, “Oceanic collections in German,” in Pacific presences – Volume I, 198. I follow his example for the field description. For the practitioners, I use the term anthropologists where the German term would be Ethnograph or Ethnologe or Völkerkundler. For missionaries who were also active in anthropology I use the term missionary anthropologist or the shorter priest-ethnographer. (All the persons concerned in this regard were male.) Adjectives related to this field are ethnographic or ethnological, as in “Ethnographical Museum Berlin” or “ethnological object”.
\textsuperscript{18} Peters, “Das Missionsmuseum Knechtsteden”; Wessel, Die Macht des Objekts.
\textsuperscript{19} Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland”.
when it comes to the amount of gathered information and primary sources about the various museums, but Schlegel is writing a museological study, while I am approaching the phenomenon from a mission history point of view.\textsuperscript{20} Schlegel herself points out that she does not pay attention to the “missionary context” of the museums.\textsuperscript{21}

In focusing on this missionary context, it was also quickly clear that I could not analyse Catholic and Protestant mission museums in the same study, as Schlegel did. The context would have been too diverse. Plus, the number of Catholic mission museums alone already suggests that they should be dealt with in a study focused on them exclusively.

Contrary to previous studies which were dedicated to single mission museums, I was curious as to what can be said about the phenomenon of a mission museum in general. This could only be done when looking beyond the individual case and considering all museums of this type. With this in mind, I compare the mission museum to the “standard” museum just for the sake of disclosing its unique features. I am, however, more interested in comparing the mission museums with each other.

The field of museology has ignored mission museums (as has the field of art history as well\textsuperscript{22}) and German-speaking mission history until recently also overlooked them.\textsuperscript{23} Still, it must be stressed that this study is neither an exhibition analysis nor is it set within the discipline of museology.\textsuperscript{24} That said, the thesis uses terminology from museology and draws theoretically from the work of museologist Angela Jannelli. The mission museum must not be seen as a “lesser” version of a “proper” ethnographical museum. Instead, I claim it to be a standalone category of a museum. In this regard, it adds to the multifaceted world of museums, with Waidacher’s words:

\begin{quote}
Today there are no areas of human interest, however minor or extraordinary, that are not covered by a museum, from diocesan to crime museums, from cosmological to thimble museums, from literary to football museums, from the horse museum to the sausage museum.\textsuperscript{25}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{20} There are also some deficits, for example double listings of mission museums, missing source citation, and a casual handling of national borders. Although the title only refers to Germany, museums in Austria and Switzerland are also taken into account. Schlegel had access to Belinda Peters’ thesis, which I could not include because it got lost at the university library in Cologne.

\textsuperscript{21} Schlegel, 8.

\textsuperscript{22} Katharina Knacker’s dissertation about museums owned by the Catholic Church in Germany and Austria focuses on art museums. Knacker, \textit{Mission Museion}. The dissertation on museums in monasteries in the German-speaking countries by the art historian Lena Weber does dedicate only three pages to mission museums. Weber, “Klostermuseen im deutschsprachigen Raum”.

\textsuperscript{23} For more on the previous research see Section 1.4.1.

\textsuperscript{24} I am aware that in the recent decades many concepts in museology have developed which would be fruitful to use when focusing on mission museums. However, I found that in order to be able to use concepts like collaborative museology, indigenous museology or appropriate museology, not enough basic historical knowledge is available for mission museums.

In claiming that the mission museum is not just a small-scale ethnographical museum, I also need to be clear about the limitation regarding the debate about Western ethnographical museums and involving calls for the restitution of their collections or parts of it. In recent years especially the debates about the planned ethnographical museum in the Humboldt Forum in Berlin were crucial, as was the change in the French attitude when President Emmanuel Macron announced in 2017 in Ouagadougou a “temporary or permanent restitution of African heritage to Africa.”\(^{26}\) However, the consequences of Macron’s announcement and the subsequent report by Felwine Sarr and Bénédicte Savoy\(^ {27}\) with far-reaching recommendations are still to be seen. Interestingly, Sarr and Savoy mention the mission museums in their report. They describe the museums as places in which

a variety of ritual objects are gathered and displayed (talismans, masks, entire tombs) taken by Catholic and Protestant priests from the African peoples targeted by their attempts at Christian conversion. When these artifacts, […] were not immediately destroyed at the sites themselves, they were transferred on to Europe and displayed as a means for civil education […].\(^ {28}\)

The authors’ description of the mission museums here is simplistic and, as mentioned above, this may be due to the lack of research so far. As well, they aimed to investigate the state-run ethnographical museums, not privately owned museums such as the mission museums.

I suggest that the basic arguments from the discussion about “collecting” for Western ethnographical museums and the requested restitution of these objects can also be assigned to the ethnographical collections of the mission museums. However, it is not the aim of this thesis to contribute to this specific discussion with the example of the mission museums but rather to provide a historical basis on which to build this discussion.

### 1.1 Relevance, aim, and research questions

Karen Jacobs and Chris Wingfield point out the visibility of mission history:

> While mission histories loom large in shaping both landscapes and identities in much of sub-Saharan Africa and the Pacific, where the architectural remains of early mission are frequently recognised as significant heritage sites, they are more easily forgotten in Europe.\(^ {29}\)

\(^{26}\) Rea, “Will French Museums Return”.  
\(^{27}\) Sarr and Savoy, “The Restitution of African”.  
\(^{28}\) Sarr and Savoy, 13.  
In accord with them, I am of the opinion that missionary heritage is not immediately visible in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland where the missionaries came from and started their journey. This part of (religious) history in Europe should get more attention because it must be seen as part of the general past. Mission history should not be treated as a special sub-category of history. Missionaries acted both in Europe and overseas. They were not just religious actors, but also citizens of their home countries, networkers, translators, and guides and brokers between different cultures. Often they were scientists and researchers and in this role responsible for the global flow of knowledge and information. In every case, they influenced perceptions on both sides: what Europeans learned about remote places, and what non-Europeans learned about Europe. The secular-religious divide in historiography is simply unhelpful regarding the missionaries’ positions and spheres of actions, both in Europe and in the mission fields. Therefore, I argue that the mission museums are heritage sites in Europe, and by studying them and generally paying attention to them and the missionaries who built them, more aspects of the overall past become visible.

Furthermore, many of these heritage sites, the Catholic mission museums and their collections, are in an unstable and insecure situation. Some even describe it as “existentially threatened in their existence”, for which the “need for action [is] all the more urgent”. Although these words sound drastic, I agree that the ageing in the mission congregations, their changing composition, and the declining embedding of mission congregations in the wider society have brought many mission museums to dire straits where sometimes the only way out has been the closing down of the museum. However the future of these institutions seems, knowledge about the past is worthwhile.

Connected with this current situation there are two surveys among mission congregations and orders in Germany and Austria that were conducted by their own superordinate bodies. These studies focused on mission collections in general, not only mission museums. The one in Germany was carried out in 2016 by the Konferenz der missionierenden Orden, a sub-group of the Deutsche Ordensobernkonferenz (DOK), the official council of superiors in

30 In Germany, the historian Ulrich an der Heyden is the one to be named for those who worked against the hard divide between traditional mission historians (aka church historians) and “secular historians”. Eckardt, “Die Festschrift als Medium,” in Mission Afrika: Geschichtsschreibung über Grenzen hinweg, 30. As just two examples I refer to van der Heyden and Liebau, Missionsgeschichte, Kirchengeschichte, Weltgeschichte and Feldt Keller and van der Heyden, Missionsgeschichte als Geschichte der.


32 “Die Deutsche Ordensobernkonferenz ist der Zusammenschluss der Höheren Oberen der Orden und Kongregationen in Deutschland. Die Verantwortlichen der General- und Provinzleitungen von Ordensgemeinschaften sowie der Abteien und selbständigen Einzelklöster in Deutschland haben sich in der DOK zusammengeschlossen, […].” Deutsche Ordensobernkonferenz, “Über die Deutsche Ordensobernkonferenz”. The name of the study is “Mis-
Germany that as such represents 16,700 sisters and 4,200 patres and brothers. The second was conducted in 2016 in Austria by the network association *Ordensgemeinschaften Österreich*, the Austrian equivalent to the DOK in Germany.33 Both studies asked *inter alia* about the relevance of the mission collections for the identity of the congregations. In Germany, eighteen out of twenty-five who reported in this category stated that the collection was relevant.34 In Austria, seventeen out of twenty-two who reported in this category replied that they were relevant for them.35 That shows clearly how the congregations themselves perceive the collections as important. Also the fact that such surveys were organised shows the relevance of this topic and the necessity of research.

In mission history, the idea of mission as a one-way street, meaning Western missionaries left Europe and brought with them their “baggage” to the non-European sphere is dated. Much has been written about the transfer back to the West from the mission fields. However, it was mostly immaterial aspects that received attention, such as languages, ethnographic information or medical knowledge and skills.36 This study at hand focuses on the material aspects of the reciprocal dynamics between Europe and overseas.

The work of the missionaries outside of Europe was out of sight for the European population who should support it and ideally, donate money for its cause. The work was not directly visible and non-tangible. Therefore mission organisations started with mission leaflets and journals which included not only texts but also photographs of the “target group”, the people who were to be converted or the newly converted.37 The work of the missionaries was expressed in pictures by which, for example, new converts were given a face. In this study, I claim that the mission museums were one step further in this attempt also to disseminate images of the mission engagement. In the museums, the European public could see for themselves; they could get an idea of how the non-Christians lived in far-away countries. Literally, they could “make their own picture” as the German metaphor puts it (*sich ein Bild machen*). In this regard, the mission museums were, as Chris Wingfield puts it in an apt...
description, the “attempt to materialize the somewhat immaterial process of conversion.”

This study is also relevant regarding the acceptance that missionaries, and with that also mission museums, were part of the colonial engagements of European nations since there is a danger in limiting the mission museums only to the religious sphere. Sharon Mcdonald states that colonial states – like Germany – could prove with the possession of artefacts from foreign and overseas cultures their ability to govern outside of their territory. The “collecting” activities of their colonial agents led to big ethnographical museums that were proof of knowledge but also of dominance and hegemony. For the visitor of state-owned museums, especially from the 19th century onwards, it became visible that her/his state or city was playing a role on the world stage. For Austria and Switzerland, two states that had no stable colonies of their “own”, it was even more important to prove this potency overseas as an act of compensation for “lacking” colonies. Even without them, they could successfully equip their own ethnographical museums as well.

Different from Austria and Switzerland, Germany had stable colonies until the Treaty of Versailles in 1919. The major ones were Togo, Cameroon, German South-West Africa, German East Africa, in the Pacific German New Guinea and German Samoa, as well as smaller territories in China. For historians, Germany’s colonial empire remained in the shadow of the Second World War and the Shoah. It was for a long time a neglected period in German historiography. But in recent years “[i]ncreasing public awareness and a growing debate in society about the German colonial past have become discernible”.

Historiography is now showing more and more interest in this historical era. Rebekka Habermas even calls German colonial history a “hot spot of historical research”. And mission history sits squarely there, intermingled with colonial history. This study at hand is consequently also a contribution to the history of German colonialism, from a mission history perspective.

38 Wingfield, “Missionary Museums,” in Religion in museums, 237. For Wilhelm Schmidt’s comment on this see footnote 2.
40 Kretzschmar, “Foreword,” in German Colonialism, 10.
41 For example Gründer and Hiery, Die Deutschen und ihre, Hiery, Das Deutsche Reich in. The best example of this awoken interest was probably the exhibition Deutscher Kolonialismus. Fragmente einer Geschichte und Gegenwart in the Deutsche Historisches Museum in Berlin. See Stiftung Deutsches Historisches Museum, German Colonialism.
42 Habermas, “Colonies in the Countryside,” 502.
show, postcolonial concepts are fruitfully used for deepening the understanding of this past and present. Concepts like the “third space” or the “contact zones” give new purpose to mission history.43

My study does not use an explicit postcolonial theoretical approach. Instead, it focuses on the basic historiography of these mission museums as a necessary first step. At the beginning of this research, there was simply not enough “substance” available on the phenomenon of mission museums. Some aspects of postcolonial theorising are already integrated into my approach, although in an indirect way. Throughout my study, I point out the colonial frame that built the context of the actors and their actions.

The aim of this study is to approach the phenomenon of Catholic mission museums in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. They are presented, described and analysed with a number- and fact-oriented approach. Three case studies together with portraits of every individual mission museum lend substance to this approach. The study shows the broad diversity of the mission museums. Some existed for more than one hundred years. Over the course of such a long time, they all developed relatively distinctly from each other, having their idiosyncrasies. As this is the first extensive study on this subject for this region, the main goal of the thesis is to map out this phenomenon and to give as a complete picture as possible of the total number of Catholic mission museums. Also their variety is in focus, and I try to correct the tendency to generalise them.44

The stereotypical heroic white man in a tropical helmet, somewhere out there in the “exotic and dangerous” mission fields, preaching the gospel, still lingers in popular images and associations with the term missionary. Generally speaking, this thesis seeks to challenge this stereotype of “missionary” on multiple levels, for example, on the question of main occupation, the gender aspect, or the level of mobility. The question “What did missionaries actually do?” is significant. As will be shown, the answer to this question can lead distinctly away from the image of the white man preaching and converting. Hence, it is to the field of Catholic mission history that this study aims mainly to contribute. Secondly, it should contribute to the history of anthropology, as well as to museology but only in regard to small-scale and amateurish museums.45

43 Three examples for research on mission and colonial history from the last couple of years are Becker, European missions in contact; Habermas, Skandal in Togo, and Hensel and Rommé, Aus Westfalen in die.
44 One such example of generalising is to be found in Weber’s description of mission museums. Her claim about the museum’s aims and function lacks (written or oral) sources and I suppose she had visited only one mission museum, St. Ottilien OSB. Weber, “Klostermuseen im deutschsprachigen Raum,” 115–17.
45 As pointed out above, I do not claim to locate this study in the various museologies that developed in the last decades and focus explicitly on ethnographical museums and the dealing with the colonial heritage.
The basic research question at the beginning of approaching these institutions is: What characterised and distinguished these mission museums? In simple words: What were mission museums anyway? Following this main research question about their essence, sub-questions can be divided into descriptive and analytical. The descriptive ones are

1. Who were the actors in the mission museums? Who were the founding persons, the “collectors”, the curators, the scholars?
2. Where were the museums located?
3. When were these museums opened and closed?
4. How did the missionaries run the museums? And especially: How did they equip the mission museums with exhibits? How did they acquire the objects for the museums in Europe?
5. How did the missionaries describe the functions of the museums?

The descriptive questions are mainly answered in Chapter 4. There, the overview of all Catholic mission museums in German-speaking countries is presented including facts and figures about them, and general characteristics. Chapter 4 is a condensed analysis of all Catholic mission museums in this study, which are presented individually in the Appendix. These portraits of each mission museum give further answers to the basic research question about the specific features of this type of museum. The portraits provide also the grounds for future research. The intention is that with the collected basic knowledge in the list of museums and the portraits, more refined research questions (like for example comparisons between Catholic and Protestant mission museums) can be answered.

The analytical research questions deal with the intention of the museums. Why did the missionaries establish mission museums? What were the internal and external intentions? How did intentions change over time?

First, I use Angela Jannelli’s concept of wild museums. I chose this approach to the phenomenon of mission museums that were – like Jannelli’s museums – small-scale and amateur museums. What can be extracted from the sources about an intrinsic intention? Was there also a hidden agenda?

Second, I investigate the act of “collecting” by the missionaries in order to equip the museums. “Collecting” and transferring the objects to Europe was the basis for the institution of mission museums and needs, therefore, special attention. The third focus is on the networks: How did the missionaries establish and use global networks for equipping their European mission museums?

What this study will not answer: A good amount of research in the field of mission history uses sources from missionaries’ archives to gain insights into the lives and realities of the local people whom the Christian missionaries encountered in their foreign mission. It is important to stress that this study does not claim to have this aim, although the collections and the individual objects
could be used for this goal. To shed light on the realities of the local population and converts is not the goal of this study. However, locals in the mission fields are part of the study as actors in the networks that surrounded the mission museums.

Another limitation of this study is the exclusion of the Mission Exhibition from 1925 in the Vatican and the resulting mission museum in the Lateran Palace (hereafter Vatican mission exhibition and Lateran mission museum). Although they were of importance for the Catholic mission history in whole of Europe, their location in Italy excludes them from this study. However, they are brought up in some portraits and in the MSC case study, as well in the SVD case study because P. Wilhelm Schmidt SVD was the decisive mastermind behind the Lateran mission museum and he was its first director. The museum, today part of the Vatican Museums, was incorporated into the networks around the mission museums in the German-speaking countries.

Two other museums, the already mentioned Museo Kircherianum as well as the Museo Borgia (of the Propaganda Fide) in Rome are also not part of this study. Both can be seen as forerunners of the mission museums – as for example, P. Wilhelm Schmidt SVD did. They and other Wunderkammern are outside the research area due to their existence in the early modern times and geographical location.

This study focuses on the actors connected to the mission museums. The visitors’ perspectives and experiences are not so much in focus because the sources are lacking, which would be necessary to understand their point of view on the mission museums. Visitors are relevant, indeed, but from an extrinsic perspective.

1.2 Outline of the thesis

In this first chapter, so far I have introduced the topic of this study and discussed its aim and relevance, as well as raised the research questions. Now follows the establishment of a suitable terminology that encompasses the complex depths of Catholic Church history as well as basic concepts from museology. Then I discuss the previous research around mission museums, which

---

46 One example is Zanesco’s article about the Bolivian collection in the mission museum of the Franciscans in Hall in Tirol. He writes: “The remains of the collection may serve to add new aspects to a history focusing on hunters and gatherers in the Bolivian lowlands, especially during the decades of the 1920s and 1930s.” Zanesco, “Recovering histories of hunter-gatherers,” 230–31. The process also included cooperation with the source community today. Documents and photographs of objects were taken to Bolivia, to not only inform about the existence of this collection in Europe, but also to fill gaps in the knowledge about the objects and its use and meaning.

47 Mapelli, Aigner, and Fiussello, *Ethnos*.

also covers the mission collections and exhibitions. My working definition completes this part.

In Chapter 2, I outline my theoretical approach to mission museums, the topic of “collecting”, the objects, and the missionaries’ networks. Chapter 3 deals with primary sources, source criticism and historical network analysis.

As mentioned, in Chapter 4, I present the results of my analysis of all Catholic mission museums in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. Here, for example, I address the locations of the museums, the congregations and orders that founded them, as well as the historical life span. A central section in this chapter is the analysis of the characteristics of these museums, such as the range of objects or the places of origin of the objects.

Chapter 5 analyses the first of the three case studies, the Africa museums of the Missionary Sisters of St. Petrus Claver (SSPC) in Salzburg, Maria Sorg and Zug. Chapter 6 presents the second case study, the Missions-ethnographische Museum in the mission house St. Gabriel by the Society of the Divine Word (SVD). The third case study in Chapter 7 is the mission museum in Hiltrup by the Missionaries of the Sacred Heart of Jesus (MSC).

In Chapter 8, the conclusion, I discuss the results of my study in regard to the intentions of the museums and present a conclusive definition.

The last part of my thesis is the Appendix, where all thirty-one mission museums in this study are portrayed. (The condensed findings from these portraits are compiled in Chapter 4.)

1.3 Definitions

In order to be able to dissect the phenomenon of mission museums in this study properly, it is necessary to clarify some central terms. The Catholic world offers a complex nomenclature that developed and changed over the centuries. The use of several languages adds to this situation.

1.3.1 Religious institutes

At first, it is crucial to know some basics about the institutions that founded and managed these museums. Apart from the uncommon umbrella notion of religious institute, orders, congregations, and societies are more frequently used in the literature and sources. The terminology for all these religious institutes as well as their history in regard to Church Law is complex. Besides the “old” orders (like Benedictines for example), three legal forms developed

---

49 “A religious institute is a society in which members, according to proper law, pronounce public vows, either perpetual or temporary which are to be renewed, however, when the period of time has elapsed, and lead a life of brothers or sisters in common.” Can. 607 §2. Internet Office of the Holy See, “Code of Canon Law”. 
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within the Catholic world: the congregations with simple vows, communities without vows and secular institutes.\footnote{Braun, “Einleitung,” in \textit{Die Kongregationen in der Schweiz}, 32.}

For this study, the detailed differences in the course of time between orders, congregations and secular institutes – regarding the Code of Canon Law – are not important. Especially because since 1983, the Codex Iuris Canonici abolished the differences between the orders (solemn vows) and the congregations (simple vows) at large, although not completely.\footnote{Braun, 40.} However, the rise of congregations in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century is closely linked to that period as the century of mission.\footnote{The 19\textsuperscript{th} century was the century of congregations and therefore as well a century of missionary congregations: In France alone, 400 new congregations were founded between 1800 and 1880, including 200,000 women who joined as novices. In Italy, 200 congregations were founded in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. Congregations were better adapted to the changing (social) circumstances. Some of the new institutes were “pure” mission congregations, but it is estimated that around half of the all new congregations had missionary engagement in their “portfolio” as well. Braun, 23–29.}

The mission museums in this study were founded by nineteen religious institutes (some opened and operated more than one mission museum). In the vast majority, they were this type of new congregations developing in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century (thirteen out of nineteen religious institutes) or even at the beginning of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century (three cases). The rest are cases like one secular institute (Schönstatt Sisters, S MS), a lay society (PWG/missio), and the orders (Franciscans and Capuchins). As the conclusive majority of religious institutes which will be at the centre of this study, including the three case studies, are congregations, I will refer to the whole of the entities as congregations. If single institutes are mentioned, I also use the correct term, such as order for the Franciscans.

1.3.2 Religious actors

Similar to the complex system of religious institutes, finding the correct way to refer to the members of these institutes can be difficult. The term missionary is used in this thesis in its broadest sense. It means women and men who were members of a Catholic religious institute engaged in foreign mission, including all three sorts of institutes. It is a gender-neutral term (includes male and female missionaries), and includes both ordained and not ordained male members. Patres (singular Pater, abbreviated with P.) are ordained priests, fratres (singular Frater, abbreviated with Fr.) are not ordained. Members of the St. Ottilien congregation are included in the term missionaries as well, though they belong to the oldest surviving order in the Occident, the Benedictines,
and with that they are de facto monks. They live in abbeys or archabbeys, not mission houses.

The term missionary also includes members who have never been themselves actively involved in missionary work in the traditional mission fields outside of Europe but worked, for example, in mission houses in Europe with fundraising and the apostolate of the press. Members of a congregation who spent all their life working in fact as scholars in Europe are as well referred to as missionaries.

Besides the gender-neutral missionary in English, the correct terminology for female missionaries in the Catholic Church is sometimes inconclusively used in academic literature. In German, the female noun Missionarin is rarely used, but there are, for example, the well-known Missionarinnen der Nächstenliebe (Missionaries of Charity), founded by Mother Teresa. Often, the term Nonne (nun) is used to refer to female missionaries in congregations, also in academic work, although a nun is strictly speaking living in a convent, which implies enclosure, rather than working “in the world”. But members who belong to the older orders, such as the Benedictine women or the Carmelite nuns, and who leave for mission abroad, retain the title of nun. These inconsistencies must be put to one side: The correct term for female Catholic missionaries in congregations is missionary sister or sister in short.

Normative works like Bernard Arens’ Handbuch der Katholischen Missionen present the European missionary personnel around the time of the First World War as the following: first, the missionary priests (Missionspriester), second: the missionary brothers (Missionsbrüder), and third, the missionary sisters (Missionsschwestern). Correspondingly, the female congregations in this thesis all use the term of Missionsschwester (or Schwester) in their official congregation titles.

1.3.3 Museum, exhibition, collection, and object

The terms museum, exhibition, and collection must be described and defined here at the outset because, as Anke te Heesen notes, in everyday life these terms get confused a lot.

---

53 An abbey is a monastery with an abbot. Benedictines are through their special vow, stabilitas, tied to their abbey. Klosterführer, 10.
54 The SSPC foundress Maria Theresia Ledóchowska is even called a “nun” in the title of an article about her, see Brewer, “Fantasies of African Conversion”.
55 Although there is also at least one group of cloistered nuns who are dedicated only to pray for the mission. The Sister Servants of the Holy Spirit of Perpetual Adoration, the third foundation of Arnold Janssen SVD, pray twenty-four hours per day for the mission and combine with this an isolated, cloistered lifestyle with a missionary spirit.
56 Arens, Handbuch der katholischen Missionen, 81–83.
57 Arens, 26–122.
58 te Heesen, Theorien des Museums zur, 19.
Museum: The museum has many origins. Some locate it in antiquity (libraries, the idea of studying together), some in the Renaissance (Kunst- und Wunderkammern, idea of putting this world in order). The third origin is located in the second half of the 18th century. It is connected to the beginning of openness and public accessibility.\(^{59}\) In 18th century Europe, the term museum gets used more commonly for a building that houses a collection that is open to the public. From the 18th and 19th century onwards, the teaching characteristic is less important. The first functions of a museum are encountering, enjoying the presented collections, and satisfaction.\(^{60}\) What is commonly understood as a museum is an idea and institution that is around 200 years old.

The Roman Catholic Church\(^ {61}\) founded and operated museums of various forms since the beginning of the institution of museums. In 1734, the Catholic Church opened its first public museum in Rome, which means it was one of the first public museums in Europe. For some, it was even the first European public museum of all. In the German-speaking countries, the first museum run by the Catholic Church was opened in 1853 in Paderborn. These museums were so-called diocesan museums (for example in Paderborn), or art museums (exhibiting items like the antique statues in the museum on the capitol in Rome).\(^ {62}\)

However, much has been written about this institution and its terminology\(^ {63}\), and today the most official definition of a museum is coined by the International Council of Museums (ICOM), a non-governmental organisation in connection to the UNESCO:

A museum is a non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment.\(^ {64}\)

The functions of a museum are therefore to acquire (to “collect”), conserve, research, exhibit, and communicate the collections. The goal is to serve the society and its development so a key feature is to be open to the public and to be non-profit oriented. These are the main criteria that the mission museums later will be compared to. These comparisons with a definition of the 21st century are not meant at all to disclose shortcomings but to work out characteristics of the mission museums.

\(^ {59}\) te Heesen, 31.

\(^ {60}\) “[…] im Vordergrund stehen die in einem Gebäude ausgestellte Sammlung und ihre Funktion: Ansicht, Genuss, Befriedigung.” te Heesen, 21.

\(^ {61}\) In the following, the terms Church or Catholic Church refer to the Roman Catholic Church.

\(^ {62}\) Knacker, Mission Museion, 13; 23-24; 36.

\(^ {63}\) For a good overview see for example Raffler, “Historische Museologie,” in Museologie – knapp gefasst, 277–308.

\(^ {64}\) Definition adopted by the 22nd ICOM General Assembly (24 August 2007) ICOM, “Museum Definition.”
An important note must be added: the term museum is not trademarked. That means that everyone can have a “museum” and give it also the title of a museum. Whether or not this museum then also reaches the ICOM standards from the definition above, is another question. Some museologists have a critical view on this development while others support a more open approach to the phenomenon of museumisation.65

**Exhibition:** The exhibition is the “presentation of carriers of meaning and with that visualisation of abstract content.”66 In other words: The exhibition is a place where the objects (the carriers of meaning) are presented for the visitors. There are several types of exhibitions, such as the permanent exhibition, the temporary exhibition, and open study collections. Mobile or travelling exhibitions belong to the kind of temporary exhibitions. They are limited in time and location.67 Travelling exhibitions are in fact the realised idea of bringing the exhibits to the people instead of letting people travel to the museum. That means that the term exhibition can also refer to the encounter between the public and the objects outside of the museum building. A travelling exhibition can, for example, be situated in a school or city hall. The term exhibition also refers to the showrooms inside of the museum building. Both meanings are used in the thesis.

However, I have to underline that this thesis focuses not just on the (inner) exhibition, but on the whole institution of the museum, including its “backstage”, for example, the depot or the study room. I refer to the whole as “doing museum” because it expresses the practical aspects of running a museum which are sometimes hidden behind the exhibition. This “doing museum” includes not only the communicating and exhibiting, but also the acquiring, conserving, and researching. It sums up all the work behind the museum as an institution. Klaus Taschwer writes that the showrooms and their exhibits (i.e. the exhibition) are only one side of the museum, the one that is “open to the public”. “Behind these exhibitions, however, are the other, less easily accessible and yet at least equally important locations for activities of all kinds.”68 In agreement with this observation, this thesis has the whole institution of the museum in focus, not just the publicly accessible parts. This approach is explained more closely in Chapter 2.

---

67 Waidacher, 144–45.
Collection: The next term that needs a definition is collection:

A museum collection is a group of predominantly authentic objects, in any case, original objects that belong together in substance, including their documentation, which is formed, systematically arranged and developed in accordance with established museological criteria.69

Collections are the product of deliberate choices by responsible actors, such as museum curators or “collectors”. Furthermore, this definition of a collection does not require public access, though access is an intrinsic feature of an exhibition and museum. This definition also stresses the minimum units of a collection, the authentic objects. It also shows that the objects stand in relation to each other, as well as that the collection is not a random gathering of items. Instead, the planning and refining of the actions involved in bringing them together are crucial.

Object: With the term objects, I refer to the cultural and natural goods that the museum organisers acquired, conserved, researched and presented to the public.

These definitions of museum, collection and object are important for the analysis later because they add precision. But it must be stressed that these categories cannot be analysed separately because of their pyramidal relationship with each other: At the base, objects constitute a collection, which is partly presented in the exhibition, which is essential for the museum at the top.

And last, the term curator in this thesis is used for those responsible in the museum and exhibition. The missionaries who organised the museums cared for them daily and they were often director, custodian, exhibition designer, writer, tour guide, cleaning staff and restorer in one person.

1.4 Towards a working definition of mission museums

From early on, the term Missionsmuseum is used without an explanation or definition, as though it was not deemed necessary. For example, Bernard Arens’ substantial Handbuch der katholischen Missionen from 1920 names under the headline of advertising material for the mission “4. die Missionsausstellungen, die wandernden Missionsmuseen”70 – mission exhibitions and travelling mission museums. These terms were apparently self-explanatory because he does not describe or define them. Therefore, it is necessary to

69 “Eine Museumssammlung ist eine Gruppe von vorwiegend authentischen, jedenfalls origin- 
nalen sachlich zusammengehörigen Objekten einschließlich ihrer Dokumentation, die in Überein- 
stimmung mit festgelegten museologischen Kriterien gebildet und systematisch geordnet und 
70 Arens, Handbuch der katholischen Missionen, 269.
begin with some systematic thinking in order to approach the phenomenon of mission museums.

1.4.1 Previous research on mission collections/exhibitions/museums

To “collect”, to store, to preserve tangible objects might seem like an irrational activity. Why keep an object beyond the necessary time span of actual use? The answer is that this object means something that transcends the original use. Friedrich Waidacher states that the meaning of all museums was and still is, to express a specific human mindset or attitude. Therefore, it is not surprising that mission collections/exhibitions/museums, founded by many different mission organisations, exist and can be found in countries that received missionaries outside Europe. Nor that they have been founded in “sending countries” in Europe and Anglo America. Research into these categories (mission collections/exhibitions/museums) does not sharply distinguish between these forms, as it is often impossible to do so.

Generally speaking, the mission museums in the English-speaking world are better researched than those in the German-speaking countries. A growing body of literature is also based on analysing the Scandinavian mission history in relation to the “collecting” and transferring activities of missionaries. Additionally, more studies have been published on Protestant mission museums/exhibitions/collections, than Catholic. Frances Lord wrote about the collections and exhibitions by francophone Canadian Jesuits, a Catholic “exception” on Anglo American soil. There are also individual studies on Protestant mission museums/exhibitions/collections in Germany and Switzerland. Especially the mission museum in Basel receives the most attention in the literature.

I follow Chris Wingfield’s classification of what he calls “missionary museums”. He distinguishes between three categories, which are ideal types, as

---

71 Waidacher, Museologie – knapp gefasst, 11.
72 Waidacher, 15.
73 For Norway see Nielssen, Til jordens ender; for Sweden see Gustafsson Reinius, “Touring the Congo” and Helgesson Kjellin, “Science in the Name”. According to Leila Koivunun, also the Finnish Missionary Society had tours in 1911-12 with a travelling exhibition through Finland, presenting Chinese and African objects. Gustafsson Reinius, “Touring the Congo,” in History of participatory media, 95.
75 Lord, “The Silent Eloquence of”.
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they also might not be clear-cut to distinguish. Type A) is the Home Missionary Museum. That is the category that the mission museums in this study are part of. I discuss this type in detail below. But first, I present the two other types for the sake of a complete picture of how mission congregations or general actors in the mission sphere used the institution of the museum.

Type B) is the Mission Field Museum. Here, missionaries founded small-scale museums for the local population of mission field communities, often newly converted Christians. As examples, Wingfield mentions museums in Benares, Malacca, in the Congo (Kivu Museum), and in Malawi (Kungoni Centre of Culture and Art). They were often established together with libraries, and their function was often an educational one; one such museum in China was called in Chinese “Hall of New Learning”. There the exhibits were local artefacts, and beyond that they also displayed technological and scientifically objects from the West, such as a thermometer or batteries. Also, objects “collected” in far off New Guinea by the London Missionary Society were also shown and thus objects travelled from one mission field to the other, here from New Guinea to China. As the museums praised the Western way of life, as well as the benefits of the Christian faith, Wingfield concludes, “Museums of this kind in a way became missionaries in their own right, contributing through their displays to the promotion of ‘Christianity and Civilization’.” Although many of these museums developed into larger professional museums today, there is little research on them, certainly not by mission historians.

Wingfield’s third category, type C), is the Missionary Heritage Museum. These museums are “generally associated with successful evangelical efforts, and form part of a wider array of practices through which missionary histories are commemorated today.” These sites can be established on (former) mission stations in (former) mission fields, like the Hawaiian Mission Houses Historic Site or the site of Genadendal in South Africa (established in 1737 by Moravian missionaries). Africa has several more examples of this category, for example, the Nakambale Museum in Namibia.

An example of a Catholic Missionary Heritage Museum in the mission field still around today is the so-called Catholic Museum founded by the Spiritans (CSSp) in Bagamoyo, Tanzania. The museum grew out of lectures in church history by the Dutch Spiritan, P. Frits Versteijnen who exhibited objects and documents for his seminary students. The Tanzania Tourist Board asked him...
to open the exhibition to the public and today the museum is located in the former house of the sisters. The site as a whole also includes the Livingstone tower, a church and other attractions (such as a massive Baobab tree with an ingrown chain). The former head of the museum, P. Johannes Henschel, described it overall as an open-air museum taking in the old cemetery, a grotto, and a huge crucifix at the beach nearby. He also made it clear that the museum strives to become professional, including an updated exhibition that also aims to help develop Bagamoyo’s tourism. He had a clear vision for the museum because Bagamoyo has the important historical heritage of being the main collecting point of the slave trade. He wanted the museum to reflect this, the freeing of slaves by the Spiritans, and he intends to shape it to become a place of an inter-cultural encounter because Bagamoyo is both home to Christians and Muslims.81

Missionary Heritage Museums can also be founded in the “sending countries”, in Europe for example. Here, Wingfield names the David Livingstone Centre in Livingstone’s birthplace in Scotland.82 For Catholic mission history, I would categorise for example the Arnold-Janssen-Haus as such a Missionary Heritage Museum in Europe. The museum is situated in the birthplace of Arnold Janssen, the founder of the Society of the Divine Word in Goch, a town in North Rhine-Westphalia. Here, as their website says, the visitor can be close to the person Janssen and encounter the modest and deeply pious environment of Janssen’s upbringing.83 Another example would be the birthplace in Oies, South Tyrol, of Saint Josef Freinademetz, a canonised SVD missionary to China.84

I want to highlight that these two categories of museums “collect” and display the same types of objects as the European mission museums. The objects (also pictures, photographs and documents) that were presented in Bagamoyo could easily be shown in an exhibition in a European mission museum. Seashells, wood carvings, Swahili-French dictionaries, and photos of missionary sisters depicted teaching children, all these objects are typical of mission museums in German-speaking countries85, as we will see below. Ian Fairweather also mentions an object on display in the Nakambale Museum, the first Bible in Oshindonga, an object of the sort that could easily be seen in a European mission museum.86

I turn now to Wingfield’s first category, the Home Missionary Museum, which he claims is “an institution in its own right [that] appears to have been
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81 Email correspondence with P. Johannes Henschel, April 21, 2015. I want to thank P. Henschel for the interesting discussion about the topic of mission museums in general, and about his museum in Bagamoyo in particular.
84 Geburtshaus Sankt Josef Freinademetz, “Sankt Josef Freinademetz 1852–1908”. Arnold Janssen and Josef Freinademetz were canonised on the same day, 5 October 2003.
born out of the Protestant missionary expansion of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.” And further, he defines them like this:

By the early twentieth century, missionary museums displaying material sent by overseas missionaries for the benefit of supporters at “home” had been established at many locations in Europe and North America.87

He names as a first example The Missionary Museum by the London Missionary Society, founded in 1814.88 Wingfield states that a recurring motif of the museums is a “competition between the resources needed to run a museum and those involved in other forms of evangelism”. And finally, all three types of museums “have in common […] their attempt to materialize the somewhat immaterial process of conversion.”89

For German-speaking Europe, there is little research that looks precisely into what characterises mission museums.90 I will present the existing research regarding their defining and categorisation and discuss them all together afterwards.

The unpublished diploma thesis about mission museums in Germany by Gerrit Schlegel gives no conclusive definition of such a museum but the author describes the mission museums as follows: They were founded between the last decades of the 19th century until the 1930s, the functions were propaganda for the overseas mission in the general public, to gain its support. Missionaries were responsible for sending the objects. “Collecting” was done unsystematically, oriented to the interests of museum visitors. Botany, zoology, ethnography and mission history were the fields that the missionaries were “collecting” for. Some individual missionaries also had a scientific interest, which had an impact on their mission museums as well. Earlier mission museums focused on non-Christian religious artefacts though later there was a change in focus towards indigenous Christian art. Some mission museums became “pure” ethnographic museums.91

87 Wingfield, “Missionary Museums,” in Religion in museums, 231.
88 This museum networked with the Mission College in Barmen, Germany by the Rhenish Missionary Society. London sent objects to Barmen so that they could also exhibit objects. Further examples named include mission museums, as well as mission exhibitions: the Vatican mission exhibition, the Misjonsmuseet in Stavanger by the Norwegian Missionary Society, the mission museum in Helsinki by the Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Mission, and the Afrika Museum at Berg-en-Dal by the Spiritans as well as the SVD’s mission museum in Steyl (both in the Netherlands). Wingfield, 232.
89 Wingfield, 236–37.
90 Tanja Holthausen gives a short introduction into mission collections in Germany at the beginning of her article in which she presents the data of the mentioned survey of the DOK from 2016. Her characterisation, which also includes the intentions of the collections, is consistent with most of my findings. However, since she only gives a short summary of general statements without providing more in-depth sources, and since she does not strive for a definition of the mission museums, the article will not be discussed further in this section.
91 Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland,” 2.
Josef Franz Thiel, himself a former member of the Society of the Divine Word (SVD) and head of a mission museum, wrote a lexicon entry about mission museums and defined them as the following:

Mission societies operating outside Europe began early on to generate increased awareness of their engagement through public collections. Until a few decades ago, the history of religious orders and mission prevailed in these collections. But also, cultural objects were shown. Since many mission museums are older than today’s ethnological museums, there one can discover not just numerous exotic objects but also rarities. However, the collecting was only seldom systematic, so that some cultural fields as a whole are missing. In the last decades, some mission museums shifted their focus successfully to modern Christian art in the new churches and thus promoted the acceptance of non-European Christian art.92

The most recent research on mission museums is embedded in the new awoken interest in (practical) museology (Museumsberatung) as more and more mission museums in Germany seek professional help in managing their heritage. One such occasion was a conference about “mission historical collections”93, where some mission museums were also discussed. Felicity Jensz gives a definition of Protestant mission museums at the end of her article in the anthology of this conference:

A mission museum is a dynamic collection of objects, which were mainly collected by people in their activities as missionaries, especially in non-European countries, with the purpose of bringing them to a place of importance for the mission society or the order. There, they were exhibited for the benefit of the mission society, to pursue further the intention that (external) visitors could view the collected objects.94

Importantly, she highlights a crucial factor, namely the centrality of the location of the museum for the congregation.

There are several overlapping issues in these four definitions or descriptions. All of them speak of objects with a non-European origin which are presented for a European audience. They also agree that it was European missionaries who “collected” and sent the objects to Europe. The location of the museums is decidedly in Europe and Anglo America. The timeframe for the development of the museums is set in the late 19th until the first half of the 20th century. Regarding the objects, all speak of cultural artefacts. Most definitions treat the museums as a neighbour to, or subcategory of ethnographic museums. Not all mention the juxtaposition of objects from different categories

92 (my translation) Thiel, “Missionsmuseen”.
93 LVR-Fachbetrieb Regionale Kulturarbeiten, Museumsberatung, and LWL-Museumsamt für Westfalen, Missionsgeschichtliche Sammlungen heute.
94 (my translation) Jensz, “‘Kurze Anweisung Naturalien zu,’” in Missionsgeschichtliche Sammlungen heute, 25.
(natural history objects as well). Christian art is named too, especially stressed by Thiel. As motives for opening and running mission museums, the authors name the goal of making their mission engagement overseas more known in society and to increase support for it. Regarding the “collecting”, Schlegel and Thiel mention that it was unsystematic, meaning unprofessional from today’s anthropological point of view.

1.4.2 My working definition
Following this overview of the available definitions, a working definition of a mission museum was necessary to conduct this study. The working definition established boundaries and helped to identify my research objects. It made it possible to build up my list of Catholic mission museums in German-speaking countries. The working definition, as brief and precise as possible, is as follows: Mission museums are permanent and publicly accessible museums established by mission congregations in their mission houses in Europe and displaying various objects transferred from non-European mission fields by missionaries.

This definition is much shorter than the descriptions above because it is a working definition that helped me in my research. With this definition, I searched for and established the list of mission museums. In my Conclusion at the end of this thesis, this definition will be refined to include the findings of my analysis.

The intentions behind founding and operating a museum are left out since it was not needed in the search for the museums and thus intentions will be worked out during the analysis and presented at the end of my thesis.

With the working definition, I attempt to more clearly distinguish the mission museum itself from the temporary exhibitions and collections. The characteristic of permanence in a museum (meaning stable existence over the years) in contrast to the temporary character of an exhibition is crucial. But as this study will show, the distinctions are in practice not very sharp. An exhibition could have been the forerunner of a stable museum, or museum and (travelling) exhibition existed side by side, organised by the same institution. This sort of juxtaposition is especially shown in the case study of the SSPC. The character of a museum that is open to the general public is also crucial as the portraits will show.

I am aware of the growing research on Protestant and Catholic mission exhibitions and collections but, as explained, I strive to focus only on stable

---

95 Also Wingfield notes these parallel developments: “The LMS museum was ultimately overshadowed in the early twentieth century by exhibitions arranged by the Society, but in other instances museums were established following exhibitions.” Wingfield, “Missionary Museums,” in Religion in museums, 232.

96 References to these studies are to be found in Section 1.4.1.
museums. Yet I use this literature when it seems applicable to mission museums as well.

*Figure 2.* Drums and vuvuzela in the *Afrikamuseum* Riedegg CMM. Photo credit R. Loder-Neuhold.
2 Theoretical approach

In this chapter, I introduce Angela Jannelli’s approach to researching small-scale and amateurish museums, which she refers to as *wild museums*. I then introduce the theoretical frameworks for the following focal points of my thesis: “collecting”, the objects and finally, the networks.

2.1 Wild museums

In this thesis, I ask the basic question of why missionaries founded museums in Europe. To approach this theoretical research question, I take advantage of Angela Jannelli’s concept of *wild museums*. Jannelli analyses small-scale, non-professional museums in Germany to shed light on why there was such a boom in founding museums of this kind after the Second World War. These amateur museums Jannelli calls *wild museums* (in German “wilde Museen”). She also searches for the functions of these museums. Jannelli was inspired by Claude Lévi-Strauss’ work *La Pensée Sauvage* from 1962, which deals with “savage thought” vis-à-vis “scientific thought” and the *bricoleur* vis-à-vis the engineer. The wording *la pensée sauvage* is translated into German as *das wilde Denken*, which also helps explain her terminology of *wilde Museen*.

According to Lévi-Strauss, the *savage mind* or *thought* is not of inferior or lesser value than its opposite, the *scientific thought* (just as the *bricoleur* is not inferior to the *scientist* or *engineer*), rather it is on par with the *scientific thought*. It differs from Western rationality, but it is not irrational. “Just as Lévi-Strauss sees *savage thought* as an autonomous style of thinking, I would like to observe the *wild museum* as a museum style in its own right”

The reason for her choice of this theory is a parallel: Just as the advocate of Western, *scientific thought* feels traditionally superior to the *savage mind*, so do a lot of “big players” in the museum universe with its long history and influence (and secured state funding) feel superior to small non-professional
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97 Jannelli, *Wilde Museen*.
98 When the *bricoleur* arranges the exhibition, she or he takes the objects at hand and creates a coherent exhibition with them. The *wild museum* is a “bricolage museum”. The *scientist* would act differently, but would also create a coherent exhibition. Jannelli, 24–27.
99 (my translation, emphases in original) Jannelli, 25.
museums. But Angela Jannelli sees the amateur museums in a category of their own (“unabhängige Spielart der musealen Praxis”), not just as a primitive precursor to the scientific museum. Jannelli’s fundamental goal is to acknowledge the amateur museums for what they are, not to belittle them or overlook them as they have been treated in museology for too long. She argues persuasively that these museums indeed must be studied. My own research on mission museums follows her argumentation.

Although her work comes from the field of anthropology, Jannelli’s study offers a view of museums that is congruent with my own. She describes the museum as practice, an expression of the cultural techniques of “collecting” and exhibiting. I share her view on museums which is oriented on the practice.

The starting point in Jannelli’s research is the boom in founding amateur museums after 1945. She asks, why it became so popular to “collect”, to gather and to exhibit, why were so many people engaged in these activities. Therefore she focuses not only on the surface (aka the exhibition), but on the cultural practices.

The focus is not on what is depicted, but rather on “doing museum” as a cultural practice. With the term wild museum, I would like to describe a special variation of the museum, a specific form of expression of the cultural techniques of collecting and exhibiting.

Following her approach towards her wild museums, I focus in this study not so much on what mission museums looked like on the stage (in the exhibition), but on the actions behind it, on what is backstage. A museum, as defined above, is not merely the exhibition that visitors can enter on Sunday afternoon, it is also a practice, it is the sum of actions that happen behind the scenes, as well as within the displayed scenes. I call this practice “doing museum”.

Jannelli’s concept includes an axis with the opposite poles wild and scientific in order to characterize the museums. One must keep in mind that there is no sharp division between these two descriptions nor does her description of wild museums always completely cover some of the mission museums.

Jannelli analyses three examples of wild museums in Germany, and all three show similarities to mission museums; she examines the staging, that is to say the exhibitions, as well as backstage, regarding the intentions and underlying functions. Jannelli’s first example, the McNair Museum in Berlin, continues to give identity and community to the employees of former allied military forces, as well as preserving the memory of dead colleagues. Her second case, the Museum Elbinsel Wilhelmsburg in Hamburg, portrays a utopian passed world as well as a change in generations. The third case, the Bienen Museum
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100 The big players even feel threatened by the “liberty” or forwardness of these smaller museums to also label themselves museums. Jannelli, 29.
102 Jannelli, 16–19.
103 (my translation, emphasis in original) Jannelli, 23. I translate Museumsmachen as “doing museum”.
Moorrege (bee museum), aims for continuity in beekeeping in the area as well as recruiting new beekeepers.

Jannelli does not give a detailed checklist of features that constitute a *wild museum*, but I name some of the most important characteristics of them that are spread out in her study. A typical *wild museum* is small in scale, depends on voluntary workers and those involved are its curators, exhibition designers, museum pedagogues and guides often in one person.\textsuperscript{104} Its future is usually not completely financially secure.\textsuperscript{105} It seems to be a world of its own, rather more like a private circle where not everyone is really welcome.\textsuperscript{106} The enclosed cafés or meeting places are often the most frequented rooms in the museums, and they have profound importance in the whole frame of the museum, for events and meetings, but also as places for work meetings.\textsuperscript{107} The *wild museum* lacks precise documentation about its history and its collection.\textsuperscript{108}

Regarding attitudes toward “collected” objects: In the *wild museum*, the object is seen as a symbol, as an allegory, and it is a tool for action. The *scientific museum* sees the object as a semaphore that illustrates an abstract concept (like a ritual, or a cultural practice).\textsuperscript{109} In the *wild museum*, the involved persons have a high personal identification with the objects and for them to have experiences with the objects is important.\textsuperscript{110} Following this, the exhibits are handled with less caution and distance than the common visitor is taught by *scientific museums*. *Wild museums* often allow the touching of authentic objects or even promote it.\textsuperscript{111}

Regarding the exhibition design: The most obvious characteristic is the overabundance of objects in the exhibition of a *wild museum*: “Everything” the museum owns seems to be on display, space is used to its maximum. In contrast, *scientific museums* are often focusing on a single example of an object category and use the individual object to express the content. In the *wild museum*, there is no strict division between a public collection and a study collection.\textsuperscript{112} A *wild museum* often lacks good signposting from the outside,\textsuperscript{113} has a small entrance or little attention is paid to create a welcoming atmosphere. The exhibition starts right away after entering the building.\textsuperscript{114} At first

\textsuperscript{104} Jannelli, 49.
\textsuperscript{105} Jannelli, 24.
\textsuperscript{106} Jannelli, 131. One can also speak of an “insider museum”.
\textsuperscript{107} Jannelli, 190–95.
\textsuperscript{108} Jannelli, 186.
\textsuperscript{109} Jannelli, 323. One example Jannelli discusses is a military uniform as an exhibit. In the *wild museum* it refers to the former owner; it is on display to prove a connection to the owner who may have passed away. The uniform reminds the viewer of a special event. In a *scientific museum* the uniform stands as an abstract for militarism, nationalism or the army. It does not have a direct, personal connection. Jannelli, 32.
\textsuperscript{110} Jannelli, 184–85.
\textsuperscript{111} Jannelli, 240.
\textsuperscript{112} Jannelli, 23; 26; 153.
\textsuperscript{113} Jannelli, 128.
\textsuperscript{114} Jannelli, 131.
glance, there is no logic in the composition of objects. The logic is not evident for the normal visitor and the outsider. The exhibition in the wild museum lacks clear marking between original and copy. Means of exclusion or distancing the visitor from the exhibits like vitrines and podiums are not as often used as in scientific museums.

When it comes to conveying the information, wild museums differ from scientific museums distinctly. They lack several sorts of texts such as entrance texts for a whole room/topic or context texts, while object descriptions are common. Like in scientific museums, didactic exhibits such as maps, models, and charts are used. As Jannelli says several times, the communication is done orally, that means a guided tour by an insider is necessary. Personal communication is essential. However, texts can have been written by academic scholars, too. A goal of transfer from the museum to visitors can be expertise (“know-that”). But it is not the sole goal of the museum.

For my study, I use Jannelli’s axis with the poles of non-scientific (in place of her label, wild) and scientific museum. However, I add another axis – professional and amateurish museum – in order to describe the complex nature of museums in a more nuanced way (see Table 1).

There is a difference between professional and scientific, and between non-scientific and amateurish. Scientific/non-scientific refers to the content (the information that the museum provides), professional/amateurish refers to the surface (the presentation, the design, the documenting and archiving) of a museum. Thus, four areas of locating the museums are possible when the two axes are brought together. For example, many museums are dedicated to non-scientific topics, like the thimble or football museum mentioned by Waidacher. At the same time, those museums can be very professional in their “doing museum”. Such museums would be located in the top left quarter of this chart as they are non-scientific and professional. In Table 1, four mission museums that I randomly chose among the mission museums in this study are added to indicate the possibility of locating the analysed museums on this chart.

115 Jannelli, 131.
116 Jannelli, 143.
117 Jannelli, 351.
118 Jannelli, 94; 153–154.
119 Jannelli, 177.
I give some examples of what these characterisations could mean in the context of the mission museums:

- **non-scientific**: conveying correct information about the subject of the museum is not the goal. Object descriptions are missing, have gaps or make generalisations;
- **scientific**: exhibition has an educational aim, object descriptions and texts are correct, museum curators are academically trained scientists in the respective fields, there is a division between the study collection and the public collection;
- **professional**: clear structure in the exhibition, coherent exhibition design as for example a colour scheme, display cases and vitrines store the exhibits, and externally produced charts, graphs and maps are used to convey information to visitors;
- **amateurish**: few or no texts are provided, object descriptions or signs are improvised and hand-made, often an over-abundance of objects;

According to the characteristics that they feature, mission museums can be positioned along the two axes. The museums above the axis of professional versus amateurish, the ones that were more “wild” than scientific are the ones...
I refer to as independent mission museums. These independent mission museums can be more professional or more amateurish.

To sum it up, I use mainly the terms of independent museums and scientific museums when analysing the mission museums. The more nuanced description within the independent museums is done with the axis of professional and amateurish. It is important to stress that this chart signals that the analysed museums are not put into distinctly boxed categories, but that they are placed along axes. There are features of the mission museums that make them be located closer to this pole or to another, but there is no complete identification with any of these four poles.

2.2 “Collecting”

The second theoretical aspect I want to consider is the term and the process of “collecting”. The discussion about “collecting” as a cultural phenomenon is lengthy; however, I focus here only on issues that are of significance for the mission museums: material “collecting” by missionaries from the mid-19th century onwards. Even with only the focus on the missionaries, there is a good amount of research available. Barbara Lawson states that “missionary collecting gained scholarly attention as a distinct domain of investigation.”

For a museum, the act of “collecting” is its very foundation otherwise its display cases and depots would be empty. The importance of “collecting” for
early anthropologists in their whole working processes is partly to be explained by the fact that fieldwork was financed by museums. Without missionaries “collecting”, mission museums would not exist, and ethnographical museums would miss many collections because missionaries were also “collecting” for secular ethnographic museums.

As mentioned already in the Introduction, missionaries “collected” also immaterial things including scientific observations, knowledge, languages (through writing grammars, glossaries and documenting and recording folk tales, songs or proverbs), and data like measurements (such as body measurements or temperatures). But such “collected” items could not be put directly behind glass into the mission museums, or any other museum, and are therefore not in focus here.

The long and stable location of missionaries added to this “natural” habit:

By living amongst a people for an extended period of time, missionaries gained their trust and placed themselves in a position to collect many objects not available to transient collectors.

The act of “collecting” by missionaries can be described as a normal part of their many activities. As mentioned in the Introduction, already from the 16th century onwards it is documented that missionaries – here the Jesuits – “collected” and sent all sorts of things to Europe: for example starfish, chocolate, or a hammock. The “collecting” went hand in hand with the deployment of missionaries to convert non-Christians overseas. This mindset continued through the centuries and was true for both Catholic and Protestant missionaries. For example, David Livingstone (1813–1873), the famous “missionary explorer”, gathered a broad range of objects which ended up in Western museums. The National Museum of Scotland holds its own Livingstone collection.

One could go as far as say that it would have been odd if missionaries – often solely because of their location – would not have been “collecting” as well. Because it was a self-evident way of behaving as Westerners, being foreign in those places and having the networks to transport the “collected” goods

---

122 Harriet Völker reports that in the early 20th century, a Lutheran missionary was paid for one box of ethnographic objects from Australia the same sum as his annual earnings. Völker, “Missionare als Ethnologen,” in Sammeln, Vernetzen, Auswerten, 204. Other explanations were to demonstrate the economic potential of the region of origin, or the aim to put the discipline of ethnology onto empirical foundations with the help of objects. Fabian, “Curios and curiosity,” in The scramble for art in Central Africa, 83–84.

123 Just as one example of many: Carl Strehlow, a Neuendettelsau Mission Society member in Australia, “collected” for the ethnographic museum in Frankfurt. The museum had the preemptive right to Strehlow’s collection. In exchange, the museum helped him in publishing his own research. Völker, “Missionare als Ethnologen,” in Sammeln, Vernetzen, Auswerten, 177–92.


125 Moser, “Neues Wissen für Europa”.

126 Worden, “‘Livingstone’s Loom’, Malawi.”
further to Europe/Anglo-America/Australia. Joshua Bell says of London Missionary Society members in New Guinea from around the 1870s until 1900:

Not only was the region awash in natural history specimens, but most, if not all of the new residents, European and Pacific Islander alike, collected and traded them.127

In short, in the 19th century ethnographic “collecting” “belonged to the general Zeitgeist”128.

For many involved actors, “collecting” often went en passant. Some missionaries “collected” without much reflection, as this thesis will show. I want to pay attention to this activity in my analysis in the case studies. Raymond Corbey and Karel Weener write that the “collecting and converting missionaries and various other parties” call for critical evaluation, especially regarding the colonial frame.129 This evaluation is what I am aiming at. Therefore, definitions like the following are for me not revealing enough:

Collecting may be defined as a process by which samples of a complex whole are removed from their meaningful and functional context in order to be preserved under artificial conditions and within a new frame of reference.130

The verb “removing” is a step in the right direction, but for analysing how exactly the objects were removed, I demand further elaboration. Helpful is Johannes Fabian’s remark:

Because we call what eventually got to museums or private owners “collections” we do not think twice when we refer to the activities involved in assembling objects as collecting. In fact, collecting is one of those terms full of connotations and hence replete with unreflected ideological presuppositions. Semantically, collecting has an aura of innocence – just picking up things that are there for the picking.131

This “aura of innocence” articulates in my point of view the often highly problematic circumstances of how the objects were removed from their original

---

128 Nielssen, Okkenhaug, and Hestad Skeie, “Introduction,” in Protestant missions and local encounters in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, 7. However, this involvement of missionaries in “collecting” and trading should get even more attention by historians than it has so far. Corbey and Weener stated in 2015 that so far this topic is underexplored: “While there is an abundant literature on shared (between makers and takers) ‘colonial’, non-European European cultural heritage in general, the pivotal role of missionaries in the latter’s convoluted trajectories and the interpretations it received has hardly been studied systematically yet.” Corbey and Weener, “Collecting while converting,” 1.
129 “A critical, in-depth evaluation is needed of the precise role collecting and converting missionaries and various other parties played in colonial settings, in particular indigenous parties […].” Corbey and Weener, 2.
context. As Fabian points out: “[B]oth kinds of collecting [natural specimens and artefacts] were always mediated by, among others, political and economic relations.”

Throughout this thesis, I put the verb “collecting” and the noun “collector” in quotation marks to recall this semantic concealment and to mark the many layers implied in this term. The collection as a noun for the objects which create together a new entity in the Western museum is not put in quotation marks because its situation as an artificially constructed entity by actors (scholars, curators, or museum custodians) is more obvious.

I want to raise several issues here about the “collector” missionary. Missionaries actively “collected” both natural history objects and artefacts. The first activity is connected to an interest in natural history and some Catholic orders and congregations, like the Jesuits, have since the early modern times been engaged in hard scientific research and knowledge exchange in their overseas mission fields. This research included “collecting”, as the example of the skeleton of a rhinoceros shows which was “unearthed by [French] Jesuit scholar-scientists and Mongol villagers and sent to Paris” to the Muséum d’Histoire Naturelle in 1926. The Museo Kircheriano (mentioned above) is, of course, the best example of this overlap of scientific interest, missionary order and museum.

Those involved in scientific “collecting” often categorised the remains of non-European people as natural specimens too. For the early 19th century, in Africa, for example, “collectors” had this mindset:

German collectors […] were also actively involved in the collecting, storing, and trading or donating of human skulls, skeletons, and even preserved flesh, adopting in the process the same methods and techniques of storage and preservation as for their other mammal finds.

Missionaries of different backgrounds were involved in this kind of “collecting”, as is shown by research so far and will be discussed in this study as well. Also missionaries in this study “collected” human remains and transported them to European museums. The appropriation of human remains was for Western “collectors” and researchers a natural part of their work.

132 Fabian, 88.
133 See for example Harris, “Jesuit Scientific Activity in”.
134 Manias, “Jesuit Scientists and Mongolian,” 308.
135 Grogan, “German Natural History Collectors,” in Explorations in African History, 65.
136 Helgesson Kjellin, “Science in the Name”.
137 For example, the German explorer Richard Parkinson sold thirty-four human skulls from the South Pacific to museums. Specht, “Traders and Collectors: Richard,” 27. The above mentioned Neuendettelsau missionary Carl Strehlow (located in Australia) was asked by his “agent” in Germany to send skulls and whole skeletons of locals, because these were in high demand in Europe. But, the agent stressed, these would be hard to get “for a missionary”. Völker, “Missionare als Ethnologen,” in Sammeln, Vernetzen, Auswerten, 206.
However, ethnographic “collecting” is more important for this thesis because of the centrality of ethnographic objects in the mission museums. First, I want to draw attention to the wide range of ethnographic objects since there is a difference between “collecting” everyday objects, like fishing nets or cutlery, and “collecting” ritual or sacred objects (such as the statue of a deity). The difference lies in the meaning and importance that the manufacturers and first owners attributed to the particular object. Whereas cutlery is most of the times a staple commodity, could be easily replaced, and there is seldom a deep emotional connection to such an item, the ritual object could be a unique piece, a one-of-a-kind artwork, and have great significance for the original community.\footnote{Johannes Fabian says of the “collecting” of curios that they were “a commodity of distinction because threatened by extinction”\cite{Fabian1993}. This raises an additional factor, that some objects were threatened precisely because of the big demand by Westerners.}

These differences among what was “collected” are less obvious from a Western perspective or for the visitor of a Western museum. The cutlery and ritual object might be presented in the same way, side by side, with both representing the culture of the source community they came from.

Johannes Fabian sees commodification as a prerequisite for ethnographic “collecting”. It means objects which were not for sale and trade before the arrival of Westerners became upon their arrival commodities, that are articles of merchandise.\footnote{The process of “collecting” included a broad range of activities, all of which were within the frame of colonialism and colonial power relations. I indicate here some possible activities, which will show up later in the study in detail:}

\textbf{Purchasing:} Missionaries purchased objects from locals, which included haggling and negotiating. This could, for example, mean that itinerant sellers came to the missionary homes several times per week and offered their objects. As a case in China shows, a Protestant missionary couple did not even have to leave their porch in order to “collect”.\footnote{Willmott, “The paradox of gender,” 142. In this dynamic, locals turned into sellers, “something that did not fit the image of savages who may ‘barter’ or incidentally part with their objects but are not expected to have mercantile ambitions.”\cite{Willmott1993}}

\footnote{Harriet Völker mentions for example tjurungas, objects that were used in sacred ceremonies by Central Australian people, and which the missionary Carl Strehlow should “collect” and send to Germany. Those objects were traditionally not allowed to be touched or even seen by non-indigenous people. Völker, 205.}

\footnote{Fabian, “Curios and curiosity,” in \textit{The scramble for art in Central Africa}, 94.}

\footnote{Fabian, 93.}

\footnote{Fabian, “Curios and curiosity,” in \textit{The scramble for art in Central Africa}, 91.}
Commissioning: One way of obtaining objects was to commission local artists. Sometimes the primary sources can even name the artist, and it becomes clear that there was a personal relationship between the missionary and the artist of the object. Examples of this are discussed in the SVD and MSC case studies.

Exchange: Objects were non-monetarily exchanged against European articles of merchandise or services, for example, for medical help. The case studies of the SSPC and SVD will show some examples of this sort of exchange.

“Picking up”: Some missionaries claimed that they – literally – picked up some objects from the trash. From the missionaries’ standpoint, those objects had no rightful owner anymore and could therefore really be taken without hesitation. Such an example can be found in the SVD case study.

Abandonment at conversion: Objects changed their possessor in connection to the very act of converting. As a sign of leaving the former religious affiliation, the owners gave ritual objects from the former belief to the missionaries. An example from the SVD is the handing over of a cult crocodile by a Christian village to the missionary P. Heinrich Lehner SVD. “According to Lehner, the villagers parted in tears from their cult crocodile, which they had previously adored as their guardian spirit.”

Here lies the thin line between seeing the agency of locals who voluntarily pass on their former religious objects as an act from conviction, and acknowledging that the same act could happen in a deeply oppressive context. The cult crocodile example raises the question of local internal power relations. Who decided about a cult object that was the property of the whole village? The tears express the emotional factors of such transfers of ownership.

Another example is a sudden conversion of fifty villagers on one of the smallest Batu Islands (West Sumatra) in 1927. The converts brought their ritual objects which were buried in a hole near the Lutheran church, accompanied by a song. “Many objects were buried, but the sources show that a number of others, undoubtedly the artistically more interesting ones, were collected” because according to Corbey and Weener, similar objects turned up on photos of a temporary mission exhibition in Zeist in 1935. What made the villagers suddenly want to become Christians and destroy their precious religious objects? Other spontaneous large-scale conversions happened in 1926–1927 as well. The explanation for these sudden changes of mind lies in the fact that at that time a Communist uprising happened in West Sumatra. The Islanders were afraid of the Dutch authorities and their military force. The locals,

---

143 A significant case is the sending of “family idols” by the Tahitian chief Pomare II to the London Missionary Society in 1816, accompanied by a letter with explanations for his action. For more details see Nuku, “The Family Idols of”.


145 Corbey and Weener, “Collecting while converting,” 9. This article offers more such examples.
therefore “emphatically started to present themselves as Christians, and therefore not Communists.” According to sources written by missionaries, the locals had handed over their objects voluntarily, but looking at the wider context, this was not a voluntary act, rather the contrary.

Except for the cases where solely force and violence were used, which will be mentioned soon, all these circumstances of what the process of “collecting” looked like involve the question of indigenous agency. This is a factor which is too often neglected, as Karen Jacobs writes. The missionaries often depended on local intermediaries and middlemen in the mission fields. Some portraits and the case studies cast light on this neglected role of local people in the process, for example, the case of Werl OFM where high Chinese province officials helped missionary Remigius Goette to “collect” rare coins.

What becomes clear in the literature and in this study is that the sources often do not mention the locals’ names and identities and only the Western “collectors” gained recognition for the scientific progress that was achieved through their “collecting”. This recognition and acknowledgement was for example expressed when new species were given Latin names which indicated the “collectors”, in other words, the missionaries or the middlemen.

Stealing and looting: The last available means of “collecting” to be addressed here is violently forcing the surrender of objects, stealing and looting. As for example, the portrait of a Franciscan mission museum (Hall in Tirol OFM) shows, parts of the collection came from a “punitive expedition” on the Ayoreoode groups. “Collecting” here means gathering war booty.

Also using the local children for “organising” objects that the adults refuse to sell is part of this kind of “collecting” which takes all advantage of the imbalance in power (see SVD case study). Also, the MSC case study gives good insights into these processes.

146 Corbey and Weener, 8.
147 “In the case of missionary collecting in particular, the tendency to view the collection and display of the objects as trophies of missionary success and as testimonials of conversion neglects the role of local people in the collecting process.” Jacobs, “Inscribing missionary impact in,” 267–68.
148 Wilms-Reinking, “Gesellschaft der reisenden Brüder,” in Reisen, entdecken, sammeln, 97. Many such cooperative processes could be quoted here. How organised this “collecting” could seem shows for example in the hiring of local teachers by Reverend James Chalmers, which means they got paid for their efforts. Every teacher had a different class of object to “collect”, one “collected” clubs, another shields, another beetles. Bell, “Bird Specimen, Papua New,” in Trophies, relics and curios?, 59.
149 The source does not mention the names of the teachers who “collected” for the Reverend Chalmers. Bell, 59.
150 An example from the beginning of the 20th century is the case of Moritz Freiherr von Leonhardi. For a small payment, locals in Australia “collected” animals and insects, which were sent by a missionary to Leonhardi in Germany, who transferred them to other German scholars. The Latin names of new discoveries honoured only Leonhardi, the middleman and ignored the missionary and the aboriginal people in Australia. For the whole process see Völker, “Missionare als Ethnologen,” in Sammeln, Vernetzen, Auswerten, 207.
As the previous example from Batu Islands shows, one crucial aspect is that the “collecting” and transport to European museums “saved” those particular objects from being destroyed: The context was iconoclasm, however “the very act of collecting led to the preservation, rather than the destruction, of these ‘idols’.”\(^\text{151}\) The research that Karen Jacobs sums up in her article turns many supposedly clear oppositions of preservation and destruction up-side-down. A lengthy debate of this is out of the scope of this theory chapter. However, I want to stress that this preservation meant the transfer of the objects to and their presence in Europe or Anglo-America, far away from the place of origin. With exceptions, this removal has lasted until today. The alternative from the locals’ point of view was, therefore, destruction \textit{in situ} or the vanishing into a public museum or private collection overseas.

A key aspect is the gender of the “collector”. For Catholic missionaries, the education and preparation of female and male missionaries before embarking on a mission overseas were very different. To put it simply, only priests received a higher or even academic education, whereas missionary sisters and brothers were given practical education.\(^\text{152}\) That led to very different knowledge regarding “collecting” and the further transport of the objects. SVD missionaries with academic training in anthropology had other qualifications relevant to “collecting” than missionary sisters who were educated as nurses or brothers trained as carpenters. But untrained “collectors” were the norm in the 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} century. Brief brochures gave some tips and tricks on how to gather, prepare and transport the objects. They were written for colonial officers, navy personnel, and medical doctors.\(^\text{153}\) The case studies show that such brochures were also sent out to missionaries.

However the processes of “collecting” seemed close up, a cultural change was undeniable, for example commodification of items belonging to locals. And, the missionaries were complicit in this regardless of the motives behind their “collecting”. Recalling the question of indigenous agency: While agreeing that in “post-colonial reassessments of colonialism, the presence of ethnographic objects in Euro-American museums”\(^\text{154}\) must be critically challenged,

\(^{151}\) Jacobs, “Inscribing missionary impact in,” 268.

\(^{152}\) The priests were among other fields trained in mission studies, linguistics, anthropology, colonial right, and tropical medicine. For a contemporary overview over what the priests of classical missionary congregations like the SVD, missionary Benedictines, Spiritans, and White Fathers were trained see Arens, \textit{Handbuch der katholischen Missionen}, 188–204. The missionary brothers received along with their spiritual studies a purely practical education in craftsmanship of different kinds. The missionary sisters were trained in practical fields such as household management, garden maintenance, nursing care, needlework, and a little bit in music and arts. Arens, 204–206. Already the attention that Arens gives to the education of priests (sixteen pages) versus brothers and sisters (together three pages) shows the difference of the pre-mission education for different groups of Catholic missionaries. But also for the Protestant missionaries who “collected”, gender was a crucial aspect. See Gaitskell, “Dora Earthy’s Mozambique”; Willmott, “The paradox of gender”; Livne, “The Many Purposes of”.

\(^{153}\) Sarreiter, “‘Ich glaube, dass die,” in \textit{Was Wir Sehen}, 48–49.

\(^{154}\) Jacobs, \textit{Collecting Kamoro}, 22.
I show in this thesis that there is more to be learnt from analysing the phenomenon of “missionary collecting” – especially in regard to the agency of local people – when not all “collecting” is automatically indicted as looting or violent appropriation.\footnote{I state this in agreement with Karen Jacobs, who writes: “Other scholars realised that collecting activities could not always be equated with pillage, and they argued that the study of collecting could reveal both obvious and overlooked aspects of colonialism.” Jacobs, 23. Jacobs names an example where the disposal after ceremonial use would traditionally mean to leave the object in the bush to decay but selling it to foreigners was “considered an appropriate alternative which brought valuable imports to the community“.

155 Sarreiter, “Ich glaube, dass die,” in Was Wir Sehen, 48.

156 Also stated in Schindlbeck, “Rotes Tuch und Ahnenmasken,” in Aus Westfalen in die Südsee, 226.

157 I want to stress the respect for all actors in the networks that are at stake here. David Maxwell notes in an interview how some scholarship is making fun of missionaries: “In this literature they [the missionaries, RLN] become a joke. There is a type of scholarship, which doesn’t respect missionaries in the same way as it respects Africans or Indians.” Egger and Gugglberger, “Doing Mission History,” 165.}

However, returning to the question of who is at the centre of attention in this study, that is the missionaries. Regina Sarreiter brings Gayatri Spivak’s concept of epistemic violence into the discussion of “collecting” for Western museums. Sarreiter states that this violence, connected to the production of knowledge and definitive power in colonialism, is prolonged when those who “collected” and categorised remain the focus of today’s research. She states that the information about objects included the name of the “collector”, when it was acquired and when it was integrated into a collection, whereas information about the local producers and owners is missing because they were seen as irrelevant.\footnote{Sarreiter, “Ich glaube, dass die,” in Was Wir Sehen, 48.}

I agree with Sarreiter’s statement that the source situation is problematic because its angle is always from a Western point of view. Doubtless, most of the time sources in missionary archives hinder elaborating on the indigenous owner’s perspective. The wider context of transfer of ownership that can be labelled forced consent is mostly not possible to be disclosed entirely. However, I want to stress that this blank space is not specific for “missionary collecting” but is true for all (Western) “collecting” and the art trade of this time.\footnote{Also stated in Schindlbeck, “Rotes Tuch und Ahnenmasken,” in Aus Westfalen in die Südsee, 226.}

But the consequence of such a view (epistemic violence) is that questions such as these remain untouched. I suggest, contrary to this standpoint, that my study design does not prolong the epistemic violence. Thus, it is valid to research the “collectors” and the act of “collecting” in the available sources, when at the same time this one-sided perspective is acknowledged and not brushed over slightly. Avoiding looking into the origins of the collections in mission museums would not help anyone. Taking the “collecting” seriously, includes taking the former producers and owners seriously.\footnote{I want to stress the respect for all actors in the networks that are at stake here. David Maxwell notes in an interview how some scholarship is making fun of missionaries: “In this literature they [the missionaries, RLN] become a joke. There is a type of scholarship, which doesn’t respect missionaries in the same way as it respects Africans or Indians.” Egger and Gugglberger, “Doing Mission History,” 165.}
2.3 Objects

A helpful theoretical approach towards the objects is provided by Karen Jacobs and Chris Wingfield’s introduction to British missionary heritage entitled *Trophies, Relics and Curios*? They use these three contemporary terms for the objects presented in the mission exhibitions and museums in Britain as their starting point.\(^{159}\)

The term *trophy* comes from the “markers of military victory” in Ancient Greek and later Latin (*tropaia, tropaeum*). More recently it is used in the sporting and hunting context. Examples of portraying objects as trophies in the mission context are “family idols” given by the Tahitian chief Pomare II to the London Missionary Society\(^{160}\), or a female statuette from Tonga in the context of conversion to Christianity. A stuffed giraffe, presented in the London Missionary Society museum in the 19th century, is literally also a hunting trophy. However, these objects were also presented as trophies that marked the “successes” of the missionaries in the mission fields, meaning the conversions of individuals or groups. But with these examples in *Trophies, Relics and Curios?*, the authors try to uncover several more senses of the word trophies. One such example is a brass necklace from Uganda. Rachel Hand asks the question, if in this special case it was the original owners who interpreted the abandoned (= gifted) object as their trophy because it became then part of the highly esteemed Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology in Cambridge, a globally known centre of learning?\(^{161}\) Thus, a transferred object can become a sort of “reverse trophy” when seen from the former owners’ perspective, conferring on them the appreciation and prestige of being connected to such a prestigious institution.

*Relic* is a term strongly tied to early and medieval Christianity when remains and material possessions of saints and martyrs were kept and venerated. In Catholicism, relics are still a vital issue of lived religiosity, whereas the Protestant Reformation rejected the importance of relics. Jacobs and Wingfield note, therefore: “It is strange then that British Protestant Missionary Societies of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries should use the term relic at all.”\(^{162}\) But obviously, also Protestant mission enthusiasts wanted to honour passed missionaries and were interested in their former possessions, for example, in David Livingstone’s belongings.

\(^{159}\) Also Barbara Lawson names relics and curiosities as two terms for objects that she encountered in the sources about “collecting” missionaries. Lawson, “Collecting Cultures,” in *Canadian missionaries, indigenous peoples*, 256.

\(^{160}\) For this case see in detail Jacobs, “Inscribing missionary impact in” and Thomas, *Entangled Objects*, 154–56.

\(^{161}\) Hand, “Brass Necklet, Uganda”.

\(^{162}\) Jacobs and Wingfield, “Introduction,” in *Trophies, relics and curios?*, 15.
In *Trophies, Relics and Curios?*, eight examples of relics are presented. Seven are material objects, like shoes or a mask. The ruins of a church in Botswana are also categorised as a relic. Only one example presents a relic in its original meaning, namely “the mortal remains of a saint”\(^\text{163}\). The human remains of the Anglican Bishop John Patteson, who was murdered in 1871 on the beach at Nukapu (Solomon Islands), were never transferred to Europe, but are still venerated today in the Cathedral in Honiara. Therefore, we can conclude that following Jacobs and Wingfield, relic in its broad meaning not only refers to human remains of dead and martyred missionaries but also to objects which have a direct connection to an important missionary.

The term *curio*, short for curiosity, is a “value-laden term which expressed a rather dismissive attitude towards the items it was used to describe”\(^\text{164}\). Objects were labelled curios when the Western visitor found them uncommon, peculiar and, I would add, exotic. This term stands in connection to the *Wunderkammer*, the cabinet of curiosities from the 16\(^{th}\) and 17\(^{th}\) century. In this context, natural history objects, as well as artefacts, were gathered together. The authors highlight that the term has twofold significance, associating it with wonder and interest, but also with condemnation. The examples for curios were often the product of the missionary encounter itself. Their working definition is: Objects “that cannot be explained by reference to pre-existing cultural practices in Africa, the Pacific or Europe, but emerge from the cross fertilization of these different worlds”\(^\text{165,166}\).

These three terms are used as a starting point in approaching the objects in the mission museums and give more insight into the matter, intermingled with the approach towards “collecting”. Looking more carefully at the objects also helps to work out the intentions and motivations behind founding and running a mission museum.

### 2.4 Networks

One main issue in this study is the existence of networks behind the museums which were needed for equipping them with exhibits. A network can be defined as “a collection of relationships (edges) connecting the nodes in a particular sample”\(^\text{167}\). That means it has two basic elements: actors and relations (plus non-relations). Actors can be persons. For example, A is befriended by B, A exchanges industrial goods with B, A and B are on the same supervisory board, etc. In these examples A and B would be nodes, friendship relation or
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\(^{163}\) “Relic”.

\(^{164}\) Jacobs and Wingfield, “Introduction,” in *Trophies, relics and curios?*, 17.

\(^{165}\) Jacobs and Wingfield, 19.

\(^{166}\) Jacobs and Wingfield, 11–19.

\(^{167}\) Adams, “Network analysis,” in *The Routledge handbook of research methods in the study of religion*, 323.
goods exchange are the edges between them. Actors can also be institutions or organisations.

The increasing use of the term network calls for a critical standpoint. Christoph Boyer states that networks are overrated as a theoretical passe-partout:

The network term often means nothing more than the rather banal fact that much is connected with much, possibly even everything is connected with everything.168

The sheer factor that human beings are as such in connection and relation to each other makes almost everything related to people possible to be labelled as a network. Nevertheless, the global connections of missionaries to each other and to actors outside of the mission context justify in every case the network approach. One could say that missionaries are networkers par excellence. The applicability of the network approach in this thesis is discussed in Section 3.2.

---

3 Methodological approach

In her study of the wild museums, Angela Jannelli used anthropological methods for her analysis such as thick description and participant observation and she conducted interviews with current museum guides and museum organizers. My sample of museums includes those that were closed a long time ago and so it is not possible to use these methods as Jannelli did. 169 My goal of covering the whole period of a museum’s existence, not just the present time and currently open museums, led me to base my study on archived material. Where it is helpful, I use the gathered knowledge and impressions from my visits to some of the museums in my study. In the years 2013 and 2014, I visited twelve museums in total. 170 Two were already closed, and the former exhibition was removed, but I could see its surroundings and I had access to archived material (Immensee SMB and Innsbruck OFMCap). St. Gabriel SVD was officially closed, but nevertheless, I could see the remaining exhibition rooms, which were nearly untouched since closure in 2005. St. Augustin SVD has very restricted opening hours now and at the time of my visit it was uncertain if it will open or fully close. However, I had an arranged guided tour with the director, Jerzy Skrabania SVD.

During my visits, I could see and experience the exhibition, talk to the present responsible missionaries and take photos. These visits were paid early in the process of this study, and they were not planned as an outright museum analysis such as Angela Jannelli’s study. I do not claim that the observations from the visits are a crucial part of my approach, but my notes and photos are used for completing the picture of mission museums in the German-speaking countries. I must mention that only on two occasions were there other visitors in the museum (St. Augustin SVD and Schweiklberg OSB). On all the other occasions, I was the only visitor in the museum which made an approach such as participant observation, for example, impossible.

169 Jannelli for example used participant observation in guided tours where she recorded and then transcribed the conversations. With this, she documented the communicating of content and the interaction between the responsible persons in the museum, the visitors and the exhibits. Jannelli, Wilde Museen, 77.
170 The eight open museums I visited are Maria Sorg SSPC, Liefering MSC, St. Ottilien OSB (partly under renovation at the time of my visit), Zug SSPC, Fiecht OSB, Riedegg CMM, Menzingen, and Schweiklberg OSB. Fiecht OSB closed some time after my visit.
3.1 Primary sources

The setup of the study and thus the structure of the thesis is dependent on the existence and availability of primary sources. The religious institutes that founded the mission museums did not prioritize the museums and so the source situation is often “thin”. As others have already noted, it “is not easy to locate source material related to missionary dealings with ethnographic objects.”171

In some cases, the Second World War had a negative impact on the source situation, when the property was targeted by air raids, and archival material went up in flames. Some missionaries also destroyed documents that could be dangerous for them under the Nazi regime. The war impacted all three of my case studies. As a result of this, in some cases, I often had to rely on conversations with today’s congregation members, sisters and brothers, archivists and their like as the only sources for information on some mission museums.

But generally, it is rare to find available – and accessible – sources of information about these museums in their archives or mother houses. Sometimes it was hard to get at least the needed information to build up the list of basic data about the mission museums in the German-speaking countries (see Appendix: Portraits of mission museums in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland).

In addition to difficulties related to sources, many congregations today face profound challenges, especially the lack of young members and also financial problems. The composition of the congregations had started to change from about the 1960s onwards and is still changing. The congregations have become more diverse, which means that many younger members now come from Non-European countries. Late vocations are also becoming more frequent. However, the most central issue is the ageing of the congregations.

Due to the thin “staffing level”, it is often out of the question for a museum to engage its own internal archivist (missionary) and an externally trained archivist is costly. There were, however, at least two external archivists with whom I had more frequent contact. Both confirmed that their situation was exceptional.

This situation means that most congregations simply did not have the personnel to deal with my questions. Some congregations were cautious about handing out information, perhaps due to the described challenges. At the same time, occasionally I felt welcome when asking for primary sources or literature, my interest in their history was positively received, and I felt encouraged to pose questions. My having German as a mother tongue helped. All in all, I can say that the female congregations were more open and encouraging to my research, which might have to do with my gender.

Often the first reaction after establishing contact with the congregations was to belittle their own museum and their own collection with statements in

---

171 Corbey and Weener, “Collecting while converting,” 3.
the line of, “We do not have precious objects” or pointing out the small size of the museum. I encountered this self-deprecating attitude when asking for sources and also when visiting the museums personally. Some of my contact persons were also surprised that a university-employed person like me would show interest in their mission museum. Disbelief was expressed as well when I explained that it is the history, the “background” of the museum, that interests me, not the – valuable or not – exhibits per se. This expectation made sense because better known mission museums were indeed contacted by anthropologists from all over the world about specific objects.

It is important to stress how the source situation limited the thesis. It was impossible to reconstruct the experience of an already closed exhibition. What the visitor of an exhibition experienced thirty, fifty or hundred years ago cannot be ascertained with the available sources. Above all, the mediation of the missionaries’ points of view eludes my research since their firsthand accounts were not available. If there had been texts (wall texts, leaflets, or object descriptions) in exhibitions which, for example, expressed an opinion about the people and their culture in the mission fields, then this text is no longer accessible to me because it was never archived. However, the message to the visitors was usually conveyed orally, i.e. in guided tours. As mentioned in the previous chapter, this oral character is an important feature of amateur museums (see Section 2.1).

The same limitation is true for an approach involving a postcolonial critique of museums when this encounter between the exhibition and the visitors is at the centre of attention. As the research shows, only currently accessible exhibitions and open museums can be analysed with this set of research questions in mind whereas former exhibitions and closed museums yield little information on this matter. Again, the message of the exhibition or the point of view that the missionaries wanted to impart to their visitors cannot be reconstructed with the available sources I have accessed. For almost all mission museums, there are no documents that can show this message, as the guided tours were not written down or archived. (An exception is the SVD case study. Here I indeed found texts from the 1960s to the 1980s that the young SVD members should use as a basis for their guiding of visitor groups. These texts contained mostly factual knowledge about the cultures and religions in the

172 For example, the Schönstatt Sisters wrote that their museum cannot compete with mission museums belonging to the bigger congregations and orders. Email correspondence with Schönstatt Sisters, September 2016.
173 One brother, Fr. Georg from Bamberg, was in our longer email exchange especially eager to discuss why I would be interested into the history, but not in the ethnographical objects in their mission museum. Email correspondence with Fr. Georg CMSF, September-October 2016.
174 Letters in the depot of the mission museum St. Gabriel SVD show how scholars requested information about objects or whole collections.
175 Only open exhibitions (for example, one about art from Benin 2007) and museums (like the Natural History Museum in Vienna and the Musée du quai Branly in Paris) are analysed in Kazeem, Martinz-Turek, and Sternfeld, Das Unbehagen im Museum.
mission museums, such as how this instrument is played or how many Hindus are living in India.) Exactly what missionaries told the visitors in front of the showcases about non-European lands and peoples was not noted down, and therefore it cannot be a subject of this study.

Another limitation due to the primary sources impacted the initially planned research question regarding the exhibition design in the closed museums: What did the exhibition look like? How were the exhibits presented? In general, these questions could not be answered because there have not been many photos taken inside the museum and/or stored in archives.176

As there is little or no literature on many mission museums in my list, Chapter 4 and the portraits in the Appendix are based on a diverse range of very different primary sources. The breadth of sources ranged from small brochures and old newspaper articles to current websites. The individual source situation and source criticism for the case studies are presented in detail at the beginning of the three cases. And also all portraits in the Appendix contain short descriptions of available sources for each mission museum.

That being said, I must note a special source of information, the two surveys that I mentioned in the Introduction above (see Section 1.1). I was informed that in 2016 the Deutsche Ordensoberkonferenz (DOK) had conducted its own survey about mission collections owned by congregations in Germany. Thanks to their readiness to share with me the answers from the survey, I was able to incorporate their results into my study as well. Though I must point out that I got this “DOK list”, as I call it, at a later stage of my research which is to say that I had my own list and it already covered most of the DOK list. The objectives of this list differed a lot from my research question since their goal was to map the current situation whereas I work historically. Therefore, those findings which were helpful for my research questions were used as an additional source for mission museums in Germany. The categories of their study only partially overlapped with my categories.

Similarly, in 2016, the Ordensgemeinschaften Österreich conducted a study of congregations in Austria and I thankfully received a short overview of the responses. This was productive in relation to some of my research questions, for example, regarding to the perceived relevance of the collections for the congregations.

176 One example for photographs is the mission museum Werl OFM, which was destroyed in the Second World War. In 1926 P. Lambert Fester produced a fanfold of thirty postcards showing the interior of the museum. These postcards are the only images of the museum that exist today. Although they give a glimpse into the late 1920s, how much can be said about the exhibition design up to the 1940s? Sure, heavy wooden showcases were not changed often, simply for financial reasons. But already smaller interventions regarding the presentation – let alone a changed description text – could have much influence on the message of a museum. Exhibits that can be identified on a photograph dating from 1926 cannot be assumed to be kept in place for roughly twenty, fifty years.
3.2 Historical network research and the question of its application

My focus on the networks of the missionaries led me to search for the possibility of using the Historical Network Research (HNR) method. There are varying degrees of this network approach, from a “light” one in which the method merely provides something like a perspective, to using HNR as a whole auxiliary science. HNR is, in short, using a method originally developed in sociology for analysing social networks and adding historical research methods and questions. HNR has as a starting point the assumption that the relationship between two entities is erklärungsmächtig, i.e. capable of giving explanations and that structure matters. The second important point in HNR is to pay attention to systems of exchange in society.

The HNR method includes several steps. First, information from primary sources is transformed into a binary database. Every historical actor, for example, must be turned into one row in a database. Node attributes (characteristics like place of birth, age, location/origin, congregation membership or there like) are added. The researcher establishes a coding system that expresses the research question. An actor in the network turns into a node (or vertex, point or agent), relations between actors turn into edges (or ties, links or arcs). Despite the fact that this is obviously a time-consuming process, this step is in itself an interpretation of the sources and therefore already part of an analysis rendering complex human relations into definite codes.

Once a complete database is established, special HNR software analyses the data. Some researchers point out that it is exactly this step, the use of software, that turns the metaphor of a network into a method. The analysis reveals the patterns and deviations that should offer a significant alternative perspective to “traditional” (not software supported) interpretation. Some possibilities for analysis are the relative positions of nodes in relation to other
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177 Next to Historical Network Research (HNR) there is also the term Historical Network Analysis (HNA). As the method comes from the field of sociology, there is also the often-used term Social Network Analysis (SNA). Scholars from various backgrounds have not yet decided about a clear use of these terms, therefore I simply use historical network research, HNR.

178 Düring, “Cheat Sheet: Social Network”.


181 „Auf der Basis solcher einzelnen Codes lässt sich ein ganzes Codiersystem entwickeln, das die Inhalte der Primärquellen abbildet und gleichzeitig auch auf die der Untersuchung zugrundeliegenden Forschungsfragen zugeschnitten ist.” Düring and Eumann, “Historische Netzwerkforschung,” 384–86.


183 Bixler and Reupke, 117. For the database, common spreadsheet software like Microsoft excel, Base, or Numbers can be used. Software for HNR are NodeXL, Palladio, VennMaker, Nodegoat, Visone, Gephi, UCInet and Netdra, or Pajek.
nodes, degree, density, distances (number of steps between two nodes if they are not a dyad) and centrality (degree of centrality, closeness centrality, betweenness centrality).  

The last step is visualisation. Network charts that give complex relations “at a glance” are the strength and appeal of this method. It allows the human sense of vision to perceive multiple and complex information at the same time. In other words, using language alone when used to describe a network one is very soon at an impasse. In a linear system like written text, it is difficult to decide where one should start to describe a network because it is – by definition – the exact opposite of a linear system.

The decision on the use of HNR has a practical and a theoretical component. Firstly, the practical aspect is that the source situation is the starting point not the endpoint of this consideration. The more standardized and already well-prepared the sources are, the better. Clearly, I do not have serial or standardized sources, quite the opposite because I have a huge variety of data. As I am the first to reconstruct a network of these missionaries in my sample, I have nothing like “complete” data about the networks. Limited sources and time are, therefore, the main arguments against using the method. Another practical point is that the historical period of interest to me is very long, from the 1890s when the first mission museum in this study was opened until the present time. Boyer objects that often the use of HNR obscures the dimension of time. Examples from the field of historical studies where HNR is used usually concentrate on short time spans, mostly a couple of years. Therefore, my sources and research question are not fitting to the method.

Other than that, the theoretical component is the main concern. The goal of HNR is to discover hitherto unseen patterns and influences, a point developed by Claire Lemercier:

188 All authors stress the time aspect, combined with the source situation. “Der hohe Arbeitsaufwand bei der Erhebung von Netzwerken aus historischen Quellen ist ohne die begründete Annahme einer ausreichenden Informationsdichte kaum zu rechtfertigen. Im besten Falle besteht bereits vor der Entscheidung für oder gegen eine relationale Herangehensweise Klarheit darüber, ob die Überlieferung genügend relationale Daten bereithält und mit wieviel Aufwand die Erhebung verbunden ist.” Bixler and Reupke, “Von Quellen zu Netzwerken,” in Handbuch Historische Netzwerkforschung, 108.
The point of formal network analysis is in fact not to conclude that networks exist and are important, but — hypothetically assuming their existence — to describe their patterns precisely, to understand how they were created and what consequences they have.\(^{190}\)

However, not just the construction and the consequences but also how the network functions is to be revealed.\(^{191}\) The goal of this method is to explain the network and the relations inside \textit{per se}. Precisely because of this, HNR is, in its fullest application, not suitable for the research questions in this thesis since the network of missionaries is not the ultimate subject of this study. Instead, the mission museums are the focus, and a reconstruction of the networks behind them should give further information about the museums, not \textit{vice versa}. Therefore, instead of using the HNR method, I restrict myself to use the network approach in a metaphorical sense. But that does not mean that knowledge about HNR is useless for this endeavour. Additional to the descriptive tool, knowledge of this method helps in the analysis, even when not using the method as such.\(^{192}\)

The network on a metaphorical level is a common feature in mission history. Dana Roberts even describes Christian mission in general as

\[
\text{a network, an international web of human relationships in which the “missionaries” scamper back and forth like human spiders, weaving and expanding the web in all directions. It is important to study the spiders, but it is equally important to notice the web.}\quad \text{\textit{\textsuperscript{193}}} 
\]

Rebekka Habermas’ article about the transnational networks of persons and ideas in the Protestant mission movement during the 19\textsuperscript{th} century is of the utmost importance for the German-speaking mission history. She states unambiguously that, in the 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} century, missionaries have probably been the most entangled professional group of all. Global networks grew around them, networks which connected the outer with the inner-European world, a self-evident fact for them.\(^{194}\)

Some years before Habermas, Reinhard Wendt and other contributors also used network as a metaphor when writing about missionary “collectors”, their transcontinental networking and the scientific output of their efforts.\(^{195}\) But

\[^{190}\text{(my translation) Lemercier, “Formale Methoden der Netzwerkanalyse,” 22.}\]
\[^{191}\text{Lemercier, 22.}\]
\[^{192}\text{“Die Kenntnis der Prinzipien dieser Methode hilft aber jedenfalls, genauer über Netzwerke nachzudenken. Während Forschung, die formale Netzwerkanalyse benutzt, nicht immun ist gegenüber den Gefahren der Über- und Unterinterpretation, könnte uns ein balanciertes Verhältnis zu formalen Methoden – d.h. sie weder zu ignorieren noch Methodologie zum Ziel historischer Studien zu machen – helfen, über die bloße relationale Mode hinauszugelangen und Netzwerke in historische Erklärungen und Erzählungen einzubinden.” Lemercier, 18–19.}\]
\[^{193}\text{Robert, \textit{Christian mission}, 177.}\]
\[^{194}\text{Habermas, “Mission im 19. Jahrhundert,” 641. That Habermas focuses in her article on Protestant missionaries does not diminish the article’s significance for Catholic mission history.}\]
\[^{195}\text{Wendt, \textit{Sammeln, Vernetzen, Auswerten}.}\]
Wendt includes minor aspects of the HNR when he, for example, mentions the extraordinarily long duration and (node) density of the Jesuits network.\textsuperscript{196} Two articles, one by Henrike Foertsch and one by Harriet Völker, each include a chart where the networks of missionaries and other actors are visualized, but HNR is not expressly used\textsuperscript{197} and in these cases it is about visualization rather than interpretation.

As in Wendt’s volume and in accord with Habermas, without immersion into HNR as a method this thesis takes the networks of the individual actors seriously when analysing the museums. The study does not aim at the networks \textit{per se}, but it uses them to answer other research questions.

To sum it up, the choice of method is led by the primary sources that were available and this aspect plays the main role in the form of this thesis and guides the development of the research questions. I do not use HNR as a distinct method, but the knowledge that I gained during attempts to make it work with my primary sources has enriched my interpretation of those sources.

4 Mission museums in German-speaking countries

This chapter presents my analysis of all Catholic mission museums that I found in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland that fit my working definition of a mission museum. I have arranged them in a list (see Table 2) which is the basis for this study as a whole. The material that I gathered together in the research for the list is also the basis for the portraits in the Appendix (see Appendix: Portraits of mission museums in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland).

This chapter gives a general insight into the broader subject of mission museums. At first, I present and introduce the list of mission museums that meet my criteria. The following sections cover the number of museums, the locations and surroundings, and the institutions that were the context to the museums. Then I present an overview of when the museums were founded and closed. All these sections focus on facts and figures. After that, in Section 4.6, I turn to the characteristics of mission museums and add content to the somewhat dry material in the beginning.

Note that this chapter does not refer to the specific primary sources, rather it presents the condensed findings from my gathered information. All sources for my general statements here are to be found in the case studies and the portraits of the individual mission museums in the Appendix.

4.1 List of mission museums

I built up this list of Catholic mission museums in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland that overall includes thirty-one mission museums. It includes the name of the museum that is used in this thesis, the original name in German, the congregation that founded the museum, the dates of opening and if relevant the date of closing, an indication about a female or male congregation, the indication of general whereabouts – in Germany, Austria, or Switzerland – and the address and website address, and finally the page number indicating the full portrait.

198 See Section 1.4.2 for the working definition of a mission museum. The list and the following overview present the status from August 2019.
Table 2. Chronological list of all Catholic mission museums in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name in the dissertation</th>
<th>German name of the museum</th>
<th>Congregation</th>
<th>opened</th>
<th>closed</th>
<th>♂</th>
<th>♀</th>
<th>GER</th>
<th>AUT</th>
<th>CH</th>
<th>Address and website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiltrup MSC</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum Hiltrup</td>
<td>MSC – Sacred Heart Missionaries</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Am Klosterwald 40, 48165 Münster <a href="http://www.hiltruper-missionare.de">www.hiltruper-missionare.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Sorg SSPC</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>SSPC – Missionary Sisters of St. Peter Claver</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♀</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td>AUT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maria-Sorg-Straße 6, 5101 Bergheim bei Salzburg <a href="http://www.mariasorg.at">www.mariasorg.at</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg SSPC</td>
<td>Afrikamuseum</td>
<td>SSPC – Missionary Sisters of St. Peter Claver</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>♀</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td>AUT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dreifältigkeitsgasse (Pagerie) and Claverianum, Salzburg (no website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liefering MSC</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>MSC – Sacred Heart Missionaries/Bondeko</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td>AUT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schönleitenstraße 1, 5020 Salzburg <a href="http://www.bondeko.org">www.bondeko.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zug SSPC</td>
<td>Afrikamuseum</td>
<td>SSPC – Missionary Sisters of St. Peter Claver</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♀</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td>CH</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Oswalds-Gasse 17, 6300 Zug <a href="http://www.afrikamuseumzug.ch">www.afrikamuseumzug.ch</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hünfeld OMI</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>OMI – Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Klosterstraße 5, 36088 Hünfeld <a href="http://www.bonifatiuskloster.de">www.bonifatiuskloster.de</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ottilien OSB</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>OSB – Missionary Benedictines</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erzabtei 1, 86941 St. Ottilien <a href="http://www.missionsmuseum.de">www.missionsmuseum.de</a></td>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Xaver SVD</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum St. Xaver</td>
<td>SVD – Divine Word Missionaries</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dringenbergerstraße 32, 33014 Bad Driburg (no website)</td>
<td>336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardel OFM</td>
<td>Brasilienmuseum Bardel</td>
<td>OFM – Franciscans</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Klosterstraße 11, 48455 Bad Bentheim <a href="http://www.bardel.de">www.bardel.de</a></td>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Münsterschwarzach OSB</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum Münsterschwarzach</td>
<td>OSB – Missionary Benedictines</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schweinfurter Straße 40, 97359 Schwarzach am Main <a href="http://www.abtei-muensterschwarzach.de">www.abtei-muensterschwarzach.de</a></td>
<td>325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limburg SAC</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>SAC – Pallottines</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wiesbadener Straße 1, 65549 Limburg an der Lahn <a href="http://www.pallottiner-limburg.de">www.pallottiner-limburg.de</a></td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innsbruck OFM Cap</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>OFMCap – Capuchins</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaiserjägerstraße 6, 6020 Innsbruck <a href="http://www.kapuziner.at">www.kapuziner.at</a></td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dachsberg OSFS</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>OSFS – Oblates of St. Francis de Sales</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dachsberg 1, 4731 Prambachkirchen <a href="http://www.dachsberg.at">www.dachsberg.at</a></td>
<td>348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Würzburg CMM</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>CMM – Mariannhill Missionaries</td>
<td>1930s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mariannhillstraße 1, 97074 Würzburg <a href="http://www.mariannhill.de">www.mariannhill.de</a></td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aachen PWG</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum Aachen</td>
<td>PWG – Pontifical Mission Societies/missio</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Goethestraße 43, 52064 Aachen <a href="http://www.missionhilft.de">www.missionhilft.de</a></td>
<td>369</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall in Tirol OFM</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>OFM – Franciscans</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stadtgraben 7, 6060 Hall in Tirol <a href="http://www.franziskaner.at">www.franziskaner.at</a></td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
<td>Gender (♂)</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamberg</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>CMSF – Congregation of the Franciscan Missionary Brothers</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>Schloßstraße 30, 96049 Bamberg</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cmsf.de">www.cmsf.de</a></td>
<td>374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benediktbeuern</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>SDB – Salesians of Don Bosco</td>
<td>1968 1988</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>Don-Bosco-Straße 1, 83671 Benediktbeuern</td>
<td><a href="http://www.kloster-benediktbeuern.de">www.kloster-benediktbeuern.de</a></td>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riedegg CMM</td>
<td>Afrikamuseum</td>
<td>CMM – Mariannhill Missionaries</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>Schloss Riedegg, Riedegg 1, 4210 Gallneukirchen</td>
<td><a href="http://www.schloss-riedegg.at">www.schloss-riedegg.at</a></td>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menzingen</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>Menzinger Sisters</td>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>♀</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>Hauptstrasse 11, 6313 Menzingen</td>
<td><a href="http://www.kloster-menzingen.ch">www.kloster-menzingen.ch</a></td>
<td>378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schweiklberg OSB</td>
<td>Afrikamuseum</td>
<td>OSB – Missionary Benedictines</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>Schweiklbergstraße 1, 94474 Vilshofen an der Donau</td>
<td><a href="http://www.schweiklberg.de">www.schweiklberg.de</a></td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuenbeken CPS</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>CPS – Mariannhill Sisters</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>♀</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>Alte Amtsstraße 64, 33100 Paderborn</td>
<td><a href="http://www.missionshausneuenbeken.de">www.missionshausneuenbeken.de</a></td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This list can also be found in alphabetical order at the beginning of the Appendix in order to simplify the search for the portrait when reading through the text (see Section Alphabetical list of mission museums in this study on page 301).

Locating these museums involved classical research (like searching through printed national directories of museums and contacting mission houses/congregations directly), online research, and recourse to the scant available literature. I99 I used the above-mentioned list from the DOK to check if I had overlooked a mission museum in Germany though I received this list at a later stage of my research.

I included in my list those mission museums that fitted my working definition (see Section 1.4.2). That means that public accessibility was crucial, as well as the existence of the museum over a certain time span (permanence). I searched in Germany, Austria, and the German-speaking parts of Switzerland. Partly, the reasons to focus on German-speaking Europe lies in the fact that I wanted to use mainly German-speaking sources. (However, the case study of the SSPC showed me later that the Catholic mission world was seldom monolingual.) But mainly, the focus on German-speaking areas is due to the fact that this topic has not yet been researched (see Section 1.4.1).

The timespan of my observation period was entirely determined by the museums I found: from the beginning of the earliest mission museum (Knechtsteden CSSp in 1896) to the latest (Neuenbeken CPS in 2016). That last case led to the discovery that the most recent mission museum was opened during the time of this research.

A crucial factor in deciding which institutions to include as proper mission museums and which to categorise as “merely” a collection and therefore to exclude from my list was the number of objects in the collection. The (primary) sources that I used for establishing my list did not routinely mention the numbers of objects, and if they did then these numbers were very vague. I had to resort to my judgement based on other factors, like occupied space and rooms. It became clear that I needed a threshold, a minimum number of objects for an institution to be included in my list. I decided on one hundred objects as the minimum. Because building up a collection for a museum would need to include more effort than — to put it bluntly — only about ten missionaries bringing each ten objects to the motherhouse during their trips home. The questionnaire for the DOK list asked for the number of objects and categories were either below a hundred objects, below 1,000 objects, and or more than 1,000 objects. Of the twenty-seven institutions that responded, ten reported having less than a hundred objects. These collections are consequently not part of my list.200

199 Most helpful was in this case Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland”.
200 Congregations that reported less than one hundred objects (for various mission houses): White Fathers; Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate in Borken-Burlo; Barmherzige Brüder
To make it easier to navigate through the many similar names of the mission museums, I refer to them with their geographical reference (the town or city of location) or the name of their mission house, followed by the acronym of the congregation. I am aware that the acronyms are normally only added to the names of the members of a congregation or order. However, for the sake of simplifying the complex names and denotations, I use the same principle and add the acronyms to the mission museums. Two examples: “Innsbruck OFMCap” refers to the mission museum of the Capuchins (OFMCap) in Innsbruck, “St. Augustin SVD” refers to the SVD’s mission museum in the mission house St. Augustin in Bonn, although it had the official name of Haus Völker und Kulturen. The headings of each portrait in the Appendix give these created names. As mentioned, at the beginning of the Appendix, there is an alphabetical list of the created names with the page number of each portrait. All of this aims as much as possible to simplify navigation throughout the thesis.

4.2 Distribution and the problem of boundaries

My list of Catholic mission museums in the German-speaking countries contains thirty-one museums. Eighteen of them were located in Germany, nine in Austria, and four in Switzerland. When these numbers of still open or closed museums are compared with today’s number of Catholics in the three countries, it becomes clear that – seen via this admittedly artificial construct – Austria has by far the most mission museums per Catholic, followed by Switzerland. This small numbers game which of course shrinks down a century of growth and decline in Catholic inhabitants should only show that the actual numbers should not overshadow the density. As often, total numbers are not always the whole picture; relations are important as well.

In line with this first topic of the distribution in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, it is necessary to raise the issue of borders and geographical entities. For this study, the current borders of Germany, Austria, and Switzerland were chosen though there are pros and cons to this choice. The reason for choosing these three lies in the German language. I am aware that there are

von Maria-Hilf (FMMA); Dominican Sisters in Arenberg; Dominican Sisters in Neustadt/Main; Congregatio Jesu in Mainz; Franciscan Sisters in Salzkotten; Franciscan Sisters in Vierzehnheiligen; Ordensgemeinschaft der Schwestern von der Göttlichen Vorsehung in Münster; Missionarinnen Christi (MC) in München. DOK Deutsche Ordensobernkongerfein e.V., “Erhebung Sammlungen katholischer Ordensgemeinschaften”.

201 Taken the numbers of 23,8 Million Catholics for Germany, 5,2 Million for Austria and about 3,1 Million for Switzerland, Germany has a ratio of one mission museum per 1,3 Million Catholics, Switzerland one mission museum per 775,000 Catholics and Austria one mission museum per 570,000 Catholics. Numbers of Catholics for 2015 respectively 2013: Statista, “Anzahl Katholiken in Deutschland”; Statista, “Anzahl Katholiken in Österreich”; “Römisch-katholische Kirche Schweiz”.
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German-speaking areas in other European nations as well. I did, for example, not find mission museums in South Tyrol in Italy. I am also aware that Switzerland has a multilingual character that lies at the heart of Swiss identity. (All four mission museums in Switzerland are to be found in the dominantly German-speaking cantons.) However, the borders of language areas were decisive for choosing the three countries.

While working within a time span of more than a hundred years, the problem of changing borders becomes evident. One example of this issue is the Austro-Hungarian Empire, whose borders differed from those of present day Austria. The current borders become irrelevant when mapping, for example, the network of branches or mission houses of missionary congregations such as the Missionary Sisters of St. Petrus Claver (see the first case study). Under the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, the congregation opened branch offices in cities like Trieste or Ljubljana that were within the empire, which made them a domestic matter. Today these branch offices would be located in the nations of Italy and Slovenia, and therefore mission museums by the SSPC in these locations are not included in the list and presented in the case study.

Another example is the SVD mission museum in Steyl in the Netherlands. Historical developments, in this case the Kulturkampf in Germany, resulted in an important museum for this congregation being built outside of the German territory. Because it is located in the Netherlands, this museum is not included in the list. Although in this case, the border remained the same, it shows the importance of being aware of borders and boundaries. For the SVD and its founder P. Arnold Janssen (1837–1909), the border meant protection from anti-Catholic laws in Germany and gave them the possibility to operate within Germany, while being officially situated in the Netherlands.

As shown in the map (see Figure 3), the Catholic mission museums in Germany were located in the west, more or less central, and in the south. Six mission museums were located in Bavaria (Würzburg CMM, Bamberg CMSF, Münsterschwarzach OSB, St. Ottilien OSB, Benediktbeuern SDB). In Austria, the mission museums were located in the west and north, with three museums (plus one Africa exhibition by the SSPC) in Tyrol alone, a distinctly Catholic stronghold.²⁰² In Switzerland, the four mission museums are all close together in the central cantons.

²⁰² Clemens Gütl also stresses the devoutness in Tyrol. He claims that beyond the Austrian-Hungarian countries, especially many Tyrolians left as missionaries to Africa. Gütl, ‘Adieu ihr lieben Schwarzen, 23–24.
Figure 3. Map of Catholic mission museums in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland.
4.3 Surroundings of mission museums

During the research for compiling the list of mission museums, one aspect became crucial: the surroundings or the embeddedness of the museums. Apart from the national context and changing borders, the immediate environment plays a role as well regarding the setting in a major city or in a rural area. This aspect of a mission museum’s “hinterland” is of importance because that is where most visitors came from and where the “competitor museums” were situated as well.

A look at the number of inhabitants\(^{203}\) in the municipalities where the mission museums were located reveals that only six were in cities of over 100,000 inhabitants (Aachen, Paderborn, Innsbruck, Würzburg, and two in Salzburg). The biggest city is Aachen with a population of 245,000. That means that the vast majority of mission museums were found in cities much below the threshold value of 100,000, with twelve mission museums in cities and towns even under 10,000 inhabitants. Therefore, it is evident that the Catholic mission museums have a clear characteristic: they have chiefly a rural rather than an urban setting. This feature would have been different if Protestant mission museums had also been included. This is because with the Berlin Mission Society and its museum, the major city of Berlin with over one million inhabitants would have to be included, as well as cities like Basel, Leipzig, and Wuppertal\(^ {204}\).

Of course, the location of the mission museums follows the location of the mission house or monastery, which obviously also had a rural tendency. It becomes clear that the congregations did not open mission museums at more urban locations that were intentionally established for that purpose. I never found traces that an additional location was rented or built for having a more urbanised environment for the museum. The mission museums were always housed within the mission house or the compound. This also shows that opening a museum followed different reasoning and consideration than other institutions would follow when they selected an attractive location in an urban centre for example. For mission congregations, the possible number of visitors was presumably not the main concern. The rationale was – as will be seen later in some portraits as well – more along the lines that the mission museum would be another attraction in the mission house for visitors who would have come anyway. Mission museums were directly connected to the mission house where the missionaries lived and worked. This factor is so crucial that it became a part of the working definition.

This remoteness of so many mission museums is independent of the age. Also younger mission museums were founded in remote places. For example,

\(^{203}\) The following numbers of inhabitants are all current numbers, not historical. My goal with that is only to give an approximate impression of the surrounding, not a detailed assessment.

\(^{204}\) For the locations of Protestant mission museums see Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland,” 105.
in 1995 the *Madagaskar Museum* (Werthenstein MSF) opened in Werthenstein, a village in Switzerland with 2,000 inhabitants.

Angela Jannelli does not mention such remoteness of location explicitly in her study. However, this seclusion of so many mission museums is a feature I would like to stress when applying her concept of *wild museums* to mission museums.

As shown, the location of the mission house and consequently of the mission museum has a small role for the congregations. And interestingly, this location had in some cases no negative impact when it comes to the academic recognition of the mission museum/collection. The mission museum St. Ottilien OSB, in the least populated area — where basically the monastery St. Ottilien with its school, agriculture, cemetery and train station constructed a little village on its own — is the most known mission museum in Germany. Also, the mission museum St. Gabriel SVD, located in the commune Maria Enzersdorf of 8,000 inhabitants and only walking distance from the city of Mödling (20,000 inhabitants), is the biggest mission museum in Austria. Both mission museums may be rural in their environment, but in the two cases named here this feature is of no greater importance when it comes to other characteristics such as the significance of scholarly research and academic connections. An explanation for this is that both museums are within commuting distance to Vienna respectively Munich. The relative closeness to (capital) cities makes up for their embedded rural remoteness.

The factor of the embeddedness needs further attention regarding the affect of the environment on the visitors. Because via mission museums, people in rural areas had access to objects from the world beyond Europe which they did not have from other (state) institutions because the latter were more likely to be located in bigger cities. And this is not only true for very rural towns, below 8,000 inhabitants. Take, for example, the capital of Tyrol, Innsbruck. The Capuchins’ mission museum (Innsbruck OFMCap) was located there, as well as an African exhibition by the SSPC. In the period of existence of the Capuchins’ museum, from the 1920s to the eve of the Second World War, Innsbruck had between 70,000 and 85,000 inhabitants while never having an ethnographical museum. The nearest ethnographical collection or museum would have been in Munich, two hours away. On the other hand, there were close-by two other mission museums in Tyrol (Hall in Tirol OFM and Fiecht

---

205 One example of remoteness is Riedegg CMM, located in the castle of Riedegg, a site in northern Austria that is hard to reach with public transportation. About this Afrika Museum, its Wikipedia entry highlights that it is “the only African museum in the Mühlviertel” (my translation) “Schloss Riedegg”. Mühlviertel is the name of the region where the museum is located. Regarding the remote area of the Mühlviertel, the question remains how many African museums, or ethnographical museums in general, one would expect in such a rural location. This shows how much the mission museums deviate from the planning of professional museums, where easy accessibility is key, for example by public transportation. Such questions were not priorities for the mission museums.

206 “Innsbruck”.
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OSB). So the only chance for the majority of people living in this city and the surrounding regions to encounter the world outside of Europe was within the walls of a mission museum. If Innsbruck’s inhabitants were interested in children’s clothes from North-East China, a statuette of the god Hanuman or a “real” stuffed tiger, they had to enter the Capuchins’ monastery. The rural majority of mission museums, therefore, offered global encounters for people who had fewer possibilities for such experiences until the middle of the second half of the 20th century.

The encounter between the rural European and the wider world is also pointed at by some mission museums themselves. About the mentioned mission museum in Innsbruck, a newspaper article from 1937 stated:

In the middle of the Tyrolean mountains, a piece of Asia! India, China in Innsbruck! That is no exaggeration. If you finally stand in the middle of this museum and open your eyes for all that is around, then it seems as if you are far away over the Tyrolean mountains, over there in the palm-filled land of India or even over there in the flowery Middle Kingdom, in China. There are so many foreign things to see in this museum.207

Clearly, this promise of an almost immersive experience seems excessive, but the contrasting of the Tyrolean mountains with a landscape of palms and exotic flowers reveals that it is this contrast that made the mission museum so interesting for their audience. And no other state museum nearby could compete with this attraction – being the only provider of this contrast kept it interesting.

Another consequence of the rural surrounding of the mission museums is that the only nearby “rival” institution were other wild museums very much as Angela Jannelli describes them. For a long time into the 20th century, visitors to mission museums had had likely prior experience of a small-scale, amateur museum like the Heimatmuseum208. This is an institution very common in German-speaking countries which exhibits objects from the local culture, especially from the pre-industrial era (traditional costumes, farmers’ goods like tools or kitchen utensils). Inhabitants of small towns and villages like Menzingen or Hünfeld maybe never had the means to visit a professional “big player” in the world of museums in cities like Munich or Zurich. For them,

207 "Mitten in den Tiroler Bergen ein Stück Fern-Asien! Indien, China in Innsbruck! Das ist keine Übertreibung. Steht man nur einmal mitten in diesem Museum drinnen, und macht man die Augen auf für all das, was ringsumher ist, dann kommt es einem vor, als ob man weit fort wäre über den Tiroler Bergen, drüben im Palmenland Indien oder gar drüben im blumigen Reich der Mitte, in China. So viel ausländische Sachen gibt es in diesem Museum zu sehen.” (my translation) “Ein Stück Indien”. Of course, the article wants to attract more visitors. It is not a critical review of the museum. But it could also have put the emphasis on other aspects of the museum. Yet it was the immersion, the feeling as if the far away atmosphere could be reproduced in the rooms of the museum that the article chooses as its main argument.

208 For a description of the Heimatmuseum see te Heesen, Theorien des Museums zur, 139–42 and Hartung, Kleine deutsche Museumsgeschichte, 54–66.
the idea of visiting a museum was probably more associated with seeing a small exhibition, more or less randomly presented in one or two rooms, rather than a stroll through awe-inspiring high-ceiling galleries in turn-of-the-century “temples” that one can find on the Ringstrasse in Vienna or on the Museum Island in Berlin. This is not to say that one is more “the correct museum” than the other, but to raise the question what people associated with the museum as an institution fifty or a hundred years ago.

This discussion of the location of the mission museums, especially of their remoteness, is an attempt to circumvent too much binary thinking when it comes to geographical areas. Of course, the mission museums offered the narration of the binary “us” and “them”, the European and the non-European, the Christians and the non-Christians. However, the binary of European metropole and the non-European, colony or mission field, comes into question when it is understood just where most mission museums in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland are situated.

The multitude of mission museums were spread out in the countryside and not gathered in big agglomerations, in this way they diversified the dynamics between Europe and non-Europe. It is not a straightforward dynamic between capitals like between Manila and Zurich, rather between smaller communities in the mission fields and small communities in Europe like Hall in Tirol or Menzingen. Instead of transfer from Manila to Munich, objects travelled from Vunapope to Benediktbeuern, to name just two places that play a role in this thesis.

The clear characteristic of the rural environment of Catholic mission museums verifies Rebekka Habermas’ proposition that so far rural societies in Europe have been widely overlooked by research as a resonance chamber for the dissemination of knowledge and images of non-Europeans. She claims that mission celebrations in the villages were probably more influential on their visitors’ imagination of the non-European world than the infamous Völkerschauen in the bigger cities, where inter alia non-Europeans were presented like animals in a zoo. She also draws attention to the mingling of local religious life and globalisation, of which the mission museums in the small entities are also good examples. Habermas uses only Protestant examples, but this section shows that it is correct: “[s]maller towns and villages learned about the colonies from missionaries […]”, and this learning happened in Catholic mission museums as well.

209 Cox critiques this for example within Catherin Hall’s work: “One binary thoroughly undermined in Civilising Subjects is that of metropole and colony, […]” (emphasis in original) Cox, “Global Christianity in the,” in European missions in contact zones, 34.
211 Habermas, “Colonies in the Countryside,” 503.
4.4 Gender and congregation distribution

Of thirty-one Catholic mission museums, six were run by female religious institutes, twenty-four by male religious institutes (eleven congregations, one order). Aachen PWG was founded by a lay institution. Therefore, it cannot be categorised into the two categories of female or male institutes. The vast majority of museums were founded within male mission congregations.

However, the DOK list of mission collections solely in Germany has a more balanced gender distribution, with thirteen female to sixteen male congregations with one or more mission museums or collections. The reason why so many of these female collections are not included in my list of museums is that they usually reported a low number of objects for the DOK list. Only the Schönstatt Sisters reported that they own more than a thousand objects, meaning all others had below 1,000 or below 100 objects. Besides the Schönstatt Sisters, Neuenbeken CPS by the Mariannhill Sisters is included both in the DOK list and in my list. The Missionary Sisters of Saint Petrus Claver’s (SSPC) mission museums were not located in Germany which excludes them from the DOK list.

As for the distribution of mission museums between the different mission congregations, most mission museums were the only ones by their congregations. However, it is often the case that these congregations have additional museums in other European countries.

Three religious institutes that are the Missionary Benedictines (OSB), the Society of the Divine Word (SVD), and the Franciscans (OFM including the Capuchins OFMCap) had each four mission museums in Germany and Austria. With this said, it becomes clear that the numerous bigger, better known male congregations had the highest number of mission museums, although this difference is not a very distinct one. The example of the Missionary Sisters of Saint Petrus Claver’s (SSPC) three mission museums, plus several other smaller exhibitions and temporary exhibitions, contradicts this fact. As I show in the case study, the reason for that lies in the SSPC’s unique character through which this small female congregation, even without their own mission field abroad, could operate so many mission museums/exhibitions.
4.5 Opening and closing dates of mission museums

In the following Table 3, I present the thirty-one mission museums with their periods of operating. Those rows without an end date and leading over the mark into the field of “open” signal that the museums are still open to the public. As I explain in a moment, I was generous in categorising the current state as “open”.

Figure 4. Typical exhibits such as masks and musical instruments on display. Mission museum in Menzingen of the Menzinger Sisters. Photo credit R. Loder-Neuhold.
Table 3. Timelines of the opening and closing dates of the mission museums.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mission museum</th>
<th>1890s</th>
<th>1900s</th>
<th>1910s</th>
<th>1920s</th>
<th>1930s</th>
<th>1940s</th>
<th>1950s</th>
<th>1960s</th>
<th>1970s</th>
<th>1980s</th>
<th>1990s</th>
<th>2000s</th>
<th>2010s</th>
<th>open</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knechtsteden CSSp</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1970s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiltrup MSC</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Gabriel SVD</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Sorg SSPC</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg SSPC</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liefering MSC</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zug SSPC</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werl OFM</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hünfeld OMI</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Wendel SVD</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immensee SMB</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ottilien OSB</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Xaver SVD</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardel OFM</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Münsterschwarzach OSB</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limburg SAC</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innsbruck OFMCap</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dachsberg OSFS</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Würzburg CMM</td>
<td>1930s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aachen PWG</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall in Tirol OFM</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamberg CMSF</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benediktbeuern SDB</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schönstatt S MS</td>
<td>1960s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiecht OSB</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riedegg CMM</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Augustin SVD</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menzingen</td>
<td>1984/85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schweiklberg OSB</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werthenstein MSF</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuenbeken CPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year(s) range:
- 1890s
- 1900s
- 1910s
- 1920s
- 1930s
- 1940s
- 1950s
- 1960s
- 1970s
- 1980s
- 1990s
- 2000s
- 2010s

Status:
- Open
Out of thirty-one museums, sixteen are currently open to the public. Eight mission museums closed after the turn of the millennium. Taking the still open together with these recently closed museums makes twenty-four mission museums (out of thirty-one) that lasted into the 21st century. On the one hand, that sounds like a lot considering that the majority of mission museums were opened in the first half of the 20th century. (Twenty-one museums from my list were founded before the 1940s.). On the other hand, I was very generous with what I categorised as still open. Often these museums exist today in a much smaller and simpler version (for example, only some few vitrines are left) or the opening hours are very restricted. Taking St. Augustin SVD as an example: It was already closed for some time, but it reopened with the restriction that the exhibition can be visited on one Sunday per month. Technically speaking it is open to the public, and I listed it as an open museum, although one day per month is not a steady and regular opening time as one expects from a “standard” and state-funded museum.

Five museums had been open for a hundred or more years, while the shortest period was only five years (Hall in Tirol OFM, from 1935 until 1940).

As shown in the table above, the majority of the museums, twenty-one in all, were founded in the first half of the 20th century. A relevant point for colonial history is that in Germany, four museums (Knechtsteden, Hiltrup, Werl, and Hünfeld) were founded during the colonial era of Germany, which is a relatively low number compared to, for example, the time until the Second World War.

During the interwar years, eleven mission museums were founded in Germany and Austria. Not surprisingly, there was a complete break in the founding of museums during and shortly after the Second World War. The mission museums in Germany and Austria suffered under the Nazi regime because it targeted the mission congregations and the mission houses. Their collections were of interest for different actors in the museum and scientific communities. For four museums it meant the complete end of their existence – these were Innsbruck OFMCap, Hall in Tirol OFM, Hiltrup MSC, and Salzburg SSPC. Three museums that had to close temporarily because of the regime but could continue after the war were St. Gabriel SVD, Maria Sorg SSPC, and Knechtsteden (see case studies for more). For the remaining twelve museums in Germany and Austria, which were founded before the war broke out, it is

\[\text{212}\] Compared with Protestant mission museums, Catholic museums are a later occurrence. Already in 1815, the museum of the London Missionary Society had announced opening hours and admission by ticket. Wingfield, “Scarcely more than a,” 111. And by 1817 a London tourist guide already suggested seeing the curiosities in this place. Wingfield, “Giraffe, South Africa,” in Trophies, relics and curios?, 26. For the German-speaking countries, the well-known museum by the Basler Mission also has its roots in the mid of the 19th century: The first “collecting” started in 1847, and in 1860 the museum was established. Schmid, “Eine ethnografische Missionssammlung,” in Mission possible?, 207–12.
not known what happened exactly during this regime and how the war impacted them.

After the war ended, the mission congregations in Germany and Austria needed time to recover, and it took until the 1960s for new museums to become established again. The table shows a gap of thirty years between the foundations before the war (1935, Hall in Tirol OFM) and after (1965, Bamberg CMSF). The two mission museums in Switzerland from before the Second World War, Zug SSPC and Immensee SMB, were unaffected by these events.

After 1945, the number of foundations could not reach the earlier highs. That correlates with the decline in new members of the mission congregations noted for the 1960s.

The founding dates – more than the closing dates – must, however, be regarded with care. As will be shown in the case studies and in the portraits, the exact dates when the museums were officially founded and opened to the public are not always easy to track down. This problematic situation will be discussed later in the case studies and the portraits; for now, it should only be noted that some of the dates presented in this section are more to be seen as trends. Some are taken from Schlegel’s Master’s thesis, which is, as I mentioned above, weak at the level of details. Most dates are the result of my further investigation, but still sometimes, for example, a more precise date than “1965–1970” as it was the information by the Schönstatt Sisters, could not be found. It becomes clear that this uncertainty about the founding (and indeed the closing dates as well) is connected to a lack of reliable sources. This leads to the assumption that documenting and archiving the mission museums had a low priority among the mission congregations and their branches.

4.6 Characteristics of mission museums

After spreading out facts and figures, we delve into the features of the thirty-one Catholic mission museums. Characteristics regarding their history and developments are summarised to give a better picture than the otherwise dry data might evoke. As I present here more general findings, I refer the reader to the portraits of each of the mission museum in the Appendix for detailed analysis, further information about the characteristics and the respective sources. The aim of this section is to present more content about their exhibitions and objects. Now, the focus of this section is to answer further questions about the characteristics of mission museums.
4.6.1 General characteristics

The beginnings of the mission museums were manifold. Typically, the first stage of a mission museum involved placing some gathered objects in vitrines at the entrance of the mission house, often in the *Pfortenzimmer* (a room next to the portal, kind of a reception room). Werl OFM is a good example of that. Around the turn of the century, it happened that some few objects were presented in such a room. This simple display of objects grew into one of the biggest mission museums in this study. The *Pforte* or *Pfortenzimmer* is the perfect location for displaying objects because it is the location where inside and outside blend in. The monasteries and mission houses were not public places that visitors could enter as suited, even if the congregations in this thesis were not following strict enclosure. Still, the *Pfortenzimmer* is the place where meetings between members of the congregation and visitors (other religious or profane visitors like relatives) took place. These rooms were modestly decorated as a rule, and the objects from the mission field were thought to have the best place there.\(^\text{213}\)

Another variant of the beginning of a museum was first to exhibit only a small collection inside the inner, private area of a mission house so that only the members themselves could access it. From this internal use, an accessible public museum developed, as in Menzingen.

On some occasions (like St. Gabriel SVD), objects were brought to Europe for research and educational reasons as a first step and this was followed by a second step in which the scholars in the congregation started a museum. This development is brought up in detail in the case study of St. Gabriel SVD.

In most cases, mission museums were set up in some rooms in the already existing mission houses or monasteries. In the case of St. Ottilien OSB, for example, early floor plans show the location dedicated to the museum in the buildings. The case of Hiltrup MSC shows how the museum was planned from the first construction plans in 1896/97 onwards.\(^\text{214}\) The case of Innsbruck OF-MCap in the early years shows the possible consequences of this choice of location. The Capuchins’ monastery was enclosed, and that meant that women were not allowed to enter the monastery. Therefore female visitors were excluded from the early mission museum. Examples, where the congregations built a designated and separated museum building, are Werl OFM (1962) and St. Augustin SVD (1973).

Only on rare occasions was a mission museum connected to another type of (already existing) museum, like a *Heimatmuseum* or later the abbey museum in Fiecht OSB. Typically, a mission museum was from the beginning onwards an autonomous foundation.

---

\(^{213}\) The reception room at the generalate of the SSPC in Rome is an example of the use of objects from the mission fields, until today.

Another rarity was a temporary exhibition within the frame of the mission museum, for example, an exhibition of nativity scenes from around the world. These special events typically started with Advent and lasted into January (for example, Bamberg CMSF). More common than these exhibitions of nativity scenes was participation in travelling mission exhibitions (especially the SSPC but also Hall in Tirol OFM and Benediktbeuern SDB). During these occasions, sound recordings from the mission fields, as well as films showing mission engagement were shown. A juxtaposition of different media (exhibitions with their material objects, lectures given by a missionary or scholar, recordings, and films) can be registered.

Some congregations got external practical help when building the exhibitions, both from female and male helpers (St. Augustin SVD, Innsbruck OFMCap, and Neuenbeken CPS). This shows that the mission congregations reached out into society and received support. It can be assumed that this was more often the case, but only twice I found written sources stating this support from non-members.215

It is common to find a mission museum associated with some service dedicated to visitors that combines the museum with a café (for example called Klostercafé) or a small shop (for books or goods produced in the monastery/mission house). The goal is to make the mission house inviting, and the mission museums are a factor in that attempt. St. Augustin SVD has a bookshop directly next to the museum building and also the mission house St. Gabriel has a bookshop at the compound. This remarkable juxtaposition of museum and bookshop, two centres of knowledge transfer, symbolises the orientation towards studying and teaching in the SVD congregation. The main “attraction” should, of course, be the various churches or chapels in the compounds, and the café/shop/museum should only round out the visit to the compound. Schweiklberg OSB offers this combination of museum, café, and a little shop next to the impressive abbey church. Schönstatt S MS is located in a famous pilgrimage place. Neuenbeken CPS is located along a hiking trail and offers a café as well. Therefore, the opening days are on Saturday and Sunday, in line with the best possibility of attracting hikers and day-trippers on the weekend.

It is not surprising that many of the compounds housing the museums in Germany and Austria suffered from war damage in the Second World War; especially Knechtsteden CSSp reported severe damage in the buildings, Werl OFM and Bardel OFM were also partly damaged through raids. The Nazi period had a massive impact on the history and historiography of the museums. Besides the forced closure of whole mission museums (discussed above in Section 4.5), some exhibits or whole collections were confiscated by the Nazi regime; other objects were hidden by the missionaries to protect them from

215 The help from professional scholars is discussed in the case studies when focusing on networks.
the regime (for example Hall in Tirol OFM, Innsbruck OFMCap, and St. Ottilien OSB).

It is not always possible to identify a specific founder for a museum though it is usually someone with personal experience in the foreign mission (e.g. Bardel OFM, Benediktbeuern SDB, and Menzingen). Personal experience is not only important for the founder, but for all missionaries involved in setting up and shaping a museum.

Only in one case, Menzingen, was it not a member but a sister of another mission congregation, who was named as the founder of the mission museum, an expert in the field of African art. So this factor of having the authority and good connections to the country of origin played a crucial role. And it shows the tight connections between some mission congregations. Additionally, in Menzingen, separated departments (African section, Latin American section, and an India/Sri Lanka section) were ascribed to three sisters who had mission experiences in these regions. Therefore, personal experience was highly important when distributing responsibility amongst involved congregation members (although the case study of the SSPC will show one exception of this rule).

In the last ten years or so, within the congregations, there has been new interest in their collections and in their own history. This could mean support for reopening an old museum, or it could lead to a thorough and therefore costly renovation (St. Ottilien OSB), or even resulted in a completely new museum (Neuenbeken CPS). As already shown, some museums are indeed very young. Sometimes, as in St. Ottilien OSB, renewed interest led to research into the origins of significant objects and some of their provenances were even compiled. Results from these processes were made publicly accessible, on websites or at conferences. A good example is the reopening of Liefering MSC. While researching for her dissertation\(^{216}\), anthropologist Alexandra Wessel dug out, examined, described, measured, and photographed the objects from the MSC missionaries, roughly one hundred years after the first objects from Oceania were put on display in this mission house. The new interest is therefore partly from within the congregations, partly from the outside, as in this case from an anthropologist.

Often an anniversary within the congregation (such as “100 years of Pallottines in Cameroon” or a commemorative year for the founder) was taken up as a reason to reorganise an existing mission museum or to renovate an exhibition within the museum rooms.

\(^{216}\) Wessel, Die Macht des Objekts.
4.6.2 Addressed topics in the exhibitions

As it is with architectural or maritime museums, the title of mission museums expresses what is essential in their content. For mission museums, this is Christian mission in its broadest sense, though it is not conveyed in a systematic way as one might expect from a schoolbook or an introductory course. Rather, the topic of mission is taken for granted, through the name of the museum or because of the location of the museum in a mission house or monastery. The museum curators seem to expect their visitors to be already informed of the concept of foreign mission. For them, texts about the Church’s or the congregation’s understanding of mission are obviously not necessary.

But we also find explicit attention directed towards the topic of mission when, for example, the Great Commission (Mt. 28:16–20) is written on the wall. In St. Gabriel SVD it says “Geht zu allen Völkern” in the foyer (“Therefore go and make disciples of all nations”). Inside the mission museums, there is no need to discuss the museum’s sole reason for existing, it is self-explanatory through its exhibition. But nevertheless, a reference to the Great Commission, for example, indicates something fundamental for the visitor.

Instead of theoretical texts, knowledge of Christian mission is imparted in the museums through visual means: A lot of photos of missionaries “in action” are to be found in the exhibitions. White sisters, often dressed in all white habits, who care for dark-skinned children, probably in a medical connection, are a repeated photo motif that I found in many mission museums I have visited. Generally, we find photos depicting missionaries in the mission fields, and I suggest that this is used by the museum curators as the main medium for illustrating what mission means for them. The concept of mission could, for example, be represented with a photo of a white sister travelling in an exotic landscape, a black sister teaching sewing to a girl in an unnamed African country, or a white pater sitting on a desk in a hut (all these examples are from St. Augustin SVD).

On the one hand, many of these photos lack descriptive details (in Liefering MSC for example) such as a location or a name for those depicted. Therefore, it must be understood that these photos are meant to illustrate mission engagement in an abstract way, not one particular missionary and her or his engagement. These photo scenes represent mission engagement such as schooling

217 In the past, St. Ottilien OSB even had a diorama (a three-dimensional scene) of a sister patching up a patient’s foot. The sign above this scene says Aussätzigenpflege, care for lepers. I only saw an archived photograph of this scene, but nevertheless it shows the importance that such an image had for the museum curators. What is also interesting is that the male missionaries regarded the work of their fellow sisters (Missionary Benedictine Sisters of Tutzing) as of such significance that female missionaries were also present in this diorama in their mission museum for the sake of illustrating the mission engagement of the whole Catholic Church. Very likely it is the same diorama that Richard Hölzl discusses as being exhibited at the Catholic Rally in Munich with its photo published in a Catholic newspaper in 1922. He interprets the scene as a reference to the foot washing in John 13. Hölzl, “Lepra als entangled disease,” in Der schwarze Körper als Missionsgebiet, 96.
and health care. Sometimes (as in St. Augustin SVD), the photos just show missionaries and locals together in a group picture, no direct action like teaching can be discovered. It seems as if the encounter per se, or better, a simple act of communication (because they are talking to each other) are already enough to symbolise mission. It is the encounter of a European missionary with locals that depicts mission on its first step.

On the other hand, Maria Sorg SSPC displays neatly labelled photographs, presumably all dating from before 1945, and here the individuals are named, for example “Katechist Julius u. seine Familie” (Catechist Julius and his family). Without getting lost in the topic of photography from missionary sources, it must be stressed, that the use of photographs in mission museums is first connected to the aim of the museum and second, photography expresses the mission activities per se by “exhibiting mission”.

Apart from photos, other means used to illustrate mission in mission museums are maps and charts that display a range of measurables. St. Gabriel SVD had these on the walls in the museum corridor showing, for example, the number of Christians worldwide compared to other religions, or the size of different Christian denominations.

Maps are a very common feature, for example pointing out the global distribution of missionaries. They often show the distribution of mission houses and stations of the current congregation in Europe and worldwide and that enables them to represent the networks of the congregation. A map in Zug SSPC even shows the origins of the objects in their collection.

The congregation’s specific understanding of mission is not a common topic in the exhibition. If at all, it is only mentioned in passing, or at the end of the exhibition and this is true for guidebooks or accompanying texts. There is one exception: In the text from the Menzinger Sisters written by Hannah Kesler and entitled Unser Missionsmuseum (our mission museum), four out of ten pages are dedicated to their views on mission.

However, in recent years there could be a trend toward a greater focus on sharing their understanding of mission so as to gather support among the wider community for the upkeep of the museums. Almost all congregations must deal with a shifting composition of their members as the numbers of young members from Europe decline since decades. Therefore, congregations must deal with the question of resources – personal and financial – for funding the museums. Maintaining the museums has been internally controversial. And in the course of arguing for keeping the museum, views on the significance of mission could be

---

218 For an overview see Eckl, “Ora et labora: Katholische”. Photographs from Catholic mission sources are analysed by Katharina Stornig. Stornig shows that European missionaries tend to be named in the captions, whereas non-Europeans tend to remain anonymous, as if the depicted person stands for their whole community, ethnic group or even a whole continent. They are often half nude or photographed in an “ethnographic style” (Typenfotografie). Stornig, “Globalisierte Körper? Repräsentationen der”. Similar statements can be assumed for the mission museums, too.
seen as something that must be conveyed now more explicitly for external visitors. This should also be seen in the context of shifts in the basic knowledge of Christianity in the society at large. The need to spell out what the congregation was and is doing might become more relevant than it used to be decades ago. Self-descriptions like the one on the website of St. Ottilien OSB, where the Benedictines proclaim that, with the renovation, the “missionary character” of the mission museums\footnote{“In den Jahren 2011–2015 wird das Museum umfassend saniert. Betont wird nun der missionarische Charakter des Museums, das um eine Dokumentation zum Leben der Missionare erweitert wird.” Missionsmuseum der Erzabtei St. Ottilien, “Museumsgeschichte”.} would be expressed more accurately, show this trend. But the mentioned problematic source situation about the explicit messages in the exhibitions does not allow for definite conclusions on this issue.

A special feature of the exhibition in Limburg SAC is that the Lord’s Prayer was printed on the walls in twenty different languages from all around the world. For me, it seems as though they wanted to symbolise their global mission activities and also the missionaries’ engagement in linguistics. Judging from one of the patres’ texts, this prayer represented for them their approach towards the exhibition as not scientific\footnote{“Da sich das vergleichsweise kleine Missionsmuseum der Pallottiner nicht als historisch-ethnologische Ausstellung versteht, endet der Rundgang mit einer Tafel, die ein Jesus-Wort aus dem Johannesevangelium zitiert […].” Holzbach, “Das Missionsmuseum der Pallottiner”.}, but as an expression of their missiological conviction and their activities – both in the mission fields and in Germany as well. With the inclusion of religious texts like Bible quotes and prayers, the visitor is meant to be reminded about the differences between a mission museum and a state-run ethnographical museum.

But all in all, there is almost no explicit dealing in the exhibitions with theology in its broadest sense and so this thesis cannot pay a lot of attention to this topic. Possible questions, touching on for example the influence of the Second Vatican Council on the museums, have to remain unanswered.

In some mission museums, political and socio-economic discussions are mentioned in texts within the exhibition. Menzingen, for example, addresses, in its exhibition as well as in the printed text, specific issues such as poverty and land confiscation or the ongoing oppression through the caste system in India. Menzingen may be a more special case in this regard since it also explicitly refers to their mission understanding.

The general history of the congregation is presented in most mission museums, though to varying degrees of depths, the museum being a platform for a congregation to present themselves and their history and to explain their guiding principles. An example is Neuenbeken CPS where the sisters tell of their origins in South Africa and of how they now run a mission house in Germany too. Fiecht OSB even had its own room dedicated to their history.

Often the foundress or founder of the congregation received special mention, and her or his own space within the exhibition was dedicated to biographical details and a presentation of works performed (Limburg SAC, for example). Mission museums with a scientific approach also presented members of the congregation who were responsible for this focus in their congregation. St. Gabriel SVD is the obvious example that will be discussed in the case study.

Next to founding figures and scholars, martyrs in the mission field were also an often-portrayed group of missionaries. Werl OFM, St. Ottilien OSB, Münsterschwarzach OSB, Fiecht OSB, and Aachen PWG had an explicit focus on their martyrs, as did Hiltrup MSC, the third case study. Stories of their lives and deaths were seen as a good way of communicating the mission engagement to visitors.

In the exhibitions, the topic of national (or regional) origin of the missionaries who went to faraway countries is stressed as well (Bardel OFM, and Innsbruck OFMCap). Aachen PWG commemorated missionaries who came from the Aachen region, including one who was tortured and murdered. Especially for a mission museum that was not opened by a congregation with its own members abroad, it is important to have the opportunity to present biographies of missionaries from the region around Aachen. In this way, a connection between the visitors and the missionaries can be created based on common regional heritage.

4.6.3 Museum curators

The missionaries who were responsible for “doing museum”, the behind-the-scenes work, I call museum curators. Amongst other practical works, they raised money for expenses, organised the “collecting” and shipping of objects to Europe, planned and organised the exhibitions, wrote texts and descriptions, guided visitors through the exhibitions and explained the objects, and they also cleaned and maintained the objects and the exhibition. Often, one single person covered all these functions.

External museum professionals were normally not involved. Costs were lower because no external staff must get paid. And, as I will show in the case studies, it was the missionaries who became “museum experts” themselves.

However, in the last two decades this has changed and some mission museums have been renewed, with steps taken into the direction of professionalising the museum. This means that they received external support. Examples are Limburg SAC, where a professional museum designer was involved, as well as St. Ottilien OSB.

In Angela Jannelli’s concept of the wild museum, it is relevant that the exhibition organiser has personal experience with the content of the museum. Indeed, many mission museum curators (or even museum founders like Fr. Columban Keller from Bamberg CMSF) have themselves been active in the
mission fields. For those who brought the objects with them, this is a given fact. These museum curators or “collectors” could personally speak about the use of the displayed hunting tools, they knew the taste of the food made by these cooking utensils, had heard the language and travelled the distance to the mission field. This may be one of the biggest differences between a mission museum and a state-owned ethnographical museum. It shows also how well Jannelli’s concept fits the mission museums.

When visiting a big state-run ethnographical museum, visitors normally do not expect that the museum watchmen or guides have personal experience of the source community of the exhibits whereas in a mission museum this was more likely the case. I experienced this myself when visiting the Afri-

kamuseum of the CMM in Riedegg. I was shown around by P. Tony who had lived and worked in South Africa for decades and who – not without pride – expanded on this fact. Of course, this is not to be generalised for every single museum curator. In museums like St. Ottilien OSB, a pater who was director for decades had never set foot in a non-European country and the same goes for the case study of the SSPC.

Still, the direct personal connection between the community of the mission-
aries and the country of origin of the objects was definitely a fundamental aspect of the mission museum. Even if the museum curator has not personally been on mission in the respective countries, at any rate her or his co-members have. The SSPC case study shows how this personal connection was established through other missionaries who visited, not the sisters themselves.

It was not just that European missionaries were the only agents of trans-

continental crossings, the first non-European members of a congregation were as well. The case of St. Ottilien OSB is of interest here. As the debate over the integration of African men into the structure in their mission field in Tangan-
yika is complex221, the impact of this on the mission museum in St. Ottilien cannot be denied: In the archive in St. Ottilien several photographs show a black Benedictine inside the mission museum. In one image he posed in front of the African scenery with the stuffed animals and animal skulls, in another he holds one of the exhibits, and in another picture he apparently explains something to a white Benedictine. Lacking more information on this event, the depicted Benedictines in the museum, and especially on the date of this encounter, drawing any further conclusions would be too speculative.

Nevertheless, it becomes clear that through the mission congregation the character of the mission museum curators was different from those in a state-

run museum. Most mission museums had curators with personal experience of the countries of origin of the objects. And through the global structure of their congregations, they then had non-European confreres and fellow sisters who came from the mission fields and the source communities of the displayed

---

221 Egger, Transnationale Biographien, 262–70.
objects, although the extent to which these non-European actors shaped the mission museums is uncertain.

Another way in which non-European actors influenced the mission museums was through the method of organising the objects. This topic is discussed in the next section.

4.6.4 Objects

In the source records and in conversations, the objects are often referred to as souvenirs and similar terms, as in Schweiklberg OSB. The term Mitbringsel (that is best translated as "something you bring with you") is used in Limburg SAC. This term has associations with tourism and can also include an object that cannot be purchased (without an individual rightful owner), like a seashell or other natural objects that could have been picked up randomly. It can also have the connotation of a little gift one brings as a thank you. The mindset of referring to a museum object as Mitbringsel precludes a scientific approach towards the object as it does the idea of it having high monetary value. A Mitbringsel is hardly a precious item nor is it an object of research; it can find its way into one of Jannelli’s wild museums or a Heimatmuseum, but not into a professional, scientific museum.

Another term used for the whole assembly of objects is Sammelsurium which can be best translated as mishmash or smorgasbord. Missionaries in Münsterschwarzach described their museum as a rich Sammelsurium from diverse cultures. Like the term Mitbringsel, Sammelsurium refers to the opposite of an accurately and professionally ordered collection. It indicates “tohubohu” or something as chaotic and is, therefore, the antithesis of the Western scientific and professional museum, which seeks to bring order into the world.

Factual souvenirs and small presents, brought by young Indian sisters to the mother house in Switzerland, could be the basis of the narrative of how a museum was founded, this time in Menzingen. The story goes that the number of souvenirs and presents grew so that the sisters decided that they will best be presented to the public in a museum. This case also shows how non-European missionaries could influence mission museums in Europe. A similar self-portrait is to be found for Werthenstein MSF, where the “material” from Madagascar that piled up in the mission house in Switzerland is admitted to be in itself the intrinsic reason for opening a museum.

Together with the fact that novices and non-European congregation members from the mission field brought objects with them to Europe as presents, another common account given is that the objects were gifts from the locals to missionaries in situ (example Neuenbeken CPS). Since the question of how these objects ended up in Europe at all is generally not raised, the characterisation of them as gifts often seemed to the curators enough information to justify their existence in the mission museums.
A gift or present is a voluntary change in property which goes both ways, involving giving and receiving. While the souvenir character would turn the object into a remnant from a holiday trip, the gift character would add the aspect of friendship and mutual understanding. According to my interpretation, identifying them as gifts and souvenirs shows how the museum curators saw the transfer of objects into a museum exhibit as harmless.

One source must be mentioned, which gives an insight into the unproblematic presentation of such transfers from local producers and owners to missionaries. In the new brochure for Liefering MSC (published in 2010), some transfers of possession between the locals and missionaries are described as unproblematic because it is stated that in some cultural contexts, the process of making a specific object can be of higher importance than the resulting use of this object and the object itself. In other words, this different kind of importance of objects for the locals (first owners) legitimises the change in possession and consequently the transfer to Europe.

What emerged from the sources and my conversations with the museum curators is, if the change in ownership is addressed at all it is often explained as legal (gift, bought souvenir), morally correct (lost its purpose, became waste), and the whole process is rather smoothed than problematised.

4.6.5 Provenance of objects

The majority of congregations acquired objects for their museums from connections and networks inside their congregation (explicitly shown in sources for Bardel OFM, Innsbruck OFMCap, St. Augustin SVD, and Benediktbeuern SDB). The origin of the objects in the sense that missionaries “collected” the objects *in situ* was of importance for some museum curators. Innsbruck OFMCap and Benediktbeuern SDB stressed this factor and also wanted to highlight that their missionaries were also men of great knowledge and wisdom. The male missionary as a learned man and therefore a well-educated “collector” is an important issue that stands in stark contrast to the above-cited attitude of a chaotic *Sammelsurium* made up of random souvenirs. Both approaches existed side-by-side.

Museum acquisitions also occurred when different congregations cooperated and helped each other. For the SSPC this was a necessity because they did not have missionaries in the mission fields. The organisation that founded Aachen PWG never had their “own” missionaries as it was a “service mission organisation” and it constitutes an exception in this list of mission congregations and orders.

Sometimes, female and male congregations that were connected to each other, for example, through a common founder, cooperated with each other. Examples are the Benedictines of St. Ottilien and the Missionary Benedictine Sisters of Tutzing, who had themselves no museum in Germany, and the MSC.
missionaries and the MSC missionary sisters, both located in Hiltrup, Münster.

Other sources of objects for the museums were to be found outside of the mission or religiously connoted area: Some exhibits in the mission museum were for example donations by benefactors, donors or local “important” persons, as in the case of Werl OFM, where an ambassador to Germany donated an object from his home country.

The last means of obtaining objects and collections are the same as for any state museum – purchase. And external donors and “collectors” also play a part. The Afrikamuseum in Schweiklberg has a majority of objects coming from outside the congregational network, from a private “collector” from the vicinity of Schweiklberg. As a consequence of that, the interest of the private “collector” resulted in a unique emphasis within the mission museum, namely African weapons.

4.6.6 Type of objects

The range of objects in the mission museums is broad. Every mission museum in this study had ethnographic objects and this is to be expected since such objects stand for the non-European/non-Christian people who are the reason for going abroad and evangelising. Although there were some mission museums that housed almost exclusively ethnographical objects (for example Schweiklberg OSB or St. Gabriel SVD), there was no mission museum with no such objects on display. Further discussions about the ethnographic character of the mission museum are to be found in the case studies.

Besides the dominance of ethnographic objects, the second main characteristic of mission museums is the mixture of these artefacts and natural history objects such as stuffed animals of some kind which are also a standard exhibit. The animal exhibits were often the best remembered items by visitors and turn up most often in the literature about visiting mission museums (example St. Ottilien OSB). This is true of course if the museums were very old because then uncommon and therefore “exotic” animals were more of a sensation than in the recent past: For Limburg SAC, the stuffed lion is named the star of the exhibition since it was said to be in Limburg since 1906. Also, often named and popular were butterfly collections (Bardel OFM, St. Ottilien OSB). Both categories, the cultural aspects and flora and fauna, constitute what I call “exhibiting the mission field”, or more precisely, “exhibiting Africa”, “exhibiting Madagascar”, and so forth.
As both features are to be encountered in most mission museums, we can conclude that mission museums often housed two sorts of museums under one roof. They combined the ethnographical and the natural history museum. This juxtaposition of ethnographic and natural history exhibits recalls the Wunderkammern of the 16th and 17th centuries, such as the Museo Kircheriano mentioned before, where objects of all kinds were gathered and presented together (see Introduction).

Apart from ethnographic and natural history exhibits, the third category is Christian art from the mission fields. As can be seen in Figure 1 and Figure 6, Madonnas, crucifixes, as well as nativity scenes made of diverse materials are very popular in the exhibitions. Paintings and drawings depicting scenes from the Old and New Testaments are also common. They show the inculturation of the Christian message and should, as I interpret it, present to the visitor how global and diverse Christianity has become.223

Besides these three categories (ethnographical, natural history objects, artwork), there are special types of objects that distinguish mission museums from other types of museums. These are memorabilia, such as personal belongings, that commemorate the lives of missionaries. Objects like these are referred to as “relics” by Jacobs, Knowles and Wingfield. In the mission museums of this study, examples of these items were suitcases or eyeglasses, or a “travel set” of liturgical items (for example in Würzburg CMM).

An important feature is when objects are displayed depicting the missionaries’ different endeavours or professional fields such as printing and the press. In the museums, whole printing presses, photographs, old cameras and old typewriters are to be seen, as well as pictures of the members working in

223 In the four discussed definitions of mission museums (see Section 1.4.1) only Schlegel and Thiel mention the “collecting” and transferring of indigenous Christian artworks to mission museums in Europe. Both write that it is a more recent trend among the mission museums.
those professions (Würzburg CMM and Maria Sorg SSPC). These displays give a good insight into how the congregation want their mission activities to be seen, as discussed above in the section of addressed topics. This is what I call “exhibiting mission”, and it varies in degree among the mission museums. I label these objects mission history objects as they are presented in the museum context solely due to their connection to mission endeavours. They are not curios or exotica from the mission field, but banal objects from the Western point of view (like reading glasses or suitcases) and derive their importance solely through their use in the missionary context.

Some mission museums had human remains in their collection which were also on display. These remains could belong to missionaries, which would make them into “real” relics, as in the Catholic tradition, though without carrying the officially recognised status of a saint. But most times, they were human remains from non-Europeans. In some cases, missionaries who were active as anthropologists, for example SVD patres, were also “collecting” human remains for their research. Therefore, these “collected” body parts became part of the congregations’ collections. If they were exhibited in the museums as well is not clear (for more on the “collecting” and researching through missionaries see the SVD case study) The case study of the MSC in Hiltrup shows that some few human remains were indeed exhibited at least until 1903 with the purpose to visualise cannibalism. Furthermore, these human remains were part of the MSC’s collection until their confiscation in the 1940s (see the MSC case study). With the exception of Bamberg CMSF, I found no hints that human remains like skeleton parts or skulls were exhibited in mission museums in the second half of the 20th century. However, what happened exactly to those remains in the collections is not yet clear.

Judging from two websites, Bamberg CMSF still exhibits a so-called shrunken head, which is also a human remain. There is no problematisation of this object in the two sources I have access to, which shows an unprofessional approach to the sensitive issue of exhibiting human remains.

Another category of objects are exhibits connected only to the colonial undertakings, for example, “colonial currency” (St. Ottilien OSB). Although this category of colonial objects is not as common as the others, it shows that the connection between missionary activity and the age of colonialism is at least sometimes addressed.

A category worth mentioning, although it can be seen only as a sub-category of ethnographic objects, is the category of religious objects. We can find objects that express different religions or religious traditions: a Talmud, Torah scriptures, kippahs, a Qur’an (as in Menzingen), prayer rugs, Buddha statues, and ritual objects (for example from Africa). The amount of space given to
religious artefacts varies. The SSPC’s museums stand out with their interest in fetishes from Africa.224

Finally, the question of how many objects a mission museum owns remains. As the size of the museums ranges from occupying a single room (Riedegg CMM) to multiple rooms in a newly constructed museum building (St. Augustin SVD), the size of the collections varies correspondingly. Bigger museums like St. Augustin SVD have around 10,000 objects and insurance value of about six million euros. As mentioned above, the number of objects in its collection played a role in a museum being accepted into my list of mission museums. Museums with less than a hundred objects were not included to be analysed in this thesis. Therefore, the range of objects is from one hundred to 10,000 objects.

![Figure 7. The SVD built an own building for its mission museum in St. Augustin called Museum Haus Völker und Kulturen. Photo credit R. Loder-Neuhold.](image)

In order to give a better picture of the experience of visiting a mission museum as well as to present the broad diversity of the objects, I want to mention some special exhibits:
- a sarcophagus and a mummy from Egypt (Werl OFM),
- a hair salon advertisement signpost (Immensee SMB)
- a “typical African” round hut (Würzburg CMM and Maria Sorg SSPC)
- a Gamelan orchestra instruments (Aachen PWG)
- the fly net from the Chinese emperor’s bed (Aachen PWG)

224 I am aware of the problematic use of the term fetish. For a discussion see Section 2.3 in the SSPC case study.
• a plaster cast of so-called “lotus feet”\textsuperscript{225} (Aachen PWG)
• specially made objects with an educational purpose such as a whole display of little female and male figurines dressed and embellished to visualise the caste system in India (Menzingen)
• a vuvuzela that represents – with its connotation to the soccer World Cup 2010 in South Africa – an attempt to include current Africa into the museum (Riedegg CMM) (see Figure 2).
• objects from an up-cycling and community workshop in South Africa (directed to support jobless people) e.g. a football made out of wrapped plastic bags, miniature cars constructed from aluminium cans (Riedegg CMM).

The exhibits last in the list are of special interest. One would rather expect such objects in a Fairtrade shop than in a museum. They are therefore also in contrast to the exhibits in professional and scientific museums which would most likely not display such objects in their permanent exhibition. Furthermore, they symbolise the developing interest of mission organisation. What was once the craftsmanship from missionary schools such as a batik table runner made by schoolgirls is now the upcycled giraffe figure made by an adult in a job training programme. The Fairtrade shop parallel is most visible with these objects, and the juxtaposing of such objects beside standard ethnographical museum exhibits like beaded jewellery is one of the most pronounced characteristics of mission museums.

4.6.7 Geographical origin of objects

An obvious factor about the question of origin is that most museums simply bear the name Missionsmuseum which gives no direct hint as to the origin of the exhibits.\textsuperscript{226} However, four museums bear the title of Afrikamuseum (Salzburg SSPC, Zug SSPC, Riedegg CMM and Schweiklberg OSB), and two refer to one single country: the Brasilienmuseum (Bardel OFM) and the Madagaskarmuseum (Werthenstein MSF).

One characteristic of the independent museum is an often casual approach towards correct and detailed labelling of the origin of objects. Sometimes the whole continent is referenced so that “Africa” or “Latin America” seems

\textsuperscript{225} It seems as though many missionaries had a certain interest in this practice. Innsbruck OF-MCap had for example shoes for so-called lotus feet, but a plaster cast of them such as in Aachen is so far unique. This misogynistic “tradition” is not only explained to the German visitors and readers, it is also outspokenly condemned in the accompanying texts. Breuer, Kurzer Führer durch das, 23.

\textsuperscript{226} The question of museum names is problematic since many of the mission museums in this study have changed their name in the course of time. I take up this problem in some portraits (like Afrikamuseum or Schwarzafrikamuseum in Schweiklberg OSB). By referring to the location and the abbreviation of the congregation I circumvent this problem.
enough for the museum curators. Imprecise names like “Congo” are often to be found; therefore when naming “Congo” in this thesis, it remains uncertain whether it is the Democratic Republic of the Congo (former Zaire) or the Republic of the Congo (aka Congo-Brazzaville).

Nevertheless, I present here (current) nations that primary sources explicitly name as the origins of objects.

- Asia: India, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Philippines, Indonesia, China, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan.
- Oceania: Papua-New Guinea, Melanesia in general and Australia
- Latin America: Mexico, Colombia, Brazil, Bolivia, Uruguay, Chile (including the Easter Island), and Argentina.

The three continents of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are the most common origins of the objects. Other labels for origins are Canada or more generally North America. Also imprecise is the hint that the objects came from the “Pacific”. Some exhibits were from Palestine, and the term “Arabia” is used as well. As the only European country, Albania is also an origin for exhibits of the mission museums.

It is a basic characteristic of the museums in this study that the regions which were represented in the exhibition through objects were mission fields of the congregation, although there are exceptions. Obviously, a congregation seldom covered a whole nation with missionaries and mission stations. To give an example: Although the Menzinger Sisters were active in parts of Chile, they were not working on the Easter Island, which is politically part of Chile since 1888. But their mission museum included objects from the Easter Island, and consequently, the culture and history of this island are also explained in the museum texts. Additionally, the Menzinger Sisters had objects on display from countries where they have never been active, Colombia for example.

---

227 The title of this thesis refers to these three regions: Crocodiles stand for Latin America, the masks for Africa and the Madonnas for Asia.
4.7 Introduction to the three case studies

The three case studies present the mission museums of three congregations: the Missionary Sisters of St. Peter Claver (SSPC), the Society of the Divine Word (SVD) and the Sacred Heart Missionaries (MSC). These case studies go into more detail than the general facts and figures and characterisation of mission museums covered in this chapter, and the portraits in the Appendix. They present a more in-depth account of the historical development of these museums and the persons responsible for “doing museum”. They also focus on the “collecting”, the objects and the networks. With the use of primary sources, the three case studies answer more research questions and give a nuanced understanding of what a mission museum was and still is.

Chapter 5 presents the first case study of the three mission museums of the SSPC Sisters in Zug, Salzburg, and Maria Sorg. They were chosen because of the special characteristic of the Sisters and their approach to mission. Their congregation did not send their own members into the mission field; instead, they focused on fundraising and the apostolate of the press in Europe. Therefore, the case study shows how these missionaries could use their networks to obtain exhibits for their museums without having their own members outside
of Europe. This case study also probes the question of class and gender as factors of networking. Furthermore, the study explores the clear aims of their mission museums and exhibitions with their focus on propaganda. The attention of the Sisters is entirely to the African continent and therefore so is the case study.

The second case study, the *Missions-ethnographische Museum St. Gabriel* by the SVD, is covered in Chapter 6. This museum was chosen because it manifested the connection between mission and anthropology. The SVD is also the biggest male missionary congregation in the German-speaking world and their entanglement with the history of the field of anthropology, as well as with developments of ethnographical museums, is not to be overlooked. Additionally, the constitution of the SVD demanded that their missionaries “collect” and send objects to Europe, which sheds light on the importance of this endeavour within the congregation. This museum had objects from Asia, Oceania, Africa, and the Americas.

The case study of the Sacred Heart Missionaries in Hiltrup in Münster presents a mission museum as a place where anthropology and natural sciences met, and both interests resided side by side (Chapter 7). This is an example of a frequent integration of interests in anthropological and natural history in a mission museum. MSC members who went to the mission fields from Hiltrup were actively involved in German scientific circles and left their imprint there. This last case study also shows the involvement of missionaries in the German colonial outreach to the South Pacific and sheds further light on the “collecting” that took place in New Guinea. Oceania is at the centre of this case study.

The order of the three case studies is meant to have one of the most independent mission museums of the three cases at the beginning. The second case is one of the least independent museums, so the differences become clear. Hiltrup MSC shows additional aspects in order to rebalance the two cases.
5 The Africa museums of the Missionary Sisters of St. Peter Claver

Zug, a neat Swiss city, nestles romantically at the lakeshore and is surrounded by spectacular mountains. Salzburg is for masses of tourists the high cultural stopover in Austria, where Mozart meets kitschy folklore style dresses. Both cities embody a stereotypically Alpine culture. Both offer a smorgasbord of modern hiking sport, Swiss cheese and scenery reminiscent of The Sound of Music with lakes backed by snow-covered mountains. Yet, both cities also house small museums that lead the visitor away from this Alpine surrounding and into the continent of Africa. These so-called Africa museums were established by the Missionary Sisters of St. Peter Claver (SSPC).

Zooming out from the focus on this congregation, and looking at female missionary sisters in general, their role was defined by the male clergy as helpers for the male missionaries. Their tasks were derived from the traditional female gender roles in European society. They were to give direct help to the patres and fratres in household chores, provide simple medical care, nursing and educating children, as well as running orphanages. In short, broadly charitable engagement defined the intended tasks for the sisters who left for their duties overseas. How was it then possible that a small number of female congregations could found and assemble a mission museum in their European branches? How could sisters manage teaching needlework and caring for orphans with the organisation of exhibits in their motherhouses?

The case study of the Missionary Sisters of St. Peter Claver (SSPC) gives insights into these questions, not by stating the gender distinction as the fundamental difference but with acknowledging that the Sisters in this case study had to deal with a stricter set of possibilities due to their gender.

---

228 The museums are both named in German Afrikamuseum (Africa museum) and afrikanisches Museum (African museum), but I use the English term Africa museum for them.

229 For research focusing on the role of German missionary sisters see for example Eckl, “Grundzüge einer feministischen Missionsgeschichtsschreibung”. A good insight into the broad engagement and dynamics of German-speaking Catholic missionary sisters is Stornig, Sisters crossing boundaries.
Besides the gender aspect, class plays a major role in this case study, as the foundress of the Sisters was Countess Maria Theresia Ledóchowska, a noblewoman. Having a countess with all her connections and educational background as the founding figure changed profoundly how the congregation could navigate through the Catholic milieu. The life of Ledóchowska is presented at the beginning of this case study because she and her congregation were inseparable until her death. To understand the congregation as the context of the mission museums, one has to understand Ledóchowska. She was, as will be shown in the detailed history of the Sisters’ mission museums, the decisive person for the congregation’s engagement in exhibiting objects.

The SSPC did not have its own Sisters stationed in Africa until the 1950s. This fact raises the question of how they managed to equip multiple exhibitions and museums. This case study shows how Ledóchowska used a network of actors in Europe and Africa for her mission engagement in general, but also for her museums and exhibitions. Geographically speaking, the case study concentrates only on the interactions between the continent of Africa and German-speaking Europe.

To begin with, this case study presents the currently available research as well as the primary sources. Then the congregation and Ledóchowska herself are discussed because her personality and that of the museums are intertwined. After that, the development of the mission museums of the SSPC is analysed, focusing on the museums in Salzburg, Maria Sorg and Zug. The last part deals with networking and “collecting” for the museums.

5.1 State of research, primary sources and source criticism

The SSPC is not one of the well-known congregations and mission history has not yet given much attention to their engagement. Some scattered articles come from the field of literary studies because the foundress Maria Theresia Ledóchowska published her own writings of various kinds. Especially her “colonial dramas” have attracted at least a little attention by literary scholars. I agree with Cindy Brewer on the gap in research on the SSPC and their foundress:

[H]er contribution to the colonial and literary history of Europe has remained untouched by academic scholarship. There are no analyses of Ledóchowska’s

230 The correct spelling of Ledóchowska’s first name is Maria Theresia, but – especially in English literature – her names is also spelled as Maria Theresa.
231 In 1957, the SSPC changed their policy and sent their own Sisters abroad. But for the crucial time of starting exhibitions and museums, they did not have own Sisters abroad.
232 There is reason to hope that in the general uptrend of mission history, figures like the foundress and a congregation like the SSPC will see more attention by researchers in future.
politics within an imperial era; there has been no critical assessment of her writings, no objective account of her successes and failures, no explanation of the cultural phenomenon she created, and no attempt to define her cultural significance within the broader framework of colonial, racial, and religious ideology around 1900.233

Ledóchowska does not fit into just any norm and this is why she has been overlooked, but from my point of view that makes her even more interesting for research. This thesis aims to shed light on some of the wider issues just mentioned.

Much time went at first into searching for basic reliable information. Most texts and literature that the congregation published revolve around the foundress who has – as in all congregations – a prominent place in the self-understanding of the Sisters. I only consulted these works with care; aware of their context and their understandable bias, some show even a hagiographic style.234 Overall, these books provide a general historical framework. When used, they are to be read against the grain. Every congregation or order tries to paint a very positive image of their founding figure and the Sisters are no exception. Regardless of the gushing praise in their own texts, the successes of Ledóchowska and the congregation show that the foundress must indeed have had a strong-willed and determined personality.235 Therefore, the challenge is to find in other sources the material for interpreting her deeds.

Besides the small focus on Ledóchowska’s literary works, there is also small-scale research on their branch in Zug, which I used when exploring the museum in Zug.236

Luckily, the lack of existing academic literature is balanced by the great willingness of the Sisters to assist my own archival research. I spent several weeks in the general archive in their generalate in Rome hunting for suitable sources. In general, the congregation is very open to researchers. Their Swiss

---

233 Brewer, “Christianity, Race, and Colonial,” 20. Brewer analysis correctly why exactly the literal work and impact of Ledóchowska was overseen by research on colonialism: Her religious inclination (but also her uncommon immobile status in Europe), her gender and her nationality as an Austrian plus her pan-European identity as a Catholic excluded her so far from scholarly investigation. Brewer, 21. Having never been in Africa herself, she also was ignored by anthropology and historians of anthropology. Brewer, “Fantasies of African Conversion,” 559.

234 For example, Ledóchowska’s prejudices against Jews and Muslims in her texts are ignored in the biographies I consulted. Furthermore, hagiographic biographies do not have to be only in connection with the congregation. Inaccurate claims, such as that the collection of the SSPC led to later ethnographic museums in Salzburg and Vienna, are to be found in independent, but still praising work as well. See for example this claim in Strohmeyr, “Maria Theresia Gräfin Ledóchowska,” in Glaubenseugen der Moderne, 54.

235 It is debatable what “successes” can mean in the context of mission work. Nevertheless, regarding the realisation of her plans and goals (running an own printing workshop for instance), the amount of raised funds, and the quick growth of her congregation in personal and branch offices definitely legitimised referring to endeavours of Ledóchowska as successes.

236 Neumayer, “‘Der Keim ist nun’.”
branch, for example, offers several transcripts from historical texts for download from their website, texts about the foundress and some of Ledóchowska’s lectures.237

For the general history of the SSPC, I used their annual reports as well as individual sources. For example, the fate of the German and Austrian branches during the Second World War and Nazi period are of importance as this time had a strong impact on the mission museums. So far, this thesis has shown this in general terms and this case study will provide some details. But the chronicles of the SSPC in Salzburg report that much material such as correspondence and intern documents was burnt by the Sisters for fear of the new regime.238 The source situation for some time periods is, therefore, worse than for others.

The most important sources for the development of the mission museums and exhibitions of the SSPC were the annual reports. The SSPC published a report about the foundation and its engagement for the early phase, from 1894 until 1896.239 From the following year onwards until 1936, annual reports in German were published. These sources are similarly structured because of common features that are repeated through the roughly forty years of reporting. All contain reports from the headquarters and later the generalate in Rome, as well as from the branch offices (Filialen and Abgabestellen) located in different parts of the world.240 Annual reports are a highly relevant source offering good insights into their development year by year. But they are also problematic because they aim to draw a very positive picture of their work: For them, there were only success stories to tell. In their reporting, every event was well-received, and huge crowds of people wanted to attend their lectures, exhibitions, slide shows and later cinema show. These self-assessments are therefore always to be treated with caution. However, the insights are fruitful.

237 Missionsschwestern vom hl. Petrus Claver, “Unsere Gründerin”.
238 "Da uns zu Ohren kam, daß die Nazi (deren es schon viele heimlich gab), die guten Katholiken aufzuspüren wollten, musste man alle Hinweise darauf zu vernichten trachten. Deshalb verbrannten wir die ganze Korrespondenz der Wohltäter. Ebenso wurden die wenigen internen Formulare, die sich noch im Mirabellzimmer befanden, verbrannt.” Missionsschwestern vom hl. Petrus Claver, “Chronik Claverianum 1938–1940”, ACSSPC. With special thanks to Sr. Maria Paola Wojak SSPC for emailing me this transcript from the chronicles.
240 Next to the small chronicles from their different branches, other repeated parts within the reports are progress reports (including lectures given by Ledóchowska and other Sisters), summaries of correspondence (number of incoming and outgoing letters and packages), summaries of money donations, number of members, and important letters of high clergy. Many pages are always dedicated to the distribution of donations (money and goods) to the various mission congregations. The transparency regarding incoming and outgoing donations of the SSPC from the early days onwards is remarkable. Annual reports had between forty and eighty pages, the earlier ones were shorter, the later ones were longer because the length grew with the rise in branches. The individual reports and chapters are not signed by authors, but general texts were for sure written by Ledóchowska herself and her successors.
even though information about the museums sometimes comes just as single sentences, hidden between reports about other events and occurrences.

For the central sections of this Chapter about the SSPC’s network, I could draw on almost unlimited resources: The biggest and most organised part of their archive in Rome is the correspondence of Ledóchowska, containing around 36,000 letters. This material is ordered by correspondents. This was roughly all private and business correspondence with missionaries and laypersons in Europe and Africa. The bureaucratic and internal correspondence of the congregation is not even included in this part of the archive. The letters were written in German, English, French, Italian and Polish. Latin is also used.

Regarding source criticism in general, the question of language is important. Published and printed material like brochures was often available in several languages (translated by the Sisters themselves). Therefore these can be double-checked. Where possible, I used German and English editions since in French and Italian it is not possible for me to get the nuances between the lines. So I used those sources with caution, though often they gave insights regarding terminology when also referring to other languages than English and German. Naturally, letters were always in one language; counterchecking was impossible. I quote from letters in German, English, and French.

The index of the archived correspondence does not cover the subject of the conversation. Therefore the use of this most ordered archival material was limited to correspondent persons whom I had already knowledge of before from other networks and lucky finds. I came across the interesting exchange between Ledóchowska and two better-known missionary sisters in Uganda, the sisters Kevin OSF and Capistran OSF. Their correspondence is presented in the last section of this case study and, as far as I know, it is the first time that these letters have been analysed.

I also got access to the files of already transcribed and digitalised correspondence, first the dyad connection between the missionary Franz Mayr and Ledóchowska, and second the vast letter network between Ledóchowska and members of the Society of African Missions (SMA). The SMA-correspondence was transcribed by Renzo Mandirola SMA, and his transcript contains 1,916 pages of letters, which shows the number of sources we are discussing here. The letters were most often in French, with occasional German letters. The normal case in the SMA correspondence is a letter by a missionary to Ledóchowska. There are no transcripts of replies from Ledóchowska. Sometimes, enclosed lists of sent objects were not transcribed as this information was not valuable for the intention of the transcriber. A few letters discuss the sending of objects and contain formalities, like when sent and to

241 I want to express my thanks for the permission of Dr. Clemens Gütl, Vienna, to use his transcript of the exchange. However, to ease the access to this correspondence for future research I quote only from Gütl’s published book about Franz Mayr. Gütl, ‘Adieu ihr lieben Schwarzen’.
which harbour, as well as prices for the shipping, and discussion of custom. All in all, the SMA correspondence gives valuable insights, although my analysis has only scratched the surface of this vast network.

In addition to the written sources, I visited the Africa museum in Zug in 2013 and the mission museum in Maria Sorg in 2014. My accounts from experiencing these two open museums refer to their status at this time. This means that my observations and photos of the exhibition in Maria Sorg document their status quo in 2014 and do not concern the current exhibition after the renovation in 2018.

5.2 The Sodalitas Sancti Petri Claver (SSPC)

The Missionary Sisters of St. Peter Claver were founded by the Countess Maria Theresia Ledóchowska. Born into a family which claims descent from the first convert to Christianity on the court of Kyiv as early as 975, her life was bound to be extraordinarily entangled with Christianity.

Maria Theresia Ledóchowska, born 1863 in Loosdorf, Lower Austria, was the daughter of Swiss (maternal) and Polish (paternal) aristocrats. To understand her later gift for networking, one has to know that part of her network was family-related. One “uncle”, her father’s cousin, was Mieczysław Halka Ledóchowski.242 Ledóchowski became Prefect of the Propaganda Fide in the Vatican, he served from 1892 till 1902, and was, therefore, one of the most powerful actors in Maria Theresia’s network. Her younger sister, Julia, became a woman religious as well and joined the Ursulines under the name of Ursula. She later founded her own congregation and Pope John Paul II canonised her in 2003.243 Her younger brother, Wladimir Ledóchowski SJ, joined the Jesuits and made a career as well. He became the 26th Superior General in 1915.

242 Mieczysław Ledóchowski was a Papal Delegate to Colombia and Chile, Papal nuncio in Belgium, then archbishop in the Prussian Province of Posen and later appointed Cardinal. Because of his stand as the archbishop in the Kulturkampf against Prussia, he was arrested and jailed. Walzer, Auf neuen Wegen, 27. The image of a fearless fighter and even “martyr” for Catholicism was widespread, not just in his family.

243 In the biography of Ursula Ledóchowska (1865–1939) a lot of parallels are visible to that of her sister. Both had a good education and spoke several languages. Ursula was engaged in several countries, like Russia and during the First World War in Scandinavia. Translating, publishing and publicly lecturing were part of her work. Both public appearance as well as the tendency to ignore national borders are obvious in the sisters’ agitating. In Poland, Ursula founded her own congregation, the Ursulines of the Agonizing Heart of Jesus (dubbed as “Grey Ursuline”). She ran her congregation from Rome until her death, another parallel to Maria Theresia. Ursula was beatified in 1983 in Poznań and canonised in 2003 in Rome. Strohmeyr, “Ursula (Julia Maria) Gräfin”.
The children had an education befitting their social rank despite the fact that the family faced financial difficulties and had to move to a cheaper house in St. Pölten near Vienna and ultimately to a country residence near Krakow.\textsuperscript{244}

At twenty-two, a smallpox infection left Ledóchowska’s face scarred. Research that focuses on her later days as a passionate missionary ignore this illness as a superficial footnote to her youth whereas laudatory texts give emotional details about this event.\textsuperscript{245} Regarding class and gender, I see this event as an important factor in her biography. After her father lost the family’s money in the bank crisis, at twenty-two years of age her beauty vanished along with her marriage prospects. In the same year, her father died of smallpox. With no money and no beauty, she was still left with a valuable name, connections to noble families and, within the Church, her upbringing and her education. It must also be remembered that two of her siblings chose a career in the Church.

First, she played the aristocratic trump card: Maria Theresia Ledóchowska became a lady-in-waiting to the Grand Duchess of Tuscany, Princess Alice, who resided in exile in Salzburg.\textsuperscript{246} She was surrounded by pomp and splendour and in hindsight this time was extremely important for the later congregation because Ledóchowska made acquaintance with various people of position.\textsuperscript{247} Building upon her inherited network, which got her the position at Court, her professional life as a lady-in-waiting offered her the chance to establish her own network of acquaintances and confidants.\textsuperscript{248} Her position also finished off her education insofar as she learned how to behave in this milieu with their etiquette and rules. It seems obvious that the position in Salzburg was the result of no marriage proposals and the family’s bad financial situation. All biographies based on her diary entries stress that Maria Theresia was not happy with this life, as she experienced it as superficial and shallow.
At court in Salzburg, she met missionary sisters, Franciscan Missionaries of Mary (FMM), in 1886 and in 1887.\(^\text{249}\) This first impression was deepened when she was given a brochure from a – Protestant as it is highlighted\(^\text{250}\) – female acquaintance. The brochure spoke of Cardinal Lavigerie\(^\text{251}\) and his “crusade” against slavery in Africa. In it, Lavigerie appeals to the Christian women of Europe, to influence their husbands, brothers and fathers to start acting on this burning issue. The brochure contains one sentence that Ledóchowska copied by hand: “If God has given you a writer’s talent, put it at the service of this cause: you will find none holier.”\(^\text{252}\) Knowing her fragile health and her literary talent, Lavigerie’s command seemed to have roused the countess to passion. She understood that she did not need to go to Africa herself; she could use her gift at home and immediately she started to write. At first they were letters to missionaries because she was interested in contacting those out in the mission field. Then she wrote pamphlets, articles, and a play which was performed in Salzburg.\(^\text{253}\) She started to edit one page in the review *St. Angela Blatt*. This page was called “Echo aus Afrika”, the echo from Africa. The *Echo aus Afrika* became an independent journal in 1891 and is published by the Sisters to this day. All these publications were signed with Afrikanus or Alexander Halka as pen names because, as a member of the court, she could not make a public appearance. It is noteworthy that she chose male synonyms for her written endeavours. Both gender and class made her use a pen name.

At that time, there were various committees and assemblies working against slavery and Ledóchowska joined one of them but her vision for the

\(^{249}\) One of the sisters was a former lady-in-waiting at the court and also a countess. Therefore Ledóchowska had a forerunner in leaving behind the court with its comfortable life and becoming a missionary in Madagascar. “Solch ein Beispiel der Weltverachtung, der Selbstentäußerung und der Liebe zu den verlassensten Seelen in den Heidenländern musste unwillkürlich einer von Gott zu Seinem Dienste gleichfalls berufenen Seele zu denken geben,” wrote Ledóchowska later. Verlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Entstehung Wirken Verbreitung 1894–1901,” 5.


\(^{251}\) The French Charles Martial Allemand Lavigerie (1825–1892) founded the Society of the Missionaries of Africa, the so-called White Fathers and the Missionary Sisters of Our Lady of Africa, the White Sisters. He is known for his engagement in Africa (mission and anti-slavery work) and was archbishop of Carthage and Algiers.

\(^{252}\) This translation is from Giertych, *A shared Vision*, 21. Ledóchowska’s copy in handwriting is printed in Walzer, *Auf neuen Wegen*, 50.

\(^{253}\) Zaïda, das Negermädchen, a “slave drama” in her words, was published in 1889. Esaié Djomo shows how these dramas should portray not only the Arab slave traders as evil, but also the local political leaders. The message is clear: Catholic missionaries (here: the White Fathers) represented the good, the Muslims and followers of indigenous religions were bad. Ledóchowska’s play was in fact a rewrite from a known plot, also used as a tragedy by Voltaire in 1732. For a detailed analysis see Djomo, “Literatur, Mission und Kolonialismus”. After this first play, Ledóchowska wrote at least eight more dramas. Cindy Brewer analyses several of them in what is in my opinion a more nuanced assessment of Ledóchowska’s whole *opus*. Brewer, “Christianity, Race, and Colonial” and Brewer, “Fantasies of African Conversion”. 
engagement was incompatible with theirs since she refused non-Catholic members. She had to leave the committee but seemed more determined than ever to follow only her own idea.254

In 1889, Ledóchowska met Charles Lavigerie personally, a meeting that was only possible because her “uncle” Cardinal Ledóchowski knew Lavigerie. Again, personal connections helped her make her way. After encouraging words from Lavigerie and since she received funding from like-minded correspondents, her secret work became more than she could handle. The necessary consequence was to quit her position at court, which she did in 1891. This step was vastly disapproved of family and friends. For her peers, this was an affront to them, and they abandoned her. Until now, class was on her side, but help from her peers ceased at this point.255 “It was the ordinary people, whom she loved, that came to her help,” writes Maria Winowska of this episode of Ledóchowska’s life.256 Ordinary people like the parish priest’s cook or the sacristan were those who came in the evenings to help Ledóchowska with manual work, like the folding and posting of her brochures.

The ending of her comfortable life at court is highlighted by biased biographers to stress Ledóchowska’s passion for her religious calling. And indeed, it does show her seriousness about her vision for herself and for the Catholic mission in general. Given the fact that there was a forerunner, a lady-in-waiting at the court had quit in order to become a missionary in Africa earlier, indicates that it is difficult to estimate just how extravagant Ledóchowska’s “career choice” was.

However, Ledóchowska found a simple and small living and working space at a monastery in Salzburg (Daughters of Charity of Saint Vincent de Paul), where her publication and fundraising work thrived, and she soon had to hire an accountant. The founding of her congregation took some time; she was supported and guided by Jesuits, whose statutes she used as a basic rule. In 1894, after a private audience with Pope Leo XIII, she received his permission. This 1894 audience was of course again only possible because her uncle, then already Prefect of Propaganda Fide, pulled strings. The chances of any other “common” laywomen meeting the pope in private would have been rather slim. Thus 1894 was regarded by her as the founding date of her community. It was a Hilfsmissionsverein, a community dedicated solely to help Catholic missionaries in Africa, to finance the ransom of slaves and support the anti-slavery movement. As the patron saint, she chose Peter Claver SJ (1580–1654), a Spanish Jesuit and missionary to African slaves in Latin America. Claver was canonised in 1888, shortly before the founding took place. The full

254 This passage is missing in some biographies. However, it is mentioned here: Verlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Entstehung Wirken Verbreitung 1894–1901,” 8.
255 Only her former employer, Princess Alice, seemed not to be bothered by Ledóchowska’s decision. She continued to have good contact with her and visited the branches of the SSPC several times, as the chronicles proudly report.
256 Winowska, Go out to the, 90.
name of her planned society was *Sankt Petrus Claver Sodalität für die afri-
kanischen Missionen* (Saint Peter Claver Sodality for the African mission).\[^{257}\]
It was constructed as a lay movement first, solely run by women, and changed into a religious community for women, a congregation in the following years.\[^{258}\]

The first residence for the new sodality (only the foundress and two followers) was called *La Pagerie*, located in the city of Salzburg. A year later, in 1897, they opened a new home in a village outside of Salzburg and christened it Maria Sorg (meaning “Mary, care for us”). Maria Sorg was a former country estate with a paper mill. Because Ledóchowska’s goal was the so-called press apostolate, she fought hard to get a concession for opening a printing press workshop with second-hand machines at this place. She wanted her sodality to be able to print their own publications and consequently at a much lower price. From 1898 onwards, the Sisters ran their printing press workshop.

Starting from their central office in Salzburg (Dreifaltigkeitsgasse) and Maria Sorg, they expanded to other cities inside the Austrian Empire: Vienna, Innsbruck, Krakow and Trieste with so-called *Filialen* (branches) with external members. Around the turn of the century, more cities followed: Breslau (today Wrocław in Poland), Munich, and Paris. Even smaller offices (in German *Auszgabestellen*) were in seventeen more cities, inside the Austrian empire, as well as in Italy, Germany, and Switzerland. They quickly expanded, therefore, beyond the Habsburg Empire as well. These branches were used to distribute the many publications, to organise lectures, conferences, and sewing clubs (for donations to Africa) and as places to collect the raised money or commodity contributions like clothes.

In 1902 the Sisters moved the generalate to Rome. The discussions about this move show how many high clergymen, even Cardinal Ledóchowski, were involved in such a decision for a female congregation. In 1913 they also expanded beyond Europe, namely to the USA, although they themselves were not active in Africa.

\[^{257}\] Sodality (from Latin *sodalitas*) means fellowship, association or friendship. In the early years, the Sisters are referred to as *Sodalinnen*. I will translate this as Sisters, since the SSPC later changed to the form of a congregation and today call themselves sisters. The term *sodality* for their first association is of importance, since it also highlights that this was very distinct from a traditional congregation. In the early discussions between Melanie von Ernst and Ledóchowska about von Ernst’s following her, Ledóchowska writes that they are not allowed – by her Jesuit advisor – to address each other as mother and daughter, since these terms would “push them little by little towards an Order”. Giertych, *A shared Vision*, 37. This changed later when the lay community changed into a religious community.

\[^{258}\] The full developments of the SSPC with its changes in status and vows is beyond the scope of this thesis. It is however important to be aware that a) the foundress was searching for the most practicable ways to implement her vision and b) the transition into a congregation was easier to obtain for someone like Ledóchowska who knew archbishops and their like whose permission were needed for these steps. The processes of these changes are for example described in detail in Giertych.
Having weak health ever since she too hastily overcame smallpox, the foundress, further weakened by her touring and lecturing, was bedridden and finally died in 1922 in Rome at the age of 59. Ledóchowska was beatified in 1975.

After losing their foundress, the congregation continued to develop their engagement and their press apostolate. Eventually, they abandoned their emphasis on Africa and today they perform fundraising for projects all around the world. An important development in 1957 was when the first Sisters left for Africa to open a printing workshop in Kisubi, Uganda. They abandoned that idea in favour of only giving support from Europe but kept the focus on printing. First books and Catholic newspapers were printed in this workshop. In 1959, another such centre followed in Lusaka (Zambia), and in 1960, a third printing press was opened in Ibadan (Nigeria).

Today, the SSPC has branches on five continents. The congregation is now globally engaged, with Sisters coming from many “traditional” mission fields.

5.2.1 The characteristics of the SSPC

Cardinal Lavigerie, who influenced Ledóchowska, stated how powerful the writing of a woman could be and named the example of Harriet Beecher Stowe’s “Uncle Tom’s Cabin”. The SSPC has written and spoken propaganda for this cause as their foremost goal. To inform the European public about the African slave trade and about the engagement of Catholic missionaries against it can be the called its prime attribute, as it was certainly the view of the foundress Ledóchowska.

Their very first publication, the Echo aus Africa, established a connection (in the sense of being informed and updated) between the missionaries abroad and the public “at home”. But it was also to keep the members from different congregations on mission work in Africa informed about each other. Maria Theresia Ledóchowska stressed this point as well.

The intended readers in Europe were not the educated elite, quite the contrary. The low price and the small size made it clear that ordinary people, with

---

259 For information about the first Sisters who went to Africa I thank Sr. Ursula Lorek SSPC. Email correspondence with Sr. Ursula Lorek, August 2017.

260 For the whole section on Ledóchowska’s biography and the development of the congregation I used the following primary and secondary sources: Gütl, “Maria Theresia Ledóchowska”; Walzer, Auf neuen Wegen; Giertych, A shared Vision; Winowska, Go out to the; Verlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Entstehung Wirken Verbreitung 1894–1901”, ACSSPC; Missionsschwestern vom hl. Petrus Claver, “Geschichte”.

little money and little time at hand, should read the *Echo*. Reaching high numbers of editions and subscribers, this approach proved successful for the SSPC. One could say that Ledóchowska understood early the importance of a broad range of recipients (like mass media nowadays). She tried to convey information on an as low threshold as possible. The low price was possible because the Sisters printed the publications themselves.

At the core of the congregation was this publishing aimed at the common people, a definitive concern of the whole congregation. The foundress saw kitchen maids and other low working-class people as funders of the Catholic mission. With that, she anticipated indeed the responsibility for and involvement in mission by laypeople, which was distinctly expressed some decades later, for example, in the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965). Winowska claims that “Mary Theresa was in advance of Vatican II”.

The threefold structure of the early community around Ledóchowska also anticipates this: “a religious congregation of ‘intern’ members; lay members, called ‘externs’, who were closely associated with the work; and finally, ‘promoters’ who would pay an annual contribution and take part in the propaganda work.” The congregation consisted of women, whereas the externs and promoters could be men as well.

Next to the apostolate of the printing press, the direct funding of Catholic mission was the second cornerstone, which came as a second step after the publication of information. The reasoning was that at first, one had to know the situation in Africa before one would give money for this cause. The goal was to support the missionaries in Africa. The SSPC sent money directly to the missionaries who asked Ledóchowska for help for their various projects. Early on, donors could, for example, “adopt” an enslaved child; this meant that they gave a certain sum so that an orphaned child could be ransomed and would be fed, clothed and baptised by missionaries. The donor could choose a baptismal name for this child. But also donations of second-hand clothes

---


263 Winowska, *Go out to the*, 111.

264 Sister Giertych SSPC stresses this aspect: “The truth, which has been highlighted by Vatican II and stressed in subsequent documents, had been understood and lived by the members of the Society of St. Peter Claver long before.” Giertych, *A shared Vision*, 75.

265 Winowska, *Go out to the*, 106.

266 Winowska, 129.

267 This structure is of such importance that this is the first paragraph of the brochure which informed about the sodality, printed in 1901. Verlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Entstehung Wirken Verbreitung 1894–1901,” 1, ACSSPC.

268 Verlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, 1, ACSSPC.

269 “Wir haben in unserer Negerkolonie Gezirah wohl an 100 ehemalige kleine Sklaven; sie wurden von den englischen und italienischen Kriegsschiffen im Roten Meer den Händlern
and other European goods, as well as liturgical items, were sent to mission stations in Africa. The foundress not only wanted verification of the arrived shipments, she also wanted photographs of these donations to show the donors how their money was put to use. Two big leather-bound photo albums in the generalate archive give tangible proof of this exchange of photos. Mission stations under construction, newly baptised local inhabitants and especially many children are shown in them. Obviously, it made sense to document the “successes” of the missionaries. One photo, depicting three children in long dresses, holding up a little chalkboard, saying “Merci”, was meant to show this successfully arrived shipment of donations, here children’s clothes.

There is another approach that Ledóchowska already used from early on: sustainability. Winowska writes that the SSPC filled a unique position in the Church by providing a home front for those in the front line, who might otherwise have been discouraged and have given up for lack of support.

And this support was long-lasting. It becomes clear from the correspondence between the foundress and the missionaries that, for her, it was obvious that one-off donations would not suffice. Continuity, not just to build a mission station, but to maintain it, was the goal.

Ledóchowska’s vision for evangelisation in Africa also included from early on the approach that converts should encounter the Christian message in their own language (catechism, prayer books, and songbooks). Therefore, the printing press in Maria Sorg printed in several African languages. Then these books of various kinds were sent to the mission stations, sometimes all for free. It is

abgenommen. Es liegt nun an uns, diese zu ernähren, zu kleiden und zu erziehen. Da könnten wir wohl auch eine kleine Gabe sehr gut anwenden. Wir könnten auch eines der Kinder auf einen bestimmten Namen taufen, wenn Sie uns also zu Weihnachten eine kleine Überraschung bereiten, so sind wir Ihnen sicher sehr dankbar. Ich werde fortfahre, Ihnen von Zeit zu Zeit zu berichten.” writes P. Xaver Geyer in 1891. Geyer, Letter Geyer to Ledóchowska (15.12.1891) ACSSPC. The correspondence between Ledóchowska and the missionary Franz Mayr often displays lists of typically Austrian names for the children (for example Maria-Katharina or Leopoldine), and Mayr replies with information like age and indigenous name of them. For example Gütl, 'Adieu ihr lieben Schwarzen, 95.


271 A very similar one shows five boys in and around a huge basket with the label “Frisch angekommen!” (Newly arrived!), palm trees in the background. Photo album, ACSSPC.

272 Winowska, Go out to the, 128.
said that by the outbreak of the Second World War, three million books in 160 different languages had been produced.273

However, the feature that most sets this congregation apart from other congregations of that period is “Catholic neutrality”. Different from the SVD and MSC,274 the SSPC ignored nation states and just saw Catholicism as the fundamental principle. They were “servants of the (Catholic) missionaries”, wherever these missionaries were coming from. The many languages in her correspondence, the many different orders and congregations the correspondents were members of, are a visible sign of this neutrality. Especially during the First World War, Ledóchowska was criticised for this. It was said she would favour French missionaries, and with that the enemies of the German and Austrian empires.275

All these aspects show that Ledóchowska’s idea of becoming a missionary without leaving Europe – a contradiction at the first sight – was indeed possible. However, this vision was over time revised, and the congregation diverged from these initial principles.

5.2.2 Class and gender in the early SSPC

Apart from the influence of class and gender on Ledóchowska’s life until the founding of the congregation, some further issues are worth noting.

After receiving papal permission, Ledóchowska searched for like-minded young women and at this point class did still matter. Her first companion was Melanie von Ernst, an impoverished Swiss noblewoman. Melanie von Ernst describes one of their first followers, an unnamed “candidate”. She was a farmers’ daughter who slept on the table in the working room, and cooked for Ledóchowska and von Ernst “in a farmer-like way”.276 Although this area needs much more research, remarks like these and also judging from the names, it seems as though the first co-workers close to the foundress were

---

273 This estimated number is to be found in Walzer, *Auf neuen Wegen*, 102. The reliability of this exact figure is questionable but it gives an idea of the possible amount.
274 The SVD was decidedly founded as a German-speaking congregation and the MSC missionaries were a French foundation in the beginning, but their German branches also had a distinctly German orientation and were involved in the German colonial empire. See their case studies.
275 Winowska gives good insights into this critique of the SSPC’s policy. Winowska, *Go out to the*, 104.
276 “Sie bewohnten zwei Zimmer. Im Büro arbeitete die Gräfin Ledóchowska, ihre Gefährtin und die Buchhalterin, sowie eine erste Missionskandidatin, eine junge Bäuerin aus Bischofshöfen, in vollkommener Harmonie zusammen. Die Kandidatin schlief im Büro auf dem Tisch, der zugleich auch ihr Bett war. Hier kochte sie abends und morgens auf bäuerliche Weise.” The collection of texts, more or less reliable, about the foundress and the beginnings of the sodality were compiled by Melanie von Ernst. In 2007 the Sisters’ archive transcribed them into a digital file. I got access to this file and quote from there. von Ernst, “Die Geschichte der Sodalität,” 3, ACSSPC.
women from both noble and humble backgrounds. One biography also mentions that sometimes Ledóchowska’s strict adherence to poverty in her congregation scared off more well-to-do women.277

It seems that after the first shock over Maria Theresia Ledóchowska’s leaving her comfortable position at court and after the successes of her congregation became evident, the rejection or reluctance by the members of the aristocracy changed into admiration for her work. The majority, who were female aristocrats, became donors, extern promoters, or protectors of the SSPC.278 The annual reports until the First World War are full of proud accounts of which princess or duchess visited which branch office and who was guided through the small exhibition there. As an example, the report about the great African charity party in 1912 in Vienna reads like a who’s who of the elite in the Austro-Hungarian Empire.279 These were the people who encountered the displayed African objects.

After the death of the foundress, another noblewoman, Countess Maria Julia Falkenhayn, followed her in the position of the general directress (Generalleiterin)280 and served until 1947. But she was to be the last noblewoman to lead the community, as the third directress was Maria Valeria Bielak, a commoner.

Apart from these central leading positions, the strict guidelines written by Ledóchowska for the small branches (Filialen, Abgabestellen) also made it possible for women without higher education to take over responsibility and leading roles on a smaller scale as heads of these little branches.281

Looking at the financial donations, the class of donors is also of interest. It is several times stressed that it was from “the Catholic middle class that [Ledóchowska] receive[d] most help and support, and not from the aristocracy.”282 On the other hand, the same biographer stresses that during the First

277 Winowska, Go out to the, 130. The poor state of Maria Sorg in its early years must have been anything but alluring. Travelling in third-class compartments and similar strict rules were not everyone’s cup of tea either.
278 See for example Walzer, Auf neuen Wegen, 93–94.
279 Selbstverlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Jahres-Bericht SSPC 1912,” 30–31, ACSSPC. This report on the charity event points out that many aristocratic women were responsible for selling African goods or wine bottles in tents and other stands in order to raise funds. How much these baronesses and countesses worked is of course contestable, but a deeper personal engagement can be noted. The report in any case shows how the aristocracy – just before the end of the empire – could throw parties in luxury complete with every imaginable cliché about the African continent (an oasis was built, the Zambesi river served as a playground, there was a Madagascar tent and a dessert lottery), all under the motto of saving souls and rescuing slaves.
280 Countess Falkenhayn was of Bavarian and Silesian ancestry. She grew up in Lower Austria, just like Ledóchowska. Selbstverlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Jahres-Bericht SSPC 1922,” 3, ACSSPC.
281 Neumayer, “‘Der Keim ist nun,’” in TUGIUM, 147.
282 Winowska, Go out to the, 85. Winowska does not name the original source for this.
World War, it was especially the “Austrian elite” that kept the offerings coming in.\textsuperscript{283} Obviously, the relationship between the religious congregation, the noble foundress, and the aristocracy became complex and contradictory at some point.

While the focus on the common people as donors and financiers of the African missions is now praised as being ahead of its time, in the early days the SSPC was accused of taking money from those who had already too little to live on.\textsuperscript{284} This was an accusation that ignored firstly the voluntary aspect of donations and subscriptions of newspapers and secondly the transparent bookkeeping and yearly documentation of donations (financial and in goods) in the annual reports. In response to these critical articles, Ledóchowska denounced this as playing poor people off against each other. She added sharply that if she had established a committee for animal rights instead, the same critics would be silent.\textsuperscript{285}

The importance of the printing press workshop in Maria Sorg and the struggle to achieve the concession for it are not to be underestimated in relation to gender and class. There was much resistance by other printing workshop owners in Salzburg who feared competition.\textsuperscript{286} The biographies and the annual reports by the SSPC describe these attacks as they were coming from anti-religious standpoints,\textsuperscript{287} especially from liberal and social-democratic newspapers. Ledóchowska offered a lot for critics to attack since they feared a new competitor, simply because she was female and was of noble background, and she was a woman religious. Some critics did not even fail to mention that she came from Poland, which was wrong, as only her father was from Polish lineage. But the truth was not important in such campaigns.\textsuperscript{288} I would argue that

\textsuperscript{283} Winowska, 156.
\textsuperscript{284} In the annual report for the year 1898 these points were taken up on several occasions discussing the printing press struggle.
\textsuperscript{285} Selbstverlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Jahres-Bericht SSPC 1898,” 33, ACSSPC.
\textsuperscript{286} Moving the workshop to the countryside (Maria Sorg) “the trade unions may have felt that they had less to fear from the rivalry of these ‘nuns.’” Winowska, \textit{Go out to the}, 113. In an early report it says that already the first machine in the central office in Salzburg in 1897 caused trouble: “Es wurden nämlich die ersten Maschinen aufgestellt: eine Heft- und eine Schneidmaschine, da die Sodalität die Absicht hatte, fortan ihre Monatsschriften und sonstigen Publikationen selbst zu broschieren. […] Leider musste wenige Monate später diese Arbeit eingestellt werden, da die Stadtgemeinde-Vorsteherung Salzburg’s darin eine Schädigung des Buchbindereigewerbes erblickte;” Selbstverlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Jahres-Bericht SSPC 1897,” 1, ACSSPC.
\textsuperscript{287} “Who can forget the war declared on us because we decided to set up a printing press for the missions? One would have thought that this project threatened to undermine the foundation of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. […] One can well imagine the rage of our opponents when they saw the printing press functioning perfectly. The storm has abated somewhat, but the anti-religious press continues to seek pretexts to shoot poisoned arrows at the Society.” Source or author unknown, quoted by Winowska, \textit{Go out to the}, 147.
\textsuperscript{288} The Salzburger Tagblatt (November 14, 1897) described her as a Polish countess. Selbstverlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Jahres-Bericht SSPC 1898,” 28, ACSSPC.
the refusal to grant permission two times was a case of intersectional discrimination based on these aspects. The question is just which aspect was more influential than the other.

First, to found and run a printing workshop by women289 (the Sisters) trespassed all gender barriers in the 1890s, for a woman religious, a countess or a bourgeois woman. Second, class: The endeavour in Maria Sorg was called a “Count’s book printing shop” (gräfliche Buchdruckerei290) and her noble background was never forgotten to be mentioned.

The annual report for 1898 recites a passage from a newspaper article which criticised Ledóchowska’s struggle for the concession: The book printers of Salzburg should “in all seriousness” get a highborn countess as a Collegenin (a female colleague) the article jokes, or a strange lady who seeks to save “poor negro children in Africa”. Where does she get the experience to run a workshop and where has she spent her four-year-long apprenticeship? it asked smugly.

To discover this would seem very interesting to us and would, in any case, make a highly estimable contribution to the question of women's emancipation. A countess at the type case, that would be a novelty!291

It is well known that mainstream newspapers ridiculed the women’s rights movement. This article put her in such struggles that Ledóchowska clearly was not aiming for. Three aspects, class, gender and her religious zeal, were used here against her and the SSPC.

Although these campaigns against her struggle for the concession also used the religious aspect against her, the SSPC being a religious congregation was, in reality, the decisive factor for their victory in the end since she was also and in this case most of all a well-connected foundress of a young religious congregation within the Church. Arguably, only the status as a religious community and Ledóchowska’s good connections inside and outside the Church led to the final granting of permission in 1898. The critical voices against the foundress were openly sexist and accused her of using her femininity/sexuality and connections on one unnamed influential man.292 While her networking

289 The SSPC hired a foreman with experience in this business, which was also a requirement for the concession. But the work force, the operating of the machines was done by the Sisters.
290 This claim can be found in Selbstverlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Jahres-Bericht SSPC 1897,” 28, ACSSPC.
292 “[...] dass bei der ganzen Concessionsgeschichte weniger ‘Unsere liebe Frau vom guten Rathe’ als eine hochstehende Salzburger Persönlichkeit im Spiele gewesen sei, die wieder das Sprichwort zu Ehren bringen wollte, dass ein Unterrock in Oesterreich mitunter mehr ausrichtet als zehn Staatsmänner, besonders wenn er mit der Kutte zusammenhält.” Quoted by the Salzburger Tagblatt in Selbstverlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, 30, ACSSPC.
was obviously the key to her eventual success, it shows that the real anger targeted the fact that Ledóchowska worked just as any other male actor in her position would which is to say using influence and networking to achieve one’s goal and to keep one’s business running. That she achieved this at the turn of the century as a woman, and as a woman religious at all, inflamed the anger of her male “colleagues”. I want to stress that the “religious factor” (being a congregation founder) plus Ledóchowska’s network was able to trump the other aspects. A group of secular women without the support of the male clergy would be less likely to have succeeded in opening a book printing workshop in Salzburg in those days.

How deeply rooted was the opposition to some Sisters working in the printing workshop, can be seen in a comment on the first printing workshop in Uganda more than sixty years later. A journalist writes in 1961 about his astonishment at seeing sisters in white habits working at the printing press:

They, who by their nature seem more suitable for handling children, operate clattering machines. They don’t talk shop about nursing patients and infants, but about paper qualities, fonts and distribution problems.\(^\text{293}\)

Missionary sisters were, according to this opinion, only imaginable as caring for infants and sick people. That Sisters would operate a press and print a brochure goes against nature, not just for printing press owners in the 1890s, also for journalists several decades later.

Combining the already mentioned focus on laypeople, Ledóchowska’s recruitment drive was from the beginning focused on employing laywomen in particular. Apart from Lavigerie, her access to the congregation was filled with female influencers as well: the visiting missionary sisters, her female Protestant friend who introduced her to Lavigerie, the nuns who gave her shelter when she left the court and missionary sisters in the mission fields who supported her work from early on. Although much of the literature stresses clergymen, such as Jesuits or local bishops, who supported the young foundress, to give more prestige to the endeavour presumably, there were also women religious who supported her.\(^\text{294}\)

Ledóchowska herself was very honest about her “target group”. Before she founded a congregation, she wanted to work with the Marienvereine (assemblies dedicated to Mary) to found women’s committees against slavery in all

---

\(^{293}\) (my translation) Theyssen. Quoted by Neumayer, “Der Keim ist nun,” in TUGIUM, 145.

\(^{294}\) For example, the support from a Franciscan Mother Superior: “Die General-Oberin der Franciscanerinnen-Missionärinnen, mit welcher Gräfin Ledóchowska schon seit Jahren persönlich bekannt war, und welche deren neugegründetem Werke schon von jeher großes Interesse und Wohlwollen entgegengebracht hatte, lieh derselben auf ihre Bitte für unbestimmte Zeit drei ihrer Missionsschwestern, von denen zwei die provisorische Leitung der Missionsanstalt ‘Maria Sorg’ übernehmen sollten.” Selbstverlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Jahres-Bericht SSPC 1897,” 4, ACSSPC.
Austrian cities: “because, so I thought, one starts with women’s committees – the gentlemen will follow suit afterwards.”

5.3 Mission museums of the SSPC

The complex use of exhibition and museums by the SSPC needs to be approached in several steps. This case study does not concentrate on just one single mission museum, because that would lose sight of the unique characteristic of the SSPC of using the whole medium of exhibiting in their own way. First, the plurality of the congregation in presenting their mission as well as Africa is analysed. Second, the beginning of these presentations in various locations – also outside of Germany, Austria, and Switzerland – is examined. Third, the three most important mission museums are presented. They were located in German-speaking countries. Two of them are still open today, but with different historical developments marked by continuity as well as disruption.

5.3.1 Plurality of both “exhibiting Africa” and “exhibiting mission”

The first crucial point about the SSPC and their mission museums is the plurality by which the SSPC used the act of exhibiting, presenting visually, or showing publicly what they were working with. Reading the primary sources, it becomes immediately clear, that terminology is a problematic key issue, because terms like museum, exhibition, collection, travelling exhibition (*Wandermuseum*), also mission exhibition were used interchangeably. These terms tell little about the characteristics of the intentions and actions behind them. Therefore, I made my own categorisation based on the available material. The SSPC established many spaces for exhibiting and a basic distinction must be made between what I call “exhibiting Africa” and “exhibiting mission”. The latter means that they publicly showed what their specific task, their charisma, involved. This was the main key in their strategic work of propaganda for the

295 (my translation) Ledóchowska, “Die Antisklaverei-Bewegung und die”. Concluding from the lists of Ledóchowska’s public speeches, it is also obvious that she spoke many times to large audiences of female-only, such as female congregations or Catholic assemblies for women. See for list of her lectures St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Bericht Gründung 1894–1896,” 19–20, ACSSPC.

296 For example in the first report from 1897: St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, ACSSPC. The same is true for their publications in different languages. The brochure for their “Musée ethnographique africain Fribourg” also titles its exhibition “Musée missionnaire africain”, that means as an African mission museum. A strict adherence to one single name was obviously not seen as necessary. “Musée ethnographique africain Fribourg.”, ACSSPC.
mission, and it was a special feature of their approach to the medium of exhibiting. It is based on what is very distinct about this mission congregation: They saw their task was to support and practically facilitate the Catholic missions in Africa. In other words, they gathered second-hand products as well as made new objects for sending them to Africa. Objects in this regard could be clothes and fabrics, medicine and microscopes, bicycles and rosaries. Most important were, however, liturgical objects, like communion cups, monstrances, portable altars or vestments. Those gathered objects were – at almost all smaller and bigger branches – regularly exhibited and people could visit these exhibitions to see and probably touch these objects before they were sent to their destination in Africa. This was meant as a way of involving the European population even more into their duty to care for the African people, as the Sisters saw it. It was not just a coin that one puts into the collecting box; these exhibitions were all about being able to feel personally the fabric of the newly made stola or altar cloth, destined for this specific Zulu church, for example. It was all about personal involvement in the sometimes too abstract goal of “converting the heathens” or “freeing a slave”.

Liturgical textiles like altar cloths, vestments or mitres, are subsumed under the heading of paraments; therefore, this first kind of exhibition was called Paramentenausstellung, an exhibition of paraments. In my opinion this was “exhibiting mission”. Some elements of the Paramentenausstellung are similar to displays in mission museums. Both showed liturgical objects, such as Madonnas or rosaries. One could, for example, compare the paraments to the mission history objects in mission museums. Perhaps the personal belongings by missionaries (for example the suitcases from the mission museum Würzburg CMM) are also suitable to compare since both “exhibit mission”. But key aspects of the use of the objects differ radically. The Paramentenausstellung only shows objects which were destined to stay in the mission field, in Togo for example. The shirt for a small boy must not return to Europe; it shall dress a young convert. The rosary must remain in Zululand and help the newly baptised to say her prayers. This difference in the movement and direction of the objects is the main reason why this case study does not include the Paramentenausstellung in the detailed analysis. It is according to the working definition not a mission museum because it is not a stable institution and it does not display objects “collected” and transferred from the mission fields to Europe.

5.3.2 The intention to “exhibit Africa”

This case study concentrates on the museums that fit the working definition for this thesis in presenting objects which came from Africa to Europe, not vice versa. In other words, the focus is now on “exhibiting Africa”, and on source material which refers to the Africa museums. Although this case study
focuses on stable museums in Salzburg, Maria Sorg, and Zug, “exhibiting Africa” also included temporarily established mission exhibitions, short presentations on a single stand within a bigger event. For all these different forms they used, *inter alia*, the term *museum*. It seemed that Ledóchowska and the Sisters preferred the term of museum to that of exhibitions.

In their own words, they describe this plurality as follows:

Because it is of great effect when the products of the African industries, the household utensils of the Negroes, the idols worshipped by them and the fruits of the African mission activity are presented objectively and explained to the mission supporters, the sodality applies to the African missionaries for such objects and establishes with these [objects] African museums in its houses and branches, or it organises in other places shorter or longer exhibitions.

This programmatic text from 1901 was written in the first decade of the congregation. It shows what they were exhibiting (products from Africa, ethnographic objects from everyday life, religious objects and products depicting the “successes” in converting, in other words mission history objects). It also shows how they were equipping their exhibitions and museums (from missionaries stationed in Africa), and how they intended to get more items (advertising so that the missionaries in Africa would send more objects). Furthermore, mission supporters or “friends of the mission” were named as the target audience, which indicates that already convinced supporters should continue to donate. The goal was to propagate their work for the mission and anti-slavery movement. But these exhibitions and museums were only *one* part of the propaganda for the SSPC, as the text goes on to list bazaars, charity parties, concerts, theatre productions and even the selling of wine from Northern Africa as other means to communicate their zeal.

---

297 For example, at the second mission exhibition in Birmingham (July 1923). Here the members of the SSPC only occupied a single stand, as it is visible on a photograph in the annual report. Selbstverlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Jahres-Bericht SSPC 1923,” 18; 28, ACSSPC.


299 “Sie trachtet auch die Erzeugnisse der Missionen, besonders afrikanische Weine zu Gunsten der Missionäre zu verwerten und denselben so manche Gelder auch auf diese Weise zu verschaffen. Auch sucht die Sodalität zu veranlassen, dass man zu Gunsten der afrikanischen Missionen Feste, Concerte, Bazare, Thateraufführungen (womöglich Stücke afrikanischen Inhaltes) organisiere. Zur berufsmäßen Thätigkeit der Sodalität gehört es ferner, überallhin Auskunft zu ertheilen über Alles, was die afrikanischen Missionen betrifft.” Verlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, 15, ACSSPC. The importance of selling wine from African mission stations is not to be underestimated. Today, it may sound similar to the idea of Fair Trade. For the SSPC it was for some time a good source of fund raising and how closely related the exhibiting and the wine
Several sources reveal how the SSPC, from as early as 1899, addressed missionaries in Africa and asked to receive shipments for their newly established and planned museums. One aspect of this is important to note: They clearly addressed male and female missionaries for this task. One circular letter from 1899 is expressly dedicated towards “missionaries and missionary sisters”. The SSPC asked both male and female missionaries to function as “collectors” and senders for their European museums, and consequently they received their exhibits from both male and female missionaries since clearly the gender of the “collector” did not matter. The few details of an object that interested them included the name of the object, if possible also in the language of the locals who produced and owned the item before, the object’s “origin” which is to say which ethnicity or “tribe” this object came from, as well as the usage and purpose of the object. This information did not require any higher education in the field of anthropology; any missionary who lived among the local population could provide this information. Therefore, this gender-neutral address was possible.

The intention of their plural forms of exhibiting were expressed on various occasions. Around 1909 they were in a phase when they had already multiple smaller and bigger exhibitions and museums. They clearly stated under the headline Africa museums:

“To help Africa, to save Africa” is [...] the main and final goal of the sodality’s engagement. The function of the museums in Rome, Salzburg, Vienna, Trieste, Munich and Zug is also to awaken understanding and interest for the black continent. These museums are open throughout the year, and no visitor will regret having seen the abundant collection of ethnographic and natural history objects there.

Understanding, yes sympathy, and interest for the African continent were the stated goals to be achieved through a visit to the museum. With goals like these, their “exhibiting Africa” places their museums in the category of independent museums, because firstly, it is a non-scientific museum. The aim of their exhibition was not to give complete and – most importantly – correct information about the situation in Africa, in line with the contemporary (academic) knowledge from the newly created field of anthropology. The aim was

---

business were regarded by the Sisters is maybe best seen in the fact that the general archive in Rome has a box labelled “museum and wine”.

300 “Rundschreiben an die Hochw. Missionare und Missions-Schwestern Afrikas”, ACSSPC.
301 St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, ACSSPC.
clearly to interest people at first, and second to awake their sympathy for people they only encountered indirectly through ethnographic objects.

As a third aim, the visitors should be inspired to start or to continue providing support for the work of the SSPC. It is similar to Jannelli’s example of the bee museum Moorrege as being a wild museum, because primarily the goal was to provide information about the importance of the bees followed by a second step in enlisting care for the bees, in the form of new beekeepers, for example.

Maria Theresia Ledóchowska was the decisive figure in the congregation as its foundress and long-time general directress (Generalleiterin). She was without doubt also the determining figure for the Africa museums and exhibitions. As long as she lived, all major decisions – like opening an exhibition or museum – were made by her. And sources mention several times that it was the foundress herself who guided important visitors of high status through the museums in various locations.\textsuperscript{303} Some sources also sound as if the foundress herself set up an exhibition.\textsuperscript{304} The close connection between the feature of exhibiting and Ledóchowska herself is illustrated by an account of her visit to Basel. Ledóchowska was a child of her times and she saw the Protestant mission activities in Africa definitely as a form of rivalry with the Catholic mission movement. This was the context of her stay in Basel, a well-known stronghold of the German-speaking Protestant mission movement. During this visit in 1906, Maria Theresia Ledóchowska could not resist visiting the mission museum of the Basel Mission. And this visit was – openly expressed – driven by curiosity and the urge to compare her own museums’ collections with the collection of such a well-known mission organisation, which could look back on almost hundred years of existence.\textsuperscript{305} The SSPC was at this time twelve years old.

Before our travellers left Basel, they visited the mission museum of the Basel Mission. This is quite extensive, especially from Africa it contains many objects from Cameroon, Togo, New Guinea [sic], Gold Coast. Some parts of Africa are not represented at all. Our visitors were pleased to see that our collections are more diverse and that we have some objects that are missing here. On the other hand, however, they regret that the Catholic missionaries, especially from some parts of Africa, are still far too little concerned with the enlargement

\textsuperscript{303} For example, Melanie von Ernst reports for 1911 that Cardinal Vanutelli visited the foundress in Rome and that she herself guided him through the museum. von Ernst, “Die Geschichte der Sodalität,” 43, ACSSPC.

\textsuperscript{304} Again, Melanie von Ernst reports this: “In einem Saal hatte die Mutter [Ledóchowska, RLN] eine kleine Ausstellung von afrikanischen Gegenständen errichtet, und die Besucher fehlten nicht.” von Ernst, 47, ACSSPC.

\textsuperscript{305} The Basel Mission was founded 1815 and their mission museum was also established in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. First catalogues and guides were published for this museum also before close of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. For more see Schmid, Mission possible?.
of our museums, probably because they are unaware of the advantages they themselves would indirectly derive from it.306

Melanie von Ernst, Ledóchowska’s first companion, also reports in her memoirs about this visit in the mission museum in Basel:

We visited the museum with rich and beautiful treasures from all around the world. Our heart suffered from the proliferation of heresy among the pagan people.”307

These two quotes show clearly how Ledóchowska and her entourage were more than satisfied to see that their Africa museums could keep up with that of such a traditional institution like the Basel Mission. Gaps in their own collections were blamed on lack of engagement on behalf of the Catholic missionaries. In their opinion, the missionaries were not as passionate about supporting the museum, as they should. But at the same time, the missionaries are excused, as they just do not see the positive outcome of their own work for such a mission museum. The short passages here show the intention behind running such museums, from the SSPC leadership’s point of view. Gaps in the collection or the idea that the Basel Mission had “better” objects from Africa were part of the competition for the attention (and money) of the common visitors. Based on the trip report of Ledóchowska to Basel it is clear that the wish to have a “complete collection” from a scientific point of view is absent. Only propaganda for the mission and the anti-slavery movement build the foundation of her engagement for the museum.

5.3.3 The beginning and spreading of “exhibiting Africa”

In the beginning, the SSPC opened Africa exhibitions. Some of them developed into mission museums according to the working definition. The first exhibition which the annual reports mention was in their headquarters in Salzburg, and it lasted for five days:


The first attempt at an exhibition was made in Salzburg in May 1895. It lasted for five days with excellent results. The audience was very much interested, and for the whole time three members of the sodality were engaged with explaining the exhibited objects and this was the best chance for propaganda for the mission.\(^{308}\)

This quote shows that the SSPC used exhibiting objects from the mission fields from the very beginning of their congregation. Already one year after being officially established – and therefore with a consequently low number of members – the Sisters could already open a small temporary exhibition. It also shows how fast Ledóchowska was in gathering objects because she already had enough to equip an exhibition as early as 1895 especially considering the time letters and shipping took in those days. In the same source, they also only refer to the exhibition with the name “African exhibition”, which is in agrees with the above-given definition of an exhibition and is the correct name for this five-day event. The intention of the exhibition in this first retrospective is also explicit: exclusively for propaganda for the mission, nothing else.\(^{309}\)

It is important to stress that it was also Sisters who served as guides in this exhibition. They were the experts in the presented objects, so to say. As the main goal was to advertise the Catholic missions and anti-slavery engagement, these Sisters could indeed serve as guides without overstepping the gender barriers. It would have been problematic if the main goal had been to provide ethnographic information about the people on the African continent. In this case, the Sisters would have had no professional expertise to offer. As already mentioned, the background of the first members of the congregation was diverse, and we do not know enough about their preceding education. But it is unlikely that they had much knowledge of ethnographic objects from Africa especially when considering the few possibilities they had to gain this knowledge around the turn of the century, for women as well as for men. \textit{Summa summarum}, from the first exhibition in 1895 onwards, the Sisters – who had never left the European continent – served as intermediaries between the African people and the European visitors.

Soon after this first exhibition, the second one took place in Innsbruck, for three days in November, along with a mission bazaar. One year later in 1896, there was an Africa exhibition in the course of the Austrian Catholic Rally


(Katholikentag) in Salzburg (three days long and especially noteworthy is that a lot of clergymen visited the presentation), and in November the branch office in Trieste (then located in the Austrian empire, today in Italy) offered an Africa exhibition, again in combination with a mission bazaar. The two exhibitions outside of Salzburg required that the objects – and the members who functioned as guides during the exhibition – had to travel from the headquarters in Salzburg. The combination of a presentation of ethnographic objects with “shopping possibilities” such as a bazaar is crucial. It also means that in this early phase, one can categorise an exhibition clearly as a travelling exhibition. This seems natural, as the number of objects was presumably only enough to equip one exhibition at a time. But the establishment of permanent museums was already planned at this time. This required an increase in their collection, an endeavour that Maria Theresia Ledóchowska embraced throughout her career.

The next branch office that we learn had an exhibition was in the capital of the empire, Vienna, in 1898–1899. A long series of proud statements in the annual reports praise the many aristocrats and high clergy that visited the African exhibition as well as the Paramentenausstellung in this branch office. The text also stresses that both high and low classes were attracted by the exhibitions, but it goes without saying that the reports spend some time telling the reader which member of the aristocracy and of the court honoured the Sisters by visiting the exhibition or attending a charity event. As well, “experts” from an undefined field of science were also mentioned as having appreciated the objects from Africa.

In 1898, the first three-day long African exhibition was opened outside of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, in Breslau (former Prussian Empire, today Poland). Since 1899 an exhibition was arranged in the branch in Munich, another one outside the Austrian empire, but very close to their headquarters in Salzburg.

In 1900, exhibitions in Maria Sorg, Krakow, and Paris followed.
For the following eleven years the annual reports list the Africa museums (big collections) and smaller collections in a separate special category. After 1912 this stops but this does not mean that the museums and exhibitions ended. Later, the museums and exhibitions were mentioned in other contexts in the sources, where they were not as easy to be tracked as for the first decade of the 20th century.

Between 1901 and 1911, museums or big collections were (almost) continually listed: in Salzburg (that means in the Pagerie), Trieste, Vienna, Munich, Rome (from 1905 onwards) and Zug (from 1906 onwards). That means that branch offices which were established later, such as in Rome and Zug, were set up very quickly with an Africa museum. Since Rome became the generalate, and Zug became the head office for Switzerland, the founding of museums there was not surprising.

The list of smaller collections includes Innsbruck, Breslau, Krakow, and Bozen (South Tyrol, today Italy). Branch offices that turned up only a few times were Maria Sorg (see Section 5.3.5), Paris (from 1899 till 1904), Milan (from 1902 till 1905, even listed as having a museum), and Ljubljana (from 1909 till 1911).

Later, an Africa museum in the branch office of Fribourg, a French and German-speaking city in Switzerland was also listed in the annual reports.316

The majority of these bigger and smaller collections were located in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, though Munich, Rome and Zug had equally stable museums.

The Africa museum in the generalate in Rome was planned from the beginning when the buildings (first Via G. Lanza, then Via dell’Olmata 16) were bought.317 The one in Via dell’Olmata was described as “a rich ethnographic museum of African missions in the generalate of the Sodality of San Petrus Claver.”318 Interestingly, in this note, they stress that an expert (un savio) could be as interested as a pilgrim (un pio pellegrino).319 The Sisters clearly adapted their advertising for the museum according to the circumstances, since in Rome, as a capital city, “experts” from various backgrounds could be expected, as well as the pilgrims from all over the world. Today, in the conference room in the generalate showcases still display a good range of these objects which are what remains of this old museum. But it is not a museum anymore, the objects are more seen as souvenirs from the past, as well as serving as decoration for this room of encounter between the Sisters and visitors.

316 It is not sure how permanent this museum was, therefore it is not included in the list of mission museums in this thesis.
317 The planning of space for a museum is mentioned in Selbstverlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Jahres-Bericht SSPC 1902,” 6, ACSSPC.
318 “[U]n ricco museo etnografico delle Missioni africane nella Casa centrale del Sodalizio di San Pietro Claver” (my translation) N.N., “Per il Vademecum del Songressista”, “Un Museo Africano”, ACSSPC.
319 N.N., ACSSPC.
After this general framing of the beginning and spread of African exhibitions and museums of the SSPC, we now focus on the three Africa museums that were the most significant for the SSPC in the German-speaking countries.

5.3.4 Afrikamuseum in Salzburg

The birthplace of the congregation, Salzburg, functioned as a headquarters until the generalate moved to Rome in 1902. Therefore, it is only natural that it was Salzburg where the first objects were received, and consequently, the first exhibition took place in 1895. As mentioned above, apart from the travelling Africa exhibitions the SSPC planned an Africa museum in Salzburg as well, since the collection was growing. Right at the beginning, they started a catalogue of the objects which listed already at the end of the year 1896 around 400 items. The objects were mostly stored in boxes; glass vitrines were planned but still not yet in place. In agreement with the report from 1897 which named this as the basis for an Africa museum, in this period it was still a collection. Although the step to document the incoming objects hints at working towards founding a more professional museum, the date of 1896 cannot be taken as the founding date of the museum. Public access, a key feature of the working definition, cannot be assumed when objects were stored in boxes.

This short report from 1897 tells a little bit about the objects. The following regions were covered (in their contemporary designation): Gold Coast, Togo, Cameroon, French and Portuguese Congo, south-west Africa, Natal, Mozambique, Nubia, Egypt, and Inner Africa (Great Lakes). The following categories of objects were to be found: pots and pottery, baskets, wattle work, mats, beadwork, weapons, deity statues and fetishes, wood samples, ivory, rhino horn, ebony, and fruits. Taken together, the stated number of 400 objects, the broad range of objects covering typical ethnographic categories as well as items from natural history, and the covering of wide regions on the African continent were impressive for such a young congregation when regarding that they had no members of their own on the African continent. One type of a typical object category for mission museums, which is missing at this stage is Christian art and handcraft from the mission fields.

The exhibition, as well as the future Africa museum, were listed in this report under the heading “Das Wirken der St. Petrus Claver Sodalität”, the


321 St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, 35, ACSSPC.

322 In Zug SSPC, however, during my visit in 2013, I could see some few Christian artworks from diverse African regions, e.g. a nativity scene, a crucifix, and a Madonna.
The exhibition and museum are mentioned right next to the written and oral propaganda for the mission, supporting seminarists in Africa or propagating the call to become a missionary sister. This shows the centrality and importance of this engagement with exhibiting for the early phase of the congregation.

The beginning of a proper mission museum according to the working definition in this thesis must be set for 1901, because then public access can be assumed, as well as being named as a bigger collection/museum in the annual reports from 1901 onwards till 1911. Of the founding, the annual report for 1901 mentioned:

At the same time as the exhibition [Paramentenausstellung, RLN] an African museum was opened as well in Salzburg, offering the visitor many interesting things worth seeing. 323

Mentioning explicitly the opening of a museum hints that this – as it was also the headquarters – was indeed a decisive step: Five years ago, they described how they gathered objects, catalogued them, and planned to present them in showcases in future. This step seems to have been achieved by 1901.

From 1901 onwards this museum in Salzburg is mentioned until 1911 in every annual report when they list their museums and smaller exhibitions. Then this chapter disappears from the annual reports, but the museum is mentioned in later reports from 1925 onwards till the early 1930s. This shows continuity and stability over a certain amount of time in the first half of the 20th century. At the same time, this Africa museum is one of the oldest mission museums in this thesis.

In 1917, the SSPC bought a new central office in Salzburg, the old Boromäum. Rechristened as Claverianum, it was their central office for Austria and Germany. They had big plans for this office downtown:

This venerable, architecturally significant building is to be transformed under the name “Claverianum” into a large mission centre for Africa with a central museum, African collection of books, stamps and photographs, collection of original letters from well-known missionaries, photo lending office, etc.324

It is interesting to note, that this “mission centre for Africa” has as a first feature a museum, even called a central museum. It indicates that for the SSPC,


the central office in Salzburg remained important, even though they already had at this time the generalate in Rome. Also clear is that the Africa museum in this place should be the most important and best equipped one. This is what probably lay behind the term “central museum”. It is noteworthy as well that such a museum was accompanied by other collections, like photographs, books (most likely examples of their own printed books for the missionaries) and letters from missionaries. All this, plus the possibility of borrowing slides for slide shows indicates that the Claverianum being almost a study centre for the wider topic of mission was an aim of the Sisters. This would definitely cross the strict boundaries of what was expected of the Sisters by the Catholic leadership. A study centre, with literature about and material from Africa, was already close to an academic study programme, a sphere from which the Sisters were excluded because of their gender. Another source verifies how the Sisters were planning ahead and keeping an eye on the academic training of missionaries: While telling about the same plans through the museum, library and archive of letters, they mention the long held plans for a university in Salzburg:

It is easy to see how important such collections accessible for study and lecture preparation purposes will be, especially if the planned establishment of a chair for missiology at the Faculty of Theology in Salzburg should ever take place.325

This quote shows the interest of women religious in further education and training. But the core of this planned centre for educating the public about mission remained their Africa museum and it was the first entity that they opened in the new Claverianum. In 1918, just as they moved into the new building, the Afrikamuseum was opened on the ground level.326 This shows the priority of such a museum.

Melanie von Ernst remembered that during the First World War there were riots in Salzburg because of the hunger that haunted the city. People were also protesting outside of the Claverianum, shouting slogans against Ledóchowska. Melanie von Ernst reports that they hid the weapons and spears in the museum out of fear of intruders.327 It is not quite sure in which year the riots took place, but it shows that the museum’s objects at this point were still seen

---

326 Selbstverlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Jahres-Bericht SSPC 1918,” 5, ACSSPC.
as tools or here weapons to use in another context, not as “sleeping” museum exhibits. Because of their potential use they were seen as dangerous.

After the First World War and after the death of Maria Theresia Ledóchowska in 1922, the focus on “important visitors” turned from aristocrats and to high clergy (like papal nuncios) and missionaries. One such visitor who is of interest for this thesis was mentioned as visiting on the 26th of September 1926 in the Africa museum in the Claverianum. This was P. Wilhelm Koppers SVD, a key figure in the case study of the mission museum in St. Gabriel. The annual report simply states that he showed interest in the museum but gives no further information about this visit. However, it is without doubt that there were multiple occasions of cooperation between the SSPC and the SVD, especially in their branch office in Vienna. Most times it was only for lectures or when members of the SVD were using a branch office of the SSPC while travelling in Europe. But in Koppers’ case, it is shown that a person who was influential for the whole subject-area of “mission and (academic) anthropology” was visiting a museum of the SSPC. It is of course not possible to reconstruct any content of this encounter between Wilhelm Koppers and the Sisters in Salzburg, but it is likely that Koppers must have compared “his” mission museum in St. Gabriel with the Afrikamuseum he visited.

From two undated photographs (see Figure 9 and Figure 10) with the caption on the back “Museum Salzburg”, one depicts seven visitors, whose clothes suggest the date to be 1900 till early 1930s. The photographs show the inside of a room, the walls packed with objects up to the ceiling and even objects hanging on the ceiling. Several glass vitrines display smaller objects like jewellery and pots. The floor is also used for displaying bigger ethnographical objects (like statues, stools and drums), but with enough space to pass. Clearly visible are also carved images of deities in various forms and sizes. There is also a model church about one meter in length. Typical objects like hunting tools and weapons are evenly distributed on the walls in a decorative style. There is a large number of natural history objects, mainly hunting trophies on the walls and stuffed animals like birds and monkeys. Additionally, there are a lot of animal skulls, one leopard skin and a basket with ostrich eggs. A statue (around one meter high) of a black-skinned child in worn out clothing and with tilted head holds up a tray with a collection box – a clear

---

329 I want to thank Sr. Ursula Lorek for giving permission to publish the photographs. She kindly sent me later (February 2017) another scan of one of the same photographs stating that it had the name of the Pagerie on the back. This suggests that the photographs are from the earliest stage, the museum in the Pagerie, until 1918. In any case, the photographs show with certainty the SSPC museum in Salzburg, be it in the Pagerie or the Claverianum.
message of the intention of the museum, to collect money for Africa. In general, the room is well-lit thanks to the high windows letting in natural light from one side.
The objects in this museum were therefore diverse, ethnographical objects and natural history objects sat side by side and also (hunting) trophies were on display.

As mentioned above, the annual reports for the early 1930s brought up the museum in the *Claverianum* without giving details. Therefore, the last part of this portrait of the *Afrikamuseum* aims to describe how it ended in the chaos of the early years of the Nazi regime and the Second World War.

After the so-called *Anschluss* in 1938, the fate of the central office in Salzburg was sealed because the local national-socialist leadership would not let a mission congregation working for Africa continue to do so in such a central building in downtown Salzburg. In 1938 the SSPC immediately began to send Sisters to a safer branch office outside of Austria, smuggling some important documents with them. Some documents that could incriminate members or donors were destroyed.\(^{330}\) In 1941, the last Sisters left the *Claverianum*.

The fate of the *Afrikamuseum* was also sealed because not only friends and supporters knew about the museum, also critics and hostiles. The Sisters began to pack “the smaller and better” (i.e. more valuable) objects into boxes, and those were hidden in the gallery of the Collegiate church in Salzburg. The Missionaries of the Precious Blood (CPPS) and private persons helped them to hide the objects. These boxes are thought to have survived the war and were handed over to the Sisters afterwards.

But not everything could be stored away. It is said that the mayor of Salzburg and a high public official brought the *Afrikamuseum* to the attention of Eduard Paul Tratz, the founder and director of the *Haus der Natur*, the Natural History Museum of Salzburg. Tratz has recently become a well-researched figure who integrated his museum into Heinrich Himmler’s project “SS-Ahnenerbe”.\(^{331}\) Rumours came up that the Sisters wanted to transfer their museum into a monastery which was partly correct regarding the hiding of objects in a church. Obviously, Tratz did not hesitate for long: The daily reports for the *Claverianum* mention a first visit from a Dr. Friedl from the *Haus der Natur* already in July 1938. He was interested in the collection of minerals, and some

---

\(^{330}\) The passage about the confiscation and end of the Afrikamuseum in Salzburg is reconstructed based on information from Dr. Robert Lindner from the Natural History Museum Salzburg, the *Haus der Natur* (conversation, and email from July 2016), and sources sent to me by Sr. Maria Paola Wojak SSPC (“Tagesberichte vom Claverianum”, ACESSP; “Chronik Claverianum 1938–1940”, ACSSPC). I want to thank Dr. Lindner and Sr. Wojak, who were both involved in the restitution and therefore best informed, for helping me.

\(^{331}\) For further information on Tratz, his museum and the accounting of the past by the *Haus der Natur*, see Hoffmann, “Ein Museum für Himmler”, Kerschbaumer, “Das Deutsche Haus der” and the blog by Gottfried Fliedl: Fliedl, “Das Haus der Natur”. It must be noted that compared to the atrocities committed by the SS during the “SS-Ahnenerbe” project, the confiscation of museum objects from the Sisters is only a small footnote. However, for the history of the Africa museum, this end is of course of importance, though the fate of the Sisters is in no way to be compared to the fate of many others who suffered under the “Ahnenerbe”. It is however interesting to see how Tratz and others did not miss opportunities to confiscate and appropriate even non-scientific and amateurish museum collections.
days later, he started to confiscate the minerals. Even Director Tratz is said to have been in the *Claverianum* packing the minerals. But not just the *Claverianum* was of interest to the *Haus der Natur*. For 1939 there are lists of objects taken from the branch offices in Vienna and Maria Sorg. Also, the exhibition in Innsbruck fell victim to confiscation by Tratz.332

With the expulsion of the Sisters from the *Claverianum* and the confiscation of parts of their collection, the *Afrikamuseum* in Salzburg downtown came to an end in 1938 or 1939, like many other mission museums in Germany and Austria as shown in the portraits.

After the war, the majority of the objects were handed back to the Sisters in Maria Sorg. It seems that the then director of the *Haus der Natur*, a disciple of Tratz, was not too keen on finding the remaining objects for restitution. In the course of the later process to come to terms with the past, the *Haus der Natur* contacted the Sisters again in 2013. Agreements between the museum and Sr. Maria Paola Wojak SSPC resulted in the restitution of a few more objects to the SSPC.

5.3.5 *Afrikamuseum/Missionsmuseum* in Maria Sorg

The first time that the annual reports mention a museum for Maria Sorg is 1900. It was opened to the public in August and was open daily.333 That means that at the same time they presented objects in the headquarters in Salzburg downtown, as well in the branch Maria Sorg outside of Salzburg. Having two museums in such geographical proximity hints that they must have had plenty of objects.

Starting in 1900, the museum was mentioned here and there in the annual reports until the early 1920s. The founding year of 1900 is also verified through a letter a Sister wrote to missionary Franz Mayr.334 When the museum is mentioned in the reports it is always in connection with visitors. As an example, archduchesses, duchesses, and princes came to visit Maria Sorg in 1916, and special attention was given to the chapel, the printing workshop and the museum.335 With the end of the monarchy, such aristocratic visits ended, but other groups of visitors took over: Visits by school classes or other groups like orphaned children continued to be mentioned in the annual reports. Most of the time visits include the printing workshop (which was more interesting to see than the museum, it seems), the museum, and the small chapel in Maria

---

Sometimes lectures about mission activities also completed the excursions. It seems that especially in the summer months Maria Sorg was a popular destination for such outings.336

The Second World War was a major interruption for Maria Sorg; the SPPC had to leave this branch too. Consequently, this meant the end of the Africa museum. But the Sisters returned, and the printing press took up work again and continued until 1977. As mentioned above, restituted objects from the Haus der Natur were handed back to Maria Sorg since this was after the war the central branch for Austria. In a way, Maria Sorg became the successor of the Claverianum, at least for the museum’s objects.

For the post-war years, however, it is doubtful that there was immediately a new Africa museum or exhibition. Sister M. Paula remembers that when she joined the congregation in 1978, in Maria Sorg only the reception area (Pfortenzimmer) displayed a museum exhibit, the stuffed cheetah with painted scenery as a background. All objects of the former museum were stored away in boxes. The initiative to re-establish and re-open an Africa museum in Maria Sorg was said to have been made by Sr. Maria Paola Wojak. She was also responsible for the restitution cases from the Haus der Natur.

When I visited the museum in 2014, it was located in two big rooms which until 1987 contained the printing press machines. This means that one important feature of Maria Sorg, the printing press, had to become unprofitable.

so that another feature, the former museum, could be re-established in the old printing workshop capacities. The plans evolved slowly, and from 1994 onwards, the first signs of a new museum took shape. The first display cases and the so-called “African hut” were set up in the location.

Everyone I contacted is reluctant to give a certain date for the opening of this second museum. Therefore 1994 is the most reliable date I could get.

The biggest difference between the two phases (until the closing during the war and from the 1990s onwards) and the most important development is that the Africa museum turned into a mission museum. Because after re-opening the congregation had itself developed into a globally active entity, the journal *Echo* also integrated the new mission fields. The new title is *Echo aus Afrika und anderen Erdteilen*, Echo from Africa and other parts of the world. This change into a global mission congregation and the abandoning of the focus on Africa resulted in the fact that the “new” museum in Maria Sorg presented itself with a higher amount and density of objects and photos from Africa, but in 2014 when I visited the museum, there were also many objects from India for example, including a mannequin in a sari and a map of the state of India. Also nations like the Philippines, Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay are on display with a few objects. But there was no balance in the attention given to different mission fields concerning the number of objects and topics presented. The focus on Africa was still overwhelming.

Regarding the objects and presentation, the second museum in Maria Sorg is of interest because there was an astonishing continuity in the African part of the exhibition. The first eye-catching display of continuity were three mise-en-scènes in three corners of the room dedicated only to Africa. There the visitor found many smaller classical ethnographic objects like jewellery (bracelets, necklaces, beadworks), small seals, wooden idols and fetishes. The most interesting detail about some of these items is that they showed the “original” object tags. Original in this sense means that these were the tags that were given to them when the objects entered the collection of the SSPC, after arriving from their “collectors”. The tags were in line with what the guidelines for the branch offices demanded of the Sisters. The guidelines from 1931 expected that the object tags were attached to the object in a way that it would

---

337 “[Das Museum] lebt von Ideen, Personen und den Objekten, die neu integriert werden. Mit genauen Jahreszahlen lässt sich also hier schwer etwas festlegen.” Email correspondence Sr. M. Paula, May 2014.

338 When I visited the museum in Maria Sorg in 2014 I was unaware of the long history of exhibiting by the SSPC. Therefore this aspect is very much a “discovery” made while working on the case study with the rich primary sources I later had access to.
not separate from it easily.\textsuperscript{339} That some objects in the museum in 2014 were still connected with labels from this time is evidence that the demands from the 1930s were successfully complied with. Also some exhibits in the museum in Zug still have these brown tags (see Figure 11). The same brown tags as in Maria Sorg, both printed and then filled out by hand, were found in the Ethnographical Museum in Ljubljana (Slovenia). These tags helped to trace the provenance of museum exhibits in this state-run museum back to the confiscated Slovenian branch office of the SSPC.\textsuperscript{340}

Continuity with the older Africa museum in Salzburg can also be verified with one single but decidedly unique object which was not an ethnographical or natural history object, rather it was part of the “decoration”. In the “African hut” which was located inside the museum until at least 2014 and which was decorated inside like a chapel, there was the statue of a child (see Figure 12). There can be no doubt that this was the same statue that is seen on the photograph of the Africa museum in Salzburg (see Figure 10). The difference was only that the current statue had jewellery around its neck which it hadn’t in the old photograph and that it held a basket on the tray, not a collecting box. This statue signifies an enduring continuity with the first phase of “exhibiting Africa” at the beginning of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. It also shows that objects from the museum in Salzburg “survived” the war and turmoil and made it into the 21\textsuperscript{st} century and into the new mission museum.

In 2014, there was another instance of continuity, here on the textual and explanatory level. Maria Sorg also displayed posters on its walls that definitely dated not from the 1990s, when the mission museum was re-opened. The posters on the wall in the African room showed black-and-white photographs. The origins of these photos must be the same as from the photos in the photo album


\textsuperscript{340} I saw these brown tags while I visited Maria Sorg in March 2013 and before in Zug. In Zug, they are written in French, and only in handwriting. About the tags in Slovenia: The objects were confiscated by the Communist regime when it closed the SSPC branch office in Ljubljana. Today, the Ethnographic museum in Ljubljana owns parts of the former SSPC collection. Marko Frelih is researching this collection. I thank him for cooperation in this question. Email correspondence with Dr. Marko Frelih, June 2016.
in the generalate in Rome. Also their captions were from the first half of the 20th century, both in style (handwritten with ink) and in wording. There was also an undated newspaper clip reporting on Petrus Canisius, an African man who was bought free by a missionary and who later studied theology in Portugal thanks to the support of Emperor Franz Josef.\textsuperscript{341} It must be highlighted that these collages of newspaper articles, photos of missionaries and former slaves were very much the essence of the time and thinking of Maria Theresia Ledóchowska, not that of the 1990s and later. I regard the re-use of these old posters in the new mission museum as an example of how the Sisters were “doing museum” in their own style, which I discuss now in detail.

An interesting view of this museum in Maria Sorg was pointed out to me, that the museum was rather a process than a stable entity:

Actually, the museum is not a “finished” project but is still subject to change. Each new superior has new ideas, most recently the mineral collection was placed in the glass boxes. If you come in a few years, the museum might look different again. It lives from ideas, people and objects that are newly integrated.\textsuperscript{342}

Undoubtedly it is true that the persons involved influenced the set-up of every museum but stressing it in this way makes it obvious that the Sisters continue to regard the museum as their very own medium to spread their message. Although I do not know if this is done intentionally, one cannot overlook the similarities to Maria Theresia Ledóchowska’s way of using different means to spread her message, shaping them as seemed to fit her needs. This way, like the integration of a mineral collection that as I was told \textit{in situ} had nothing to do with the mission aspect, puts the museum in Maria Sorg of the 21st century close to the \textit{independent museums}. (I have already pointed out that it was non-scientific.) The Sisters shaped this old collection and added a new feature to it as it suited them. Having the old collages and new additions like the mineral collection side by side is exactly a key characteristic of Angela Jannelli’s concept of the \textit{wild museum}, that is, an independent approach to how to present their message and how to fill their museum. This approach towards exhibition design (mineral collection next to the 

\textit{\textit{sari and printing press}}) is for me a clear sign of “doing museum” independently.

\textsuperscript{341} The article headline is “Der Negerknabe des Kaisers Franz Josef getötet” and the newspaper article is undated. It is reported that Franz Joseph allowed Petrus Canisius to study in 1901 and, as he was forty years old at the time of his death, the newspaper article is probably from the 1920s.
Another aspect of Jannelli’s work on amateur museums is that of the “insider-museum” like the McNair Museum in Berlin. Its functions fit the museum in Maria Sorg. The “insider-museum” is less directed towards the general public and first-time visitors but rather directed towards the members of the club or association which runs the museum. This aspect has much to do with the advertising for the museum. Other than from the website www.mariasorg.at, which dedicates one page to the museum, there is not much publicity made for visiting the museum such as being included in various lists about museums in the region of Salzburg or similar. Until 2018, their former website invited especially children’s groups like those preparing for first communion and confirmation to come and visit. It seems obvious that the museum is more directed towards supporters and friends of the SSPC – in other words “insiders” – who would in any case know about the museum. The advertisement is directed towards those already active in the Catholic sphere. This is in accordance with what Jannelli shows for the McNair Museum which has the “normal visitor” (in their words “guest”) only on the third rank of its welcome, after the “member” and the “friend”.

One important characteristic of the museum in Maria Sorg is that the exhibition until 2018 again included the aspect of “exhibiting mission”. The second big exhibition room was dedicated to telling the story and development of the congregation. The walls were crammed with black-and-white photographs of the Sisters working in the case room, at the printing press and other machines to produce books and journals or to prepare to send boxes and shipments to Africa. Also, photos of the foundress Ledóchowska with early members were to be seen. What distinguished this museum from other mission museums were the many technical instruments and machines in the exhibition: an old addressing machine, an old slide projector, and tools for bookbinding. As seen in Figure 13, two desks were prepared showing how “it used to be”, with old seals, hole puncher, clock, telephone, paperknife and a huge Underwood typewriter. Both represented two different eras of desktop work because the second was slightly more “modern” in its tools than the other. Between all these items, small ebony statues from Africa were scattered, to remind you of the actual background of the museum. And arguably this is also to remind the visitor of the reason why the women in the photos were doing all this. There were also pot plants in the exhibition, near to the desks and machines.

One characteristic showing Maria Sorg SSPC as an amateur museum is, for example, the lack of leading texts or explanatory texts in the exhibition. Some objects had labels like “Bamboo water tank, NAGA PHILIPPINES”. And when encountering the tools and machines, the visitor was not guided through a written explanation. Commonly, all visitors are with a Sister as a guide in

343 Jannelli, Wilde Museen, 127–70.
344 Jannelli, 133.
the museum and she would give explanations. This feature is important for the *independent museum* and the “insider-museum”.  
In 2018 the exhibition in Maria Sorg was renovated. The old showcases were replaced with new ones to improve the lighting of the objects. The exhibits remained more or less the same, only very few were removed and some were added from the Afrikamuseum in Zug. The Sisters in Maria Sorg also plan to dedicate the smaller room of the museum to their foundress. They want to present Ledóchowska’s life and work and the history of the congregation.

5.3.6 *Afrikamuseum* in Zug

The SSPC wanted a bigger central office to manage the engagement in Switzerland, and the city of Zug in central Switzerland was chosen as the perfect site. Zug was dominantly Catholic and located on the railway line to Rome. In 1905 the SSPC bought a centrally located building with opulent baroque ornamental paintings on its façade (St. Oswalds-Gasse 17) and opened its central office for Switzerland.

---

345 Observations based on personal visit in Maria Sorg in April 2014.
346 Email correspondences with Sr. M. Paula and Sr. Ursula Lorek, April 2019.
347 Neumayer, “‘Der Keim ist nun,’” in *TUGIUM*, 147–48.
Immediately, still in 1905, a museum was planned for this central office, which shows the priority of establishing an Africa museum, as well as the devotion to Ledóchowska’s order that they open exhibitions and museums:

Finally, as soon as conditions permit, a substantial museum of ethnographic objects will be created here, for which a large hall on the 3rd floor of the house we are now occupying [...] is particularly suitable.348

The next annual report, for 1906, described how Ledóchowska herself was present for an assembly and how she invited (and probably guided) her guests, clergymen from Zug, into and through the newly installed Africa museum.349 That means that 1906 is the founding date for the museum in Zug. Contradictory to this dating, an explanatory text in the current Afrikamuseum states that the museum went back to an “African collection”, which was started in the times of the foundress, around 1907 in Zug.350 The annual reports are nearer the time and consequently more reliable. Therefore 1906 is taken as the right date of the founding.

After the opening, visits to the museums from school classes or from (higher) clergy and missionaries were mentioned in several annual reports.351 Some of the visitors who were missionaries also used their visit to share their experiences, for example a missionary sister from Lyon352 who came to Zug “to visit our museum”353 and who told stories about her mission station in Porto Novo. It is, therefore, important to note that the spreading of information from the mission fields to organisations like the SSPC branch office in a Swiss town was not only through postal networks but also through personal encounters. As this report states clearly that the visitor from the African mission field was also in the museum, it can be easily imagined how she may also have explained one or the other of the museum exhibits she recognised from her region in Africa. The audience for these stories (fetish cult, snake cults next to

351 One example: Selbstverlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Jahres-Bericht SSPC 1926,” 14, ACSSPC.
352 It is not quite clear which congregation the “Lyoner Missionsschwester” was part of, probably the Sœurs missionnaires de Notre-Dame des Apôtres, founded 1876 in France for the evangelising of Africans.
polygyny were mentioned in this annual report as part of the sister’s narratives) were the SSPC Sisters in this branch office who presumably learned from the missionary sister and used her as a source for information regarding the objects. In this way, biased knowledge travelled through missionary sister and then the SSPC member and ended in a Swiss town. As this example shows, this path of imparting information was solely made by women. The sources are very clear about the female involvement. However, the information for their Africa museums – as did their objects – came from both female and male informants.

In 1909, the third *Schweizerischer Katholikentag* (Swiss Catholic Rally) took place in Zug, and the branch office of the SSPC was active in this event, too. The annual report states that there were “masses” visiting their Africa museum and claims that on one day only more than 1,000 visitors were inside their museum.354

From this early phase of the museum, I found a visual insight: a shot of the museum in the annual report for 1913.355 The photograph shows a wooden panelled room; the walls draped with hunting trophies. Mainly natural history objects are visible, having big stuffed animals like a lioness, a leopard and other smaller animals in the foreground. But also some “classical” ethnographic objects like jewellery are to be recognised in the back, arranged on boards. In this museum, no showcases were to be seen, that means, no exhibits were literally “behind glass”. Through the low ceiling, the fancy panels, and the relatively small window, the exhibition room does not have that typical “museum flair” as we find in the photographic records of the museum in Salzburg, which had been taken around the same time. Maybe the presence of visitors is the main missing ingredient. But more likely it is the lack of typical museum furniture, and with that, the separating and distancing of the object from the visitor’s reach that are crucial for this impression.

The political neutrality of Switzerland allowed an unbroken continuity in the Swiss branch: no confiscation troubled the branch office. In 1950, the SSPC bought more parts of the building in Zug and rebuilt their branch office. This allowed the museums to move into the rooms on the ground floor in 1951, where it is located until today. The former location of the museum was transformed into a house chapel.356

The already mentioned plaque was signed by Sr. Pientia CPS. She was not a member of the SSPC, but a Mariannhill Sister. As I was also told by Sr. Elisabeth during the visit, Sr. Pientia not only wrote these texts for the museum, but she also painted some pictures inside the exhibition. It is very likely

354 Selbstverlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Jahres-Bericht SSPC 1909,” 12, ACSSPC. The reliability of this number is of course questionable, but it gives at least insights into their view about the importance of the museum for their public outreach during such events.


Caption reads: “Afrikanisches Museum in der Filiale Zug (Schweiz)”.

356 Neumayer, “‘Der Keim ist nun,” in *TUGIUM*, 150.
that this Sr. Pientia CPS is the same Sr. Pientia Selhorst CPS who is said to be
the foundress of the mission museum in Menzingen by the Menzinger Sisters.
The dating of the early 1980s fits, as well as the verified cooperation between
the SSPC in Zug and the closeby Sisters of Menzingen in other fields of their
engagement.\textsuperscript{357} We can, therefore, assume that there was small cooperation
regarding mission museums by three female congregations (Menzinger Sis-
ters, Mariannhill Sisters, and the SSPC), of which two had mission museums
in their closely located branches. It is interesting to note that those two con-
gregations shared their gifts (such as the creative expression in Sr. Pientia) and
supported each other, instead of seeing each other as rivals due to the fact that
both offered museum experiences that were only ten minutes apart by car.

Contrary to the museum in Maria Sorg, the museum in Zug remained true
to the motto of “exhibiting Africa”. It was from the very beginning and is still
an \textit{Afrikamuseum}, everything being about and from Africa. The museum in
this branch office never changed to a general mission museum, which further
verifies the above-mentioned individual influence on the museum of the re-
 sponsible Sisters.

According to Sabina Neumayer, generally speaking the museum is all the
inhabitants of Zug know about the SSPC – they do not know the congregation
very well.\textsuperscript{358}

At the time of my visit, the museum was open from Monday to Friday,
from 8.30am until 11.30am and 2pm until 5pm, and on Saturday and Sunday
by appointment. This means it presents itself as a “standard” museum that can
be visited at regular hours. The website of the Swiss branch offered some lines
of information about the museum, like the origin of the exhibits (central and
southern Africa, and Madagascar). The website also informed that the objects
were given by the missionaries to the Sisters out of gratitude.\textsuperscript{359} As we know,
that is an inaccurate account because only a minority of the objects were sent
with this intention.

The current exhibition is well organised, and in line with the Swiss stereo-
type of cleanliness, the exhibition is clean in the sense that the exhibits are all
presented in a clearly structured manner. The overabundance we find in many
mission museums, and \textit{independent museums} in general, is not to be found in
Zug (see \textit{Figure 14}).

When I visited, the exhibition offered some descriptive texts, for example
stating the name of the object and the country or region where it originated.

\textsuperscript{357} The distance between Menzingen and Zug is only ten minutes by car. The Menzinger Sisters
are often mentioned in the annual reports, most often as they brought their young members to
Zug for lectures and other information events.

\textsuperscript{358} Neumayer, 133.

\textsuperscript{359} Also the already mentioned plaque in the museum from 1983, signed by Sr. M. Pientia,
states that it was the missionaries and the new converts who sent the objects to thank the SSPC:
“Durch diese Gaben wollten vor allen Dingen die Missionare und auch die Neuchristen ihre
Dankbarkeit dem Mutterland gegenüber bezeugen.”
Some exhibits also named the mission congregation which transferred it to Zug, like “Christian ancestor figure from the Makonde (Tanzania, the mission of the Benedictines)”. Apart from this descriptive and short information, the visitor finds two plaques, one briefly describing the museum itself, the other informing about Maria Theresia Ledóchowska. There is also a world map, depicting the different branches of the SSPC today, as well as the locations in Africa where the objects came from. Apart from that, texts with more explanation regarding the use of an object or the cultural context were rare. One such rare example described a high twin rate\(^{360}\) another a prominent and tall nail-fetish.\(^{361}\) A similarity to Maria Sorg is that a few objects also still feature their old object tag, like one from 1915, Object Nr. 10.2296 from the Ivory Coast (see Figure 11). But those were the exceptions, and they were not presented together as in Maria Sorg. Most ethnographic objects were behind glass, in showcases (see Figure 14).

The natural history objects, separated from the main room gathered in an extra space, were not behind glass. Most of the stuffed animals were to be recognised from the photographs from around 1915. That means that for this part of the collection, at least a definite continual use in the exhibition over more than one hundred years can be established. For a small town like Zug, it

---

\(^{360}\) “Über 30% der Geburten sind Zwillinge, aber die Sterblichkeit ist sehr hoch. Nach dem Tod wird das verlorene Kind durch eine Zwillingsfigur ersetzt.”

can be imagined how whole generations of children have stood awe-struck before the lioness with its open mouth and bared teeth, well into the 21st century.362

5.3.7 Objects

In this section, I present five features of the SSPC museums and exhibitions in regard to their view on and handling of objects. I am of the opinion that through this, characteristics of their museums come to light even more than I have presented for the three museums above.

Looking at the terminology, it seems clear that the “exotic factor” was most evident: Early reports talked about “curiosities from Africa”363, or “diverse African objects of interest”. Terms and descriptions as in the following example from 1912 are evidence of how the Sisters advertised the “thrill factor” that the objects presented for them.

> Here you find a great variety of African objects of interest of all kinds, not least all the shuddering objects that remind you of the horrors of idolatry and the torments of the slaves who are so severely tortured, and since what you look at with your own eyes usually makes more of an impression than what you read or listen to, these museums are very eloquent advocates for the sorrowful country from which they come.364

According to such passages, the value of the object does not lie in its uniqueness, its artistic craftwork or its rarity, rather the value that was praised in many of the older sources lies in representing a fundamentally different, suffering and at the same time cruel people.

One group of objects is very much the focus of attention of the SSPC: the fetishes and idols. The goal of referring to this category with terms like Götzendienst (idol worship) is to paint a negative image of the state African people were in.365 The term Götzte can be translated into English as idol, or

---

362 All observations from the current exhibition in Zug were made during my visit in March 2013.
363 St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Bericht Gründung 1894–1896,” 31, ACSSPC; “Rundschreiben an die Hochw. Missionare und Missions-Schwestern Afrikas’, ACSSPC. In French, the objects are called “intéressants objets de curiosité”, as it is shown in the same circular, printed in the same year and translated into French.
364 “Hier finden sich in großer Mannigfaltigkeit afrikanische Sehenswürdigkeiten aller Art, nicht an letzter Stelle auch alle die Schauer erregenden Gegenstände, die an die Grauel des Götzendiens und die Martern der so hart gequälten Sklaven erinnern und da gewöhnlich das, was man mit eigenen Augen schaut, mehr Eindruck macht, als was man liest oder erzählen hört, so sind gerade diese Museeen sehr beredete Fürsprecher für das unglückliche Land, aus dem sie stammen.” (my translation) Selbstverlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Jahres-Bericht SSPC 1911,” 48, ACSSPC.
365 The German term Götzte, going back to Martin Luther, was definitely used in a pejorative sense as it is close to the word Gott, but from this closeness the idea of a “false god” is evident. The German term Fetisch has undergone a change in associations and attributions in the 20th
false god. “Fetishes” were often the first objects that the missionaries in Africa were asked to obtain, for example in Ledóchowska’s letter, where she asked for “collecting” and sending “false gods (Götzen), fetishes, weapons, natural history and ethnographical objects.” Her interest in these specific objects is evident because idols and fetishes were named first.

Another manifestation of a fascination with fetishes and idols is a brochure about fetishes from the Portuguese Congo region, written in German by the missionary P. Luttenbacher CSSp and translated into Italian as well. The brochure is the only one on a specific group of objects that I found in the archive. To produce, translate and print in high numbers (around 1,000 copies were printed according to a small note on the cover), makes tangible the importance of the fetishes as a specific object group. But it was not only the missionaries who were fascinated by such figures. The big nail fetish from Zug was exhibited in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York during their exhibition “Kongo: Power and Majesty” in 2015–2016. This fascination was and still is shared by others in the West though it was a congregation like the SSPC which had such an exhibit amongst many other museum objects.

Lucky finds in the rich archival material show how the SSPC needed to enlist from outside of their congregation the skills they lacked for “doing museum”. As mentioned above, the Sisters came from various backgrounds, but in the early decades no one had an academic education or specific background in museum-related disciplines. As we know, Ledóchowska and other Sisters from a higher social milieu had been regular visitors to professional museums.

---

366 “Götzen, Fetische, Waffen, naturgeschichtliche und ethnographische Gegenstände” (my translation), Ledóchowska, Letter Ledóchowska to missionaries (11.09.1911), ACSSPC.
367 Luttenbacher, “Die Fetische im portugiesischen”, ACSSPC. The Italian version is called “I Feticci al congo portoghese”. Luttenbacher’s expertise in fetishes shows up in other contexts as well. He is referred to in the brochure about the Africa museum in the SSPC branch office in Fribourg. “Musée ethnographique africain Fribourg.”, ACSSPC. There are also hints that Luttenbacher himself (or his congregation) sent some of the fetishes, but there is no evidence for this other than one sentence in this brochure. But the exchange of information and consequently of material objects is not farfetched.
368 Sr. Elisabeth Brudak informed me about this short term loan to the Met. The fetish was presented online as “Power Figure (Nkisi N’Kondi: Mangaaka)”. Of its provenance it stated: “Donated by missionaries to the Saint Petrus Claver Sodalität, Rome office, before 1898 (?); transferred to the Afrika Museum der Saint Petrus Claver Sodalität, 1915 (?)”. This shows that also a highly professional museum like the Met had to deal with the scarcity of information that an independent museum like the one in Zug could offer for one of their most interesting objects. Metropolitan Museum of Art, “Power Figure (Nkisi N’).
and art galleries, but to run a museum – “doing museum” – was something different.

The missionaries in the mission fields in the first half of the 20th century often had no suitable training in how to “collect”. This included knowing how to catch certain animals or insects, how to kill and process them, to store them and finally to safely send them to Europe. Therefore, the SSPC prepared short handouts which explained in practical terms the required steps. Some missionaries also actively asked for handouts that would explain this task.369 One such handout, in German, French and Italian, described this process for a range of bigger animals and birds. It also included easy recipes for how to bath the fresh skin of the “quadrupeds”.370 A similar one, only in French this time, contained explanations of how to conserve insects.371 It is not possible to reconstruct who these external advisors were who wrote these brochures. But it is out of question that the SSPC wanted to raise the standards of their own mission museums by using these advisors. The goal was simply to have well-made stuffed animals that should also last a long time. These efforts with the manuals and brochures were a step away from being an amateurish and becoming a professional museum. As well, this also was transmitted professional knowledge from Europe to missionaries in Africa. On several such handouts, it was noted that they were to be printed in the number of 1,000 pieces.372

The museum objects were often transferred between the different museums and (permanent or short time) exhibitions. This is described in detail in the *Anleitung für die Filialen* (Instruction for the Branch Offices). Two pages in them were dedicated to how to maintain an index for those objects which were transferred to another museum or exhibition permanently or as a temporary loan.373 Judging from this handbook “doing museum” seems predominantly a matter of keeping lists and organising the transfer of objects between different branch offices. In the last decades when the number of members decreased, and branch offices were closed, this question of transferring objects and whole collections was still current.374 These instructions also show that the SSPC wanted to become more professional in their routines in the museum.

The objects were often handled in a rather casual way. As mentioned above, exhibits were also used for decorating charity events or for performances of

---

369 The Swiss missionary Johann Landolt SMA for example asked Ledóchowska personally for such handouts: “Falls Sie Käfer- und Schmetterlingssammlungen wünschen, so würden Sie mir einen großen Dienst erweisen, durch die Übersendung einer geeigneten Broschüre, die einige Ratschläge in dieser Hinsicht gibt.” Landolt, Letter Landolt to Ledóchowska (10.1.1914), ACSSPC.

370 Handout for missionaries.

371 “Avis aux RR. PP. Missionaries – Manière de prendre et de conserver les scarabées”, ACSSPC.

372 Most of these handouts are archived in the box “Circolari ai Missionari” in the general archive in Rome.


374 Sr. Ursula Lorek, personal comment to author, April 15, 2016.
the plays written by Ledóchowska. This is typical for the category of independent museums whose exhibits do not gain the status of “untouchable” and do not lose their former function. Another aspect of this casual view is that the border between unsaleable museum exhibits and merchandise was sometimes blurred. At the African exhibition at the Swiss Catholic Rally in St. Gallen in 1913, some exhibits were clearly for sale because “the missions have to support themselves”. This passage comes right after describing the craftsmanship of various African people and describing some special exhibits produced by Madagascans. It is therefore possible that some “ready-made” objects rather than “pure” ethnographic objects were for sale at this very exhibition. But this cannot be said with certainty, rather the lines between a mission exhibition and a mission bazaar were not very clear-cut.

This is true not just for the first half of the 20th century. It is mentioned that in Zug, for many years, objects were sold to European “collectors” and art dealers. The intention of the Sisters with the sale was in this case clear: to raise money for the missions. But it happened that the deals were disadvantageous to them. From the 1960s, more attention was paid to the real value of objects in order to avoid unfair dealings with expert buyers. Accounts such as these makes it obvious that the objects were not merely seen as museum exhibits which permanently entered the collection. Their value was connected to the goals of the SSPC, which included next to propaganda in various forms also the raising of funds for the mission. Therefore, the value of the objects they got from Africa was also monetary, something they could use outside of their museums. This contradicts the ICOM definition of a museum as “a non-profit, permanent institution” (see Section 1.3.3). But the Sisters were able to involve themselves in a kind of art-dealership as they were clearly running an independent mission museum, not a “standard” and professional museum.

5.4 Networks and “collecting”

“We will do everything we can to help you furnish your African Museums.” Thus writes the missionary Jean Ogé SMA, stationed in Monrovia (Liberia), to Ledóchowska in 1911. Ogé is one example of a correspondent in her vast postal network. The massive remains of Ledóchowska’s correspondence in the SSPC general archive in Rome are a remarkable indication of the foundress’ skills in building and maintaining a network that stretched between Europe and Africa and beyond. During Ledóchowska’s life, her network can

375 “Die Ausstellungsegenstände sind nämlich zum größten Teil verkäuflich, denn die Miss- 
376 Neumayer, “Der Keim ist nun,” in TUGIUM, 149.
377 “Nous ferons en outre tout ce que nous pourrons pour vous aider à garnir vos Musées africains.” (my translation) Ogé, Letter Ogé to Ledóchowska (6.10.1911), ACSSPC.
be divided into two parts: her personal network that is based on her class and origin, and the professional network which she built up with missionaries, partly of course influenced by her private network. She had actually already started her network to missionaries as a lady-in-waiting. One biographer mentions that

[i]n order to obtain correct and up to date information she started corresponding with the White Fathers […] and other missionaries. The missionaries informed her not only of the slave trade and their efforts to help the slaves, but also of their missionary endeavours and successes.378

There can be no doubt that in these years, the 1880s and 1890s, starting a direct correspondence network was the only way to gain reliable information on such topics. It seemed logical to start with the White Fathers as informants after she had met their founder Cardinal Lavigerie, who had made a deep impression on her. Meeting him in person – which was possible due to her personal high social status – increased possibly the probability that the White Fathers would indeed answer her letters.

Networking is even mentioned as a significant task of the whole congregation, not just a characteristic of the foundress. The sheer number of letters makes it clear that it was not only Ledóchowska who wrote to missionaries; she also let Sisters write for her. They describe it like this:

The further task of the sodality and its members includes an extended correspondence with the missionaries and missionary sisters on the one hand, and with the benefactors on the other.379

And already in 1897 the correspondence is described in the first report. It tells the reader that since 1896, the Sisters filed the letters in alphabetical order from their respective congregations. A high number of letters came from the White Fathers, from the Spiritans, and the Jesuits on the Zambezi. The report also mentions proudly that some of the authors of the letters became martyrs.380

In the process of its founding and in the early years of the sodality, Maria Theresia Ledóchowska also personally toured, lectured (called the oral propaganda in contrast to the printed and written propaganda) and met clergymen. She needed the personal permission of bishops and cardinals to operate as a sodality in their dioceses (called approbation).381 Therefore the networking was not solely restricted to writing letters, it also meant personal contact. But

378 Giertych, A shared Vision, 23.
381 Walzer, Auf neuen Wegen, 67.
in the following, I concentrate on the vast correspondence network of the SSPC.

Regarding the private network, it already became clear how Ledóchowska used her personal connections. One of the most significant dyads (one to one) in her network was with her uncle, Cardinal Ledóchowski. He clearly took her father’s role after his early death. It seems as if Ledóchowska made no major decision without her uncle’s agreement. His opinion was central to the very beginning of her missionary work.\footnote{For example, she describes how she heard of critical voices about Cardinal Lavigerie’s engagement, and so she asked her uncle, another cardinal, for his view on that matter. The letter by Cardinal Ledóchowski in which he brushes aside his niece’s scepticism is even printed in publications of the SSPC. Verlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Entstehung Wirken Verbreitung 1894–1901,” 7, ACSSPC.}

Although her sister Julia Ledóchowska was not a prominent high member of the clergy like her uncle, she also played a role in the network. From the very beginning, Maria Theresia Ledóchowska must have used the connection to Julia for establishing one of her filial branches, the one in Krakow in 1894\footnote{St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Bericht Gründung 1894–1896,” 38, ACSSPC.} because this branch was located in an annexe to the cloister of the Ursulines there, a religious institute Julia had joined.

Another example of how Ledóchowska used her connections is the establishing of a branch office in Spain. As the foundress herself was as a child a playmate of the later queen of Spain, Maria Christina of Austria, Ledóchowska sent her Sisters to Spain in 1921 and wrote a letter reminding Maria Christina, now the king’s mother, about their common past.\footnote{Selbstverlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Jahres-Bericht SSPC 1921,” 34–37, ACSSPC.} Childhood memories functioned as door openers for her congregation.

But the aspect of a personal network was, as Winowska correctly points out in her biography of Ledóchowska, a “double-edged sword”:

\begin{quote}
[T]he backing of influential persons, even those of the Church, can become an obstacle as well as an advantage, […]. How many times was Mary Theresa attacked because of her aristocratic birth and distinguished connections!\footnote{Winowska, \textit{Go out to the}, 108–9.}
\end{quote}

Thus the personal network of Ledóchowska was first a tool to expand the congregation. Now, we turn to SSPC’s “doing museum” with the help of these networks. This section will answer the fundamental question of how a mission congregation without its own members in the mission fields could establish and equip their own Africa exhibitions and museums in Europe.
5.4.1 Networks with missionaries in Africa

Ledóchowska was quick in establishing ties to mission congregations who were active in Africa. Next to information exchange it was her sending donations that allied them. She raised these donations in Europe through her writing activities. Already in 1897, three years after the official founding of the SSPC, a report lists sixteen mission congregations which received donations from the SSPC. Three of these were female congregations. When matched with the list of mission museums in German-speaking countries in Section 4.1, it shows that the SSPC was in contact with the following mission congregations that had a mission museum in Germany, Austria, or Switzerland as well: The Spiritans (Knechtsteden CSSp), the Pallottines (Limburg SAC), the SVD missionaries (multiple mission museums), the Missionary Benedictines (multiple mission museums), the Franciscans (multiple mission museums), the Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate (Hünfeld OMI), and the Oblates of St. Francis de Sales (Dachsberg OSFS). This means that seven of the congregations in the SSPC’s network also had one or more of their own mission museums in German-speaking countries.

There is more to it than that: In the annual report for the year 1897, the mission house St. Gabriel of the SVD, and the mission house in Limburg of the Pallottines are listed as receivers of a donation. Clearly, not all the money went directly to Africa, as they often stressed. A small percentage of their incoming donations were obviously used for mission houses in Europe. These two mission houses also hosted mission museums. That shows how closely entangled the different actors in the German-speaking Catholic mission movement were and how the networks around one specific congregation were connected to other, wider networks.

The annual reports informed of the new connections that the SSPC established. There was a section of their own in their annual report for 1897 headed Schriftwechsel (correspondence). The next annual report from 1899 had the heading Affiliationen, and that meant connections as well as correspondence. Here they proudly presented the newly established alliances with missionary congregations which they had lately started supporting, and they continued with these sections through the years. I want to illustrate the amount of correspondence with two examples: For the year 1898, the total number of letters

---

386 Several other “Africa assemblies” and mission societies in Europe were also listed as recipients but are of no further significance here.
389 It was a worthwhile use of donations to give to European mission houses because the (financial) support of the individual calls to become a missionary was part of the core tasks of the SSPC. The SSPC even accepted young girls into Maria Sorg who wanted to test their vocation to become a missionary sister in a different congregation which sent them then abroad.
sent by the SSPC was 1,403 and of these the total to missionaries was 168.\textsuperscript{391} In the year 1933, the total (excluding postcards) was 64,788.\textsuperscript{392} Unfortunately, they did not give the exact number of letters to missionaries. However, this shows how the extent of the correspondence – and with that their whole network – expanded only during the first decades of the SSPC.

5.4.2 The acquisition and transfer through missionaries abroad
As we learn from the annual reports, the very first African objects were sent to Ledóchowska even before the SSPC was founded in 1894:

> Already before the foundation of the sodality, grateful missionaries from the different regions of Africa sent the editor of the “Echo” smaller or larger deliveries of African curiosities among which are deities, weapons, utensils, natural products etc.\textsuperscript{393}

First, it is noteworthy that the receipt of objects was reported to be so early, even before the congregation was officially founded. That seems possible, regarding the second noteworthy claim, namely that it happened out of thankfulness. The relationship can be imagined to be individual, meaning between one missionary and Maria Theresia Ledóchowska, functioning as the founder and editor of a fundraising brochure. That those who received some funding from Ledóchowska then sent her objects to thank her individually, as they may have done with other individual donors, seems reasonable. Relying only on this source, it is likely that the “collecting”, transferring, and consequent presenting of objects publicly from Africa was actually initiated by the missionaries abroad, not by Ledóchowska herself. As the SVD case study shows, this was special for the SSPC’s mission museums.

In order to discover how the acquisition and transfer developed from those random gifts from single missionaries into more planned and orchestrated actions, I present a few dyads and partial networks from the greater Ledóchowska/SSPC network.

5.4.2.1 Network with Franciscan sisters of St. Mary’s Abbey
At first, I want to have a look at Ledóchowska’s networks of missionary sisters stationed in Africa to see how female missionaries contributed to the museums and exhibitions in Europe. As two examples, I use the correspondence with

\textsuperscript{391} Selbstverlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, 19, ACSSPC.
\textsuperscript{392} Selbstverlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, “Jahres-Bericht SSPC 1933,” 57, ACSSPC.
two Franciscan sisters, Mother Mary Kevin OSF and Sister Mary Capistran OSF.394 Both worked in mission stations near Kampala in British East Africa which is now Uganda. They corresponded with Ledóchowska between 1909 and 1922 (Kevin) respectively between 1910 and 1916 (Capistran) and wrote in their mother tongue, English.

It lies in the character of archived correspondence that the preserved letters in the Archivum Centrale of the SSPC are almost only letters to Ledóchowska. The archive is one-sided. Only a few letters by Ledóchowska or an SSPC sister were archived and/or are still readable.395 Common topics in their correspondence were for example the progress of the mission station (building of a hospital, how many pupils come to school or how many patients they care for), events like the consecration of their new bishop or heavy rains or a fire that destroyed half the mission station. The sisters also told shorter stories about the native population and their customs, new converts and particularly about the children. They also criticised the low social status of women and children, especially the selling and marrying off of girls.396 Many lines in the letters are dedicated to asking for money from Ledóchowska, or asking for material things, like altar cloths. Also, Ledóchowska was asked to organise a new cassock from Rome for the poor Bishop John Biermans.397 Some of the sisters’ letters were even published in the Echo.

The whole correspondence started when Mother Kevin introduced their mission station called St. Mary’s Convent Nagalama Kampala to Ledóchowska in 1909. First, she only told about their work and asked if Ledóchowska wanted to take them under her patronage. Here, she mentioned that she could

394 They were Franciscan Sisters of St. Mary’s Abbey, Mill Hill in London. Mother Kevin, born as Teresa Kearney in Ireland, is described as “one of the great figures of the Church’s modern missionary movement”. Hogan, The Irish missionary movement, 114. “Both Mother Kevin and her bishop had long since concluded that the major obstacle to a meaningful Catholic medical apostolate was the church’s refusal to allow priests and nuns to practice maternity nursing, medicine, and surgery. She was one of a group of bishops and others who made representations in Rome in the late 1920s and early 1930s to have the prohibition modified or withdrawn. (Repeal eventually came in 1936.)” Hogan, “Kearney, Teresa”. This struggle of Mother Kevin for being able to serve mothers in labour was described in details in letters to Ledóchowska during the years of 1919–1920. Kevin founded eventually two congregations, the Congregation of the Little Sisters of Saint Francis and in 1952 the Franciscan Missionary Sisters for Africa (FMSA).

395 Regarding the archived correspondence of Kevin and Ledóchowska, fifty-one letters are stored in the archive in Rome. Four of these letters were written by Ledóchowska and, of these, three are unreadable. For the archived correspondence of Capistran–Ledóchowska there are twenty-three letters. Only one postcard is sent by Ledóchowska and another letter is written by a SSPC sister on behalf of Ledóchowska.

396 An example: “[T]he condition of the women & girls is dreadful – sold like cows & with no rights at all. Children still unborn are sold & quite tiny girls will be living with their husbands. I met a girl in widows weeds this week, she could not have been more than twelve years old.” Capistran, Letter Capistran to Ledóchowska (12.5.1915), ACSSPC.

397 Bishop Biermans appears regularly in the letters, he had much influence on Kevin, for example, he decided with Kevin’s Mother Abbess about her courses back in Europe. For more on Biermans see Pirouet, “Biermans, John Henry Mary”.
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send “a little of the children’s work especially mat-weaving we shall be delighted to send you some.” Thus, correspondence, exchange of information and the suggested sending of photographs and objects were initiated by Mother Kevin. Kevin’s intention became clear in this first letter: The mission station needed support and what the sisters could offer in exchange was information, photos and local objects (such as children’s work). Only in her third letter did she asked directly for money.

There were many boxes and parcels that left for Europe, described by both Capistran and Kevin. The character and purpose of these deliveries were diverse: first, there were single and smaller objects that were more of an exchange of personal gifts between the missionaries and Ledóchowska. For example, Sister Capistran sent an elephant tail to Ledóchowska, accompanied with just a note explaining how the locals believe that a bracelet of elephant hair secures a good journey and a safe return. The second category consisted of objects that were meant for sale in Europe and here they also discussed the prices of objects. As we have seen, the SSPC also organised so-called mission bazaars. A third category consisted of deliveries of objects with an unclear goal or function – whether they were meant for sale at a bazaar, or to be displayed in a museum or exhibition is not detectable from the text. A fourth category were objects that were clearly sent for the purpose of exhibiting, sometimes mentioning the exhibition expressively and then, there was no discussion of prices. The objects were directed toward different locations (such as Salzburg, Rome, or Geistingen) where the SSPC had museums or organised temporary exhibitions. Shortly after the sisters started to send objects from Uganda, the First World War interrupted their actions.

Worth noting is that both sisters often mentioned that the objects that they sent were an “offering to show gratitude”, or a “token of gratitude”. Therefore they did not want to be reimbursed for the cost of the content but agreed

398 Kevin, Letter Kevin to Ledóchowska (11.7.1909) ACSSPC.
399 Capistran, Letter Capistran to Ledóchowska (2.2.1913) ACSSPC.
400 Examples: “On reply to your kind letter I have sent off two parcels to Geistingen containing native pottery, two pointed baskets & two round ones, a cushion […].” Capistran, Letter Capistran to Ledóchowska (21.6.1913), ACSSPC and: “We hope to send you some things for your exhibition but they will have to be by post because we have no working materials left but expect some in next mail and will send them as soon as we can, probably in April.” Capistran, Letter Capistran to Ledóchowska (2.3.1913) ACSSPC.
401 “The undersigned Directress General acknowledges receipt of the letter of 27/8/1915 accompanied [sic] by a receipt N. 72 and begs to thank for it. What regards the curious, I beg to send them off only after the war. Respectfully Yours Ledóchowska.” (emphasis in original) Ledóchowska, Postcard (copy) Ledóchowska to Capistran (?10.1915), ACSSPC and “After the war I hope to have a nice collection of curios for you. The natives of this tribe cut out of a log of wood beautiful cups-stools & bowls.” Capistran, Letter Capistran to Ledóchowska (24.8.1915), ACSSPC.
402 Kevin, Letter Kevin to Ledóchowska (13.11.1912), ACSSPC; Kevin, Letter Kevin to Ledóchowska (14.10.1912), ACSSPC; Kevin, Letter Kevin to Ledóchowska (19.6.1913), ACSSPC.
that the SSPC would pay for the freight. They seemed to only expect the continuing financial support of the SSPC as reward for collecting and sending.

From several phrases in the two missionaries’ letters, it becomes clear that in Ledóchowska’s letters, which we do not have access to, she directed which objects she preferred or wanted. After the initiative by the sisters stationed in Africa, the equipping of the museums and exhibitions by the SSPC was then clearly directed by the foundress.

We turn now towards the objects. The sources show that typical ethnographic objects were sent: shields, musical instruments like drums or “native harps”, hoes, knives and pipes. Baskets (in various forms) and especially bark-cloth articles (typical from Uganda) were very popular. Mats made from bark-cloth were expressly “ordered” by the SSPC. Interestingly, Mother Kevin mentioned that the objects they sent were used: “[…] they are not new, but have been in use, but I think you would prefer them to new ones is it not so.”

One of the most significant characteristics of an ethnographic object – its status of a used tool or material – is mentioned here, half apologetically. Though this remark made sense considering that some of the objects, like the mats, were also newly produced, as was the case for school children’s work. On the one hand, this highlights the non-scientific approach of the sisters to their “collecting”. On the other hand, the sisters put effort into describing in detail the objects they sent, as well as writing down lists of the correct names for them in the local language.

The sisters did not send many natural history objects, except for things such as coffee beans and some seeds. There is no talk about butterflies or beetles. Pieces of ivory are ambiguous because they can be seen as cultural objects when used as material for jewellery. On a side note, ivory is still today the “colonial material par excellence”. The missionary sisters tried unsuccessfully to send leopard skins. The same letters also reveal that the bishop, who worked very closely with the congregation of Kevin and Capistran, also used their shipping to send objects to the SSPC.

---

403 Kevin, Letter Kevin to Ledóchowska (14.10.1912), ACSSPC.
404 Kevin, Letter Kevin to Ledóchowska (15.10.1912), ACSSPC; Kevin, Letter Kevin to Ledóchowska (14.10.1912), ACSSPC.
405 “I had hoped to have sent you a good piece of ivory which was on its way from the Congo but man […] ivory have both become ‘lost to us’ as a Muganda would say.” Capistran, Letter Capistran to Ledóchowska (21.6.1913), ACSSPC.
407 “2 native drums, 1 very long drum used for dances & feasts, 1 native harp, 3 cucoons, 3 shields, 4 pipes with long stems, 2 pieces of (I think) ivory from the Bishop to you. 1 leopard skin, 1 ngabi (?) skin (from M.C.) and a few odds & ends (?), the things cost me £ 10, but I think they are worth it, as they are getting rarer & rarer. I hope the box will reach you before this letter.” Kevin, Letter Kevin to Ledóchowska (8.1913), ACSSPC. But the skins did not make it far: “I trust by this time you have received the box we sent months ago. First it got to Mombasa & was sent back as there were two Leopard skins in it. As we took them out & sent it off again. It left Mombasa some time ago. I do hope you have get it safely.” Kevin, Letter Kevin to Ledóchowska (20.1.1914), ACSSPC.
Looking at the terminology, we see that both sisters used the term *things* for their objects, but most of the time they wrote about *curios*. Also Ledóchowska uses *curious* in the only retained letter where she mentions the objects directly.\(^{408}\) This underlines again the *independent* character of “collecting” in Africa and the transfer to Europe. From their point of view, they transferred strange and therefore interesting objects, not something of cultural or scientific value. As Kevin and Capistran were native speakers in English, their use of *curios* may be in line with Karen Jacobs and Chris Wingfield’s remarks about this term, who state that it was used in a dismissive attitude\(^{409}\) and that goes along with the missionary sisters’ use of this term.

Most of the time there is no reference to how the two sisters exactly “collected” the objects. Even if they give a little bit more information about an object, there is crucial information missing:

> One small piece of ivory, worn round the neck, that piece came from the neck of a very old heathen woman, who has a witches’ reputation, & is said to bewitch anybody whom she is jealous of.\(^ {410}\)

After an account like this, one then feels inclined to ask how exactly the object ended up with the two sisters. Here the sources are mostly silent and the former owner is not even mentioned by name. Only rarely they hint at the circumstances of the “collecting”. Here is an example from 1912:

> The things are not new, & we have bartered for most of them, or done some little service for the owner who gave us a curio in exchange, so we would like you to accept them from us as a little token of gratitude.\(^ {411}\)

Again, their “collecting” did not happen in a strategic and planned way. But this quote also shows that the locals received at least something in exchange, for example, an (immaterial) service by the sisters. This is the missionary context of this “collecting”: The sisters had skills that were needed in their setting. However, we do not know the relation of the value of old bows and pipes to the exchanged goods and services. With certain goods, especially the mats produced by women, the sisters highlighted several times the long production duration and with that, the intrinsic value of the object. However, a certain degree of power imbalance must be assumed, even when there was something given in return.

\(^{408}\) Ledóchowska, Postcard (copy) Ledóchowska to Capistran (?10.1915), ACSSPC.

\(^{409}\) Jacobs and Wingfield, “Introduction,” in *Trophies, relics and curios?*, 17.

\(^{410}\) Kevin, Letter Kevin to Ledóchowska (15.10.1912), ACSSPC.

\(^{411}\) Kevin, Letter Kevin to Ledóchowska (13.11.1912), ACSSPC.
5.4.2.2 Network with the Society of African Missions (SMA)

The next partial network that I present concerns the Society of African Missions (Societas Missionum ad Afros, in short: SMA).\footnote{The Society of African Missions was founded 1856 in Lyon and in 1900 approved by the pope. First specialised for mission in Africa, they work globally today. Hoeben, “Lyoner Seminar afrikanische Missionen”. In German they are known as Gesellschaft der Afrikamissionen or the Lyoner Seminar, in older sources as Lyoner Missionare.} In the source criticism section of this case study, I have already presented the source material in use for the following part. Because the correspondence is predominantly letters sent by the missionaries to Ledóchowska, the partial network can be imagined as a subset of the greater network, putting Ledóchowska in the middle (as the ego) and the SMA Patres who sent her letters as the alters around her (ego-focused network). As the SMA Patres referred to each other in the letters, they were also connected to each other by links in this partial network. The missionaries presented their mission activities, reported about the “successes” (numbers of baptisms, confirmations, weddings and funerals) and their problems. They even told in long letters about warfare and massacres that happened in their region or at their mission stations. Very often they asked for money for their activities, like building a new church or hospital wing and they expressed thanks for money sent to them.

Out of this vast network of between 200 and 300 SMA missionaries who corresponded with Ledóchowska, I extracted at least nineteen SMA Patres as alters, who wrote about transferring objects for the cause of exhibiting them by the SSPC. It can be said that the transcript of all letters sent from one congregation to Ledóchowska give an understanding of how the acquisition and the transfer of objects to Europe and the support for the African exhibitions/museums were a task of the whole congregation. It was not just a matter between Ledóchowska and a single missionary out there; it concerned the whole congregation. The patres cooperated and worked together in this process as the following passage shows:

Madam Countess, I have the honour to write this letter to you to inform you of a small shipment of African objects for your exhibition. I am not telling you the use and provenance here; P. Berlioux and I labelled them and glued the labels on the objects themselves.\footnote{“Madame la Comtesse, J’ai l’honneur de vous écrire cette lettre pour vous annoncer un petit envoi d’objets africains pour votre exposition. Je ne vous en dis pas l’usage et la provenance ici; le P. Berlioux et moi les avons étiquetés et collé les étiquettes sur les objets mêmes.” (my translation) Strub, Letter Strub to Ledóchowska (23.12.1912), ACSSPC. Other letters which show that the congregation as a whole embraced the equipping of the museum from their African mission stations are for example by Jules Moury (31.12.1912), ACSSPC or François Steinmetz (25.8.1912), ACSSPC.}

Following this first general impression, I now present some more features of the relationship among the missionaries who supplied the Africa museums.

---

412 The Society of African Missions was founded 1856 in Lyon and in 1900 approved by the pope. First specialised for mission in Africa, they work globally today. Hoeben, “Lyoner Seminar afrikanische Missionen”. In German they are known as Gesellschaft der Afrikamissionen or the Lyoner Seminar, in older sources as Lyoner Missionare.

413 “Madame la Comtesse, J’ai l’honneur de vous écrire cette lettre pour vous annoncer un petit envoi d’objets africains pour votre exposition. Je ne vous en dis pas l’usage et la provenance ici; le P. Berlioux et moi les avons étiquetés et collé les étiquettes sur les objets mêmes.” (my translation) Strub, Letter Strub to Ledóchowska (23.12.1912), ACSSPC. Other letters which show that the congregation as a whole embraced the equipping of the museum from their African mission stations are for example by Jules Moury (31.12.1912), ACSSPC or François Steinmetz (25.8.1912), ACSSPC.
First and foremost, the SMA missionaries saw their relationship in the sense of *do ut des*, they invested their time and efforts into “collecting” and shipping objects, and as a return service, they wanted their own mission endeavours to be propagated by the SSPC. And this they did by sending their own objects to the various Africa museums/exhibitions. The missionary Clement Bannwarth expressed his expectation clearly:

> Let me remind you that I had sent twenty-eight articles from Niger for the Metz exhibition, of which I wanted to be part. I wanted the Upper Niger mission to be represented at the exhibition as well.414

As the missionaries were reimbursed by the SSPC for the costs of purchase (if objects were indeed bought) and shipping, the reciprocity was in fact not satisfied alone with the financial aspect of the objects since the missionaries also gained from being represented through the SSPC’s propaganda and this was also highly important. Similar to that, there are letters which show that the writer saw the obtaining and sending of objects as a real part of his workload.415 This missionary saw his part in the transfer of objects as a normal way to help the SSPC raise money for his mission station. Sending “good” objects (“les objets qui me semblent bons pour un musée”), resulted in income for his zeal (“l’argent pour nos chers noirs”). Here we find the definite difference between how the SMA Patres saw the exchange and how the sisters Capistran and Kevin above assumed it: The patres did not characterise their objects as “tokens of gratitude” or similar. They clearly saw their exchange in a more equally balanced way: The missionaries had something, and they wanted something back as a reward: *do ut des*.

On several occasions, it is also mentioned that missionary sisters were involved in the “collecting” and sending by the SMA Patres. The letters do not mention exactly which female congregation these remarks concerned, they only vaguely referred to the sisters of the Benin Mission416 or simply “les Sœurs de Ouidah”417 in the letters. The latter case shows that two named male

---

414 “Permettez-moi de vous rappeler que j’avais envoyé pour l’exposition de Metz dont j’ai voulu faire partie 28 articles du Niger. J’ai tenu à ce que la mission du Haut-Niger soit aussi représentée à l’exposition.” (my translation) Bannwarth, Letter Bannwarth to Ledóchowska (5.1.1914), ACSSPC. In Metz, Germany, the SSPC was very active with mission exhibitions.

415 “J’ai commencé à collectionner une série d’objets pour vos musées. […] Je veux bien vous aider à trouver l’argent pour nos chers noirs en vous envoyant les objets qui me semblent bons pour un musée.” Delfosse, Letter Delfosse to Ledóchowska (12.12.1907), ACSSPC.


417 “Cette caisse contient des objets offerts par Monseigneur Steinmetz, par les Sœurs de Ouidah et par moi.” Bauzin, Letter Bauzin to Ledóchowska (20.4.1913), ACSSPC. Ouidah is a city in Benin.
missionaries (Adrien Bauzin and François Steinmetz) and several unnamed female missionaries as a group “collected” and sent together objects to Europe. This is interesting because Bauzin included in his letter a list of the objects reporting separately for the three donors (Bauzin, Steinmetz, the Sisters of Ouidah). Therefore, we know which objects the sisters “collected” and sent, but we do not know their identity. This shows that missionary sisters were naturally part of the whole transfer of objects from the mission fields to European museums but that they were not seen as worthy of being mentioned by name. Their efforts were part of the networks of a male mission congregation, here the SMA, and therefore their contribution to this large-scale transfer of material gets lost in the sources produced by their male colleagues, when they remain unnamed and treated as a group, rather than individual actors like Bauzin and Steinmetz.  

This story resembles that of the bishop who used the shipments of Mother Kevin and Sister Capistran to send his own objects to Ledóchowska. But the difference is that the sisters’ letter mentions Bishop Biermans by name, while the male missionaries’ letters conceal the identity of the female “collectors”. This is just one small aspect of the problematic relationship between male clergy and women religious in the Catholic Church.

Given the amount of correspondence directly with the “collectors” in situ, it is disappointing to learn how little can be determined about the very act of “collecting”, in the sense of how the object came into the possession of the missionaries. Sometimes, short notes on specific objects in the lists which were transcribed, give hints about the circumstances of how the acquisition took place. Missionary Ernest Hauger described how he could send objects through another confrere who travelled back to France. Hauger sent fetishes, which as he stressed were hard to get. Those he obtained came from an “old fetish priest before his conversion”.

418 It is likely that the unnamed sisters were members of the Sœurs missionnaires de Notre-Dame des Apôtres, founded as the “female branch” of the SMA. Their founder was P. Planque, the first general superior of the SMA. To stress the complex matter of inexact naming and multiple colloquial names of Catholic congregations through the years, this very congregation is not in the index of the Archivum Centrale of the SSPC. But “Missionarie Africane di Lyon (M.L.)”, the same name the index of the archive uses for the SMA missionaries, is to be found in the index for the correspondence with missionary sisters. That shows that Ledóchowska was also corresponding with this “sisters of Ouidah” directly. What is of importance in any case is how easily female actors got lost in a network reconstructed dominantly by sources from male actors.

419 “J’ai le plaisir de vous annoncer que le R. P. Freyburger, rentré en France par le courrier du 11 courant, a emporté avec lui 3 caisses remplies de fétiches et objets fétiches tout à fait authentiques et très difficiles à obtenir. Ils viennent d’un ‘babalawo’ ancien féticheur ayant sa conversion. Les fétiches sont: Shango, Orisha nla, et Ifa avec tous les instruments de leur culte. Les ayant obtenus, après bien des démarches, juste au dernier moment, le Père les étiquettera à Lyon et se fera un doux devoir, de vous en faire parvenir la nomenclature avec une pte description de chaque objet, avant d’envoyer le tout à l’adresse indiquée dans votre circulaire.” Hauger, Letter Hauger to Ledóchowska (27.3.1913), ACSSPC.
The vicar apostolic François Steinmetz planned to send objects connected to fetishism as well. Those he got came from catechumens who used the objects before their conversion. Therefore, Steinmetz concluded, the authenticity of the fetishes can be guaranteed.420 Both cases, from Hauger and Steinmetz, show that indeed there were a few objects that came into the possession of missionaries in the context of a previous conversion to the Christian faith as said by Jacobs and Wingfield of the category of trophies (see Section 2.3).

Some circumstances of this handover of objects were probably noted down because the objects in question were fetishes and thus, for the actors highly interesting items, for which it was “worth” giving more information about.

SMA missionary Jean-Marie Bedel from Koroko listed the skin and teeth of a panther.421 That this panther was killed by a local Christian, on top of that, by an employee of the mission station (the cook), was noteworthy for the letter writer, next to stressing how expensive and highly esteemed these objects were in the local culture. Therefore, we can see hints that indigenous Christians, sometimes recently converted, played a role in the actions of acquiring and changing of ownership though how exactly this change happened is not described. As there is the stated price in the list too, one can assume that the successful hunter got money for the panther, but there is no definite evidence for that. The same list also mentions five poisoned arrows.422 They are described to have been given by a chief, which hints at a more voluntary act, like a gift. Again, no exact indication of how the objects came into the possession of the sending missionary, but on both occasions the cook at the mission station and the chief remain nameless, like the sisters above. It seems, the local actors were mentioned mostly to give the objects a more interesting back story, but the locals’ agency and their identity remained unexplored.

Two letters from the SMA correspondence talk openly about the aggressive actions by missionaries. First, the missionary Pierre Piotin from Agenegbode, today Nigeria, describes objects linked to witchcraft:

I learned from your Review that you had started a museum of African curiosities; I think you will be pleased to receive through a colleague, P. Cermenati, a case containing various articles of witchcraft. I carefully indicated with labels

420 “Votre musée n’est pas oublié. Je viens de faire étiqueter plusieurs objets fétichistes; ils m’ont été remis par des catéchumènes, qui, avant leur conversion, les avaient à leur usage. Je puis donc en garantir l’authenticité. Ayez la bonté de me dire où il faut les envoyer.” Steinmetz, Letter Steinmetz to Ledóchowska (14.8.1912), ACSSPC.
421 “Dents de panthère, tuée par un chrétien de Koroko, cuisinier à la mission, marié et père de famille, dents très recherchées et estimées fort cher dans ce pays, cédées pour les bienfaiteurs à 2f.50 / 1 peau de panthère tuée (voir note 2) 20f.00.” Bedel, Letter Bedel to Ledóchowska (30.6.1913), ACSSPC.
422 “5 flèches très empoisonnées!!! cédées par un chef (de Pôfiré sur mes prières instantes et avec promesse de cadeau de la part de Mme la Comtesse Ledóchowska) (l’arc était trop long pour être expédié) 2,50°. Bedel, Letter Bedel to Ledóchowska (30.6.1913), ACSSPC.
the purpose of each article and its nature as far as I could. These objects belonged to different sorcerers that I managed to chase out of the country. There is, among other things, a pestle and a mortar that has been used to poison a lot of people.423

We cannot know how involved Piotin was in that eviction of the sorcerers, though he claimed it was him (alone) who did it. The fact that he came into the possession of their ritual objects – the pestle and mortar are explicitly named – shows his powerful position in situ. As this passage is followed by a summary of the eight years of missionary work in this area, claiming little progress, it can also be interpreted that he wanted to tell only little about the objects themselves (in order to give them a colourful background story). Instead, he wanted to highlight his own efforts and his own “successes”. Then these objects would undoubtedly be seen as trophies by the missionary Piotin. If the sorcerers were gone and the objects were on their way to a European museum, the local religious traditions were clearly interrupted or ended. This meant a better prospect for their mission work which – consequently – made them a better recipient for funding from Europe. It seems clear that the missionaries who “collected” for Ledóchowska’s museums saw her as a correspondent who was foremost a potential fundraiser for their own missionary engagement, not an anthropologist interested in sharing research. This example shows as well that the origins of some objects displayed in the Africa museums were ambiguous. Read against the grain, his report shows a hostile aspect of the act of “collecting” which was also formed by colonialism, where missionaries could end local customs and had the power to remove and to send away material for these rituals. On the other hand it could also be the case that in fact, the “sorcerers” were using their knowledge for harming others and that the end to their power was, in fact, positive for the wider local society. As only his report is available, we simply cannot know the exact circumstances of this event. What is, however, possible to know is the powerful situation of this missionary who was able to take away the objects from the “sorcerers” and send them to Europe in order to have them displayed at a mission museum.

A second case is the missionary Johann Landolt from St. Gallen, Switzerland. In his letter from 1914, he openly tells about the resistance of locals to being stripped of their belongings: “I hope to find some real fetishes. This is

423 “Ayant appris par votre Revue que vous avez commencé un musée des curiosités africaines; je crois vous être agréable en vous envoyant par l’intermédiaire d’un confrère le R.P. Cermenati une caisse contenant divers articles de sorcellerie. J’ai eu soin d’indiquer par une étiquette le but de chaque article ainsi que sa nature autant que j’ai pu. Ces objets ont appartenu à différents sorciers que j’ai réussi à chasser du pays. Il y a entre autre un pilon et un mortier qui a servi à l’empoisonnement de pas mal de gens.” (my translation) Piotin, Letter Piotin to Ledóchowska (1.3.1904), ACSSPC.
difficult since the pagans, of course, do not want to surrender them.”424 His lack of understanding of the consequences of his own actions for the locals is obvious in Landolt’s report. The resistance of the locals was just seen as a bothersome hindrance to obtaining authentic objects. The fact that the locals were attached to their objects was important to the missionaries, but only for the reason of proving authenticity.

One last aspect of the network that Ledóchowska built with the SMA missionaries is that they themselves ran a mission museum in Europe, in their birthplace of Lyon: the Musée Africain de Lyon. Having been established in the 19th century, the museum is nowadays separated from the congregation.425 I find it noteworthy that the missionaries, although they were surely “collecting” for their “own” museum did also invest their time and efforts in contributing to the SSPC’s exhibitions and museums. The fact that this made their own mission endeavours more well known (through taking part in the temporary exhibitions, especially in Switzerland and Alsace) and through receiving donations from the SSPC, were strong arguments for giving support via acquisition and transfer of objects from their mission stations.

5.4.2.3 Network with Franz Mayr
One dyad in the greater network that played a role for the Africa museums is the one that joined Ledóchowska and the missionary Franz Mayr (1865–1914), a Tyrolean diocesan priest who was active over many years in different places in southern Africa. Mayr is an interesting figure in Catholic mission history, as he managed against many odds to become a missionary with a bodily handicap (kyphosis). He was active in Natal, Swaziland, and South Rhodesia and was murdered on the 15th of October 1914 in Swaziland.

Thanks to existing research on Mayr426, the relationship between the countess-turned-missionary and the farmer’s-boy-turned-missionary gives valuable insights into the question of how Ledóchowska equipped her museums. This time it was a diocesan priest, who “collected” for her.427 Without the support of a congregation or order, Ledóchowska was his most important financial aid. He stressed more than often in his letters that he and his mission stations in Natal totally depended on her funding, referring to the SSPC Sisters as his “best friends”, and Ledóchowska herself as a “bread-mother”, which

424 “Ich hoffe, einige echte Fetische zu finden. Es ist dies schwierig, da die Heiden sie natürlich nicht ausliefern wollen.” (my translation) Landolt, Letter Landolt to Ledóchowska (10.1.1914), ACSSPC.
425 “Musée Africain de Lyon”.
427 He was however closely connected to the monastery Mariannhill (Franz Pfanner, the founder was a fellow Austrian) and cooperated with them, in South Africa as well as in Europe.
expressed the dependency dramatically. And Ledóchowska used her connection with Mayr for expanding her network in South Africa. As can be reconstructed from his letters, she asked him several times for his opinion on other missionaries in his region, regarding their reliability, for example. She obviously trusted him and his judgement. Mayr was open with his assessments and he also introduced new missionaries to Ledóchowska, for example Sr. de Pazzi, and he also connected Ledóchowska with his local bishop. The networking worked both ways as Mayr tried to get in contact with the Propaganda Fide via Ledóchowska and her uncle, Cardinal Ledóchowski.

The correspondence between Mayr and Ledóchowska shows, for example, how the SSPC could publish pictorial postcards depicting mission stations, or portraying stereotypical African children. But it is the communication about sending objects for the museum that is of interest in their letter correspondence. In fact, the very first letter that Mayr wrote to Ledóchowska dealt with this topic. At this time, not knowing her identity, he addresses her as the editor of the Echo in the male form. He wrote that he sends “him” some everyday goods from Natal, on which he also wrote the local names and German translations.

Years later, in 1898, we have a letter from Ledóchowska, where she explicitly asked Mayr to send objects for planned museums:

> Since we intend to establish African museums in Salzburg and Vienna in the near future, it would be very nice for us to have some more African curiosities; our already quite beautiful collection is not enough for both cities. So we would be very grateful if Reverend would occasionally send us something like this; of course, we would be responsible for all the expenses that would arise as a result.

---

428 Ledóchowska, Letter Ledóchowska to Mayr (22.2.1902) in Gütl, 146.
429 Mayr, Letter Mayr to Ledóchowska (15.2.1897) in Gütl, 96–97 and Ledóchowska, Letter Ledóchowska to Mayr (15.12.1896) in Gütl, 95. Both, Sr. de Pazzi and the bishop Charles-Constant Jolivet are to be found in the archival index, therefore his introductions seemed to have been successful.
430 Mayr, Letter Mayr to Ledóchowska (17.2.1899) in Gütl, 113.
432 “Negerlein-Ansichtskarten für Propagandazwecke. Preis 5 h. (5 pfg. – 5 cent)” Verlag der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität, 32, ACSSPC. In the mentioned photo albums in the generalate in Rome, missionary Mayr is also depicted in photographs.
433 Mayr, Letter Mayr to Ledóchowska (7.8.1894) in Gütl, ‟Adieu ihr lieben Schwarzen, 71.
With that, it is clear that the relationship became stable and involved the sending of objects. It had started from unsolicited shipping to the editor of the Echo, and later the foundress then encouraged him to cooperate in this matter. It is noteworthy that Ledóchowska already assured him in her request that the SSPC would pay for the costs. She apparently paid attention to the pragmatic circumstances of the transfer. Already four months later Mayr reported that he had sent one big box for the museums. He hoped that this box would arrive in Hamburg one month later.435

Many letters regularly mention deliveries of Kaffern-Kuriositäten (“Kaffir-curiosities”), as Mayr expressed it.436 Communication about the transfer often took some space in their letters and was therefore of certain importance. He also asked what kind of objects he should “collect” and send. This shows that it was Ledóchowska who could decide to a certain degree which objects would end up in her museums and exhibitions although it was Mayr and the other missionaries who were stationed “at the source”, in Africa.

Regarding the objects that Mayr sent to the SSPC: next to the mentioned every-day goods and curiosities, he mentioned birds, nests, bird eggs, minerals, locusts,437 butterflies, beetles, and horns (for example from antelopes). In one shipment alone there were sixty to seventy different species of birds.438 For ethnographic objects that he sent, the letters mentioned jewellery (for example made from pearls), clothes for Zulu men, women and children, pots and tools, weapons and drums from the Shona people.439

One extraordinary group of objects that he mentioned is Kriegs-Kuriositäten (curiosities from the war in South Africa), like bullets from the Boers. Those were not sent to Ledóchowska, but part of his own little mobile exhibition that he took with him when he travelled to Europe for his own fundraising tour in 1900.440 If those had been shown in a mission museum, they would be part of the category of colonial history objects.

One aspect that is hitherto unique about missionary Mayr is that he obviously engaged with a local museum though it remains unnamed. It seems that

435 Mayr, Letter Mayr to Ledóchowska (17.2.1899) in Gütl, 113.
437 There was a locust infestation in the area of Mayr’s mission station which was devastating for the food situation and agriculture. Mayr described in detail the plague and the consequences. Offering to send some examples of the locusts for the museum seemed like an attempt to highlight how critical such an infestation could be for his region. Mayr, Letter Mayr to Ledóchowska (29.6.1896) in Gütl, 90–91.
438 Mayr, Letter Mayr to Ledóchowska (15.12.1898) in Gütl, 112.
439 Mayr, Postcard Mayr to Ledóchowska (12.6.1896), Mayr, Letter Mayr to Ledóchowska (11.5.1902), (5.2.1907), (1.5.1908), (3.9.1910) in Gütl, 90; 150; 270; 297; 349.
440 The letter is not that clear; maybe he also indicates that these objects could be part of an African exhibition in Paris by the SSPC as well. Ledóchowska later asks for those exhibits for her institutions. Mayr, Letter Mayr to Ledóchowska (20.4.1900) and Ledóchowska, Letter Ledóchowska to Mayr (21.5.1900) in Gütl, 132–33.
he acted as an intermediary, obtaining objects from this local museum in exchange for objects from Europe. He even asked Ledóchowska to send him European natural history objects:

I could easily get natural produce of South Africa by exchange from the museum here. If Your Highborn is very interested in it, I ask to send me European natural produce, and I promise you a good exchange with African things. Coins and antiques will as well. All the objects I sent on which you have found English designations came from the museum here.441

This breaks the pattern of the SSPC sending money and donations for the mission work in exchange for local objects. With this passage, Mayr enters the terrain of exchange between different museums, located in Europe and in Africa. He and Ledóchowska, the missionaries, would be the middlemen between the two institutions. Mayr asked three years later again if the SSPC could send “European animals for the museums here.”442 Every European animal would be compensated with an African animal. Ledóchowska remained sceptical to his offer and wrote simply that he must specify the desired objects, as she has no idea what could be appreciated in Africa.443 I assume that Ledóchowska did not want to join this swapping business with another museum. Her goal was to send rosaries and psalm books to newly converted Christians, not European fauna and flora for Africa museums. Ledóchowska was dismissive about this idea because, it can be argued, the idea of Africa museums with European animals did not fit into her picture of Africa.

But despite Ledóchowska’s hesitation, Franz Mayr was indeed actively “collecting” for the museum in Africa. Gütl mentions the Natal Museum in Pietermaritzburg as the institution that he “collected” for.444 It seems plausible

---


442 “Die Kiste mit den Vögeln (etwa 60–70 verschiedene Arten) Hörnern, u. s. w. wird bald abgeschickt werden. Da dieselbe viele wertvolle Sachen enthält, werde ich sie für £ 50 oder £ 60 versichern lassen. Soll ich auch Schmucksachen, Waffen und Hausgeräthe der Kaffern sammeln und schicken oder nicht? Könnten Euer Hochgeboren nicht europäische Thiere für die Museen hier senden? Ich würde Ihnen für jedes europäische Exemplar ein afrikanisches schicken. Bitte um gültige Beantwortung dieser Fragen.” Mayr, Letter Mayr to Ledóchowska (15.12.1898) in Gütl, 112. He returns to the subject in another letter, obviously he was convinced that this was indeed a good opportunity. Mayr, Letter Mayr to Ledóchowska (17.2.1899) in Gütl, 113.

443 “Bezüglich eines eventuellen Austausches von Museums-artikeln wollen Euer Hochw. uns gütigst mittheilen was für Artikel besonders erwünscht wären, wir haben keinen rechten Begriff, was man dortzulande besonders schätzen würde.” Ledóchowska, Letter Ledóchowska to Mayr (24.4.1899) in Gütl, 116.

444 Gütl, 308; 389.
that with the museum he mentioned in his letter from 1896 he meant this museum, as he was at this time stationed in Pietermaritzburg. Furthermore, the University of Natal in Pietermaritzburg discovered in their botany department a herbarium that had been started by Franz Mayr.445

Besides his impact on institutions in South Africa, Mayr furthermore organised objects from his mission region for an unknown “collector” in Europe, who might not be connected to any mission movement at all. This departs from the main question here, but it should be stressed that Franz Mayr was one of many missionaries who not only “collected” and shipped for mission museums and Catholic schools446 in Europe, but also did so for commercial reasons.447 It must be noted that he, as a diocesan priest, had no congregation or order to securely support him financially.

Another aspect of Mayr’s activities as a missionary is that he also published a few anthropological and linguistical articles448 in the *Anthropos Journal*, a journal connected to the SVD and which plays an important role with the second case study, St. Gabriel SVD. Obviously, Mayr was a man with many talents, and it shows how broad the range of engagement was for a serving missionary: Not only planning schools, baptising children and pastoral care for prisoners, also writing articles and organising the exchange of museum exhibits between Europe and Africa was part of his engagement.

5.5 Summary and conclusion of the SSPC case study: Propaganda for Africa with authentic objects

When reading through the laudatory biographies of Ledóchowska, many traits are described as visionary or even prophetic. After understanding the specific characteristics of her congregation, comparing her *opus* to that of contemporaries and especially in relation to her time, I come to the conclusion that indeed, Ledóchowska anticipated certain features of business that are common today, for example public relations. The use of authentic objects, sent directly from mission stations in Africa to her branches in Europe, is also such a feature. Of course, the exoticism also played a role, but the object as the direct

445 Gütl, 389.
446 Mayr “collected” also for the natural history cabinet of the minor seminary Vinzentinum in Brixen, which he himself attended in order to become a priest. Gütl, 389.
447 The objects that are mentioned in this context are: horns, two goldstones from Johannesburg, jewellery, medicine, seashells, sea grass. Mayr, Letter Mayr to an unknown collector (15.9.1902) in Gütl, 153.
448 Mayr, “The Zulu Kafirs of”; Mayr, “The Zulu Kafirs of”; Mayr, “The Zulu Kafirs of” and Mayr, “Zulu Proverbs”. All articles are re-printed in Gütl, ‘Adieu ihr lieben Schwarzen, 219–70. Interestingly, he mentions his article to Ledóchowska in a letter but writes that he does not need to attach this article, because she would surely have known the journal well. Mayr, Letter Mayr to Ledóchowska (2.5.1907) in Gütl, 272. This shows how closely connected the Catholic mission milieu of Europe was.
messenger between Africa and Europe is crucial here. She tactically used the tangible object for publicity. In other words, it was propaganda for Africa using authentic objects. Her goal was not to educate the visitors in a sense as the early ethnographical museums at that time would have done. The choice of words for her museums and the objects shown in the primary sources are clearly different from what will be discovered in the next case studies. Another feature of her engagement is the creation of an illusion of personal connection, for example, with the possibility for the donor in Europe to choose names for newly baptised African children.

The first important result is that the intention of the mission museums and exhibitions of the SSPC was clearly publicity and propaganda. The aim was to raise awareness for what the SSPC saw as urgent matters in Africa. And as the next step, fundraising for fighting for those matters took place. At the beginning of their engagement, the topic of slavery in Africa was most important. When this issue shrank in importance, the zeal to convert the continent to Catholicism remained. All forms of their mission museums and exhibitions, also the *Paramentenausstellungen*, had this motivation. Therefore, often the distinction between objects for exhibition and objects for sale, for example in bazaars, was not that sharp. This distinction was not necessary in their view since both exhibition and bazaars existed for the same purpose.

The second important result is the discovery of how Ledóchowska used her vast networks, building upon her existing private networks inside and outside of the Church. Here, her class played an important role. The networking also explains how the SSPC could equip their many museums and exhibitions without having its own members in the mission fields. Given the many restrictions because of their gender, we can get a vivid picture of how they reached their goal against all the odds.

A third important result shed light on the context of the museums and exhibitions and the impact of gender roles on the Sisters. Ledóchowska’s account of her fight for her printing press workshop gives an example of the gender roles in her time. But more relevant in this thesis is the Sisters’ engagement as experts for Africa. They were the intermediaries who imparted information from Africa to the European audience. In a time when women were still fighting to get access to higher and especially university education, a “professional” formation in the sense of academic education for the Sisters was out of the question. A formation which would have prepared them for their role as an intermediate between Africa and Europe, especially since the field of anthropology was still developing and defining itself. What was hard for secular women449, was unthinkable for women religious, since the roles for

---

449 The first female doctoral student in ethnology in a German-speaking country, Marianne Schmidl, was able to finish her studies in 1915 in Vienna. In 1919 Anne Jolles-Kulka followed, then Margarete Schurig in Leipzig and Aloisia Maria Bieren in Vienna (1926). Beer, Frauen
religious sisters did not include higher education. And this context was not only relevant for the SSPC Sisters who introduced the African objects in the museums and exhibitions. It is also very relevant for the missionary sisters in the mission fields who “collected” the objects for the SSPC and sent them to Europe. This was shown with this case study as well. Women, like the Sisters Capistran and Kevin, worked at the origin of the transfer (in the mission field) as well as in the encounter zone between the European visitor and the African object.

In mission history, only singular cases of female “collectors” in the missionary movement are known. For example, the Scot Annie Royle Taylor (1855–1922), a member of the China Inland Mission and Tibet Pioneer Mission, whose significant collection is today in the National Museums Scotland. Another example is Dora Earthy, who worked in Mozambique as a missionary with the Anglican Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (1917–1930), and clearly “collected” immaterial knowledge as well as cultural artefacts. Earthy is portrayed as a “female missionary anthropologist”. She worked in Africa at about the same time as the Sisters were in contact with (female) missionaries in Africa. Like them, Earthy had no professional training, rather she is described as a “gifted amateur”. Therefore, it is important to add the SSPC Sisters and the missionary sisters who “collected” and transferred the objects for them, to these examples. They were decidedly involved in the transport of knowledge and images of Africa to Europe, but because of their gender and their status as members of a religious congregation, their impact has so far remained overlooked or ignored by both mission history and the history of science. This case study sheds light on their agency and impact despite the problem of limited source material.

Focusing now only on the intermediation of the SSPC Sisters in their museums and exhibitions, an additional factor is important to stress: The Sisters did not have personal experience of the mission fields which could “compensate” in some way for their lack of professional training. Their knowledge of the peoples and cultures in Africa came from reports of other male and female missionaries, which was subjective and “second hand” knowledge. But as shown in the portraits of the other mission museums (see the Appendix), it was common that members of the mission congregations who have never been

---

450 The only field where sisters were gradually allowed to be educated in higher education institutions, was medicine, and reluctantly in obstetrics and midwifery. See for example Canon 489 by the Propaganda Congregation “Maternity Training for Missionary Sisters” from 1936, in Hogan, *The Irish missionary movement*, 195–96. As mentioned above, the letters of Mary Kevin OSF, where she told Ledóchowska about her struggle with the male clergy to be educated in midwifery is a good example for this inner-Catholic debate.

451 Livne, “The Many Purposes of”.

452 Gaitskell, “Dora Earthy’s Mozambique,” in *The spiritual in the secular*, 189.

453 Gaitskell, 188.
on mission abroad themselves functioned as museum curators and guides as well.

Further subtler findings refer to the unique features of the mission museums of the SSPC. It became clear that the foundress Maria Theresia Ledóchowska used the medium of exhibiting from the very beginning of her congregation. Sources for the earliest times report on these exhibitions and how they spread her message in various ways. Their activities in showing objects publicly, objects that were sent by missionaries to the foundress and her Sisters, were indeed a cornerstone of the SSPC’s engagement as a whole.

Political regimes and both world wars had deep impacts on the Africa museums, as could be seen in Salzburg and Maria Sorg. Also, other smaller collections in branch offices outside of the German-speaking countries were afflicted by the change in regimes, and therefore these mobile goods changed ownership. A history of the “biographies” of collections with all their comings together and dispersal could be written for every smaller branch office with their exhibitions. The differences between the branch offices in the Austrian and German Empires in contrast to the office in Switzerland also become obvious. While Maria Sorg and Salzburg had to struggle with changing regimes, the Africa museum in Zug enjoyed continuity and can look back on more than a hundred years of undisturbed existence.

Observing the difference between the mission museum in Maria Sorg and the Afrikamuseum in Zug, and remembering Sister M. Paula’s words about the individual influences of the Mother Superior on “her” museum, it is undoubtedly true that the idea of foundress Ledóchowska to have many very similar organised Africa museums in her congregation has developed over the first hundred years into two quite different museums. Starting with the clear instructions printed and handed out to the heads of the branch offices, the museums nowadays have a unique character and reflect the influences from within the congregation but also from the wider world (foremost the world wars and persecution which the museum in Switzerland was spared).

The Paramentenausstellungen were a unique feature of the SSPC and in contrast to the portraits of the mission museums in this study. Interestingly, some rare examples of these exhibitions still exist in the 21st century.

Regarding the objects that were shown in the museums and exhibitions of the SSPC, it becomes clear that they were seen first and foremost as “curiosities” – in several of the quoted letters this word is used for the objects, by

---

454 As already mentioned, the branch office in Ljubljana was seized by the Communist regime.
455 There was a Paramentenausstellung in 2013 in the Benedictine abbey Schäftlarn (Germany) (“Kloster Schäftlarn: Paramentenausstellung Juli-September”), in the diocesan museum St. Pölten (Austria) in 2011 (“Paramente!”), and in the same year the Päpstliche Missionswerke der Frauen in Deutschland also had a Paramentenausstellung. The latter was not only founded to finance the ransom of female slaves and to supply charity for women and the production of paraments (similar to the SSPC), they also continued to fabricate paraments for subsequently sending them to Africa. Päpstliches Missionswerk der Frauen, “Bei uns kann jeder”. 
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Ledóchowska herself as well. And some objects also had the aura of trophies, commemorating hard won “victories”, both in connection with direct conversion stories (sent for example by François Steinmetz) but also in the sense that local religious traditions were actively interrupted. Here I refer for example to the pestle and the mortar that the SMA missionary Piotin sent (among “various articles of witchcraft”) and to the many fetishes that the SSPC owns and, for example in Zug, still exhibits. Contrary to the case studies of the SVD and the MSC, the objects sent in were not seen to be connected to any form of research or study interest.

This first case study has shown how a relatively small mission congregation founded in the late 19th century took part in the imparting of information (immaterial) and the transfer of objects (material) from Africa to Europe. Many special characteristics – both of the congregation and of the mission museums and exhibitions – have been shown by this example.
The secretary unlocks the door of the museum and lets me enter. This mission museum has been officially closed for eight years. It is one of the bigger mission museums, but it is somehow hidden in this massive building complex of the mission house St. Gabriel in Mödling, near Vienna. One needs guidance to find the museum. Otherwise, one would get lost in the long corridors. Now in 2013, eight years after the closing date, the exhibition rooms feel ambivalent. On the one hand, most vitrines are untouched, objects and descriptions are still in place. The exhibition design is homogeneous, straightforward and clear without embellishments or decor. There are still books waiting for visitors to flick through them; one in Arabic, one about Christian-Buddhist dialogue. On the other hand, some objects have been removed. There are empty spots in the showcases, and a stuffed snake that twines around a tree stem looks like it needs care for its broken skin. A label announces that exhibits from the Ethnographical Museum Vienna are to be found in the showcase, but these objects are gone. Contrasting with the many huge photographs and colourful statistics and world maps in the exhibition, the museum seems lifeless and waiting for its fate to be decided.

This was my impression when I had access to the closed Missions-ethnographische Museum in St. Gabriel in June 2013. The main reason to choose this mission museum was its strong scientific character. And this feature was eye-catching, even though my visit to the closed museum was very short due to the unhealthy conditions in the damp and mouldy rooms. The biggest showcase, covering the entire wall, was dedicated to famous priest-ethnographers, and on display were ethnographic objects from the indigenous groups they researched, as well as their photographs, and a row of copies of their journal, the well-known Anthropos Journal (see Figure 15). Furthermore, in the exhibition, separate wall texts were dedicated to individual scholars, like Wilhelm Schmidt, and Martin Gusinde. Next to a figure wearing a typical sari and other common ethnographical exhibits representing India, Wilhelm Koppers’ book about the Bhil people in India is exhibited. This case study shows the context

---

456 Parts of this Chapter, especially about the network with the Ethnographical Museum Vienna, have been subject of one of my articles. See Loder-Neuhold, “The ‘Missions-ethnographische Museum’ of”.
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and history of such compositions in a mission museum. The presentation of scientific literature in the showcases would have been unthinkable in the previous case study.

This chapter begins by presenting the literature and the source situation. The next section describes the context of the museum: the missionary society SVD and the mission house St. Gabriel near Vienna. The following section deals with the scholarly orientation of the SVD, especially anthropology, and portrays the so-called Anthropos Patres, named after the *Anthropos Journal*, as key figures of this engagement. Then, we turn our focus to the museum itself, looking at its founding phase and subsequent development. The collection and objects are also presented. The last section deals with the network of the SVD members who shaped the mission museum.

6.1 State of research, primary sources and source criticism

The SVD is a better-researched missionary congregation, in comparison with the SSPC. The SVD is a well-known society, and especially the connection to the field of anthropology is the reason why its members are referenced in so many publications. Also, the SVD showed interest in their own history and was (financially) able to publish on their history and their members. The history of the mission house St. Gabriel is only written by SVD members, which
means that some publications must be read critically, particularly when it
comes to the interwar period. However, for researching the mission museum
St. Gabriel SVD, those works are indispensible.457

The one who gets the most academic attention by far is P. Wilhelm Schmidt
(1868–1956), who is the subject of much research. Ernest Brandewie wrote a
monograph about Schmidt, with the far from humble title of When giants
walked the earth (1990). It is a highly problematic work. For instance,
Brandewie laments that Schmidt is misunderstood and sometimes maligned.458
He criticises the “suppression of many of the brightest in ethnology at the time.
Schmidt, for example, had to flee to Switzerland.”459 Overlooking other schol-
ars, who were not only forced to flee by the Nazis but who lost their lives460,
he turns Schmidt into a half-martyr. Brandewie’s book is sometimes necessary
to consult but will be used as what it is, a hagiography, rather than a distanced
biography of Schmidt.

But critical literature on Schmidt exists. This literature also needs to draw
on basic information given by SVD historians, but it nevertheless also includes
new sources outside of those repeatedly cited by many SVD members. These
“non-SVD” authors will be my main secondary sources for the biographies. It
must be stressed that this independent work is also published in the Anthropos
Journal, the journal that Schmidt himself founded and until today is published
by the Anthropos Institute. That means the SVD is supporting critical research
on their own history.461

Once granted permission by the mission house council (Hausrat), I was
able to work in the “museum archive”, which was in fact the museum depot.
It was described to me as the only place in the mission house where some
information about the museum could be found. In June and August 2013, I
worked through the depot, trying to separate the helpful material from the ran-
domly stored papers, photos, photocopies, books, and brochures. The fate of
the museum, the hasty closing, led to the situation of a disordered “archive”.
Therefore, the task of tracing the founding and development of the mission
museum is difficult. Gaps in the reconstruction cannot be avoided. Another
consequence of what I encountered in the depot is my improvised way of nam-
ing the primary sources in this thesis. Rarely did the file folders and ring bind-
ers that I looked through and photographed have a specific name on them. A

457 Especially Brunner, 100 Jahre Missionshaus St. and Alt, Die Geschichte des Missions-
hauses.
458 Brandewie, When giants walked the, 5.
459 Brandewie, 100.
460 Berthold Riese compiles a list of seventy-one German and Austrian anthropologists, who
were persecuted and forced to flee between 1933 and 1945. Two of them committed suicide,
two were possibly murdered in a concentration camp, and one was executed. Riese, “Während
des Dritten Reiches”.
461 As an example, see the article by Janne Mende, Mende, “Kultur, Volk und Rasse”.
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systematic order of any shape was not to be found. I found traces of someone trying to start a systematic order, but the attempts remained unfinished.

While working in the depot, I could also visit the closed museum and take pictures of the remaining exhibition (June 2013).

A most interesting find was a folder that documented that someone had indeed planned to write a 200-page book about the mission museum and the library in St. Gabriel. I found notes about this intended second volume of the series “Das Missionhaus St. Gabriel in Geschichte und Gegenwart”, for which the first volume was the history of St. Gabriel written by Josef Alt SVD in 1990. The plan included a handwritten table of contents for both parts, the museum and the library, with notes about intended authors for the different chapters. Interestingly, there was also a list of primary sources for the museum, starting in 1898. Enclosed were some copies of those primary sources. Whoever planned to write this book sometime in the 1990s was unable to continue and finish, as Alt’s first volume in the series remained the only one. However, this find shows that for some members within St. Gabriel, the museum was indeed of significant interest, sufficient for this book project to be started. The museum and the library seemed worthy of a presentation even for a general readership.

To complement the findings from the depot in St. Gabriel, in December 2015 I also visited the archive of the Ethnographical Museum Vienna, today called World Museum Vienna. There I found material that enlightens the matter of networking between this state-run museum and the mission museum. The material is primarily ordered according to individual SVD missionaries and their collections in the museum but also some files are dedicated to the confiscation during the Second World War and the later struggle to recover objects after 1945. The acronym for the archive of the Ethnographical Museum Vienna is AVKM, for the depot it is AMEM.

6.2 The Societas Verbi Divini (SVD)

The Catholic congregation Societas Verbi Divini was established in 1875 by the German Arnold Janssen (1837–1909) as a pronounced German mission society. The founding location is in the Dutch village of Steyl, near the German border. In German-speaking countries the name “Steyler missionaries” is a more common designation for the Divine Word Missionaries/SVD missionaries. The reason why Janssen established his society in the Netherlands can be found in the Kulturkampf in Germany: Janssen chose Steyl so as to circumvent the anti-Catholic laws in Germany, which would have kept him from founding a mission congregation.462 The first mission house in Steyl was

---

462 Divine Word Missionaries, “History”.
named St. Michael and as mentioned above, St. Michael also has a mission museum. It is an interesting example of mission museum because it deliberately kept its (almost) original form from the 1930s. The location outside of the German-speaking area excludes St. Michael from this study.

The SVD consists of patres (priests) and fratres (brothers). Arnold Janssen together with Maria Stollwerk and Josepha Stenmanns founded two female congregations, also part of the “SVD-family”. The first is the Missionary Sisters Servants of the Holy Spirit (SSpS; called the Holy Spirit Sisters or Blue Sisters) in 1889. The second, co-founded with Adolfine Tonnies in 1896, is dedicated to permanent prayer for the mission. They are called Sister-Servants of the Holy Spirit of Perpetual Adoration (SSpSAP), known as Pink Sisters.

The SVD members started work in the mission fields from as early as 1879 when the first missionary went to China. The most famous missionary of the SVD is arguably Joseph Freinademetz, a South Tyrolian who went to mission in China. Freinademetz was canonised together with Arnold Janssen in 2003. Since the early mission engagement in China, the society spread to countries like Argentina, Papua New Guinea, Indonesia, India, and African countries.

The charisma of the SVD changed over time. At first, it was mainly the overseas mission with a focus on founding Christian parishes. Today their worldwide engagement is focused on social issues, like pastoral care for youth and religious vocation. Their services also include a bank institute (Steyler Bank). This “missionary bank” has strict ethical guidelines and the profit is used for the SVD’s many projects in poor societies. One main characteristic, the scientific engagement of this congregation, is of utter importance for this case study and will be presented later in a separate chapter.

---

463 “The Mission Museum in Steyl is very special. It is a museum of a museum. Maintained in its original style, it exudes the atmosphere that must have been tangible at the beginning of the last century. Nothing has been changed here since 1931. The division of the museum into ethnological and natural history sections actually stems from that time.” “Mission Museum of Steyl”. This mission museum is said to serve as a magnet for visitors. Given the 1,500 stuffed animals (including a famous stuffed bear with inbuilt mechanics so that it can move) and the big collection of butterflies, spiders, scorpions and beetles, this comes as no surprise. “The Animal World”. Chris Wingfield rightly points out how this mode also evades a debate: “The Missionary Museum at Steyl […] effectively presents itself as a historical curiosity, a missionary display unchanged since the 1930s, thereby sidestepping a great deal of contemporary critique.” Wingfield, “Missionary Museums,” in Religion in museums, 233.

464 Rivinius, “Steyler Missionare/Missionsschwestern”.

465 Dienerinnen des Heiligen Geistes von der Ewigen Anbetung, “Geschichte”.

466 Häußler-Eisenmann, “100. Todesstag des Heiligen”.

467 Divine Word Missionaries, “History”.

468 Steyler Missionare, “Steyler Bank”.
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6.3 The mission house St. Gabriel in Mödling

After this short introduction to the SVD, I will give a historical background of their mission house St. Gabriel, which was the basis for the development of the mission museum. St. Gabriel’s existence over a hundred years cannot be discussed in full detail but main developments in the history of St. Gabriel need to be pointed out.

From early on, the founder Arnold Janssen SVD had plans to establish a mission seminary within the borders of the multi-national Austro-Hungarian Empire. His efforts led in the end to being granted permission by the Emperor Franz Joseph I. In 1888, the first construction work on the grounds started. St. Gabriel was outside of Vienna but well located in regard to train connections to the capital Vienna. It grew into a huge building complex, with an impressive church, agriculture and different workshops such as book printing workshop, bookbinder’s workshop, and joinery. The ongoing enlargement of the house was due to the growing number of members: students, novices, fraters, patres, and some missionary sisters. The latter were primarily engaged in the kitchen. St. Gabriel’s inhabitants strongly promoted the mission idea in the Austrian Empire. For this purpose, they organised mission garden parties for the neighbouring people (Missionsfeste), pilgrimages with thousands of participants and popular missions, as well as academic mission congresses and spiritual retreats.

At this point, it is necessary to remember that the detailed history of the mission house is entirely written by members of the society and thus the information must be approached with caution, particularly when it comes to the interwar period. Alfons Jochum SVD, for example, divided its history into periods with telling names. For him, the period between 1919 and 1939 is the “blooming time”, the heyday of St. Gabriel. After the First World War, St. Gabriel housed 650 members, the highest number of inhabitants in its history.

For Jochum, the blooming period is first and foremost expressed by this influx of new members, coming most prominently from Germany and former parts of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Moreover, on the eve of the Second World War, the students originated from fifteen different nations.

Jochum also stresses the public activities of P. Wilhelm Schmidt and other members’ connections to state universities, which will be discussed later. The

---

470 Jochum, “Werden und Wirken”.
471 Jochum, 20.
472 Alt, *Die Geschichte des Missionshauses*, 289. Alt does however not hide the fact, that the multinational, multilingual community was anything but harmonious. Conflicts between the novices and students became intense when the Nazi movement became significantly stronger in Germany. Political events like the 1000-Mark-Sperre with the goal to isolate Austria had direct influence on the mobility between the different European mission houses of the SVD. Alt, 270–72.
last point is the proud reference of involvement of party members of the Christian Social Party (CS), which established the Austro-Fascist regime or Dollfuß-Schuschnigg-regime between 1933 or 1934 and 1938:

Jochum presents the last Austrian president before the so-called Anschluss, Wilhelm Miklas (CS) as a regular guest and speaker at events in St. Gabriel.

Jochum explicitly mentions Prelate Ignaz Seipel (1876–1932), who served twice as Chancellor. Alt mentions Seipel only once but praises him for his efforts to stabilise the economy and reform the constitution.

Neither of them mentions that Seipel was one of the major actors in the interwar period conflicts between three political camps: 1) the Catholic, conservative, and often anti-Semitic faction, dominated by the CS; 2) the left (labour movement and socialists); and 3) the small faction of liberal and national parties (anticlerical, anti-Semitic, strong amongst students).

These conflicts before and during the Dollfuß-Schuschnigg-regime were the main background to St. Gabriel’s heyday. The mission house stood at a geographical distance from the contested inner city of Vienna, where for example in the university buildings violent riots against left and/or Jewish students and teachers took place. But this university, as shown later, was central for the network around the mission museum.

One expression of the SVD’s engaging in politics is in its members’ involvement in local pastoral care and charity work, especially in areas outside Vienna predominantly inhabited by industrial workers.

Regardless of Seipel’s anti-Semitism and his involvement in the bloody July Revolt of 1927, his connection to St. Gabriel was still proudly noted by Jochum. Alt’s history of St. Gabriel is more nuanced when referring to the interwovenness of the CS and the SVD. Alt, however, excuses the SVD’s support for the Christian Social Party with Dollfuß’s stand against National Socialism and Kurt Schuschnigg’s passion for the Catholic foreign mission.

---

473 For a short overview on the problematic of labelling this period (Austro-, cleric-, proto-, semi-, pseudo- or para-fascist) see Peniston-Bird, “Austria,” in The Oxford Handbook of Fascism, 450–51.


475 Alt, Die Geschichte des Missionshauses, 409.


477 See especially Taschwer, Hochburg des Antisemitismus.


479 As an example, he fought for a numerus clausus for Jewish students at universities. Taschwer, Hochburg des Antisemitismus, 65.


481 “Er führte ja in den Augen frommer Katholiken nicht nur den Kampf gegen die alten Feinde wie Sozialisten, Juden und Kommunisten, sondern organisierte auch die Abwehr gegen den Nationalsozialismus. Er war in St. Gabriel öfters zu Besuch gewesen, hatte an Missionsfeiern und Exerzitien teilgenommen. […] Sein Bundesminister für Unterricht, Kurt von Schuschnigg,
These years of close relations to the political actors in power in Vienna ended abruptly with the so-called Anschluss, the Annexation of Austria to Nazi-Germany on March 12, 1938. Consequently, Jochum identifies an unusual period – from 1939 to 1946 – as “Die Zeit des Unheils”, the time of misery. In short, this period was marked by the menace of the new political order, the National Socialists, precisely because of St. Gabriel’s previous connection to the Austro-fascist regime and its opposition to the Nazi movement. But at the same time, some SVD members shared for example opposition to the political left and a sometimes religious-based anti-Semitism.

On the very first day after the annexation, St. Gabriel was searched by Nazi forces for anti-fascist texts and weapons and two patres were arrested. In 1940, twenty-six students were brought to the concentration camp in Dachau, where fourteen of them were murdered. With the outbreak of the war, SVD members were conscripted and the number of inhabitants at St. Gabriel began to shrink. In 1941, St. Gabriel was confiscated by the Secret State Police (Gestapo) because of “subversive” behaviour, all of course while not letting go of the over 200 members serving in the Wehrmacht. Several capable fratres had to stay behind to work, but the majority were forced to leave their home at St. Gabriel. Finally, in April 1945, German forces abandoned St. Gabriel and Russian troops assumed control.

Post-war restoration started immediately. The years after this war seemed to bring a second – though brief – vitality to St. Gabriel. But from the 1960s onwards a decline in the numbers of new members was obvious. Since then, the important book print workshop and the academy (Theologische Hochschule) had to be closed.

Today, a small group of international SVD members is living in St. Gabriel. Their current work is directed towards spiritual care in urban parishes of Vienna and among refugees. Interreligious dialogue is an important task, as the books in the mission museum show. The international patres in St. Gabriel are

---

482 Jochum, “Werden und Wirken,” in *100 Jahre Missionshaus St. Gabriel*, 26. Note that he includes the year of 1946. The Soviet army arrived in Mödling on Friday after Easter 1945. He does not use terminology of freeing or relieving. This must be seen in connection to the fact, that one pater and two brothers were shot by Russian soldiers in St. Gabriel for “unknown reasons”. Jochum, 26.
483 Alt cites an internal letter from 1935, wherein a novice master reports that the majority of the young members are in opposition to the Nazi party. Alt, *Die Geschichte des Missionshauses*, 272.
484 Alt mentions P. Johannes Thauren, and P. Peter Schmitz (well-known for his social engagement), as the two arrested members.
485 Alt does not specify the circumstances and reasons for the arrest, nor the nationalities of these students. Alt, 290. Regarding the members’ previous closeness to the Dollfuß-Schuschnigg-regime and their international roots this number seems reasonable.
486 Alt, 277–302.
also active in pastoral care for migrant communities.\textsuperscript{488} St. Gabriel can also be referred to as a demonstration for “reverse mission”\textsuperscript{489}, because for foreign-born SVD members today, Austria is named as their mission field.\textsuperscript{490}

### 6.4 The scholarly orientation of the SVD

The aim of this section is to present the context of the founding and development of the mission museum in St. Gabriel, the important figures of the SVD who shaped the history of the mission, and the network around it. It will be shown that the SVD had a special characteristic, in its scholarly orientation primarily in anthropology. Reinhard Wendt uses the term \textit{Apostolat der Wissenschaft}, Apostolate of Science, for the global engagement of the Jesuits in modern times and I would argue that the SVD case shows similarities to the Jesuits mindset.\textsuperscript{491}

There is a vast amount of literature on the relationship between mission and anthropology and to discuss it fully is beyond the scope of this thesis.\textsuperscript{492} However, I claim that in the evolving years of the discipline of anthropology, there was not always an antagonism between being a missionary and an anthropologist. As will become clear in this case study, the earliest “professional” anthropologists were often missionaries. Marcus Tomalin writes: “[I]n practice, the dividing line between missionaries and anthropologists during the late nineteenth century was extremely indistinct.”\textsuperscript{493} This case study will show that this assertion is true later than the late 19th century.

Authors like Stefan Dietrich and An Vandenberg speak of a distinct “Catholic ethnology”\textsuperscript{494}. Most of the Anthropos Patres presented here (SVD members who participated in the work for the \textit{Anthropos Journal} and Anthropos Institute) worked primarily or entirely as anthropologists. According to my understanding, they were missionaries, since they were members of the SVD, but their careers had a different orientation than what is commonly thought of as missionary. Some might not have left their study rooms in Europe, they were “armchair ethnographers”, and if some did, they commonly went to mission stations and used them as a base for field research. By pointing this out, I want to broaden the understanding of “missionary”, rather than use different

\textsuperscript{488} Helm, “Mission im großstädtischen Milieu”.
\textsuperscript{490} “Ihr Missionsland wird Österreich sein.” Tauchner, “Priesterweihe in St. Gabriel”.
\textsuperscript{492} For a recent overview of literature that deals with these “holy twins” (or “unholy twins”), as Hermann Mückler calls mission and anthropology, see Mückler, “Zum Verhältnis von Missionaren,” 242–46.
\textsuperscript{493} Tomalin, “‘No connection or cooperation,’” 836.
\textsuperscript{494} Dietrich, “Mission, local culture and”, Vandenberghe, “Entre mission et science”.
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terms for those who dedicated themselves to scholarly work. However, to distinguish these missionaries, who were, in fact, professional anthropologists, I also use the term priest-ethnographer.

Louis Luzbetak SVD, himself a director of the Anthropos Institute writes about the SVD:

Arnold Janssen’s missionaries [...] introduced a somewhat revolutionary dimension into the meaning of mission – the scientific study of humankind as an integral part of the missionary task itself.

My claim for the strong scientific engagement of the SVD is also grounded in their constitution. The version from 1922 reads in §282 as follows:

282. Undoubtedly, the duty first and foremost of all missionaries is to bring the light of faith to all the peoples of the earth who are still in the darkness and in the shadow of death. But it is also certain that the apostolic ministry of the missionaries will receive much honour and benefit from continuing observations during their free time and making accurate notes on religious beliefs and customs, or in the fields of economics, ethnology, anthropology, natural history, geology, archaeology or meteorology. They may then, as instructed by the superiors, collect such descriptions and samples of garments, utensils, and other things from the country, and send them to the superior general.

Scholarly engagement, although secondary to the first task of bringing the light of faith to all the peoples, is portrayed as a beneficial task. Ethnology and anthropology are explicitly named fields, even though some of these fields were still in the process of becoming distinct academic disciplines. Interestingly, it is also natural sciences that can benefit missionaries obtaining and sending objects. This alone highlights the scientific claim that this congregation made for the early 20th century. But for this study even more important is the reference to “collecting” (colligere) and transferring (transmittere): in

495 The SVD members were not the first ones to have this characteristic. Reinhard Wendt describes how the German Jesuit Johannes Schreck (1576–1630) has been dedicated to mission through his engagement in botany, mathematics and so on. He published scientific books in Chinese, but nowhere does he touch religious questions. “Schreck wollte der Mission durch seine Arbeit als Wissenschaftler eine Tür öffnen, beteiligte sich aber selber nicht an direkter Evangelisataion.” Wendt, “Des Kaisers wundersame Heilung,” in Sammeln, Vernetzen, Auswerten, 36.


497 (my translation) Constitutiones Societatis Verbi Divini, § 282. The Latin text reads: “Quamvis primum omnium missionarium sit docere omnes gentes, qui in tenebris et in umbra mortis sedent, multum tamen decus et utilitatem afferet ministerio apostolico, si praeterea missionarii horis liberis successive investigant et accurate annotant, sive quae ad religionem, ad oeconomiam nationalem, res ethnologicas, anthropologicas, sive ad historiam naturalem, geologicam, archaeologicam, metereologicam pertinent. Deinde iuxta Superiorum ordinationes scripta eiusmodi necnon exemplaria vestium, utensilium aliarumve rerum illius regionis colligant et Superiori generali transmittant.” I want to thank Stanislaw Grodz SVD and Christian Tauchner SVD in St. Augustin for helping me find the right passage and version.
their very own constitution, the SVD members are encouraged to “collect” and send objects to Europe.

The dominant person in this case study is P. Wilhelm Schmidt, but several other well-known SVD members were of also important for the history of the mission museum in St. Gabriel and will be introduced here as well. As said, I refer to this group around Schmidt as Anthropos Patres after the *Anthropos Journal* and Anthropos Institute though it should be noted that there is no pre-established group composition of them other than my choice. I constructed this list of Anthropos Patres, and the decision whom to include is based on the relation to the mission museum in St. Gabriel. There are other SVD members who were significant in the history of anthropology as well but who are not dealt with in this thesis.

After presenting Schmidt, there will be four briefer biographies. Literature on these other Anthropos Patres is often written just for comparing them to Schmidt, the “dominant father figure”. The first portrayed is Wilhelm Koppers, who held the highest academic position in the group. Martin Gusinde is still important for the SVD for public relations and self-representation. Next to Gusinde, the other “great field researcher personality of the 20th century”, is P. Paul Schebesta. And finally, P. Georg Höltker is presented.

6.4.1 P. Wilhelm Schmidt SVD (1868–1956)

Wilhelm Schmidt was born near Dortmund and joined the SVD at the young age of fifteen becoming one of its most famous as well as infamous members. Detailed studies have been written about Schmidt, ranging from almost idealising him and his impact to very critical approaches. Therefore, Schmidt’s biography will be restricted to a short sketch for a general life story with special focus on issues that are important for the museum and the network. I outline first the myth around Schmidt in order to understand the high status he enjoyed in his life and for some time after.

The myth: A part of the creation of the myth is his massive productivity. The fact that Schmidt was a so-called armchair anthropologist who did not do field research, certainly plays a role in that output. His *opus magnum*, *Der Ursprung der Gottesidee* alone includes twelve volumes and contains around 10,000 pages. His scientific oeuvre lists 647 articles, books, and reviews.

---

498 Joseph Henninger, for example, mainly compares Koppers to Schmidt. Henninger, *Professor P. Wilhelm Koppers*.


500 Petermann, *Die Geschichte der Ethnologie*, 610.

501 Brandewie, *When giants walked the*.
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Apart from that, he composed hymns, masses and choral pieces, also partly published.\textsuperscript{503} His scholarly work – significant for his milieu at the end of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century – revolved around an apologetic attempt to assess new findings and discoveries (such as the theory of evolution) since he saw many discoveries as attacks against the Catholic Church.

It is also clear how the relationship between mission and anthropology was shaped in his endeavour: although claiming that anthropology served mission (as it is expressed in the SVD constitution), it was the other way around. Schmidt was not concerned about progress in the foreign mission. His work was rather “an attempt to provide a forward defence for Catholicism against (real or imagined) adversaries in the academic world.”\textsuperscript{504}

Schmidt’s approach within this “Catholic ethnology” was the idea of an \textit{Urmonotheismus}, an original monotheism, that he wanted to prove existed in the earliest “stages of humanity”.\textsuperscript{505} Following this, he broadened and modified the so-called \textit{Kulturkreislehre} (culture circles), a concept first introduced by Leo Frobenius and Fritz Graebner. The goal was to ratify the Catholic doctrines about revelation with his theory.\textsuperscript{506} What made Schmidt successful is that through his network he could entrench his school also outside of the sphere of the Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{507} Of the relation of mission and anthropology it is said:

\[\ldots\] the real “relation of support” was not from the ethnologist to the missionary, but rather the reverse: the missionary as ethnographer had to support the ethnologist for debates on the home front. More than that, the conceptual framework of \textit{Kulturkreislehre} ethnology was largely useless for the missionary in the field.\textsuperscript{508}

When working, the missionaries abroad were not in his mind. The practical implementation of his findings was not the goal. This quote shows for whom Schmidt was writing, for the “home front”. This front could also include prominent names. The myths around Schmidt include the assertion that Sigmund Freud had expressed in 1937 that he is more afraid of the political influence of the Catholic Church in Austria than that of the Nazi movement. In a letter to Arnold Zweig, Freud wrote that he saw P. Schmidt as his special adversary

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{503} Bornemann, “Verzeichnis der Schriften von”.
  \item \textsuperscript{504} Dietrich, “Mission, local culture and,” 113.
  \item \textsuperscript{505} The idea of an ancient highest deity is not Schmidt’s invention. He builds on the works of Andrew Lang and Leopold von Schroeder, whose lecture he heard 1902 in Vienna. Thiel, “Der Urmonotheismus des P.” in \textit{Kulturwissenschaften im Vielvölkerstaat}, 257.
  \item \textsuperscript{507} Stornig, “Globalisierte Körper? Repräsentationen der,” in \textit{Der schwarze Körper als Missionsgebiet}, 144.
  \item \textsuperscript{508} (emphasis in original) Dietrich, “Mission, local culture and,” 116.
\end{itemize}
and that he was the hidden ruler in Austrian politics.\textsuperscript{509} Schmidt’s influence was clearly seen as way beyond the Catholic and academic spheres.

To demystify Schmidt, a first step is to see two sides of the same coin: he was both a scholar and a deeply politically engaged person. Therefore, it is not possible to only read his scientific publishing, but also to take into account his vast public contributions in various (Catholic) newspapers and magazines.\textsuperscript{510} It would be too easy to just forget about the second, political and very public side of this scholar.

Reading Schmidt’s scientific texts, he does not include the same extraordinary rude and racist remarks, as many contemporaries did. He did believe that the “white race” was hierarchically beyond every other, though this was held to be indisputable in scientific circles in his time. But his judgements were often drawn from his (Christian-based) moral reasoning. On the question of colonial regimes, he saw a certain moral responsibility in the European colonists for their subjects.\textsuperscript{511}

Schmidt’s influence on Austrian politics is hard to evaluate. Born a German, he became an Austrian citizen in 1902\textsuperscript{512} and had loose ties with the last Austrian Emperor, Karl I. Schmidt remained a monarchist.\textsuperscript{513} Already before the interwar years, Schmidt was like a “grey eminence”. He is said to have functioned as a messenger between the Emperor and Ignaz Seipel.\textsuperscript{514} As mentioned above, during the Dollfuß-Schuschnigg-regime, the connections of the whole SVD with the regime was tight.

Regarding the rise of National Socialism in Germany and Austria, Schmidt said it was unthinkable to be Catholic and Nazi.\textsuperscript{515} He rejected the race theories of the Nazis, as he did their ideology and promise of salvation.\textsuperscript{516}

In his public voice in popular books and articles during the 1920s and 1930s, his anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism was vital, a circumstance that even

\textsuperscript{509} For the whole relation between Freud and Schmidt see Robertson, “Freud und Pater Wilhelm”.
\textsuperscript{510} A good overview on his articles in \textit{Tagespost, Schönere Zukunft} and \textit{Das Neue Reich} is to be found in Conte’s bibliography. Conte, “Wilhelm Schmidt: Des letzten,” in \textit{Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus}, 273–76.
\textsuperscript{511} Conte, 263–66.
\textsuperscript{512} Mischek, “Antisemitismus und Antijudaismus in,” in \textit{The study of religion under the impact of fascism}, 469.
\textsuperscript{513} How well this connection was established is disputable. Some claim he was the father confessor of the Emperor, like Conte, “Wilhelm Schmidt: Des letzten,” in \textit{Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus}, 262.
\textsuperscript{516} Mischek, “Antisemitismus und Antijudaismus in,” in \textit{The study of religion under the impact of fascism}, 476–82.
SVD members as his biographers could not ignore. His attitude flowed from his scientific theories about religions, his political opposition to communists/socialists/social democrats who were in his eyes often of Jewish background, and his critique of materialism (poor and rich Jews as providers of materialism). All in all, he showed a mixture of a racist anti-Semitism with a Christian anti-Judaism, which contradictions he tried to smooth out. Schmidt stayed true to his anti-Judaism after the Shoah. No other Anthropos Pater gave anti-Semitic or anti-Jewish statements publicly; he was the only one among them.

Publicly, Schmidt opposed the fight for equal rights for women and even abused women in his anti-Jewish tirades. For him, the concept of family was fundamentally important, and his conservative view on women only made them thinkable in the context of being a Catholic, married mother.

Now, after explaining the myth around Schmidt and pointing out the problematic facets of him, we turn to the main developments in his biography.

After his education in Steyl, he was sent to the mission house Heiligkreuz/Nysa (present-day Poland) as a teacher. Then he was sent to Berlin to study at the university, from 1893 to 1895. His subjects were Hebrew and Arabic, also Islamic theology, as well as languages like Syriac and Aramaic. In Berlin “he experienced at close quarters the mutual hostility between primarily Protestant academia and the Catholic Church.” In 1895 he was sent to St. Gabriel for a teaching position at the seminary, and this is where he started his career.

At this time, the SVD received New Guinea, then partly belonging to the German colonial enterprise, as a mission field. This new endeavour for the SVD caught Schmidt’s attention and he first started to study New Guinean languages, later expanding his interest to Polynesian, Melanesian, Australian, and African languages. The material came from missionaries from New

---

517 Fritz Bornemann for example is very clear about Schmidt’s anti-Semitism and his silence about the shoah after 1945. Bornemann, P. Wilhelm Schmidt, 279–80. Ernest Brandewie dedicates a whole chapter to Schmidt’s anti-Semitism. Brandewie, When giants walked the, 233–42.

518 Mischek, “Antisemitismus und Antijudaismus in”.

519 Conte, “Völkerkunde und Faschismus?,” in Kontinuität und Bruch, 244.

520 Marchand, “Priests among the Pygmies,” in Worldly provincialism, 310.

521 The train of thought was according the following lines: Jesus Christ had to rescue the women from the Jewish men, and the “Christian Mary” perfected what the “Jewish Eva” could not achieve. Mischek, “Antisemitismus und Antijudaismus in,” in The study of religion under the impact of fascism, 480–481.


523 Bornemann, 16–19.

524 Marchand, “Priests among the Pygmies,” in Worldly provincialism, 294.

From an initial linguistic interest, he gradually turned towards anthropology. It was “a steadily widening interest from purely linguistic issues to cultural and religio-historical problems.” An important step in his endeavour was the foundation of the *Anthropos Journal* in 1906. Schmidt wanted to fill the gap that he saw: a professional journal in the Catholic sphere, where missionaries could publish their studies from the mission fields and present themselves in the academic world. Schmidt felt it unacceptable that often secular scholars used the work of missionaries without giving them credit for their intellectual work. The intended contributors were principally Catholic missionaries, but also articles by Protestant missionaries and secular academics in Europe were welcome. As Schmidt’s choice of words in his invitation for possible contributors shows, only male missionaries were thinkable as authors.

The *Anthropos Journal* is the most important piece in the construction of a “Catholic ethnology”. Approval for the new journal also came from professional anthropologists outside the Catholic sphere. One wrote that even he, well-known for his anticlerical views, must appreciate such a well-made journal. Later in the 1930s, in St. Gabriel the Anthropos Institute was established. From its beginning till the so-called *Anschluss*, the journal was located in St. Gabriel. It moved with Schmidt and the Anthropos Patres to Fribourg in Switzerland. It must not be forgotten that the Institute and the journal, with articles in German, English, French, Spanish, Italian, and Latin, was financed by the SVD. Without the founder Arnold Janssen, such an expensive undertaking could not have been realised. How inseparable Schmidt and “his” journal became is shown when one of the later editors writes that “[i]f anything of W. Schmidt’s work survives him, then surely *Anthropos* is that work.”
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526 Henninger, *P. Wilhelm Schmidt*, 34.
528 Rivinius, *Die Anfänge des “Anthropos*, 44.
529 Schmidt, “Einladung zu Mitarbeit und,” in *Die Anfänge des “Anthropos*, 180. He also criticised the ignorance in work about the history and development of anthropology that silenced the involvement of missionaries Schmidt, “Die moderne Ethnologie,” 152. For more on this silencing in general see Harriet Völker’s article, where she also mentions Schmidt as an advocate for missionaries’ voices in the anthropological field. Völker, “Missionare als Ethnologen”. In the described cases Schmidt advocated for Protestant missionaries and their research in Australia.
530 Rivinius, *Die Anfänge des “Anthropos*, 49.
531 Schmidt writes of men and confreres in his invocation where he presents the goals of the new journal and promotes to contribute with articles. Schmidt, “Einladung zu Mitarbeit und”.
532 Several publications deal with the founding of the *Anthropos Journal* which shows its ongoing importance, first and foremost for the SVD. Rivinius, *Die Anfänge des “Anthropos*, Rivinius, *Im Dienst der Mission*, Quack, “100 Years of Anthropos”.
533 Quack, 3.
534 In 1962, the Institute, the library and the journal moved to St. Augustin in Germany, where it is still edited today. Quack, 5.
535 Quack, 6.
Schmidt’s style of work can be described as an “armchair ethnographer at the top of the missionary feeding chain”. For his research, he used the material and data that came from missionaries. In this role as a broker between the missionaries and the scientific circles in Europe, he could also abuse this central position for suppressing new data that would not support his theories. How unscientifically he sometimes worked with the missionaries’ material can be illustrated with an anecdote. A basis for his theory was that monotheistic people also live in a patriarchal and monogamous society. When P. Schebesta came back from an expedition studying so-called “pygmy peoples” and reported that some male hunters could have a second wife, Schmidt answered: “Schebesta, I do not want to hear that!” He never did any fieldwork himself, yet toured worldwide to give lectures. These tours included typical countries for fieldwork like China or the Philippines. Maybe as a compensation for his own inactivity, he organised and helped finance (for example from the Vatican) fieldwork trips for his disciples like P. Gusinde and P. Schebesta. Their field research must have been important to him, as he mentioned them in his self-written CV.

The networking with the academic circles in Vienna (and globally) will be discussed in Section 6.6.4, now it should just be mentioned that in 1921 he became private lecturer (Privatdozent) at the University of Vienna, all without having a doctorate which shows his powerful position at this time. His lecturing, covering ethnology, linguistics and comparative religious studies, started in 1922 and continued until 1938.

A crucial step in his career was when Pope Pius XI tasked him to organise the anthropological department of the Vatican mission exhibition in 1925. In continuity with this exhibition, Schmidt became from 1927 onwards the first
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536 Marchand, “Priests among the Pygmies,” in *Worldly provincialism*, 302.
537 Völker describes this for a secular middleman in Germany as well: “Diese Vermittlerrolle konnte aber insofern missbraucht werden, als sie seinem Inhaber erlaubte, die erhaltenen Informationen nur dann zu verwenden, wenn sie bereits etablierte Theorien unterstützen. Widersprüchen diese diesen, konnten sie einfach zurückgehalten werden.” Völker, “Missionare als Ethnologen,” in *Sammeln, Vernetzen, Auswerten*, 208.
538 “Pygmies” are members of any group whose adult men (!) are on average less than 150 cm tall. As this term is seen as pejorative, it is today also common to instead use the specific names, like the San. At the moment, there is no alternative term to refer to all those groups in Africa and Asia. As the SVD anthropologists were interested in all of them, more or less as a concept, I am forced to stick to the term “pygmies”, when describing the anthropologists’ work. It must be understood as an emic term that the anthropologists used.
539 (my translation) Thiel, “Der Urmonotheismus des P.,” in *Kulturwissenschaften im Vielvölkerstaat*, 258–59. This encounter was witnessed by a Benedictine pater.
541 Henninger, 30–32.
542 Henninger, 36–37.
director of the resulting museum, *Museo Missionario-Etnologico* (in the following: Lateran mission museum).\(^{543}\)

On the day after the so-called *Anschluss* in 1938, Nazi troops raided St. Gabriel. Although it is still claimed that he was arrested, it is more likely that he was “only” placed under house arrest. His *venia legendi* (permission to teach) was withdrawn by the new regime. How Mussolini and the pope intervened to get him free is questionable\(^{544}\), but the important point is that Schmidt – and with him the Anthropos Institute with their library – managed to escape to Rome and finally found exile in Froideville near Fribourg, Switzerland.

Straightaway, at the age of seventy, Schmidt re-started his academic career by building up the field of anthropology at this young university in the Catholic stronghold of Fribourg. With objects brought to Switzerland by other Anthropos Patres (Koppers, Höltker) a small museum was also established at the university.\(^{545}\)

It is indisputable that Schmidt fell victim to the purge at the University of Vienna after the so-called *Anschluss*, like so many others. His connections to the Dollfuß-Schuschnigg-regime were too close. But that he therefore was a victim of fascism, at the same level as many others who had to flee (for being left and/or of Jewish background) must be rejected.\(^{546}\)

After the war, Schmidt was too old to take up the chair at the University of Vienna again, therefore he stayed in Fribourg. He continued working, travelling through Europe and giving university lectures (as visiting professor also in Vienna) until the age of eighty-three. He died in 1954 in Fribourg and is buried in St. Gabriel.\(^{547}\)

### 6.4.2 P. Wilhelm Koppers SVD (1886–1961)

The German Wilhelm Koppers went down in history as the closest and longest co-worker of Wilhelm Schmidt and his right hand man.\(^{548}\) Koppers joined the SVD, studied in Rome and Vienna and made a straight academic career at the University of Vienna: Doctorate in 1917, habilitation and lectureship in 1924, head of the *Institut für Völkerkunde* (Institute of Ethnology) in 1929, and *Ordinarius* (full professor) in 1935.\(^{549}\) It was Koppers who in the end became the

---

\(^{543}\) Henninger, 30–38. This exhibition and museum was important to Schmidt, since he also mentions his position in his CV. The museum is then of crucial importance for the networking of the Anthropos Patres and will be discussed below.

\(^{544}\) Some authors stick to this story how from high intervention only, Schmidt was freed and could escape (for example Henninger, 44) but there is no real evidence for that.

\(^{545}\) Bornemann, *P. Wilhelm Schmidt*, 296.

\(^{546}\) Conte, “Völkerkunde und Faschismus?,” in *Kontinuität und Bruch*, 243 and Mende, “Kultur, Volk und Rasse,” 534 are outspoken about this important difference.


\(^{548}\) Petermann, *Die Geschichte der Ethnologie*, 606.

\(^{549}\) Alt, *Die Geschichte des Missionshauses*, 393.
official leading figure of the SVD at the anthropology chair in Vienna, not the more famous Schmidt.550

Already in 1913, Koppers worked for the Anthropos Journal and his workload and responsibility for it were extended continuously mostly due to his ability to “bear” Schmidt’s behaviour.551

Koppers never hid his rejection of the national-socialist movement before 1938, he is even called “at least a Nazi-opponent using Catholic reasoning”552. Therefore, he was categorised as anti-deutsch (anti-German) and intolerable after the Nazis seized power. The new regime stripped Koppers of his venia legendi, and he had to leave Austria.553

In contrast to Schmidt, Koppers did fieldwork studies (1921–22 in Chile), and used the purge from the university to justify field research on the Bhil in central India.554 According to Bornemann, British forces imprisoned him in India, but he was released in 1940 and returned to Europe. He joined the Anthropos Institute in Fribourg though he was uncomfortable there and searched for a way to escape the small community.555 As soon as the war was over, Koppers returned to Austria and resumed teaching at the university in Vienna. Mainly through Koppers, the influence of the so-called “Vienna School of ethnology” at the state funded university of Vienna continued to exist. Koppers was a rare exception as one of the teachers being called back from exile after 1945. This supports the case that there was significant continuity between the conservative politics of the Dollfuß-Schuschnigg-regime and the post-1945 years at this university. In other words: Scholars like Koppers and Schmidt were warmly welcomed back, but left-wing and/or Jewish victims of the purge in 1938 were not.556

As already mentioned, the comparison to Schmidt is often the main way to sketch an Anthropos Pater’s biography, and it seems as if Koppers (eventual) rejection of Schmidt’s teaching became his main academic achievement.557 In effect, some say that Koppers “spoke of a crisis” of Schmidt’s concept of the Kulturkreise558 and in the early 1950s he turned openly away from them.559 Other authors date Koppers’ “first doubts about the Kulturkreise” already in

550 See self-representation of the institute today: Institut für Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie, “Zur Geschichte des Instituts”. Ranzmaier points out that it was mainly the old age of Schmidt at that time which made Koppers the more suitable candidate. Ranzmaier, Die Anthropologische Gesellschaft in, 251.
551 Henninger, Professor P. Wilhelm Koppers, 1–2.
552 “Koppers war immerhin ein katholisch motivierter NS-Gegner.” Taschwer, Hochburg des Antisemitismus, 252.
554 Petermann, Die Geschichte der Ethnologie, 606.
556 See especially Taschwer, Hochburg des Antisemitismus, 237–72.
557 Henninger, Professor P. Wilhelm Koppers, 14; Heine-Geldern, “One Hundred Years of,” 414.
558 Zwernemann, Culture history and African, 71.
559 Henninger, Professor P. Wilhelm Koppers, 10.
However, the disagreement over central scientific issues is not to be denied. In 1957 Koppers retired but gave occasional lectures. He died four years later in Vienna.

6.4.3 P. Martin Gusinde SVD (1886–1969)

The Silesian Martin Gusinde, whose name was given to an anthropological museum in Chile, joined the SVD at their mission house Heiligenkreuz/Nysa. He studied theology and anthropology in St. Gabriel. Ordained in 1911, he was involuntarily sent to teach at a Catholic school in Santiago, Chile. Latin America would become his main field of interest and – although primarily interested in natural sciences and medicine – this area for anthropological research is which Gusinde is known for until today. Especially associated with his name is his work among the almost extinct indigenous groups in Tierra del Fuego.

Several authors state that a starting point for his anthropological investigations was his voluntary work for the newly founded ethnological museum in Santiago, Museo Arqueológico y Etnológico, near his school. This refers to how, in his early years, Gusinde made acquaintance with museological work cataloguing this museum’s collection from the Easter Island. He studied – out of his medical interest – the available literature on the “Araucanian shamans” (colonial terminology for Mapuche people) and, in 1916, the museum ordered Gusinde to gather a bigger collection from this people. Simultaneously, he was given more authority within the museum and in 1918 became head of the department. It is said that with the museum’s work he intended to record the locals’ past.

560 Zwernemann, *Culture history and African*, 110.
562 The Museo Antropológico Martin Gusinde was founded in 1975 in Puerto Williams. It mainly focuses on “aspects of the settlement of the Tierra del Fuego archipelago”. Grendi, “Yaghans’, Explorers and,” 3.
563 Gusinde went through a education similar to the university study of medicine. He even practiced at a hospital in Vienna. This gives a good impression of the different fields of knowledge of the missionaries-to-be and of their duties and tasks in a European mission house. Bornemann, “P. Martin Gusinde,” 738.
564 One example of Gusinde’s reputation as an expert on Tierra del Fuego is the exhibition of his own photographs in 2015 in Arles, France, and at the Musée du Quai Branly some years before. For the Anthropos Institute it is seen as a good opportunity when presenting their members’ scientific work and they stress that “already 100 years ago the Catholic Church had a great openness for foreign cultures and religions.” Tauchner, “Fotoausstellung von Gusinde”.
566 Bornemann, 739–42.
Without going into details regarding his four field trips to Tierra del Fuego, an issue of interest is Gusinde’s reliance on the network of missionaries in this area. In the very south of the continent Protestant and Catholic missionaries were active and among the latter were Salesian missionaries who invited him to come and do research. They gave him a warm welcome and furnished him with information. Not much more is known about this relation while on field work, but one thing is clear: “Above all he [Gusinde] was interested in the mission museum whose Tierra del Fuego collection exceeded all others.”

So Gusinde, also coming with the task to “collect” for the museum in the capital Santiago, encountered in the ethnographical field, which is at the same time a mission field for the Salesians, an already existing collection made by the people in situ, established by the missionaries. It is not clear from Bornemann’s recount if and to what extent this “museum” or “exhibition” was publicly accessible or exclusively for Western visitors. It is also unknown, if there was an exchange of objects between the Salesians’ museum, and the museum in Santiago or with European (mission) museums. For the time being, it is only clear, that in the Salesian missionaries established some kind of gathering of objects in this Latin American mission field in the early decades of the 20th century.

Gusinde “collected” also human remains. On this first trip he returned with forty skulls and three skeletons. Judging from his medicine and natural science background, his interest in this kind of “collecting” is less surprising. Gusinde’s own article also mentions that he worked on skulls in his private collection. His research interest was the characteristics of the “races” seen via comparisons between these skulls with for example those of indigenous people from Australia.

567 The main interest was directed towards the Yamana, Selk’nam (Ona), and Halakwulup. The prime achievement during his stays was to be accepted by the people enough to partake in two youth and men ceremonies. This is discussed in many portraits of Gusinde, see for example Prinz, “Forscher und Fotografen – Kurzbiographien,” in Der Geraubte Schatten, 513 or Anthropos Institut, “Martin Gusinde SVD”.


569 Bornemann, 743–46.

570 Gusinde starts the article by reporting on this appropriation and portrays the amount as a failure because only forty skulls and three skeletons were the outcome: “[…] konnte ich insgesamt nur 40 Schädel und die Skelette von drei Individuen heimbringen,” Gusinde and Lebzelter, “Kraniologische Beobachtungen an feuerländischen,” 259. In this article, they also include work on other human remains stored in the institute at the University of Vienna (Prof. Otto Reche’s institute at that time), as well as in museums in Rome, Florence, Dresden and in private collections.

571 What is surprising is the casualness with which Bornemann in 1970 mentions this “purchase” (Erwerb) and the following research through Gusinde and other European scholars. But he shows the same attitude towards Gusinde’s measurements of prisoners of war.

572 Gusinde and Lebzelter, 261.
After the fourth field trip he taught at the Catholic university in Santiago and the museum granted him a stay in Europe. P. Wilhelm Koppers, who joined Gusinde on the third field trip, published literature about Tierra del Fuego, not as agreed under their both names but only mentioning Gusinde in the subtitle. Not surprisingly, Gusinde felt betrayed and the relationship between these two Anthropos Patres became hostile, which hindered Gusinde’s career.

However, back in Europe he caught up on his academic training and progressed quickly in his studies at the university in Vienna. His dissertation was grounded in his field work in Tierra del Fuego. His scholarly reputation grew. While studying he worked in the Lateran mission museum. According to Bornemann’s account, Gusinde expected a tenured employment at Schmidt’s side but was disappointed in this and clashed with him too. This problematic situation also hindered Gusinde’s career. Schmidt and Koppers seemed to have convinced him to withdraw his application for habilitation at the University of Vienna. Next to the two professors from St. Gabriel, there was no room for a third. Without a proper academic position, he joined his former classmate P. Schebesta on a trip to the Congo and Rwanda.

An involvement worthy of condemnation was his anthropological study among prisoners of war from 1940 to 1942 for the Museum of Natural History Vienna, that Bornemann mentions in line with his studies in Africa, where he also studied the physical appearances (hand-, finger-, and footprints, and blood samples). This shows that Gusinde was involved in this type of research during the Second World War. Different from other Anthropos Patres he had apparently experienced no difficulties during the Nazi period as he also had no official post from which he could be expelled as Schmidt and Koppers were. He only lost much of his research material in war damages.

From 1949 onwards, he was appointed visiting professor at the Catholic University in Washington. Until his seventies, he was active as a global field researcher (also with missionaries in situ as resources), gave lectures all around the world, and helped in founding anthropology chairs (for example in Japan). He spent his remaining years in St. Gabriel and died there in 1969.

574 Koppers, Unter Feuerland-Indianern.
576 Despite these initial problems in Gusinde’s pursuing a career, Clemens Gütl assumes over 200 publications written by Gusinde to be true. For an overview of these publications and Gusinde’s numerous honours and awards see Gütl, “Martin Gusinde”.
577 Prinz, “Forscher und Fotografen – Kurzbiografien,” in Der Geraubte Schatten, 513.
579 Bornemann, 748–57.
P. Paul Schebesta SVD (1887–1967)

Like Gusinde, Paul Schebesta is assumed not only to be one of “a new generation of field researchers”, but also counts as one of the great “field researcher personages of the 20th century”. Schebesta, again similar to Gusinde, was born in Silesia and joined the SVD in their mission house Heiligenkreuz/Nysa. Known for his talent in learning languages, he gained his formation mainly in linguistics, anthropology, and egyptology. Schebesta was sent – as a missionary, not as a researcher – to Portuguese East Africa (today Mozambique) in 1912, where he was imprisoned between 1916 and 1920 because of his Austrian citizenship. After his release he worked for the Anthropos Journal and went on several research trips to British Malaya (Semang), Congo (Bambuti people), and the Philippines. His engagement to research the Bambuti – it is said that they called him baba waBambuti, father of the Bambuti – should be highlighted. Werner Petermann, while stressing the colonial context of Schebesta’s work in situ, praises his character, for example by mentioning his care for the peoples’ interests, his concern for the direct contact with the people he studied, rather than being interested in abstract theories like Schmidt or Koppers.

He shifted from missionary to “pure” scholar when he began his research trips in the 1920s. While his dissertation in 1926 was still about a topic of this past (about the region that is now Zimbabwe), Schmidt soon entrusted him with the research on the so-called “pygmy peoples”, an important topic for Schmidt himself. While Gusinde is known for his research in Tierra del Fuego, Schebesta is recognised for his research of the so-called “pygmy peoples” around the world. Schmidt raised money for Schebesta’s first trips to the Malay Peninsula (Malaya and parts of Myanmar and Thailand) from the Vatican. Schebesta was sent out by Schmidt to find evidence for Schmidt’s monotheistic concept of a high god (Hochgottglaube). Ironically, Schebesta’s research on the Malay Peninsula and the Philippines did everything to contradict Schmidt’s theories about the so-called “pygmy peoples”. Like Gusinde he was criticised for not following Schmidt’s and Koppers’ theories.
Schebesta was editor at the *Anthropos Journal* from 1918 onwards and taught at the today University of Economics and Business in Vienna after 1947. But his main teaching duties were always within the mission house St. Gabriel where he was engaged – with interruptions – teaching anthropology, linguistics and religious studies from 1921 until 1960.

During the early time of the Nazi regime, Schebesta was less constrained in his travelling because of his Czech citizenship which he gained after the Austrian monarchy’s collapse. When coming back from the Philippines in late 1939, he was ordered to live and work in Fribourg with the other Anthropos Patres. His first impression when arriving there was that he could not stand this place and he claimed that St. Gabriel was the only right environment where he could work up his material from the Philippines. With special permission he returned to St. Gabriel. He took over all courses that Schmidt gave before 1938 and he is said to have been a support for the community in these problematic years.

According to Margit Berner Schebesta left his mark on many different institutions. She lists not only libraries and archives, but also the Hrdlicka Museum at the University in Prague (Hrdličkovo museum člověka), National Museum Prague, Ethnographical Museum Ljubljana and the Musée royal de l’Afrique centrale in Belgium. He liaised closely with the Natural History Museum Vienna, and after 1928 also with the Ethnographical Museum Vienna which bought ethnographic objects from him. After the war, he worked in the mission museum in St. Gabriel. Paul Schebesta died in 1967 in Vienna.

6.4.5 P. Georg Höltker SVD (1895–1976)

Georg Höltker is a good example of how fruitful “collecting” could lead to many collections in various places in Europe, both in mission museums and in state-run museums. His collection at the University of Fribourg led to a recent conference and anthology about him. This portrait is only a brief sketch of this Anthropos Pater.

Höltker joined the SVD in 1919, studied at the seminary in St. Augustin and St. Gabriel, and at the ethnological seminary under Schebesta. Both Schebesta and Schmidt are said to have supported Höltker. He was also a guest student at the University of Vienna (1926) and Berlin (1927–1929). Finally, he earned a doctorate in Vienna in 1930. After graduation, he worked briefly in the Lateran mission museum. This engagement changed quickly when he

---

588 Berner, “Paul Schebesta,” in *Sammeln, Erforschen, Zurückgeben?*, 152.
590 Bornemann, *P. Wilhelm Schmidt*, 300.
593 See Ruegg, *Ethnographie und Mission*. 
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became editor-in-chief of the *Anthropos Journal* (1931). He was on field research in New Guinea from 1936 onwards and left just before war broke out. In the South West Pacific, he was researching, establishing contacts within the network, and he also “collected” objects as well as photographed.594 He returned from New Guinea to the Anthropos Institute in exile in Fribourg in summer 1939. His ethnographical collection of about 2,000 objects was transferred to Fribourg. From there, parts of the collection were donated to or purchased by different museums. He started a university career in Switzerland.595 Höltker was invited to teach at the tropical institute in Basel about anthropology in tropical regions.596 The SVD members were obviously seen as experts in their fields though the context of this engagement was surely also the difficulty of getting lecturers to Switzerland during the height of the Second World War.

P. Höltker taught at the university in Fribourg until he was forced by the SVD leadership to resign. He was prohibited from publishing and had instead to teach at a high school. The reasons were probably that Höltker concentrated himself too much on (scientific) work outside of the SVD network and after Schmidt’s death, whose protégé he was, Schmidt could not intervene for him any longer. This hiatus ended suddenly in 1960 when he was appointed professor at the mission house St. Augustin and restarted his career as an anthropologist.597 Höltker sold and donated objects to the Ethnological museums in Basel598 and in Vienna.599 Parts of his collection stayed in Fribourg at the university, parts followed him to St. Augustin and were incorporated into the newly founded museum.600

### 6.4.6 The Anthropos Patres

The Anthropos Patres are often presented as a homogenous group but as we have seen, this image of a collective “St. Gabriel group” is unfounded whether regarding scientific opinion or comradeship as confreres in the SVD. Several times conflicts between them surfaced, for example Schebesta and Gusinde were on field research together in Africa, but soon they split up and researched separately and even published separately on their “common” trip.601

594 For some insights into his “collecting” see Rossi, “Georg Höltker et les”; Grauer, “Georg Höltker (1895–1976) und” and Voirol, “‘In der angenehmen Erwartung’.
596 Bornemann, *P. Wilhelm Schmidt*, 301.
598 Voirol, “‘In der angenehmen Erwartung’.
599 Loder-Neuhold, “Georg Höltkers Sammlung Völkerkundemuseum”.
600 See the portrait of this mission museum: St. Augustin SVD: *Museum Haus Völker und Kulturen* on page 333.
It was not only personal conflicts and tensions that argue against the image of homogeneity, it is also the scientific struggle between them. A better fitting picture of the Anthropos Patres is that of a ground-breaking theorist (Schmidt) whose disciples are more or less obliged through being member of the SVD to follow his theories. Clearly, they built their careers within the framework of the SVD and also with Schmidt’s support. But they struggled with his theories. And indeed, much of the comparison between the Anthropos Patres and Schmidt circles around the question, when did they openly abandon Schmidt’s theories? That they did it eventually is out of question. Josef Franz Thiel reports heated discussions between Schmidt and Schebesta about the theories concerning the so-called “pygmy peoples”. How much free play the other Anthropos Patres had next to the “master” Schmidt is hard to tell. Many criticised SVD internally for not following Schmidt’s thinking closely enough. Besides the scientific system of theories, they clearly parted ways for example regarding anti-Semitic and racist attitudes.

But what they had in common was their lifestyle as professional scholars and as members of a missionary society. They all could dedicate their lives to scholarly research instead of having a career as a “traditional” missionary. The life as an Anthropos Pater meant greater freedoms than other SVD members had. Consequently, the Anthropos Patres were known for their “lack of discipline”: They were often travelling to conferences, were more casual in their clothing (for example when going to the university in Vienna), and some even smoked cigarettes. All this led to criticism within the SVD.

Besides these differences, the Anthropos Patres often visited ethnographic collections and museums on their research trips. It is known that for example Koppers and Gusinde together visited the Colonial exhibition in London (British Empire Exhibition), the British Museum and museums in Oxford and Cambridge in 1924. Their knowledge of professional museums was therefore higher than that of other missionaries. This factor is crucial for my claim of St. Gabriel being a scientific mission museum.

603 Conte states that among the members of the Anthropos Patres, only Schmidt published anti-Semitic texts. Also, when it comes to racism, Conte comes to the conclusion, that “reassuringly not all of Schmidt’s close co-workers were thoroughly conform with their teacher in these questions” and he quotes Schebesta who reveals the blindness of colonisers to their own position and self-referentiality. Conte, “Völkerkunde und Faschismus?,” in Kontinuität und Bruch, 229–64; Conte, “Wilhelm Schmidt: Des letzten,” in Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus, 261–78.
604 Alt, Die Geschichte des Missionshauses, 321.
6.5 The Missions-Ethnographische Museum St. Gabriel

Only those who know and appreciate the culture of the people, their expressions and views will find the right “language” for the gospel. The Missions-Ethnographische Museum in St. Gabriel holds testimonies of ancient cultures (below: African jar for gold dust, fetish from the Easter Island, Chinese inlaying) and Christian faith from all over the world: a Chinese Madonna, Foot Washing scene (Philippines), Calming the Storm (Bali), Holy Family (Zaire).606

This quote with reference to ethnographical objects and Christian Art such as a Chinese Madonna leads from the key figures in this case study and the context to the mission museum itself. At the beginning of this section, the founding phase is presented with special attention to the aim of the museum. Then, the development up to the closing of the museum in 2005 is shown. Finally, the collections and objects are discussed.

6.5.1 Founding and early intentions

Most important for the founding of the mission museum in St. Gabriel is that there is no exact date for the opening of the museum. Several mission museums presented in the portraits show this characteristic as well.

Literature written by SVD members about the museum do not give specific dates for the founding date. Fritz Bornemann SVD mentions in his Schmidt biography a “small museum in St. Gabriel” as early as 1899.607 Josef Alt SVD cites in his history of the mission house St. Gabriel that in 1901 the “museum should fully unfold itself.”608 Whereas Andreas Bsteh SVD claims that around 1909 an ethnological collection was started.609

The current website that the mission house St. Gabriel dedicates to the closed mission museum offers an overview written by Andreas Bsteh. There he says of the founding of the museum: “The beginnings of this documentation were small. Around 1900, the first objects, which had mainly come from China and Oceania, were compiled.”610 That means Bsteh locates the opening between “around 1900” and 1909.

Unpublished primary sources do not give a more precise picture either: The handwritten chronicles of the mission house St. Gabriel for 1900 and 1901 both mention a museum.611 A Festschrift (commemorative publication) from

606 (my translation, emphases in original) Brunner, 100 Jahre Missionshaus St., 14.
607 Bornemann, P. Wilhelm Schmidt, 164.
608 Alt, Die Geschichte des Missionshauses, 94.
609 Bsteh, Das Missions-Ethnographische Museum, 23.
610 (my translation) Bsteh, “Geschichte des Missionsethnographischen Museums”.
611 Hauschronik 1900, AMEM; Hauschronik 1901, AMEM.
1910/1912 mentions “mission museums in which various strange and interesting collections of objects from the peoples among whom the St. Gabriel missionaries work are stored and can be visited.”

This means that between 1900 and 1910 a kind of entity that was labelled a mission museum existed inside the mission house St. Gabriel. The chronicles are the most reliable source for that and I therefore take 1900 to work with in this thesis as the founding date for the mission museum St. Gabriel.

With “around 1900” as the founding date, this mission museum is one of the oldest Catholic mission museums in this study, right after Knechtsteden CSSp (1896) and Hiltrup MSC (1897).

Regarding the intention for founding the museum, the already mentioned Festschrift from 1910/12 speaks of peculiar or odd, but also interesting objects which come from those peoples, where the missionaries from St. Gabriel were engaged. This early source puts the objects at the centre and undoubtedly their “strangeness” for the European context. Explicitly, the intention for having those objects here, in the mission house St. Gabriel, is the connection between St. Gabriel, the missionaries sent out from St. Gabriel, and the peoples to whom the missionaries were sent. Why those objects are to be encountered by the public is directly connected to the intention of the mission house itself: for preparing, educating and then sending out missionaries. And explicitly it is not the whole SVD congregation or the whole Catholic mission movement; rather it is missionaries from St. Gabriel who connect the town of Mödling and the peoples “far away”.

A different narrative written much later similarly refers to the beginning of the museum as marked by the wish to document the various paths of confreres who left St. Gabriel as missionaries.

Apart from these few remarks that would align the mission museum in St. Gabriel with many other mission museums among the portraits in the Appendix, the St. Gabriel case study emphatically points another way. This is because the scientific orientation of the museum can be seen in its involvement with the work of Wilhelm Schmidt and the Anthropos Patres. Note that, with only a few exceptions, the mission museum St. Gabriel is usually described

613 N.N, AMEM.
615 Bornemann SVD – who strays away from many other often repeated narratives in his book about Schmidt – writes also a different story when it comes to the foundation of the mission museum St. Gabriel. He claims that P. Schmidt in 1899 took over a small museum in St. Gabriel and reorganised it. The objects were sent from missionaries in China, Togo and New Guinea out of thankfulness for financial support. Bornemann, P. Wilhelm Schmidt, 164.
as the opus of Schmidt. If a single person is mentioned in connection with the founding it is always Schmidt. This is true for primary sources (external function)\textsuperscript{616} and in secondary sources as well.\textsuperscript{617} When Bsteh presents the mission museum in a book series about Austrian museums in 1980, he even starts the whole volume by introducing Schmidt and his work.\textsuperscript{618}

In retrospect, Schmidt is overwhelmingly portrayed as the founder of the museum, but it is debatable whether he himself would have agreed with that. Indeed, the problematic issue with the narrative of Schmidt as founder of the mission museum is that I found no evidence that he saw himself as such. His seminal texts on his understanding of how to do anthropology do not mention the mission museum in St. Gabriel.\textsuperscript{619} However, he names the \textit{Ethnographische Museum von St. Gabriel-Mödling} as the last one of many museums that loaned objects for the big Vatican mission exhibition.\textsuperscript{620} In his article \textit{Les musées des missions et en particulier le musée pontifical du Latran pour l'étude des missions et de l'éthnographie} where he theorises about mission museums in general, the museum in St. Gabriel is absent.\textsuperscript{621} In his self-written CV he does not mention the mission museum in St. Gabriel but refers to his leading position in the Lateran mission museum.\textsuperscript{622} To conclude, I could not find a clear reference by P. Schmidt himself to the mission museum St. Gabriel as having been founded by him. But it is also unthinkable that the museum was founded or developed without any form of involvement on his part. At the time of founding, he was clearly located in St. Gabriel and his interest in linguistics and anthropology was in its early phase and becoming more and more prominent. And indeed, archival sources from the Ethnographical Museum Vienna show how Schmidt worked for the mission museum. He was involved in organising objects from Catholic mission stations in New Guinea in the years 1899 until 1901 for this museum in Vienna and he also took objects from these shipments for the mission museum St. Gabriel.\textsuperscript{623} Clearly, in

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{616} Again the letter from 1935: “Das Missionsmuseum besteht seit 1898, von P. Wilhelm Schmidt ins Leben gerufen […]”. Letter to Klímš (16.12.1935), AMEM or this exchange with a publishing house Letter Bergland publishing house to Piskaty (10.4.1970), AMEM.
\textsuperscript{617} For example Bsteh, “Das Missions-Ethnographische Museum” and Jochum, “Bedeutende Persönlichkeiten,” in \textit{100 Jahre Missionshaus St. Gabriel}, 54.
\textsuperscript{618} Bsteh, \textit{Das Missions-Ethnographische Museum}, 23.
\textsuperscript{619} Like Schmidt, “Einladung zu Mitarbeit und” or Schmidt, “Die moderne Ethnologie”.
\textsuperscript{620} Schmidt, “Die Ethnologische Abteilung,” 137.
\textsuperscript{621} Schmidt, “Les musées des missions”.
\textsuperscript{622} Henninger, \textit{P. Wilhelm Schmidt}, 30–32. As Quack notes, to reconstruct Schmidt’s life and his worldviews is not an easy task: “These beginnings [of the Anthropos Journal, RLN] are difficult to reconstruct in detail even today. Nor did W. Schmidt himself leave us a very reliable, let alone detailed, account of these beginnings. He was not particularly concerned with how history would perceive him. In any case he did not make the task of his later biographers any easier.” Quack, “100 Years of Anthropos,” 4.
\textsuperscript{623} This is discussed in Section 6.6.5.1.
\end{flushleft}
the course of organising objects for the state museum, he was gathering objects for the museum in his mission house. Besides, these sources also confirm the opening date of “around 1900”.

However, it seems likely that the retrospective naming of him as the founding figure was intended to give the museum a prominent founder, Schmidt being the most prominent of the Anthropos Patres. It seems that especially Bsteh’s texts seem to be written with this goal.624

The narrative of Schmidt as the founder goes on: It was P. Schmidt who ordered the SVD missionaries to send objects to St. Gabriel, at least from 1901 onwards. And his order must have borne fruit because years later he is said to be busy with moving the museum.625 It seems as if the above quoted phrase, that he was at the top of the missionary food chain, meant that the missionaries overseas were cooperatively sending not just reports and articles but also tangible objects.

Around the turn of the century, actors like Schmidt and the Anthropos Patres saw collections and ethnological museums foremost as scientific institutions. It was not just that they visited ethnographical museums wherever they travelled to keep them updated,626 also in letters from 1911 Schmidt talks of how the Vatican should take the lead in anthropology, a goal that should be achieved with the foundation of “a museum or ethnoreligious research institute within the Vatican”.627 The difference between a museum and an institute is not important for those actors, both were institutions dedicated to research. Even later, for Schmidt the Lateran mission museum is an institution of education and research:

In this way, in accordance with the pope’s intentions, the museum will itself develop into a place of training for missionaries and a place of research for men of science.628

Also, that Schmidt founded a small ethnographic museum at the University of Fribourg (Switzerland)629 suggests his strong role in the foundation of the mission museum in St. Gabriel. Universities, libraries, and museums, those were for him the institutions where anthropological research took place.

---

624 An example is Bsteh, *Das Missions-Ethnographische Museum*, 23.
625 Alt, *Die Geschichte des Missionshauses*, 94; 113.
627 An Vandenberghe refers to Schmidt mentioning this idea in 1910 during a conference of the Leo-Gesellschaft in Vienna and mentions specifically Schmidt’s letter to P. Friedrich SVD from the 6th December 1911. See Vandenberghe, “Entre mission et science,” 21–22.
The founding period of the mission museum is right at the time where chiefly Schmidt, but others as well, are trying to establish a “Catholic ethnology.” Schmidt was

the driving force behind the establishment of a complete research infrastructure [for this Catholic ethnology, RLN], consisting of a journal (Anthropos), a monograph series, an institute (“Anthropos-Institut”), a museum (“Pontificio Museo Missionario-Etnologico Lateranense”) and a workshop (“Semaine d’ethnologie religieuse”).

I argue that the intention of establishing the mission museum in St. Gabriel should be seen as another piece of this infrastructure. Bsteh also expresses the close involvement of the museum and the development of a specific “SVD ethnology”, which would be in essence the already mentioned “Catholic ethnology”: “The history of the mission museum of St. Gabriel went parallel to the development of the ethnological school of St. Gabriel.” In this sense, the mission museum (and the later exhibition and museum in the Lateran Palace) was the materialisation, or in religious terms, the incarnation, of the immaterial (scientific) endeavours of the Anthropos Patres. This immaterial part also included the articles (Anthropos Journal) and books written by SVD scholars. Schmidt had ordered missionaries overseas to send him reports and notes for his own research, lectures and articles for the Anthropos Journal. Now, they were to equip the mission museum with objects as well. And it is not farfetched to claim that Schmidt must also have had high standards for those objects that they sent, just as he also wanted to set his scientific Anthropos Journal apart from the many other common mission magazines that were produced by congregations for mission fundraising and that contained reports and letters from missionaries overseas. Schmidt criticised those magazines and leaflets in 1904 during the preparations for the Anthropos Journal and dismissed their goal of fundraising and creating awareness for the mission movement. Although not specifically mentioned by Schmidt, he meant journals like the ones presented in the SSPC case study. Just as the Anthropos Journal was not meant to provide light reading, the mission museum St. Gabriel was

630 An Vandenberghe mentions as Schmidt’s fellow campaigners in this endeavour Désiré Mercier (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven), and the Jesuits Frédéric Bouvier and Léonce de Grandmaison. Vandenberghe, “Entre mission et science,” 20–21.
631 Dietrich, “Mission, local culture and,” 112.
633 Rivinius, Die Anfänge des “Anthropos, 88. Both Schmidt and Ledóchowska were aware of the different target groups of their journals. Ledóchowska mentioned the Anthropos Journal in a letter and postulated that it was “for the most educated”. I argue that the journals can be seen in parallel with their respective mission museums. For a comparison between the Anthropos Journal and the Echo aus Afrika see Loder-Neuhold, “Schreiben als alltägliche Handlung”.
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founded with the intention of educating people, not just to enrich a family’s Sunday afternoon.

Besides providing objects for the Anthropos Patres, another intention of the mission museum was an internal to the organisation: for the anthropological formation of young SVD missionaries, to prepare them for their time in the mission fields, to familiarise them with what they might encounter:

The collection of ethnological demonstration and study objects in St. Gabriel, which he set up around the turn of the century, was one example of how much P. Schmidt’s interest in ethnology had grown in the meantime. They [the objects] were mainly intended to serve as suitable illustrative material for teaching. Over time, the collection developed into an ethnological museum with expertly displayed exhibits, […].634

According to this description, the mission museum was one entity in the mission house, like the big library. Several times, the library and the museum are presented as equally important features of the mission house, for example in the commemorative publication for its centenary celebration.635 The unrealised plan for a substantial publication about the museum and the library that I found in the depot is another suggestion for this attitude. What could be read about in the library could be seen in the museum – one refers to the other. A further argument is the mise-en-scène of scientific books by SVD scholars in the display cases of the last accessible exhibition, as described in the introduction to this chapter (see Figure 15).

This internally directed nature of the museum was very strong. Still in 1929, the main intention was internal use, as a quote from the Generalrat (general council) shows: “The rooms [of the museum] are foremost meant for our confreres.”636 The term foremost shows that the museum was of course also publicly accessible.

6.5.2 Development and change from “ethnographic” to “missionary”

It might be suggested that parallel to the flourishing scientific work of the Anthropos Patres, together with their expeditions until 1938, the mission museum grew, at least in the number of objects. This period is also what was named above as the heyday of St. Gabriel. In 1929 the museum was enlarged and renovated, in time for the sixth mission congress that took place in St. Gabriel.637 In addition to the ethnographical objects, there were other scientific

634 (my translation) Rivinius, Die Anfänge des ‘Anthropos, 44.
635 Brunner, 100 Jahre Missionshaus St.
637 Alt, 268.
collections as well. One source mentions a zoological, mineralogical and a biological collection, but I found no clues about them in the depot of the mission museum.

At that time, head of the museum (called “P. Museumsdirektor”) was P. Johannes Thauren (1892–1954), not Schmidt. Thauren studied missiology in Münster and came to St. Gabriel in 1926. In 1932, he became a professor of missiology at the Catholic Theological Faculty in Vienna. He was therefore not an anthropologist, not one of the Anthropos Patres. Despite this, he was the director of the museum until his death, even while other Anthropos Patres were still active in St. Gabriel. But most portraits and obituaries do not mention his work for the museum, only his missiological engagement. Why a missiologist and not an anthropologist ran the museum can only be guessed at. This is especially so when considering that Thauren had studied at Joseph Schmidlin’s Chair of Missiology. Schmidlin is called the “father” of Catholic missiology and was a prominent scholar. Moreover, Wilhelm Schmidt and Schmidlin were not on good terms with each other.

The blooming days of the mission museum and of St. Gabriel ended in 1938 with the so-called Anschluss. As described above, the Anthropos Patres at large had to leave and they took the precious collection of books of the Anthropos Institute with them. The museum was left behind. In the course of the confiscation of the mission house St. Gabriel, the museum and the mission house library again had the same fate, and both were disappropriated and brought to state institutions after their Gleichschaltung (process of Nazification). The library stock was transported to the national library in Vienna, and the museum collections landed in the Ethnographical Museum Vienna (hereafter referred to as VKM, for the German name Völkerkundemuseum). The confiscation will be discussed in Section 6.6.5.2 because it is interwoven with the previous close cooperation between the VKM and the mission museum. During the Nazi regime, the ethnographic collection was of most interest to the new leaders which is connected to the general interest and use of anthropology by the Nazis. But of greater importance is the fact that this did not mean the end of the mission museum as it did for some other institutions in Germany and Austria under the Nazis. For the purpose of this case study, an equally strong impact on the museum was the exile of many Anthropos Patres and their institute. However, even without their presence in St. Gabriel, the mission museum continued to exist in St. Gabriel.

---

638 Announcement by the Rector, St. Gabriel (3.6.1936), AMEM and Letter to Klimsch (16.12.1935), AMEM.
639 Alt, Die Geschichte des Missionshauses, 411.
640 For example Jochum, “P. Johannes Thauren” or Beckmann, “P. Johannes Thauren”.
642 See the case studies of the SSPC and MSC, as well as the portraits of Innsbruck OFM Cap and Hall in Tirol OFM.
It should be noted that not all objects were formally confiscated, many simply “vanished” during those war years and the circumstances of how the objects were taken away are unclear. It took some time after the war ended for the museum objects and the stock of the library finally to return from Vienna to Mödling. Bsteh states that the museum was rearranged, and Paul Schebesta is given credit for this new arrangement.

The post-war years in St. Gabriel were characterised by reconstruction, but also by the coming to terms with the loss of human life among the missionaries, in Europe and in the mission fields, as well as with the change in political circumstances. Regarding these circumstances, the mission museum had clearly a low priority in the mission house. That is visible, first in how long it took the objects to be returned to St. Gabriel from Vienna. The whole complex was badly damaged by air raids and lootings during the war, and therefore also the museum rooms had to be renovated before bringing the collections back in. Further, that low priority can be detected in the many letters and petitions to the rector and house council asking for more support for the mission museum. The earliest letter is from January 1949. This unsigned document is about the re-erection of the mission museum. It starts by pointing out the urgent need to return the objects from the VKM (Ethnographical Museum Vienna) and regrets the architectural changes that were done to former rooms of the museum such as the transformation of the four highest and brightest rooms into toilets. The anonymous author presents a new concept for the museum, mentioning that new mission fields of the SVD, such as India and the Philippines, must be integrated into the exhibition. A renewed museum should also be updated to modern standards of exhibition design, citing that singular but special objects became more important than quantity and abundance of objects.

The goal of having a modern museum for the public is expressed in a petition from 1949. The new concept proposes a first room containing an overview of the worldwide missionary engagement of the SVD and particularly of the work efforts of the missionaries from St. Gabriel. The importance of this

---

644 Bsteh, “Geschichte des Missionsethnographischen Museums”.
645 An impressive source for this examination and accepting of the recent past is a letter by P. Paul Michalke written in 1947 to his dispersed classmates. He starts by referring to their classmates who died in concentration camps or on sunken ships in the Philippines and in New Guinea. He writes that some fates of missionaries from their class are still unknown. Michalke, “Rundbrief St. Gabriel 1947”, AMEM.
647 “Da die moderne Museumstechnik nicht so sehr auf die Fülle und Vielheit der Objekte, als auf die Charakteristika in Einzelobjekten Gewicht legt, ist eine größere Raumbeanspruchung gegeben. Damit gestaltet sich die Neueinrichtung des Museums besonders schwierig.” N.N., Petition to the rectorate St. Gabriel ‘Wiedererrichtung des Missionsmuseums’ (24.1.1949), AMEM.
work would be a new feature since this was not the case in the pre-war museum, the document states. A world map and a map showing the worldwide distribution of religions should be painted on the wall. The biggest room should be dedicated to the presentation of anthropological research and expeditions of SVD members. Other rooms should be dedicated to China, New Guinea, Africa, Japan, India, and the Dutch East Indies. The suggestion is that the post-Second World War exhibition should continue the strong ethnographic character of the museum’s early phase, but also a decisive change in the attitude is to be discovered here. Now, the missionary work of the SVD should be highlighted within the exhibition as well, not only the anthropological work of their members.

The rest of the petition gives details about the organisation, necessary architectural adaptations, and the exhibition design (for example, “their missionary sisters”, I assume the Holy Spirit Sisters, should paint the backgrounds – landscapes, mission stations etc. – of the display cases). The author also felt it necessary to point out that this museum – as every museum worldwide – will need continued financing since it will not be a source of income for the mission house. Here I want to recall the ICOM definition of a museum that clearly defines a museum as “a non-profit, permanent institution” (see Section 1.3.3).

Besides these details, how this document portrayed the museum is of interest here. It shows how a member of St. Gabriel saw the museum in 1949: First, he portrays it as “a representation of the S.V.D. and advertising material for the house and professions”. The intention is clearly directed towards the outside, the public: the museum as advertisement. The internally directed aims of the first half of the 20th century have lost their importance by 1949. If the objects had been first and foremost for educating those soon to be SVD missionaries, painted landscapes and thick glass for protection would not be necessary. This is an important shift, although the scientific orientation of the SVD is still significant. But here it has turned into a feature of the congregation that can – via the exhibition – be communicated to the public. It can also be seen as the basis for their mission work, or as their inheritance.

Second, the character of the museum is constituted in the petition as one of a mission museum:

---

648 “[…] und kann die Bedeutung der S.V.D. sowohl im allgemeinen [sic], als auch St. Gabriels im besonderen [sic] (auch für die Seelsorge der Heimat) betoner herausgestellt werden, als es in der alten Aufstellung der Fall war.” N.N., AMEM.


650 “eine Repräsentation der S.V.D. und Werbemittel für das Haus und Berufe” (my translation). N.N., AMEM.
Basically, our museum must become a mission museum, not a purely ethnological one. Anthropologists shall be asked to make themselves available for the installation.651

That is a strong statement. The use of the future tense shows that the author is aware that so far, the museum has had a focus on ethnographic objects. In that sense, the petition marks an overall change and, given that Schmidt and the Anthropos Institute have not returned to St. Gabriel, this shift comes as no surprise. It seems, the days when Schmidt and his disciples were a dominant factor in St. Gabriel – and thus in the museum – were over, but the mission museum is here sketched as a place where their efforts should be remembered. The question whether mission or anthropology should be the main focus has also to do with the fact that Thauren, a missiologist, was now at the helm.

Internal petitions and letters from the years between 1962 and 1973 indicate how important the museum was for individual SVD members in St. Gabriel as these petitions document their struggles on behalf of the museum. A recurring topic in these primary sources is the concern for the precious collections that seemed to be in an unsecured state also according to Anton Vorbichler652, a member of the Anthropos Institute in 1962:

The mission museum of St. Gabriel has valuable ethnological collections of cultures from Africa, New Guinea, the Philippines, Indonesia, India, China, and Japan, which are the envy of the great museums of the world653 writes Vorbichler, while stressing how easily a unique museum could be arranged and referring to §282 in the SVD constitution from 1922.654

A recurring topic of concern is the high humidity inside the museum because of the age of its construction.655 There are several suggestions of costly counter measurements against the humidity, referring to the high value of the collections as Vorbichler also highlighted above.656

---

651 “Grundsätzlich muß unser Museum ein Missionsmuseum werden, kein rein ethnologisches. Die Ethnologen sollten gebeten werden, sich für die Aufstellung zur Verfügung zu stellen.” (my translation, emphasis in original) N.N., AMEM.

652 Gütl, “Anton Vorbichler”.


654 See Section 6.4 for the referred passage in the constitution.

655 For example Strassmann, Letter Strassmann to rector and house council, St. Gabriel (4.3.1971), AMEM and Hammer, Letter Hammer (?) to rector and house council St. Gabriel (25.10.1971), AMEM.

656 Lackner, Letter Lackner to rector, St. Gabriel (10.5.1973), AMEM.
Next to the construction problems, another source claims that the precious collection is not even appreciated inside St. Gabriel.657 The unknown author tries to highlight the value of the objects in an easy to grasp manner, namely in pointing out their age and uniqueness: “The objects are partly unique and most of them were collected around the turn of the century – not available anymore.”658

How well-founded this criticism was shows again in Vorbichler’s letter in which he describes how he found parts of the stored and locked ethnographic objects vandalised.659 That members of a congregation so proud of their anthropological achievements could do this seems baffling.

Some sources complain in their petitions that the exhibition needs updating. The current exhibition had racist elements such as the presence of the infamous Nickneger660 that was obviously still part of the exhibition in 1962.

The intentions expressed for the museum in these sources are twofold: the museum existed for the public, as well as for the internal use i.e. for the young missionaries in training.661

The first intention, an outspoken one, was for the mission museum to be a museum open to the general public that advertised the work of the missionaries. Some sources refer to guided tours through the museum. Walter Strassmann, who was active in and engaged with the mission museum, writes about the tours:

But the most important thing that a guided tour should offer is what you already have: yourself. [...] Within an hour you can leave a deep personal impression on the visitors, which will have a lasting effect. On behalf of our missionaries

657 “[…] wäre es angebracht, die wertvollen Sammlungen, die das Haus besitzt (um die leider die wenigsten wissen), hier Besuchern und Mitbrüdern zugänglich zu machen.” N.N., “Eingabe an den Hausrat St. Gabriel” (16.6.1966), AMEM.
658 “Die Gegenstände sind zum Teil Unica und die meisten wurden um die Jahrhundertwende gesammelt – heute nicht mehr zu bekommen.” (my translation) N.N., AMEM.
660 “Natürlich müssten solche Kulturschanden und das Gefühl besonders der Farbigen beleidigende Dinge, wie der Sammelbüchse negger mit dem nickenden Kopf oder der rassisch vollständig danebengeratene Negrito mit dem umgehängten Sammelkorb daraus verschwinden.” Vorbichler and general critical assessment is to be found by Strassmann, Letter Strassmann to rector and house council, St. Gabriel (4.3.1971), AMEM.
and the missionary cause of the faithful Church, you stand before these Europeans. This is a responsible task, [...].

He calls this guiding a missionary task (missionarische Aufgabe), a decisive statement about a task that was not done with much enthusiasm by many of his confreres. The guide would represent the missionaries and the whole missionary cause of the Church.

The second intention, the educational task for young members, still existed for those authors in the 1960s and 1970s. It often sounds like a win-win situation in which both the visitors and the members themselves can use the museum: “[...] and at the same time the objects exhibited in the aforementioned rooms would provide illustrative material for anthropology lessons.”

Josef Hammer, who took over the responsibility for the guided tours from Strassmann, writes about the ethnographical collections that were at the time still stored in the attic (around 3,000 pieces). He needed to find a better solution for the storage as well as for accessibility for experts like anthropology students. He suggests, for the normal visitors of the mission house, the mission museum is good enough.

From their point of view, the glorious history of the scientific work of the SVD is also part of their argument. The museum should add to the “scientific prestige of our [mission] house,” writes Anton Vorbichler, himself a member of the Anthropos Institute whose emphasis on the anthropological work of his forerunners comes as no surprise.

The earliest petition mentions an anticipated newly constructed building just for the museum, but already in 1966 it becomes clear that there are no resources for such a costly endeavour. Again, with the absence of the Anthropos Patres and the Anthropos Institute, the SVD did obviously not want to invest in this mission museum. It should be kept in mind that only some years later, in 1973, St. Augustin achieved for the Museum Haus Völker und Kulturen exactly what these petitions were asking for: a new building solely dedicated to housing the mission museum. It seems as though St. Gabriel fell in importance within the SVD while St. Augustin rose.

---

662 “Doch das Wichtigste, was eine Führung bieten sollte, das hast Du bereits, das bist Du selbst. […] Man kann aber innerhalb einer Stunde einen tiefen persönlichen Eindruck bei den Besuchern hinterlassen, der sehr nachhaltig wirken wird. Stellvertretend stehst Du dann vor diesen Europäern für unsere Missionare und für das Missionsanliegen der gläubigen Gemeinde. Das ist eine verantwortungsvolle Aufgabe, […]” (my translation) Strassmann, Announcement St. Gabriel (24.4.1969), AMEM.
664 If I make out the signature correctly, the name is Josef Hammer.
665 Hammer, Letter Hammer (?) to rector and house council St. Gabriel (25.10.1971), AMEM.
666 Vorbichler, “Antrag” (18.1.1962), AMEM.
668 For this mission museum of the SVD see the portrait in the Appendix on page 334.
After all these petitions for a new building or at least a thorough renovation, between 1977 and 1979, the museum was indeed renovated and re-organised. Financial subventions came from the state of Austria and the county of Lower Austria.\textsuperscript{669} Judging from photographs in publications, the exhibition design for this renovation remained until the closure in 2005, and when I visited the closed museum in 2013.

This exhibition from the 1970s had an entrance room which was dedicated to the missionary work of the SVD (for example books by SVD members were laid out for browsing). It also displayed the Great Commission on the wall as a greeting for the newly arrived visitor. Also, the mentioned plan to mount maps of the global distribution of religions was realised, besides other graphically presented statistics such as the ratio of Catholic priests per Catholic inhabitants. Next to the rooms dedicated to different geographical entities, the biggest room indeed is dedicated to the Anthropos Patres, displaying the many volumes of the \textit{Anthropos Journal} and the research areas for which they are famous. For example, a separate display case is dedicated to Martin Gusinde, displaying objects from the Tierra del Fuego region (masks, children’s toys like dolls and balls, and baskets, needles), portraits of a local woman and man, and a photograph of Martin Gusinde and Wilhelm Koppers during their fieldwork. Next to the display case, a text informs about Gusinde’s life and research.\textsuperscript{670} This shows that “Catholic ethnology” remained indeed an important part of the exhibition until the last phase and the closure of the Missions-ethnographische Museum in St. Gabriel in 2005.

The shift from “pure” ethnographic to a missionary orientation in the mission museum is important and must be seen in the general context of the congregation: In the course of the decades after 1945 and after Koppers’ retirement from the University of Vienna in 1957, the SVD lost its strong influence on the study of anthropology in Austria. In step with the decrease of young members and general changes in society, one can say that the mission museum represents the “retreat” to the religious sphere and a relinquishing of the claim to be closely involved in an academic discipline like anthropology.

The quote at the beginning of this section from 1989 is another expression of this shift in the second half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. After stressing the importance of being acquainted with and prizing the culture of peoples so as to find the right “language” for spreading the Gospel, seven museum objects are named. The publication depicts those seven objects as well. Three of them are “indigenous” art objects (from the Easter Island, Africa and China) and the remaining four are Christian art, all showing an inculturated Christianity. They include a Chinese Madonna, Jesus and his disciples with Balinese or Filipino


\textsuperscript{670} There are also photographs in the depot depicting the original display of the vitrines, next to a handwritten list of the used objects with their signatures. List “Feuerland Vitrine 4”, AMEM.
appearance, a nativity scene depicting a family of three from Zaire.\textsuperscript{671} In this way, with these selected seven objects, the mission museum St. Gabriel represented itself at the end of the 1980s.

At this point, I conclude that regarding the location of the mission museum St. Gabriel on the chart of the two axes (see Table 1), at first it must clearly be labelled a \textit{scientific museum}. From the beginning onwards, the intention behind “collecting” and exhibiting was closely connected to the scientific goals of the Anthropos Patres. It was not an arbitrary gathering of random objects from the mission fields. Rather, the exhibits were “collected” by researchers like P. Gusinde and chosen by experts like P. Schmidt. The objects \textit{per se} were of interest to those studying the source communities, not for their exotic flair for the European visitors.

The responsible persons in the museum, the Anthropos Patres and later P. Thauren, were not museum professionals in the sense that organising museums was their only work description. But they were professionals in the sense that they had high academic status and were well-travelled. Gusinde was employed at the ethnological museum in Santiago de Chile. Many of the Anthropos Patres were involved with setting up the Lateran mission museum. Schmidt and two other SVD missionaries took a multi-week tour through European museums, to study them and learn.\textsuperscript{672} One can hardly call them amateurs when it comes to “doing museum”.

The division into the museum collection and a study collection for experts, inside and outside of St. Gabriel, is a clear sign of the aspiration to be a \textit{scientific museum}. Regarding the exhibition design for the second half of the 20th century, the orientation toward being a “proper” museum is undeniable: After the renovation, there was an entrance room for the visitor that served as an introduction to what to expect in the following rooms. There was a clear arrangement in which different regions were assigned different rooms with accurate labels next to the objects. There was further information on the walls, like charts and graphs, but also information about the Anthropos Patres. The overabundance of exhibits – a classical feature of the \textit{independent museum} – became a thing of the past when the goal was clearly to update the exhibition design to current standards.

In sharp contrast to the case study of the SSPC, the scholarly orientation of the SVD congregation finds its expression in the exhibition design: In the exhibition that lasted till the closing in 2005, the largest room (and video showroom) is dedicated to the scholarly orientation of the SVD. (Gusinde’s case in this room is already described above.) In the biggest display case at the back of the room, casebound volumes of the \textit{Anthropos} take up several meters of

\textsuperscript{671} Brunner, \textit{100 Jahre Missionshaus St.}, 14–15.
\textsuperscript{672} Bornemann, \textit{P. Wilhelm Schmidt}, 164–65.
shelving. There are also photographs of some Anthropos Patres and ethnographical objects that express their research – and thus their “collecting” (see Figure 15).

The only clear independent feature would be that the museum had for long an unstable financial situation, and the existence within the institution was not always secure. Continuity after the disruption during the Nazi period was a goal for some missionaries, but the means to achieve it had to be secured again and again. Some passionate SVD members were still pushing their agenda to keep the mission museum open.

When it comes to the guided tours, a personal connection with the mission museum as a whole had a high priority. But other than Jannelli’s bee museum case, there was not a direct personal identification with the single exhibits. This is because for the second half of the 20th century it seems clear that most of the guides were young members of St. Gabriel and so they were students who had not yet headed to the mission fields, rather than experienced missionaries after they had returned.

To conclude this section and to come back to the chart with the two axes of non-scientific/scientific and professional/amateurish, St. Gabriel SVD is not only to be located towards the pole of scientific, but also towards professional.

6.5.3 Objects, “collecting” and collections

The origin of the collections in the mission museum is interwoven with Wilhelm Schmidt and his network. Researching, “collecting” and networking cannot be separated. Schmidt is said to have ordered the SVD missionaries overseas to send objects to St. Gabriel. There are no sources by Schmidt himself verifying this request for St. Gabriel, but years later, for the Lateran mission museum, he clearly demanded all Catholic missionaries to contribute to the collections. This was to be through sending of publications, reports, and articles, as well as objects from the context of missiology and anthropology.

However, primary sources in the archive of the Ethnographical Museum Vienna reveal that Schmidt indeed organised an exchange of objects between the ethnographical department of the Natural History Museum Vienna (what was later to split up and become the independent Ethnographical Museum Vienna, abbreviated in this thesis with VKM) and the Catholic mission station in Berlinhafen in German New Guinea. The exchange consisted of ethnographical objects from New Guinea for European industrial goods. Some of the shipped objects, intended for the Viennese state museum, ended up in the mission museum St. Gabriel: There is a note on one of the documents stating

---

673 Alt, *Die Geschichte des Missionshauses*, 94.
674 Schmidt, “Gründung eines Museums für,” 996.
675 Heger, Post II 1900 “Ethnographische Sammlung der Missionäre von St. Gabriel bei Mödling in Berlinhafen. Deutsch-Neu-Guinea”, AVKM.
that Schmidt himself selected some of the pieces and kept them “for the mission house St. Gabriel”. It is not clear from the wording in the source if this meant that the objects were for display in the mission museum in St. Gabriel or for his “private” use for his research at that time. I suggest that it meant both. Using them temporarily for inspection and analysis does not exclude having them (afterwards perhaps) on display in the museum as well.

Therefore, the beginning of the “collecting” for the mission museum can be characterised as following: It was clearly connected to the mission fields that the SVD congregation were assigned to. New Guinea was allocated to the SVD in 1896 and three years later the exchange of objects began between this mission field and the mission museum St. Gabriel as well as with a state museum in Vienna. The allocation of the mission field was also connected to Schmidt’s new interest in linguistics and later anthropology, one led to the other. This explains the strong anthropological character of the collection that came out of this context and with it the intention of the museum. The idea of “collecting” also began clearly in St. Gabriel and thus, the interest in “collecting” the culture of non-Europeans – here the inhabitants of New Guinea – for the mission museum started in Europe. This scientific interest also means that, unlike other mission museums, St. Gabriel clearly shows a more strategic “collecting”. It was no random gathering of “interesting things” when Schmidt selected specific objects for St. Gabriel from the shipments. Very likely, he also used some for his own scholarly work. These sources also reveal that the networking between St. Gabriel/Schmidt and the state museums in Vienna started as early as this, when “collecting” for the mission museum was in its initial phase.

The collections that the museum owned were of ethnological, not missiological, character. For the first half of the 20th century, this is also proven by a remark of the missiologist P. Thauren. The background of the correspondence between Thauren and Fritz Röck, director of the Ethnological Museum Vienna, was that this state-run museum was ordered in 1933 to organise a special exhibition with the title Das Kreuz auf der Erde (The Cross on Earth) about the expansion of Christianity. Röck wrote to Thauren because, unsurprisingly, his museum did not have any “missiological” objects and Schmidt had

677 Mückler, Mission in Ozeanien, 92–93.
678 The exhibition was to take place during the Catholic Rally (Katholikentage) in Vienna. Why this state museum should have such an exhibition is not mentioned in the letters, but the context is that in summer 1933 Engelbert Dollfuß was already chancellor and in the spring of 1933 the self-elimination of the Austrian Parliament had already happened. Austria was on its way to becoming a (clerical) dictatorship and therefore such a demand of the museum, which resides on the Heldenplatz, the most prestigious square in Vienna, fits into the picture of politics at this time.
promised to loan them such objects from the mission house St. Gabriel.\textsuperscript{679} But Thauren does not seem to know anything about Schmidt’s promise and replies that the mission museum is not equipped with such objects either: “Unfortunately, we have only a few missionary or missiological objects in our museum, which we […] cannot take from the collections […].”\textsuperscript{680} Thauren goes on with his assessment of mission museums in general: “I know the stocks of mission museums in Austria. They are all ethnological collections, […].”\textsuperscript{681} Besides showing the character of the collections, it gives again insights into the involvement of St. Gabriel with the inner political sphere at that time. And it shows that P. Thauren was not aware of or ignored the mission museums and exhibitions of the SSPC Sisters.

When the objects in St. Gabriel SVD are compared with the objects that Jacobs and Wingfield describe\textsuperscript{682} – trophies, relics, and curios – then it becomes clear that they are not easily categorised as one of the three types since the goal with the “collecting” was a scientific one. But because Jacobs and Wingfield have a broad definition of relics, one could argue that some of the exhibits in the vitrines that were dedicated to the Anthropos Patres are relics in the sense that they commemorate important missionaries (see Section 2.3).

It seems clear from the earliest accounts that in the initial phase, the objects were only coming from SVD internal sources, meaning that SVD missionaries brought and sent the first objects, for example from New Guinea. This acquisition of objects by SVD missionaries continued until the late 20\textsuperscript{th} century. In primary sources, this internal “collecting” is often mentioned. For example, among the few photographs that I found in the depot, one depicts an excavation. The note on the back says it is P. Hermann Hochegger SVD doing an excavation of stone tools on the 13\textsuperscript{th} of March 1977 in Zaire.\textsuperscript{683} The research and the “collecting” by SVD members and the mission museum are therefore closely intermingled until the late 20\textsuperscript{th} century.

\textsuperscript{679} “Im Hinblick darauf, dass das Museum für Völkerkunde über viel zu wenig Material verfügt, das sich auf die Tätigkeit der christlichen Missionare und auf christlichen Einfluss in den verschiedenen Ländern bezieht, hatte Hw. P. W. Schmidt die Freundlichkeit, dem Herrn Ersten Direktor des Naturhistorischen Museums eine Reihe von Leihgaben des Missionshauses St. Gabriel für die geplante Ausstellung in Aussicht zu stellen.” Röck, Letter Röck to Thauren (7.7.1933), AMEM.

\textsuperscript{680} “Wir verfügen leider in unserm [sic] Museum nur über ganz wenige missionarische, bezw. [sic] missiologische Objekte, die wir […] nicht den Sammlungen entnehmen können […].” (my translation) Thauren, Letter Thauren to Röck (10.7.1933), AMEM.

\textsuperscript{681} “Ich kenne die Bestände der Missionsmuseen in Österreich. Sie sind alle ethnologische Sammlungen, […].” (my translation) Thauren, AMEM.

\textsuperscript{682} Jacobs and Wingfield, “Introduction”.

\textsuperscript{683} Photograph P. Hermann Hochegger, AMEM. P. Hochegger (1931-2009), a disciple of Schebesta, was active in Bandundu in many other ways. “Missions-Ethnographisches Museum St. Gabriel”.
Regarding their self-image, the mission museum pointed out proudly their prominent “collectors”. Some sources that are directed to the public refer specifically to the Anthropos Patres Koppers, Gusinde, and Schebesta. They mention their fieldwork and with this, the source of their “collecting”:

The ethnological section was exclusively supplied by our missionaries from China, Japan, New Guinea, Togo and also contains the collection from the expedition by PP. Koppers & Gusinde to the Tierra del Fuego Indians 1923, as well as the expedition of P. Schebesta to the Semang in the jungle of Malacca and his expedition to the Pygmies in the Congo jungle.684

Again, just as when referring to Schmidt as the founder of the museum, referring to those more well-known scholars was meant to give the collection more prestige. The “big names” were not only important for their publicity, but also for their internal lobbying. Internal sources, for example, mention Gusinde as “collector” as well.685

The focus of the “collecting” for the mission museum changed. Whereas the Anthropos Patres had been interested in ethnographical objects, the second half of the 20th century brought a focus on religious art. As mentioned in the previous section, the focus in the museum shifted from “ethnographic” to “missionary”. This is expressed by the focus on global Christian art which is also detectable for example in the development of the collection of the other bigger SVD mission museum in St. Augustin. It must be stressed that often these pieces of art were commissioned works and that the SVD missionaries in the mission fields often knew the artists personally.686 Some artists were also members of a Christian congregation.687 Other artists of Christian art were in fact not Christians themselves.688

685 Vorbichler, Antrag am 18.1.1962, AMEM.
686 Such an example is described in the correspondence about crosses from the Congo. Miyala Falvien personally knows P. Hochegger SVD, who is stationed in Zaire. Hochegger is named as the one who brought the wooden crucifixes to Europe. Correspondence between P. Bsteh and Maria Mateurx (5.3. and 12.3.1980), AMEM.
687 Example of a painted meditation by A. J. Thambu Raj SJ, a teacher at Loyola College in Madras. He was asked to compose a meditation about “peace” and enclosed a letter where he explained his painting where Jesus Christ is represented by the wheel of Dharma. Thambu Raj, Notes A. J. Thambu Raj (10.2.1982/19.1.1982), AMEM.
688 Example of a Madonna figure by the Hindu artist I Gusti Ngurah Regig. Thijssen, Letter Thijssen to Bsteh (20.10.1981), AMEM.
Temporary exhibitions in the mission house also express this interest in art, like the special exhibition “Christian art in the context of African, Melanesian and Asian cultures”, that took place in 1983 in St. Gabriel.689

*Objects as gifts*: An interesting source for how the collection was obtained is in the file cards in the depot. Some offer notes about how the objects found their way into the possession of the missionaries. One, for example, says that it was a gift to a missionary by locals: “This shell was donated by Fr. Gouzaga, Wewak, dentist in PNG. It is from the island Tarawa and was given to the Brother by the locals. 22.7.1978.”690 The context and therefore the expressed voluntary act of giving the shell as a present to an SVD missionary by locals from Papua New Guinea cannot be reconstructed here. It is, however, important to highlight, that the context of the “collecting” – here as a present – is mentioned as the only information about this shell.

*Purchased objects*: There are many sources in the archive which prove the purchasing of objects. Lists like the one about objects from India (jewellery for men and women, clothes, instruments, and weapons) and one box for transportation with neatly noted prices in rupees691 clarify that for some of the organised items paying for them was a normal part of the “collecting” process.

*“Found” objects*: In what seems to be the transcription of an interview with the SVD missionary P. Toth in May 1992 at the mission museum, we find a peculiar context of “collecting” by a missionary. The interview contains mostly explanations about certain objects from New Guinea. Toth is asked questions like, are there any ethnographical museums or research institutes in Papua New Guinea? and, do the locals sell objects privately? Regarding wooden figures as decoration for the household, he states that people “in the village” wanted to throw the figures away and young people also did that.

After three years, P. Toth found this figure in a cesspool. There have always been rumours. One suspected that they were sold. He secretly recovered the figure; otherwise people would run away for fear of ghosts. P. Toth wrote to the museum if there would be something for the village [as compensation], which also happened. So, the young are not punished, and the old are satisfied.692

689 Guidebook “Sonderausstellung – Christliche Kunst im Kontext afrikanischer, melanesischer und asiatischer Kulturen”, AMEM.
691 “Einkaufspreise der Sammlungsgegenstände”, AMEM.
Although P. Toth claims that he found the wooden figure in a cesspit and that the former owners wanted to throw it away, he reveals that the bigger context is far from being an uncontested situation. He took the item in secret because he claims that the locals would be afraid of the spirits connected to the figure. The figure was held to have kept its power, even though thrown away as waste for years. But Toth presents the removal of this item as a win-win situation since he also stresses that the mission museum gave a donation for the village. The question remains why one would pay for something afterwards that was first labelled as waste. In the same conversation, Toth points out the probably most important context to this problematic situation, namely an intergenerational conflict among the locals over how to treat discarded objects.

Old things are not sold, because spirits are still immanent, bring diseases, cause damage. Christian sects are interested in the disappearance of the belief in spirits. Old objects should, therefore, be thrown away, burned, not be sold. Young people secretly exploit them – art theft. Borders are guarded, boxes searched. There are gangs of smugglers. The government forbids the export of old things.693

According to Toth, the younger generation was more interested in using the “old stuff” as he phrases it, for commercial reasons. They are ready to commodify objects to meet the demand, even against the efforts of their own government. Toth does not express any reflexion on his position as himself embodying the demand of the West (state-run museums, private collectors, or art dealers). The voluntary purchasing character of his “collecting” is therefore highly unbalanced.

Objects organised by children: Another case that shows the powerful position of missionaries is to be found in the accompanying text to a stone carving, the head of a dog. A missionary recounted how locals in the Kasap/Murigaga area (Papua New Guinea) offered him ritual stones, but their prices were too high, so he could not purchase them. Instead, he approached local children and asked for such stones. And one school child returned with said stone, telling him that it was buried. He discovered that “it was not approved” that he should possess such a stone when he tried to find out more about the ritual object. His catechist, a local Christian, assured him that the figure has indeed been at the centre of the local cult.694 Although the object was not taken from an individual

---


694 Note “Stein-Schnitzerei: Hunde-Kopf!” (17.1.1978), AMEM.
owner, this must be seen as theft. The improper removing of an object – especially through the manipulation of a child – gives a further example of how the “collecting” for mission museums in Europe might look.

**External sources for objects:** Although the acquisition and “collecting” is predominantly done by SVD members, there are some exceptions. An interesting case is a wooden Corpus Christi from Goa, India, that was a gift to the mission museum by a former employee at the Austrian embassy in India. When visiting India years later with her two young daughters, one of them found this Corpus Christi in a shop and wanted to “rescue our Christ” under the rubble of the store. In the shop, it was labelled as being from Goa and dated around the 17th century. Back in Vienna, the origin and age – and with that the value of the artwork – was verified. Having it a long time in their own household, the family decided to donate it to the mission museum and documented the “biography” of this Corpus Christi as well.695

There is also the “Sammer Collection”. Helene and Josef Sammer “collected” over the years out of personal interest objects from China, Tibet, and Thailand. In old age, they read about the mission museum in one of the publications of St. Gabriel and decided to donate their collection. From April 1982 this collection has been part of the museum, and remained as a permanent display, the “Sammer Collection”. It includes porcelain, lamps, furniture, instruments, artwork, and Buddha statues.696 As shown, certain exhibits entered the mission museum as gifts and donations. But it is reasonable that these objects with a non-missionary background constituted only a minority in St. Gabriel.

In whatever way the objects were “collected” and thus entered the mission museum, the colonial power relations and their aftermath were always in place. The colonial structures, which the SVD missionaries were also an inextricable part of, were the context of this “collecting” and transferring.

To conclude this section, St. Gabriel SVD was a scientific, not an independent museum based on the handling of the objects. From what can be reconstructed, the objects were treated as valuable exhibits. Their authenticity was needed in order to study and research them. It is therefore understandable that P. Vorbichler was outraged when he discovered how some stored objects had been vandalised in 1962 (mentioned above). SVD members who were responsible for the mission museum in later decades rejected the idea that visitors could touch the exhibits which is a typical characteristic of Angela Jannelli’s wild museums. The sources also mention the often addressed need to have the

---

695 Correspondence between P. Bsth and Antonia Süss-Linaert/Linnert (1987), AMEM.
696 Folder “Sammlung ‘Helene und Josef Sammer’ April 1982”. When I visited the museum in 2013, the Sammer Collection was still part of the exhibition. A label on the wall named it as “Chinesisches Zimmer – Sonderausstellung aus der Schenkung Josef und Helene Sammer”, AMEM.
objects protected behind glass. Therefore, the scientific museum characteristic of distance between the visitor and the exhibits was fully in place.

6.6 Networks

Here I first discuss how the objects were mainly transferred within the structures of the SVD congregation. Secondly, the networking in the wider framework of the Catholic Church is described. Here the Lateran mission museum is a crucial institution in the network. Then the academic networks of the Anthropos Patres are discussed.

The most important entities in this network are the Anthropological Society Vienna, the University of Vienna (more precisely the chair for Ethnography), the Natural History Museum and later the state-owned Ethnographical Museum Vienna. These institutions were closely involved regarding the staff and the locations.697

So far, only SVD missionaries have been discussed as the central nodes in this network around the mission museum St. Gabriel, but more nodes (actors) are introduced in this section. Node attributes (like being in a certain mission organisation, working in a certain mission field, certain home country) are analysed whenever information is accessible.

6.6.1 Networks within the SVD

At the latest, the constitution of the SVD from 1922 encouraged the sending of descriptions and objects from the mission fields. These deliveries were organised from top-down. The hierarchy ordered them, and it was via the General Superior, so that these shipments should find their way to their European mission houses. Clearly therefore it was centrally organised.

This written mention in 1922 refers to an ongoing practice of collecting that was occurring prior to its being expressed in the constitution. Indeed, the beginnings of the two SVD’s museums (St. Gabriel and St. Wendel SVD) were earlier than 1922. Thus § 282 does not refer to the beginning of the transfer of objects to Europe. After all, a valuable shipment from Paraguay was announced by an SVD Pater to Wilhelm Schmidt around 1910.698 Somehow the delivery landed in Steyl like most deliveries from the mission fields, and not in St. Gabriel where Schmidt expected it. According to Bornemann who reports this incident, a certain Fr. Berchmans took from these objects whatever he liked for the mission museum in Steyl. Schmidt protested to the General

---

697 Mayer and Taschwer, “‘Rassismus’ im Museum,” 77.
698 Bornemann is vague about the date of this event. However, it indicates that earlier constitutions than that of 1922 also included this paragraph. I did not have the chance to check all constitutions before 1922 for this demand.
Superior and referred to the constitution that these shipments were meant for scientific processing, and it was St. Gabriel, where this processing was done, and not Steyl: “therefore those deliveries belong to St. Gabriel, at least the experts there must first be consulted.” 699 Obviously, at this point (around 1910) Schmidt was still engaged for the museum and organised acquisitions for it, as well as for his own research. Again, we see how closely entangled research and the establishing and running of the museum was. Some object transfers from SVD missionaries in the mission fields obviously took their route via the “headquarters” in Steyl at this time. Meaning they first went to Steyl and then to the spread-out mission houses. Later sources (see below and also the quote at the beginning of this thesis by Altnöder) show that the transfers were directly from the mission fields to the mission houses. Furthermore, this incident shows that there was competition between the different locations, and one can say, between the different mission museums of the SVD. Missionaries, in this case Schmidt and Berchmans, competed at a distance for the most desirable objects.

Apart from this early incident, all sources that I found in the St. Gabriel museum depot that give insights into the networking by museum curators date from 1957 on. Therefore, a comprehensive reconstruction of this internal part of the network around the mission museum can be given only for the second half of the 20th century.

St. Gabriel was integrated into a network that involved many institutions that borrowed from the mission museum for their temporary exhibitions. They included partly other Church-related entities such as Catholic youth organisations, but also secular and state institutions. It seems that the mission museums were seen as good providers of “exotic” objects since various institutions turned to St. Gabriel when they needed samurai clothes or African masks. The documents that I found in the depot also included requests by private persons and researchers from around the globe who asked about specific exhibits.

The sources give insight into the many SVD actors in the network regarding transporting the objects from their original location to Europe.700 The names include patres and fratres, actors in Europe (in St. Gabriel and in St. Augustin), and actors in different hierarchical positions, a mission procurator, and a bishop, Anton Hubert Thijssen SVD, bishop of Larantuka, Indonesia.

Sources also show that objects and museum exhibits, once in Europe, were transferred between different mission houses and mission museums of the SVD. On their way, objects often accompanied SVD members between different locations. In this manner, costs could be reduced, and the safe passage of precious objects was secured. One example is the carved wooden base of an Indian lamp. The lamp had been a gift from the SVD’s Ishvani Kendra

699 (my translation) Bornemann, P. Wilhelm Schmidt, 164.
700 For this segment, I refer among others to the source “Verzeichnis der Überbringer von Exponaten für MEM”, AMEM.
Missiological Institute in Pune, India, to the mission museum in St. Gabriel. As the base had been too heavy, first the lamp alone made its way to St. Gabriel. Three years later, in 1991, the Institute’s rector, Augustine Kanjamala SVD, a famous Indian missiologist, travelled to Rome for a consultation. He brought the base with him. Kanjamala wrote to St. Gabriel:

I have left it [the base] with Fr. Leo Cornelio, […]. I requested him to send it to St. Gabriel through somebody traveling to your place. In case any confrerer [sic] is traveling from Vienna to Rome you could request him to collect this gift for your museum from Fr. Leo Cornelio.\footnote{Kanjamala, Letter Kanjamala to rector St. Gabriel, AMEM.}

Clearly, through different transit stations, Rome in this case, an object could travel with various SVD members until it reached the mission museum that it was destined for.

In a letter from 1995, Andreas Bsteh describes how the SVD came in possession of a carved wooden crucifix from Papua New Guinea. The recipient is an SVD member in Bratislava where they also plan to establish a mission museum, and he had asked for some exhibits to be given for this new museum.

Some years ago, we received the crucifix with several other art objects from New Guinea by paying the costs for production and transport. Similarly, we have been in contact with Zaire, Philippines and other countries over the past 20 years and have been able to acquire a lot from there over time. At the same time, it brought us very valuable contacts with our confreres in the missions, and it was also a support for the local artists and craftsmen.\footnote{"Das Kreuz haben wir vor einigen Jahren mit mehreren anderen Kunstgegenständen aus Neuguinea erhalten, indem wir dafür die Kosten für die Herstellung und Transport bezahlten. Ähnlich waren wir auch in den vergangenen 20 Jahren mit Zaire, Philippinen und anderen Ländern in Verbindung und konnten mit der Zeit einiges von dort erwerben. Es brachte dies zugleich sehr wertvolle Kontakte mit unseren Mitbrüdern in den Missionen und war zugleich eine Hilfe für die einheimischen Künstler und Handwerker." (my translation) Bsteh, Letter Bsteh to Vojencik (7.9.1995), AMEM.}

To his confrere, Bsteh presents the gathering of these art objects for St. Gabriel as reciprocal. Being in contact with other SVD missionaries is seen as “valuable”, and the local artists and craftsmen got support as well.

Another example is the exchange of a so-called Japanese \textit{fumi-e}\footnote{\textit{Fumi-e} means to step on a picture in Japanese. It is a picture of Jesus Christ or Mary made of wood or stone. During the persecution of Christians in Japan these pictures were used to identify Christians by forcing them to trample on these pictures and see if they would refuse.} (\textit{Tretkreuz} in German) between St. Gabriel and the mission museum in St. Augustin. St. Gabriel owned such a \textit{fumi-e} and loaned it to St. Augustin where they made a replica for their own exhibition.\footnote{Lemanczik, Letter Lemanczik to Piskaty (21.10.1965), AMEM.} This example shows that the various mission museums of the SVD cooperated with each other. Different
patres established connections, in HNR so-called edges, via correspondence and exchange of objects, at least in respect of such rare objects like the fumi-e. There was competition just as there was cooperation.

Through correspondence, it becomes clear that the sending of objects was often accompanied by explanations and information provided by the sender. These actors in the network are all in one: missionaries, “collectors”, and experts for the objects while being useful for reducing the costs for the shipping.

An example of how the organising and transfer within the SVD worked around the 1960s can be reconstructed through a letter from Francis Kutscher to Kurt Piskaty, the latter then head of the mission museum. Kutscher was stationed in Cubao, Philippines, and organised objects for Piskaty. Though he did not purchase the objects himself, he knew a “lady, who buys the stuff for me”. This “good helper” was in his eyes very talented, as she was able to haggle successfully. As a foreigner, he would have to pay almost double the price had he bought them.705 Judging from his choice of words, the helper must have been a local woman; therefore, the involvement of local actors at the beginning of the process of transferring objects to mission museums is again proven. Kutscher wanted Piskaty to inform him what kind of objects he was looking for. The decision about what was of interest was therefore made in Europe, not in the Philippines. It is not known how much Piskaty knew about these matters. Kutscher, therefore, proposed to ask another pater, because “he knows what you can get here [in the Philippines]” 706. So, although the missionaries overseas were located at the source, it was the European taste or “gaze” that decided what to “collect”. In economic terms: the European demand was more crucial than the supply. However, Kutscher made a few suggestions as to what he could send: cheap landscape paintings, knives, vases crafted by Muslims from Mindanao, old saint figures from Spanish colonial times, and models of Filipino houses. The whole correspondence was about what would suit the audience and visitors, and about the prices. This process was significantly different from any anthropological “collecting” at the beginning of the 20th century when Schmidt argued over the scientific goals to be achieved by the shipments from the mission fields.707

705 “Die Preise sind so abgerundet, weil es keine festen Preise gibt, und meine gute Helferin handelt die Preise immer bis zum Äussersten herunter. Unsereinem würde das einfach nicht gelingen. Ich müsste trotz allen Handelns fast das Doppelte bezahlen.” Kutscher, Letter Kutscher to Piskaty (2.5.1965), AMEM.
706 “Hättest Du noch was anderes gerne? Frage P. Zarda. Er hat eine Ahnung von dem, was es hier alles gibt.” Kutscher, AMEM.
707 Such exchanges about what would be of interest in Europe and what the mission field has to offer are common in the correspondence. Another good example deals with Paraguay: “Ja ich hoffe und wünsche, dass Ihnen die bescheidenen Sachen dienen werden im Missionsmuseum. Gern werde ich sehen einiges zusammen zu bekommen für daselbe [sic]. Vielleicht [sic] dient Ihnen auch ein Schlangenfell, welche man hier erwerben kann, gleichfalls gibt es recht nette Schnitzereien Indianerköpfe ect [sic]. Man könnte da etwas zusammenstellen. Hier hätten wir
It seems that this development intensified in the following decades, at least due to the efforts of one SVD member, Ferdinand Altnöder. A helpful amount of correspondence in the museum depot deals not only with the acquisition and transportation of new objects for the mission museum but with organising items for the purpose of reselling them profitably. A corpus of twenty-one letters to and from Altnöder gives insight into the acquisition. Altnöder was at this time – 1975/76 – still a student at St. Gabriel. Two letters show how he contacted SVD missionaries in the mission fields and explained his interest in importing certain goods from their region. Like this, a business connection was established.

One of my hobbies is the purchase of arts and crafts from mission countries. [...] We sell these items in our mission bookstore. The proceeds go partly to the missionary, partly to the bookstore and partly to our mission museum. We also keep some of the articles for our museum. So far, we have connections to New Guinea, Japan, Ghana and the Philippines.708

In this letter from 1976 to P. Helmuth Thometzki in Indonesia, Altnöder specified which kind of objects he is interested in: carvings, masks, dolls, fabrics, needlework, paintings, Christian art like crucifixes and Madonnas. But it was not souvenirs, rather authentic art and artisan craftwork that he looked for.709 The correspondence proves that Altnöder established networking edges with actors in the mentioned countries. The purpose was clear: raising money that will benefit the mission fields, the bookstore of St. Gabriel and finally also the mission museum. It is not clear how Altnöder was connected to the mission museum, but I would argue that he, still a student, was not in a leading position. However, he could use the infrastructure of the museum. The shipments were addressed to the museum, referring to Siegfried Lackner as the person responsible there. Furthermore, the correspondence is stored in the depot of the museum. Also, the responsible for the museum must have approved of his “hobby” as shipments were addressed to the museum. Altnöder was a student in St. Gabriel and in this position, he could easily establish links with SVD missionaries abroad.710 The organising of objects for reselling and for the museum are intermingled. A letter destined for the Philippines from 1976 reads:

ganz tipische [sic] Pfeil und Bogen, doch diese sind 2 meter lang und man wird so was nicht annehmen [sic] beim Versand.” Bruder, Letter Bruder to Bsteh (26.7.1980), AMEM.


709 Altnöder, AMEM.

710 Some links to missionaries had an amicable character. P. Mehler writes to Altnöder: “Lieber Ferdl, gleich nach meiner Ankunft in Manila kaufte ich folgende Artikel, […].” Mehler, Letter Mehler to Altnöder (29.2.1976), AMEM.
“You can really send some things once more: Bracelets (braided), larger (real?) masks, shell chains, carvings, even things for the museum.” And again for the Philippines: “Please no souvenirs, but more real handicrafts, maybe some antique pieces for our museum, like for example masks.”

Several passages in these letters make clear that the distinction between museum exhibits and objects that could be sold in the bookstore was not a sharp one for Altnöder. The example for this is quoted at the beginning of the thesis, where he asks if there might be a bigger stuffed crocodile available for the museum. Of course, “antique pieces” were intended for the museum, not for the bookstore, but the intermingling of both types of objects by this SVD member is remarkable. The way of transportation and using the SVD network for transfer to Europe was the same for both categories of objects. Also, for objects destined to become museum exhibits, the correspondence circled around topics like toll, weather extremes and damage or destruction that might be incurred on the sea passages. However, the correspondence in the museum depot about the most purchasable objects is noteworthy considering the highly scholarly approach to “collecting” in the early days of the museum. The changes over about seventy or eighty years are clearly visible. One example of this change is the words of Imre Nagy, stationed in New Guinea from the 1970s: “Are people interested in small stuffed crocodiles?” It was now the visitors and/or customers’ taste that led the “collecting” in the mission fields.

6.6.2 Networks within the Catholic Church

The mission museum was also equipped with exhibits via the wider network within the Catholic Church, not just within the SVD. File cards, as well as texts about temporary exhibitions, show that the Holy Spirit Sisters (SSpS), the second foundation of Arnold Janssen, were involved in equipping the mission museum St. Gabriel. For example, in 1982, Sr. Luzietis SSpS donated several objects, such as a water pipe or mate spoons, to the museum. With

712 “Bitte keine Souvenirs, sondern mehr echtes Kunsthandwerk, eventuell auch ein paar antike Stücke für unser Museum, wie zum Beispiel Masken.” (my translation) Altnöder, Letter Altnöder to Manas Jr. (14.4.1976), AMEM. Manas was not an SVD member, but a private family man in the Philippines, who wrote that he and his wife Araceli “would like to establish business relations with you”. The tie was however arranged by P. Piskaty.
713 Altnöder, Letter Altnöder to Nagy (27.4.1976), AMEM.
714 “Haben die Leute Interesse in [sic] kleinen ausgestopften Krokodilen?” (my translation). Nagy, Letter Nagy to Altnöder (?2.1976), AMEM. Altnöder answered that the crocodiles are indeed selling well and Nagy should send more of them.
715 As an example: file card 01-0339 a-d, AMEM. Some of the file cards name 1982 as the date of transfer to the museum.
their involvement in equipping the mission museum, the sisters are bound
tighter to St. Gabriel SVD than it seems at first glance.

The above-mentioned register names one sister as a source of objects: Sr.
Cleophae in Papua New Guinea equipped the museum with items in 1981. She
was in connection with P. Bsteh.\textsuperscript{716}

The correspondence of Ferdinand Altnöder wherein he ordered goods from
the mission fields for sale in the bookstore in St. Gabriel also brings to the
forefront that female actors were part of the network: P. Georg Gemeinder in
Japan answers positively to Altnöder’s request for objects from Japan: “I can
get such items sent from different regions of the country through my [female]
catechists who work all over the country.”\textsuperscript{717} These local women, engaged in
the Catholic sphere, must therefore also be seen as actors in the network that
allowed the many objects to cross continents, with some of them certainly
ending up in the museum collection, as the register shows for the case of P.
Gemeinder. The register, however, only mentions the name of the SVD Pater,
the local catechists remain unnamed.

Involvement of women in the network around the SVD mission museum is
nowhere mentioned in the literature or published sources. It must be remem-
bered that the Holy Spirit Sisters (SSpS) would help in creating the exhibition
design of St. Gabriel. For the temporary exhibition about Christian art in 1983,
however, the loans from the Mariannhill Sisters (CPS) are mentioned and de-
scribed in the guidebook. The sisters loaned textile art, mostly woven works
by South African female artists. Also the Pontifical Mission Societies Austria
is mentioned.\textsuperscript{718}

The Lateran mission museum was one institution in the SVD network that
has been mentioned already several times. In brief, a massive exhibition, \textit{Es-
posizione Universale Missionaria}, for the celebration of the Holy Year 1925
was arranged in the Vatican. It had over a million visitors. The pavilion for
ethnology at this exhibition was organised by Wilhelm Schmidt. Afterwards,
Pope Pius XI transformed this exhibition into a permanent museum, located
in the Lateran Palace in Rome. Of the 100,000 original objects, 40,000 were
selected to remain in this place as gifts to the pontiff. A commission led by
Schmidt made the selection. The Lateran mission museum was officially
opened in 1927.\textsuperscript{719} Schmidt became its first scientific director, and he took

\textsuperscript{716} Verzeichnis der Überbringer von Exponaten für MEM, 24, AMEM. It is not stated which
exact congregation Sr. Cleophae belonged to.

\textsuperscript{717} “Ich kann durch meine Katechistinnen, die im ganzen Land arbeiten, solche Artikel von den
verschiedensten Gegenden des Landes geschickt bekommen.” (my translation) Gemeinder, Letter Gemeinder to Altnöder (17.4.1976), AMEM.

\textsuperscript{718} Guidebook “Sonderausstellung – Christliche Kunst im Kontext afrikanischer, melane-
sischer und asiatischer Kulturen”, AMEM.

\textsuperscript{719} The Lateran Palace is situated outside of the Vatican. It must be mentioned that the visit of
the pope at the museum in 1929 was the first time since 1870 that a pope left the Vatican. “The
many SVD members with him to Rome as curators. Michael Schülen SVD became the most prominent of them, and he succeeded Schmidt as director. Other museum collections (e.g. from the already mentioned Museo Borgia of the Propaganda Fide) were incorporated into the Lateran mission museum, which is now the Ethnological Museum situated with the Vatican museums.\textsuperscript{720} 

As already mentioned, Catholic missionaries, especially missiologists and anthropologists, were called by Schmidt to send in objects and written material.\textsuperscript{721} A total of forty-eight male mission congregations and societies sent objects.\textsuperscript{722} What seems to have been a joint endeavour to illustrate the collaborative global mission, on second glance looks more like a competition between mission congregations for space in the exhibition to present their very own mission “successes”. Schmidt was concerned that the SVD would lose out in this competition. He ordered lists of objects from the mission museums of the SVD in Steyl, St. Wendel and in Heiligenkreuz that he could choose from them. From the mission museum St. Gabriel, he himself would take objects directly. But Schmidt felt betrayed when his own generalate in Steyl refused him objects. They were afraid that the exhibits would not be given back after the exhibition, despite the pope’s promises. Given his temperament, Schmidt and his superiors clashed over this situation.\textsuperscript{723} 

Schmidt was more successful at organising collections from SVD members who were indeed stationed in the mission fields or under his direct influence. One example is the so-called Kirschbaum collection (ceremonial and religious art objects), sent by Franz Kirschbaum SVD from New Guinea. It contained about 850 pieces, was sent for the exhibition to Rome, and should afterwards be transferred to the mission museums in St. Gabriel and Steyl. However, Schmidt kept most of this valuable collection in Rome as part of the stock of the museum.\textsuperscript{724} Two other collections by SVD members that are mentioned in connection with the Lateran mission museum were those of the Anthropos Patres Schebesta and Gusinde.\textsuperscript{725} Also a collection by P. Höltker ended up in the museum in Rome.\textsuperscript{726} 

But the objects from the missionaries and from the Borgia museum were not enough to satisfy Schmidt’s scientific aims for the exhibition. Therefore, he used his network beyond the Catholic Church to organise the exhibits. He

\textsuperscript{721} Schmidt, “Gründung eines Museums für,” 996.
\textsuperscript{722} Bornemann, \textit{P. Wilhelm Schmidt}, 190.
\textsuperscript{723} Bornemann, 184–85. As the exhibition was turned into a museum, not all objects were given back to their owners. Steyl seemed to have been prophetic about this issue.
\textsuperscript{724} On an interesting side note, Kirschbaum opened a museum of local art in Rabaul, the capital of German-New Guinea. The museum and collections were all destroyed in the Second World War. Piepke, “The Kirschbaum Collection”. It shows that SVD missionaries “collected” but also opened small museums in their mission fields. This European war that spread globally destroyed art works in New Guinea whereas those collections sent to Europe survived.
\textsuperscript{726} Schmidt, “Die Ethnologische Abteilung,” 137.
proudly names eleven European state museums/institutes or private museums from Helsinki to Budapest and from Paris to Berlin as lenders.727

The involvement of the Lateran mission museum with the Ethnographical Museum Vienna via St. Gabriel will be discussed in Section 6.6.5.2.

6.6.3 Network with external actors

My use of the basics of historical network research (HNR) has me paying attention to missing links. Edges and nodes that do not exist can be equally telling as those that exist. While analysing the network around the mission museum, it becomes evident that the network has only Catholic missionaries as directly involved active nodes. The mindset of the Anthropos Patres was in general competitive with other Christian denominations when it came to missionary goals. However, in the field of their research, this issue is more complex.

Sometimes there was cooperation across denominational boundaries. For example, when on field research, priest-ethnographers cooperated not only with other Catholic missionaries who were living in the areas they wanted to research. Martin Gusinde, for example, cooperated with Anglican missionaries and befriended an Anglican-Yamana family when travelling to the Yamana people.728 Another example is Gusinde’s efforts concerning the unpublished manuscript of a Yamana language dictionary by Thomas Bridge, an Anglican missionary. Until 1933 he co-edited the dictionary, found financing and supervised the printing in St. Gabriel.729

In contrast with this cooperation, I found no traces that those boundaries were crossed concerning the equipping of the mission museum with objects. I would argue that the reason was simply that this kind of cooperation was unnecessary. The above-mentioned cases of Gusinde show that he needed the help of Anglican missionaries because there were no other Westerners to take him in. And Bridge’s manuscript was simply the only one existing. But when it comes to organising museum exhibits, the network around St. Gabriel had enough actors who were Catholic missionaries or secular actors who were on good terms with the Anthropos Patres. Necessity is the key to this question.

Leaving the question of trans-denominational ties behind, there are different secular actors that appear in the network around the mission museum, namely development aid workers. An undated letter, probably from Altnöder, reads:

But if it should happen by chance that another missionary or development aid worker travels here, we want to take advantage of this opportunity. We would

727 Schmidt, 137.
like to ask you to put together another shipment, also with less commercial or big valuable pieces.\footnote{Sollte es sich aber zufällig ergeben, dass wieder ein Missionar oder Entwicklungshelfer hierher reist, so wollen wir die günstige Gelegenheit natürlich nützen. Wir möchten Sie bitten, dann wieder eine Sendung zusammenzustellen, auch hier weniger Commerce [sic] oder grosse wertvolle Stücke.” (my translation) Altnöder, Letter probably Altnöder (n.d.), AMEM. This letter is not signed, and the first part is missing, but as Fr. Salvius Appenzeller is named, it is very likely that this letter is written by Altnöder to Fr. Nagy. Salvius was stationed in Wewak, New Guinea, and sent many objects to St. Gabriel.}

In the course of this correspondence from the 1970s, a specific aid worker is mentioned in several letters:

\begin{quote}
In April we sent some carvings to your address on the order of Frater Imre Nagy. We sent them with the personal goods of the Austrian development aid worker, Mr. Franz Natschläger, who worked here for three years. He will deliver them to you, personally. In this way, you shall receive them duty-free.\footnote{Im April haben wir einige Schnitzereien an Ihre Adresse auf Bestellung von Bruder Imre Nagy aufgegeben. Wir sandten sie mit den persönlichen Gütern des österreichischen Entwicklungshelfer [sic], Herrn Franz Natschläger, der hier 3 Jahre gearbeitet hat. Er wir sie persönlich bei Ihnen abliefem. Auf diesem Wege sollen Sie sie zollfrei erhalten.” (my translation) Appenzeller, Letter Appenzeller to Altnöder (28.7.1975), AMEM.}
\end{quote}

It becomes clear from the remarks about this aid worker and about this professional group in general that the missionaries were on such good terms with them that they were helping the missionaires in the transfer of objects to St. Gabriel. In terms of Historical Network Research method, this group had several node attributes that made them relevant for the SVD members. They were Westerners, located in their mission fields, and travelled back and forth between the continents. Hence, with their support, the SVD could save costs at customs. Another node attribute that we know Natschläger possessed is that he was an Austrian citizen and therefore, a perfect candidate for creating an edge in the network.

A highly relevant source, the register of donators of museum exhibits, offers some insights into who besides the SVD members was active in the network. This snapshot covers the 1970s and 1980s. In the register forty-one names are listed (one pair, the already mentioned Sammer couple who gave the Sammer collection, see Section 6.5.3). Of course, the majority of the names belong to SVD Patres and Fratres. It is however notable that besides them, the biggest other group of donors to the museum were secular women (meaning that they were not missionary sisters in a congregation), with six names listed. All seem to have an Austrian background, so this geographical node attribute was of importance for them to turn up in the network.\footnote{Verzeichnis der Überbringer von Exponaten für MEM”, AMEM.}
6.6.4 Network with the scientific circles in Vienna

Connections to actors in the Austrian capital form important edges in the network. These were a significant part of the Anthropos Patres’ engagement in academic research, especially in what is now the academic field of social and cultural anthropology. Within this amalgamation of disciplines, in the first half of the 20th century the *Wiener Schule der Ethnologie* (the Vienna School of ethnology) was formed. This close connection is best depicted by the former SVD member Josef Franz Thiel who answers a question about the relationship: “Yes, there was lively exchange. The Chair [of anthropology] was originally operated from St. Gabriel.” According to this statement, it seems to have been a self-evident situation that a chair at the state-run university was deployed by a missionary congregation. This unique situation cannot be highlighted enough. Suzanne Marchand calls it a counter-reformation in ethnology. Here, Austria, not Germany, took a *Sonderweg*, or special path; all over Europe and America, clerics tried to take back Darwin’s turf, but only in Austria did they succeed.

Marchand sees the reasons for the success among other factors in Schmidt’s connections, his organisational skills, and intellect that gave him influence and power. In other words: his networking made the difference and led to this dominance of priest-ethnographers.

A crucial point is the institutionalisation of the university chair in anthropology at the Philosophical Faculty. This part of the history of science is contested. Most portrayals of the beginning of anthropology in Vienna equate it with the Vienna School of ethnology, which is disputed by other researchers. To engage in this debate about “true pioneers of ethnology” and Catholic supremacy that suppressed other developments in this field is beyond the scope of this thesis. My interest lies in discovering the involvement of the Anthropos Patres in the academic milieu of Vienna. At the same time, I reject the view that only they were the “founding fathers” of anthropology in Austria. Rather, I am interested in the ties they had to secular actors in the academic milieu. The institutions that are of interest in this section are the Anthropological Society Vienna and the university institute.

733 Josef Franz Thiel (born 1932) was later head of the SVD mission museum in St. Augustin.
735 (emphases in original) Marchand, “Priests among the Pygmies,” in *Worldly provincialism*, 288.
736 Marchand, 288.
737 Clear critique on this equation is verbalised by Karl Wernhart in his preface to Koger’s dissertation. Koger, *Die Anfänge der Ethnologie*, 5.
The Anthropological Society Vienna was founded in 1870, and it was instrumental for the establishment of the university chair as for the Ethnographical Museum (professionalisation and institutionalisation). Both institutions were discussed and prepared for in this Society. Wilhelm Schmidt joined it in 1899, studied in its library, lectured there and used its publications for his first scientific articles. Through the Society, Schmidt not only established initial ties to scholars, but he also brought his (international) connections with the SVD into the Society.

Further steps in institutionalisation at the university were that autodidacts or abroad-educated men became docents for ethnology, without a chair. In 1910 Schmidt became docent for anthropology and ethnology at the university. This was shortly after his entry into the scientific circles in Vienna. It shows, how quickly he was able to make a name for himself in the Society, in the Austrian Academy of Sciences (where he too became a member), as well as abroad.

In 1913, the Institute for Anthropology and Ethnography was founded at the University of Vienna. Its head, physician Rudolf Pöch, became full professor in 1919 but died three years later. In the same year, Schmidt became a private lecturer, without having a doctoral degree. From 1922 onwards he gave weekly lectures in this position. In 1928 the institute was divided: Ethnography was separated from physical anthropology. The first Chair for Ethnography (1928), then the Institute for Ethnography (1929) was established. The head of the latter was Wilhelm Koppers, not Schmidt. With this, the Anthropos Patres had good control over the academic study of anthropology in Vienna, with the only interruption being during the Nazi period. It is this time that Thiel’s quote above refers to when saying that the Chair was operated from St. Gabriel.

The so-called Anschluss of Austria in 1938 forced Schmidt and Koppers into exile. How intermingled the Anthropos Patres and the institute were is best illustrated through the fact that Koppers’ “successor” Viktor Christian, a staunch Nazi, found an empty office when Koppers had left. He was obliged to discover that Koppers had taken with him most of the furniture from the university institute because they were his private property. And even worse:

739 It was in a lecture at the Society, where Schmidt encountered the theory of Andrew Lang (high spiritual ideas), the basis for his own edifice of ideas (Urmonotheismus and others). Henninger, P. Wilhelm Schmidt, 32.
740 Ranzmaier, Die Anthropologische Gesellschaft in, 140.
742 As a Privatdozent (private lecturer) one is allowed to teach at university level but does not belong to the regular academic staff.
743 Chevron, 508–12; Henninger, P. Wilhelm Schmidt, 36.
Around ninety percent of the books in the library, also the Anthropos Institute’s possession, were taken into exile as well.\textsuperscript{744} This made the continuity of teaching and studying nearly impossible.

The influence of the Anthropos Patres on academic anthropology continued well into the second half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century as when Koppers was welcomed back to the university after 1945. Schmidt’s return was hindered by his old age.\textsuperscript{745}

Students of anthropology also created the ties between the main university of the Austrian-Hungarian Monarchy, later to become the largest university of Austria, and St. Gabriel. The SVD members who studied in Vienna were Koppers (graduated 1917), Gusinde (graduated 1926), Schebesta (graduated 1926), and Höltker (graduated 1930). Josef Franz Thiel mentions five more SVD members who studied at the same time at the university: Klostermaier, Fabian, Hutterer, Loiskandl, and Hochegger.\textsuperscript{746} Two of them are relevant for the mission museum: Hochegger was responsible for many acquisitions for the museum, especially from former Zaire, where he worked as a missionary. Along with Hochegger, Bsteh mentions that Klaus Klostermaier helped in the museum after 1945.\textsuperscript{747} We can, therefore, note that almost all who worked in the mission museum in St. Gabriel had an academic grounding in anthropology, not just the known Anthropos Patres. This helps build a case for the categorising of the mission museum as a \textit{scientific museum}.

Thiel also mentions in his interview other fellow students: Hermann Jungrathmayr, Peter Fuchs, Josef Kreiner, Justin Stagl, and Engelbert Stiglmayr. Except for Stiglmayr, who became assistant to Josef Haekel at the University of Vienna,\textsuperscript{748} all four Austrians made a university career in Germany or other countries. This indicates that the network of SVD members was also created by university students. The node attribute in these cases was that they, as SVD members, studied together at the same university and had, therefore, a personal relationship (different from a network based on written correspondence, for example).

A connection between St. Gabriel and the institute at the University of Vienna existed in Paul Schebesta who was the “collector” of a study collection that is still in the possession of the institute. This collection consists of 204 objects, mainly from the so-called “pygmy peoples” and various Bantu groups.\textsuperscript{749}

\textsuperscript{744} According to Linimayr, it is not clear how the new “enemies of the state” were able to bring the library out of Austria at the end of 1938. Linimayr, \textit{Wiener Völkerkunde im Nationalsozialismus}, 148.

\textsuperscript{745} For an overview of the continuity and later decline of their influence see Marchand, “Priests among the Pygmies,” in \textit{Worldly provincialism}, 315–16.

\textsuperscript{746} German Anthropology, “Interview Josef Franz Thiel”.

\textsuperscript{747} Bsteh, \textit{Das Missions-Ethnographische Museum}, 25.

\textsuperscript{748} German Anthropology, “Interview Josef Franz Thiel”.

\textsuperscript{749} Institut für Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie, “Ethnographische Sammlung”.
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The close connection between St. Gabriel and the academic circles in Vienna ended in the second half of the 20th century when Anthropos Patres were no longer employed by the university. For example, Koppers retired in 1957.

6.6.5 Network with the Natural History Museum and Ethnographical Museum Vienna

The close interweaving and cooperation between St. Gabriel and the Ethnographical Museum Vienna (referred to as VKM for Völkerkundemuseum) cannot be underestimated. When initially getting into contact with St. Gabriel regarding the mission museum, I was informed that the last scholar who was interested in the mission museum was an employee of the VKM. Not long ago, this expert from the VKM had tried to find the last remaining loans from the VKM to St. Gabriel. The connection is multi-layered, loans being just one part of it.

The VKM developed out of the Natural History Museum Vienna, and the two museums remained in a personal and bureaucratic overlap, increasing the complexity of this historical situation.

The traces of the VKM go back as far as the “collecting” activities by members of the Habsburg family, for example, the Novara expedition or their purchases from James Cook’s voyages. Those first collections were accommodated by the Imperial Royal Natural History Museum in its own Anthropological-Ethnographic Department (established 1876). Therefore this section is divided into the first part about this department (before 1928) and a second about the then independent VKM.

6.6.5.1 Network with the Anthropological-Ethnographic Department (until 1928)

The earliest sources I found referring to the connection between St. Gabriel and VKM concern the Anthropological-Ethnographic department in the Natural History Museum. A contract dating from 1899/1900 shows an edge in this network between Schmidt and Franz Heger, and Wilhelm Hein respectively. Heger, originally trained as a geologist, was appointed to this department and is named the first full-time employed anthropologist in Vienna. Hein was an orientalist and linguist by training, later becoming a private lecturer at the University of Vienna. This contract was already mentioned in the section on the founding of the mission museum of St. Gabriel. It is now time to focus on its content. The first contract from January 1899, signed by Heger, documents that European industrial goods and everyday objects were purchased by the

750 Collections from the Anthropological Society were also kept at this museum. Feest, “The Origins of Professional”; Chevron, “Anfänge der Ethnologie in”.


752 “Hein Wilhelm”.
museum department. Then these goods were exchanged with the mission station in Berlinhafen (New Guinea under German colonial rule) for ethnographical objects from the local people in this area. The contract lists fishing equipment, candles, cotton fabric, knives, pearls and mirrors as European goods. 753

This reveals how the state-run museum used the network of the SVD missionaries to acquire objects from New Guinea. Common European products like candles and knives were in demand by locals, and everyday objects from New Guinea were sought after in Vienna. Via the SVD network, these objects could be exchanged. And Schmidt was the broker in this exchange, the crucial node in this network that linked the Viennese department with missionaries stationed in Berlinhafen and other places. He represented the other missionary actors in the SVD network to the Natural History Museum.

A second document adds to this contract that the costs of transportation for both the European goods and the ethnographic objects were funded by the department. This sheds further light on the question of how the shipments were organised and paid for. Equally interesting, this specification states that in case of a surplus of ethnographical objects destined for the department, any duplicates from other areas should be given to the mission house St. Gabriel. 754

And the mission house, we can assume with certainty, refers to the mission museum which was still under development at this time. These documents, plus a final list of objects 755 as well as notes on payments (paid via commercial goods or in cash), show a well-functioning mode of acquiring objects for the department through the SVD network. These documents also show how both museums, the department and the mission museum in St. Gabriel, benefited regarding the acquisition of objects from New Guinea.

From these early years, the archival sources reveal that there was a collection called “P.W. Schmidt” containing ethnographical objects from Togo. But Schmidt was neither in Togo nor on fieldwork and could not have “collected” personally. Therefore, his name was clearly given to the collection that was only arranged by Schmidt via the SVD network. SVD missionaries had been stationed in Togo since 1892. This document from 1901 shows that Schmidt again made an exchange deal, also benefiting the mission museum St. Gabriel: The objects “were sent in from the museum in St. Gabriel near Mödling as an exchange for other ethnographical objects through P. Wilhelm Schmidt.” 756

One document from 1905 shows that Schmidt also gave ten so-called Fetischtöpfe (“fetish pots”) from Togo, some already broken, as a present to the museum. 757 This donation was also mentioned in the annual report of the

753 Heger, Post II 1900 “Ethnographische Sammlung der Missionäre von St. Gabriel bei Mödling in Berlinhafen. Deutsch-Neu-Guinea”, AVKM.
754 Schmidt, E 21.II.99, declaration (20.2.1899), AVKM.
756 Hein, “Aufnahmebefund der Sammlung P. W. Schmidt Post V-1901”, AVKM.
757 Heger, Post XIII. 1905 “Fetischtöpfe aus Deutsch-Togo”, AVKM.
Natural History Museum for 1905.\textsuperscript{758} It seems natural that Schmidt was “nurturing” the relationship with the museum in this way.

Next to the “Schmidt Collection”, there are two other collections that refer to St. Gabriel. One contains objects from Togo, the other from New Guinea (1901/02).\textsuperscript{759} Partly these documents offer only concise lists of objects, and partly the objects are described in short passages. Furthermore, it seems that only Heger and Hein were the actors in the department of the Natural History Museum, who connected St. Gabriel to this state-run museum.

\subsection*{6.6.5.2 Network with the VKM}

A separation of the Anthropological-Ethnographic Department into an independent Ethnological museum was for a long time demanded and debated. Schmidt was part of this discussion. In 1910 he publicly demanded a \textit{Kulturhistorisches Museum}, next to the museums of Natural History and Art History in Vienna. In this new museum, the Anthropological-Ethnographic Department should find its only suitable place.\textsuperscript{760} Related to this discussion was the debate over the handling of non-European art. In Vienna, Schmidt and Koppers were very vocal in this debate. Their correspondence with other actors, who were nodes in the SVD network, supplies written sources for reconstructing this debate.\textsuperscript{761}

In 1925 the Ministry of Education decided in favour of the separation and established a committee to organise the removal of the collections and their relocation at the newly established VKM. In this committee, we find the director of the Natural History Museum, the head of the Anthropological-Ethnographic Department (Friedrich Röck), the university professors Christian and Reche – and Wilhelm Schmidt.\textsuperscript{762} It is not only obvious how integrated Schmidt was in the Viennese scientific circle concerning the university and the beginning of the VKM. Moreover, he was in such a high position that he became one of five members in this leading committee. The network of Schmidt was highly placed.

At the same time, SVD members were involved in practical work at the VKM. Three patres from St. Gabriel are named among those who carried out the actual relocation work and organised the new exhibition. This work at the VKM included the final exhibition design and decisions about the presentation

\begin{multicols}{2}
\textsuperscript{758} Steindachner, “Jahresbericht Für 1905,” 84.
\textsuperscript{759} Heger, “Ethnographische Gegenstände aus dem Togogebiet”, AVKM, Post VI “Sammlung Missionshaus St. Gabriel” 1901–1902, AVKM.
\textsuperscript{760} Bornemann, \textit{P. Wilhelm Schmidt}, 164.
\textsuperscript{761} In short, this discussion revolves around presenting non-European art like Western art or like ethnographic objects. For details about this discussion see Plankensteiner, “‘Völlige Fühllosigkeit dem Künstlerischen”.
\textsuperscript{762} Plankensteiner, 3–5.
\end{multicols}
of the exhibits. The three were Georg Höltker, Theodor Bröring, and Fridolin Zimmermann.

With P. Georg Höltker it becomes clear that he as an Anthropos Pater had edges in the Catholic internal network (he worked at the Lateran mission museum), ties to the university institute (he graduated and taught there) as well as to the VKM.

Theodor Bröring was a missionary for ten years in China. He then studied sinology in Hamburg and came to St. Gabriel in 1926. There he was active in the mission museum with “expansion and renewing the mission museum” when Thauren was director of the museum. Bröring’s case shows that an SVD missionary, this time with mission experience, worked in parallel at the mission museum and the VKM. He was also responsible for loans from the VKM to the mission museum, for example, the VKM loaned a shrine with a golden Buddha figure of 60 cm height to the mission museum St. Gabriel. Theodor Bröring was the one who signed the contract on behalf of St. Gabriel in 1931.

The VKM was finally opened to the public in 1928. The tight cooperation between the two museums continued. A third institution, the Lateran mission museum became involved in the network too. Although it was planned that the exhibits for the exhibition from 1925 should all be sent in by mission congregations, sources from the VKM archive disclose that Schmidt also obtained objects from the VKM to cover all the geographical areas. The deal between Schmidt as head of the mission exhibition (and later the museum) and the VKM contained an exchange of Chinese for Japanese objects. Schmidt was in urgent need of Japanese objects but was confident that he – in the long run – would be able to obtain some exhibits through Catholic connections to Japan as well. This network connection was obviously in the making. Apart from the deals about objects, the VKM was also involved in the exhibition design since display cases were brought from the VKM to the Lateran mission museum. The Viennese museum was, therefore – via St. Gabriel and notably Schmidt – connected to what is now the Ethnographical museum in the Vatican museums.

The archival sources show how the two institutions (St. Gabriel and VKM) swapped, loaned and donated objects. But the network also enabled cooperation in practical terms: employees of the VKM worked for Anthropos Patres on their collections. We learn about this only because one of the VKM staffers

---

763 Plankensteiner, 6.
765 Bröring, contract (20.1.1931), AVKM.
766 Schmidt, Letter Schmidt to Director VKM (16.11.1927), AVKM.
767 Schmidt, Letter Schmidt to Director VKM (11.11.1927), AVKM.
wrote an angry letter to Schebesta demanding to be paid for nine weeks work on Schebesta’s collection from the Belgian Congo.768

Yet the bulk of the correspondence between Anthropos Patres/St. Gabriel and the VKM concerns whole collections that found their way into the Natural History Museum and later the VKM.

*Martin Gusinde:* Collections from Tierra del Fuego and the San people (formerly called “Bushmen”) were the results of Gusinde’s “collecting”. The first collection was bought by the VKM in 1927.769 Although it is not part of these two collections at the VKM, it must be remembered that it was Gusinde who was responsible for some of the human remains in the Natural History Museum Vienna: Fourteen skulls found their way into the collections of this museum.770 State-run museums like the VKM and the Natural History Museum Vienna have human remains out of missionary sources, such as here from Gusinde. However, I have found no evidence in the primary sources that the mission museum St. Gabriel also had or still has human remains out of Gusinde’s “collecting” in Chile.

*Paul Schebesta:* Both Viennese museums own collections obtained by Schebesta. In the VKM archive, no less than six folders are dedicated to Schebesta, and they give insight into how collections from this Anthropos Patres were acquired. After the VKM had already purchased a collection from him in 1928, Schebesta offered his collections, one from the Malay Peninsula (“Malakka-Collection”) and one from the Belgian Congo. It becomes clear that outwardly Schebesta was the owner of the collections although within the SVD itself they did not personally belong to him. Negotiations and efforts to raise the money for the purchase took place in 1933/34, years of turmoil in Austria when buying an ethnographical collection was not of high priority. Although Friedrich Röck, the then VKM director, stressed that a purchase would secure a premium tourist attraction for Austria because no other museum in the world could offer a collection of such coherence and size.771 Raising the money was difficult; a private fund-raising drive (*Bausteinaktion*) was initiated. And again, a deal including the Lateran mission museum was arranged as the VKM had an outstanding financial interest in that institution. Schmidt was responsible for arranging this which shows that the collection

---

768 Lechner, Letter Lechner to Schebesta (16.3.1932), AVKM.
769 Folder “Dr. Gusinde Martin” Post XI/1927, AVKM and Folder “Martin Gusinde”, AVKM. Letters are dated 1926 and 1927. The available documents in the folders give a good impression of the collection from Tierra del Fuego, although they date from later inventories from the 1940s until 1970s.
771 (my translation) Röck, Letter Röck (15.3.1934), AVKM.
was not Schebesta’s, rather it was property of the SVD. Finally, on the 7th of
March 1934 the contract for Schebesta’s collections could be signed.772

The Natural History Museum in Vienna owns a collection of anthropologi-
cal plaster casts773 produced by Schebesta. These plaster casts are not objects
made and used by locals but the result of a working process by the researchers
themselves (like a photograph or a voice recording). On the question of resti-
tution, the casts are not to be treated like human remains, but researchers like
Margit Berner and Britta Lange highlight that the act of the plaster casting
often overstepped ethical, personal and religious boundaries of those who
served as “models”. Therefore, they are a case of sensitive objects since they
are evidence of an intimate process between the “model” and the researcher.774

Berner mentions that Schebesta also “collected” skeletons and parts of skele-
tons but does not elaborate further. She highlights, however, that Schebesta
himself in his publications from the 1930s describes how the locals refused to
point out the graves of their relatives.775

Georg Höltker: As I have argued elsewhere in detail776, Höltker is a good
example of the connection between the Anthropos Patres and the museums in
Vienna. There is a collection of New Guinean objects in his name at the VKM
in Vienna, at which he already worked and helped before the Second World
War. This collection came to the museum in the war years 1940–1941, after
the Anthropos Patres had been purged from the university and when Höltker
was in Switzerland where the Anthropos Institute was in exile. This shows
that even after the tumultuous interruption of close cooperation between St.
Gabriel and the VKM, the now gleichgeschaltene museum777 continued to buy
exhibits from an SVD missionary.

As shown, the VKM and St. Gabriel had a tight relationship, where loans
and swaps were common. The edges in the network were built up by several
actors, not just Schmidt alone. This changed, of course, when the Nazi regime
came to power, and the museum became gleichgeschaltet. The relationship

772 Folder “Malakka Sammlung Schebesta”, AVKM; Folder “Malakka Slg Schebesta”, AVKM;
Folder “Schebesta Post 17/1928”, AVKM; Folder “Schebesta Belg. Kongo”, AVKM.
773 Anthropological plaster casting (or casting moulages) is the creation of a three-dimensional
copy of a human body or parts of the human body. The German term is Körperabformung.
process of this research method of life casting is well analysed in Berner’s article. It is important
to note that there were negotiations and exchange of goods for serving as a “model” (tobacco,
salt, and Japanese fabrics for example) and that Schebesta reflects in his articles and popular
books about these processes while life casting, photographing and measuring. In a museum in
Prague, Schebesta’s casts were further used and exhibits for the exhibition produced, while in
the Natural History Museum in Vienna, the casts were stored away and largely forgotten
775 Berner, 152; 156.
776 Loder-Neuhold, “Georg Höltkers Sammlung Völkerkundemuseum”.
777 The museum was then controlled by Nazi party members or sympathisers, who already
worked in the museum (so-called Nazizelle). Linimayr gives an overview of the complex affilia-
tions within the VKM. He names Schmidt and Koppers as belonging to the “enemy group”
of the Nazis inside the VKM. Linimayr, Wiener Völkerkunde im Nationalsozialismus, 182.
became hostile as the power balance shifted in favour of the VKM. The loaned objects became a topic of hot debates between the VKM and St. Gabriel. The correspondence between the VKM and St. Gabriel, mainly in the person of Johannes Thauren, the director of the mission museum at this time, from 1940 until 1945 show how the relationship changed.\textsuperscript{778} From 1940 onwards, the VKM demanded their loans back and sent employees to search for them in St. Gabriel. A criminal investigation division was involved as well. It becomes clear that some of the objects that were loaned to the mission museum were not to be found anymore, and others, which undeniably belonged to the VKM were not documented in contracts and lists. Clearly, the deals before the Nazi period had not been documented in an orderly fashion. Furthermore, objects that according to lists should still be in St. Gabriel showed up in the depots of the VKM. That indicates that lists from this time are not reliable. I assume that because St. Gabriel and the VKM had been on good terms and benefited both from their network connections earlier, accurate bookkeeping had not been seen as necessary prior to the regime change. But with 1938, the power shifted. St. Gabriel, with most Anthropos Patres in exile, all influence in Vienna lost, was in a weak position. Thauren, therefore, proposed that the loans of the mission museum to the VKM could be “donated” to the VKM. Inside the VKM, this deal was seen as advantageous, as these items were more valuable than the “missing” objects (which might also have been already returned to Vienna without notice). The VKM accepted this deal.

But only three months after this agreement, the whole mission house was confiscated anyway. Only six days after this confiscation the VKM wished to incorporate the whole mission museum plus the Anthropos library. In a letter to the political authorities for the art, theatres, and museums, the VKM stated that the mission museum had had a collection from New Guinea that surpassed their own and should fill existing gaps in their collection. Some East Asian objects were also very valuable. The same was true for collections from Togo, especially as this was a former German colony.\textsuperscript{779} In short, the VKM argued that seizing this opportunity would be in the interest of the Nazi regime.

It is puzzling that at the same time the VKM bought Höltker’s collection and he conversed with the director, Friedrich Röck, in a friendly manner.\textsuperscript{780}

\textsuperscript{778} The following section is based on primary sources from St. Gabriel (mainly the folders “Korrespondenz mit dem Museum für Völkerkunde in Wien: 25.5.1940 bis 18.1.1943 mit den diesbezüglichen Unterlagen betr. Leihgaben des Völkerkundemuseums an St.Gabriel (18.7.1929 u. 23.7.1929) und Leihgaben St. Gabriels an das Museum für Völkerkunde in Wien.”) and from the VKM archive (folders “Eigentumsfragen 1940–1942”, “Bergungslisten”, “St. Gabriel 1940–1942 1929 1931” and DA (Direktionsakten) for the years 1939/40/41/42/43/45).

\textsuperscript{779} “Die unterzeichnete Direktion des Museums für Völkerkunde stellt den Antrag, dass die ethnographischen Sammlungen des beschlagnahmten Missionshauses St. Gabriel-Mödling in ihrer Gänze dem Museum für Völkerkunde als Eigentum zugewiesen werden.” Letter Z:124 (8.5.1941), AVKM.

\textsuperscript{780} For example Höltker, Letter Höltker to Röck (26.1.1942), AVKM.
Already on the 25\textsuperscript{th} of May 1945, only weeks after the surrender, Thauren writes in a polite letter to the VKM that the mission house St. Gabriel wants its “museum” back: He mentions the ethnographical collections and furniture such as display cases.\textsuperscript{781}

How quickly the relationship between these two institutions was reinstated is astonishing. Already in September 1945, only months after the war ended, the VKM writes of a planned exhibition of Austrian scholars, which – of course – would include the Anthropos Patres Koppers, Schebesta and Gusinde. Therefore, they kindly ask for the loan of some exhibits from the mission museum.\textsuperscript{782}

The close cooperation from before the war resumed, especially under the leadership of Etta Becker-Donner and later Hans Mann dorff as directors of the VKM. Schebesta, who reorganised the new mission museum in St. Gabriel after its return from Vienna, received support from the VKM staff.\textsuperscript{783}

In the network that developed around the mission museum St. Gabriel, the edges to the crucial actors in the VKM were tight and strong. The connection with this secular museum continued for roughly a hundred years. In the years 1938 to 1945, the edges became hostile and even led to the incorporation of the weaker mission museum into the VKM. That the cooperation continued after this period is to be explained by the tight networking before, when SVD Patres had multiple professional edges with the VKM. Also, there was no other ethnological museum of this size and quality in Austria with which the VKM could have cooperated.

6.7 Summary and conclusion of the SVD case study: Mission and anthropology

This case study shows how this mission society was and still is heavily involved with anthropology. The Anthropos Patres were involved in the very shaping of this academic field in Austria, as well as the beginning of the Ethnographical Museum Vienna. St. Gabriel managed the chair and institute at the state-run university. The Patres Schmidt, Koppers, Gusinde, Schebesta and Höltker studied and taught at this university in Vienna. Other SVD members who worked at the mission museum in St. Gabriel were academically trained there as well. This is in sharp contrast to the first case study, where the Sisters did not have access to academic development because of laws that discriminated against women.

The network around St. Gabriel included the Natural History and the Ethnographical Museum Vienna. The fact that SVD missionaries worked in the

\textsuperscript{781} Thauren, Letter Thauren (25.5.1945), AVKM.
\textsuperscript{782} Letter to Thauren (11.9.1945), AVKM.
\textsuperscript{783} Bsteh, \textit{Das Missions-Ethnographische Museum}, 25.
exhibition rooms of the state-owned museum speaks for the tight cooperation. Regarding “doing museum”, I argue that the mission museum curators in St. Gabriel were nothing less than professional according to the standards of their time. Anthropos Patres were also involved in developing other museums (the Lateran mission museum is often seen as an SVD project because of the involvement of Schmidt and other Anthropos Patres). In exile during the Nazi period, they also laid the foundation for a small ethnographical museum at the University of Fribourg in Switzerland.

The scientific engagement of the Anthropos Patres also broadens the picture of what missionary work meant for different missionaries. Their lifestyle between university lectures, conferences, field research and networking with museums, differed unquestionably from the “stereotypical” missionary, at least for the first half of the 20th century. Not all SVD missionaries had this lifestyle apart from the Anthropos Patres and the members I mentioned in this case study. In this broadening of the picture, the SVD case adds a new nuance following the SSPC case study and that highlights how naturally the Anthropos Patres had room to move around freely because they did not experience restrictions due to their gender.

As for the intention of the mission museum in St. Gabriel, it was shown how the foundation of the museum was intermingled with growing scientific interest and the involvement first and foremost of Wilhelm Schmidt in the scholarly circles in Vienna. Both material and immaterial things, objects and written information, flowed from the mission fields to St. Gabriel. The aspect of formation for young missionaries in the mission museum was obviously an important difference from, for example, the mission museums of the SSPC as the Sisters were never intended to go to Africa themselves. The intention to use the “collected” objects for educational purposes is shown in this case study.

The Missions-Ethnographische Museum St. Gabriel can be seen as one part of an anthropological infrastructure of the SVD. Together with the Anthropos Journal, the Anthropos Institute and the library in St. Gabriel, it offered the material resource for development and research.

Both the SSPC and the SVD had museums and publications: The SSPC’s journals were directed towards the broad public, as were their Africa museums. The Anthropos Journal, on the other hand, was decidedly made for the scientific community. The same can be said for the early mission museum in St. Gabriel: it was made for studying purposes, not to be enjoyed by families on a Sunday afternoon.

This museum does not fit in with Angela Jannelli’s concept of wild museums, rather St. Gabriel was clearly a scientific and professional, not an independent museum.

---

784 Ruegg, “Georg Höltker Nouvelle-Guinée”. On a side note, this rather small city of Fribourg also had a mission museum by the SSPC.
The intention of the mission museum changed in the years after the Second World War. While the Anthropos Patres and their research still had an important place in the exhibition, the focus moved towards the interests of external visitors. The museum became more missiological, less anthropological. As for the other big SVD mission museum, St. Augustin SVD, Christian art from the mission fields began to play a bigger role in the “collecting” and the exhibition.

As can be seen, the massive network is the answer to the question of how St. Gabriel SVD could be equipped with objects. Nodes in this network were not just the Anthropos Patres or SVD members, but many others. The SVD actors were located either in Europe or worked in the mission fields around the globe. Even when they were living in these areas, they often had local helpers who “collected” for them. SVD actors are well-documented as having been involved in the “collecting” and transferring of museum exhibits, for example, when objects travelled as personal baggage with SVD members to Europe. Objects were purchased, given as presents (by the source community or by external European donors), taken without permission (“picked up”) or even acquired through manipulating local children. There were no hints that human remains which were “collected” by the Anthropos Patres Gusinde and Schebesta during their fieldwork, were on display in the mission museum. As both gave such “research material” to other museums, the presence of human remains in the mission museum (at a certain time at least) cannot be excluded neither.

Further nodes in the network were female and male missionaries from other Catholic mission organisations. The common node attribute that explains their connectedness was their being Catholic missionaries. Other actors in the network were locals who haggled and purchased on behalf of missionaries. These actors could be within the Catholic Church, or they could be secular. The node attribute that explains their edge better is not very easy to decipher. It could be friendship, or purely an economic relationship in which someone was simply earning an income from “collecting”. There are no hints that the SVD network for acquiring objects included non-Catholic missionaries (“missing” nodes).

The most important institution in the network around St. Gabriel was the Natural History Museum Vienna and the Ethnographical Museum in Vienna (VKM). Edges linked to actors in the state-run museum were established at a managerial level and on a practical level (for example, by SVD members who furnished the exhibit rooms of the newly established museum). The connection between these two museums was close; exhibits were swapped and loaned. This became a problem during the Nazi period when the VKM was gleichgeschaltet and in a powerful position towards St. Gabriel. This hostile time ended with the confiscation of the whole mission house and the incorpo-
ration of the museum into the VKM. Afterwards, good relations were reinstated. The examples of Schmidt’s, Schebesta’s, Gusinde’s and Höltkers’ named collections in the VKM show that the missionary sources of collections in state museums should not be overlooked.785

785 These mentioned Catholic missionaries were not the only missionaries who “collected” for state-owned museums. The German and Lutheran missionary Günther Säuberlich (1864–1946) conveyed a collection from East Africa with 1,450 inventory numbers to the VKM. Plankensteiner, “Endstation Museum,” in K. u. k. kolonial, 266.
Rabaul is a town on the island of Niu Briten (the creole Tok Pisin name of New Britain) in the country of Papua New Guinea. The town was founded by the German colonial empire in 1910 as a headquarters for their rule in New Guinea. It was a big town of over 3,000 inhabitants including people from all over Asia as well as Germany.\textsuperscript{786} Surrounded by active volcanoes, Rabaul has always borne the brunt of volcanic eruptions. During the Second World War, the town was occupied by Japan and heavily bombed by the Allies.\textsuperscript{787} The reason for mentioning Rabaul at the beginning of this chapter lies in the fact that Rabaul was a main destination of the Sacred Heart Missionaries (MSC) from the mission house in Hiltrup/Münster, North-Western Germany. Rabaul was the first mission field of the MSC in their foreign mission endeavour. “There the congregation made the greatest sacrifices, but there it also had the most plentiful harvest”\textsuperscript{788} according to the MSC missionaries themselves. Thus, from Rabaul to Hiltrup was a common route taken by objects from the South Pacific to the mission museum in Hiltrup.

In this case study I investigate the mission museum of the Sacred Heart Missionaries which was founded in 1897 and closed in 1941. The Sacred Heart Missionaries are a male mission congregation founded in the 19th century in France. In Germany, they are also known as 

\textit{Hiltruper Missionare}, after their main mission house in Hiltrup which is today incorporated into the city of Münster.

The main reason for choosing this mission museum as a case study lies in the fact that the mission museum in Hiltrup shows a strong natural science focus. This chapter demonstrates how a mission museum could participate in the development of natural sciences and that natural science specimens fitted in with mission activities. The MSC missionaries are a suitable third case study as they also display a scholarly approach similar to the SVD, although without their members being academically trained like the Anthropos Patres. The MSC case study bears similarities to both the SVD and the SSPC case studies. Another significant reason for choosing this mission museum is the

\textsuperscript{786} Hiery, “Die deutschen Kolonien in,” in \textit{Die Deutschen und ihre Kolonien}, 100.
\textsuperscript{787} “Rabaul”.
\textsuperscript{788} (my translation) Bender, “Missionshilfe in der Heimat,” in \textit{Pioniere der Südsee}, 199.
primary source situation which in this study differs from the two previous ones and allows new insights.

This chapter starts by looking at the state of research and the source situation. Then the congregation and the mission house are presented so as to give an impression of the museum context. The next sections present the mission museum regarding its historical development, its intention and its character, its collections and objects, and finally the exhibition design. Afterwards, the “collecting” and networking (congregation internal networks, Catholic networks, external networks) are examined. The last section discusses the destruction done by “collecting” and removing objects from the mission fields.

7.1 State of research, primary sources and source criticism

Publications on the history of the MSC have so far been written in connection with jubilees and were published by MSC members.789 As mentioned in the beginning of this dissertation Catholic mission in general in the German colonies, especially in Oceania, has been neglected until recently in German scholarship.790 However, the recent increased interest in the history of Germany’s colonial past has drawn attention to mission history and with it to the Sacred Heart Missionaries.791 One instance of this new interest in mission history in the South Pacific manifested in 2017–2018 not only in a conference and an anthology but also in an exhibition in Münster. The anthology and exhibition were both titled “From Westphalia into the South Pacific: Catholic mission in the German colonies.”792 However, to concentrate on the history of the mission museum I had to start from a tabula rasa.793

In 2015, the MSC in Hiltrup started a new up-to-date archive with an external professional archivist, Sabine Heise, who began to categorise and register old as well as newly found archival documents. From 1896 onwards, documents had only been stored unordered. This new archivist could not only give me information about sources concerning the museum, but she also sent...
a few already digitalised sources. And thankfully she put me in contact with Hilary Howes, who generously offered her own photos of primary sources from her previous visit to the MSC archive.\textsuperscript{794} These documents, roughly 700 pages, were already more than enough for this case study, as the main source is a catalogue in four volumes about the mission museum from 1933 to 1941.\textsuperscript{795} This catalogue was so fruitful for my research questions that – with some exceptions – I used it as the only source. It limits this case study only in respect of the time period in focus. The catalogue was written by P. Johann Braam MSC, the last head of the museum. Braam also referred to himself in the first volume as the \textit{Geschichtsschreiber des Museums}, the chronicler of the museum.\textsuperscript{796} Braam wrote this catalogue in Berlin in 1943–44, after the mission house Hiltrup was seized by the Nazi regime. It was based on his ten-year long work of ploughing through labels and older catalogues, published scientific literature and conversations with both local German scholars and MSC missionaries who returned to Europe.\textsuperscript{797} Braam had access to those collections from the mission museum that were confiscated by the regime and stored in Berlin and he wrote this catalogue under the harsh conditions of the Second World War. Judging from these circumstances, which can most of the time only be read between the lines, this primary source was Braam’s \textit{magnum opus}. It must not be forgotten that Braam wrote this catalogue during the Nazi regime and he reminds the reader from time to time that there is a war raging outside.\textsuperscript{798}

The catalogue is useful as it is professional in its structure and content. The first volume includes first a preface, bibliography, abbreviations, a floorplan of the museum during 1933–1941, and a history of the museum. It includes the whole inventory of the mission museum, with item locations inside the exhibition (display cases, placement on walls) listed and described in detail. The locations of objects stored in Berlin are also mentioned. For no other mission museum described in this thesis is there better documentation of the exhibits at this time. Thanks to Braam’s work, the content of a mission museum in the first half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century can be reconstructed almost entirely. This catalogue is a big exception to the rule of lack of source material about the exhibits.

\textsuperscript{794} Although working in archive is a pleasure, I want to thank Sabine Heise and Hilary Howes for their generous help with equipping me with archival sources, which allowed me to “visit” the archive though only virtually.

\textsuperscript{795} The catalogue has three volumes, but the second volume is divided into two parts, therefore there are four archival signatures: Volume I: 1267a, Volume II: 1267b and 1267c, Volume III: 1267d.

\textsuperscript{796} Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 19, ANPMSC.

\textsuperscript{797} Braam, 2, ANPMSC.

\textsuperscript{798} One such reminder is written in poetic style: “Aber […] wir [hoffen], dass sie [die Objekte RLN] […], aber auch als handgreifliche Erinnerung an die missionarischen Bemühungen um die Wissenschaft erhalten bleiben, selbst im Wogendrang schwerster Kriegszeiten.” Braam, 42, ANPMSC.
But the catalogue is more than just an inventory. Braam notes scholarly literature he used for the sections and which was relevant for further research on the objects. Furthermore, he links the objects with the Bible and mythology or non-Christian religions. For example, when listing the stuffed swans, he refers to swans in Greek mythology and he mentions that the tiger is omitted from different translations of the Bible and that the eagle is traditionally a heraldic animal in Germany.

Because Braam’s catalogue is more than just a detailed list of objects, it should be seen as a fruitful resource for more research questions. Braam describes in his texts his own problematic source situation, and he reflects on his sources. For example, he refers to a historical event saying that one pater reminded him of this event in a letter from about 1935, a letter that was destroyed in an air raid in Berlin 1943. 799 Thus, Braam’s text reflects on the sources for his writing. He also mentions the former catalogues and handwritten notes on which he worked last and he draws attention to his own much older card catalogue (Zettelkatalog 1933–1941, which survived the confiscation of the mission house) with 5,000 to 7,000 cards that he used for his text. 800

Braam, the chronicler, is interested in the history and historiography of the museum: Most sections in the catalogue which represent for example one specific collection are followed by a shorter or longer recapitulation, about the collection itself, about its meaning for the mission museum as a whole, or its meaning for the mission history of the MSC. 801 When interpreting a museum object in the catalogue, for example, he says, “The date [on an exhibit, RLN] seems to us of importance for the history of the museum; it shows the interest of the zoology teacher and museum curator in the year 1904.” 802

Braam’s ideal of a scientific museum influenced his writing. Correct information about every object is his goal and he notes any uncertainties in his writings himself. In this regard, he is oriented to scientific and professional museums regarding the independent museum concept in this thesis. These features of Braam’s catalogue are what made it such a reliable source for me.

The most significant additional primary source is the chronicle of the museum, also written by Braam and covering the time period from 1933–1940. 803

799 Braam, 16, ANPMSC. 
800 Braam, 20–26, ANPMSC. 
801 One example should be mentioned, the show case with samples of handmade articles by pupils (the so-called Handarbeitsschrank). After describing the meaning of the exhibits in the museum’s context, he analyses psychological insights that one could get from the samples after more reflection e.g. for the families in the mission field it could be of interest that the names of the pupils are noted along with their works. He then lists every child and interprets their work. Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. III. Band, 95–98, ANPMSC.
802 “Das Datum erscheint uns für die Geschichte des Museums sehr wichtig; es zeigt, wofür der Zoologielehrer und Museumspfleger sich im Jahre 1904 interessierte.” (my translation) Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 128, ANPMSC.
7.2 The Missionarii Sacratissimi Cordis (MSC)

The congregation of the Sacred Heart Missionaries was founded by the French priest Jules Chevalier (1824–1907) in 1854 in central France. Chevalier was its first superior general (until 1901) and, in 1869, Pope Pius IX recognised the new congregation officially. First, the main task for the new congregation was to work in the local French parishes. In the 19th century, Chevalier was a prominent figure in the devotion to the Sacred Heart, a distinctly Catholic devotion that was strong in France.

MSC members are patres or fratres. In the beginning, the MSC was “originally dedicated to teaching and restoring the faith in the rural sections of France.” Founded in France, the congregation spread to other European countries. Thus, their international character developed from early on. The founding of high schools and boarding schools was integral to their engagement. Then Pope Leo XIII ordered them “to undertake the difficult island missions of Micronesia and Melanesia in the South Pacific.” The first missionaries were sent there in 1881, and the MSC developed into an international mission congregation. The mission fields multiplied over the years, including – besides Micronesia and Melanesia – Indonesia, Philippines, China, Japan, the Congo, Senegal, and in Latin America Brazil, Peru, Argentina, Dominican Republic, and Guatemala. Today, there are around 1,700 MSC members active in over fifty countries worldwide.

Like the SVD, the MSC family also includes two sister congregations. Together with Marie-Louise Hartzer, Chevalier founded a female missionary congregation, the Daughters of Our Lady of the Sacred Heart (FDNSC). As the German government only allowed German sisters to work in the German colonies, in 1900 P. Hubert Linckens founded a distinctly German female mission congregation in Hiltrup, the Missionary Sister of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus (Missionsschwestern vom heiligsten Herzen Jesu von Hiltrup). They are called MSC Sisters and in German they are known as Hiltruper Schwestern, also using the acronym MSC behind their names.

---

804 Petit, “Chevalier, Jules”.
805 “Jules Chevalier”.
806 Petit, “Sacred Heart Missionaries”.
808 Missionaries of the Sacred Heart, “About Us”.
809 Bender, “Missionshilfe in der Heimat,” in Pioniere der Südsee, 203.
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7.3 The mission house in Hiltrup

The mission museum of the MSC in Liefering in Salzburg (Austria), was the first one in the German-speaking countries. To settle down in Germany was harder due to the Kulturkampf laws. As was the case for the SVD, where Germans were trained in the Netherlands, in 1886 the MSC opened a mission house for Germans in Antwerp, Belgium. In 1884 parts of New Guinea came under the rule of the German colonial empire as the then called Kaiser-Wilhelms-Land. The colonial empire allowed then to send German – and despite the Kulturkampf also Catholic – missionaries to this area.

Obtaining permission from the governmental authorities in Germany took until May 1896. The mission house in Hiltrup, then still outside of the city of Münster, was constructed and in 1897 the first MSC members moved in, coming from their branch in Antwerp. From the beginning, high school classes for male pupils were given. Hiltrup became headquarters of the new German province (with the Dutch-born P. Hubert Linckens as Provincial Superior).

The Propaganda Fide dedicated the Apostolic Vicariate of New Pomerian (Neupommern in German, today in Papua New Guinea) to the MSC as their “special” mission field. This vicariate is often referred to as Rabaul, after its capital and German headquarter. Neupommern is called Niu Briten in this chapter, as it is the locals’ designation in Tok Pisin today.

Hiltrup accommodated the provincial archive of the MSC and had its own library with about 16,000 books (the Patres-Bibliothek, differing from the pupils’ library) including works in mission studies, anthropology and natural sciences. This library also gathered every scientific work authored by a Sacred Heart missionary, especially the German ones.

7.4 The MSC as a scientifically oriented mission organisation

The MSC was scholastically oriented, but to a lesser degree than the SVD. Many of the MSC members from Hiltrup who engaged in scholarship and thus are mentioned in the primary sources in connection with the mission museum did not have an academic education. A pattern seems to emerge in which they started their scholarly engagement after they settled in their mission field.

---

811 Bender, “Missionshilfe in der Heimat,” in Pioniere der Südsee, 198.
813 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 15–16, ANPMSC.
814 Bender, “Missionshilfe in der Heimat,” in Pioniere der Südsee, 198.
815 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 24, ANPMSC.
816 I checked all MSC members who occur in Braam’s catalogue in Mückler’s register. None of their short portraits mention an academic education. Mückler, Missionare in der Südsee.
One of the best-known examples is P. Otto Meyer (1877–1937). After his final vows, Meyer asked for permission to undertake some years of training in natural sciences in Germany before travelling into the South Pacific. In case he must travel immediately, he asks for "scientific equipment". His superiors rejected the request, but nevertheless, Meyer started his observations and research once he had arrived in the mission field. More than fifty publications in diverse fields like archaeology, linguistics and zoology confirm his scientific interest. That some bird species were named after Meyer bears witness to his passion for ornithology. Meyer is the perfect example for our case study: he published in the *Anthropos Journal*, for example about fishing in Vuatom, and he "collected" fishing equipment from there, that can be seen in the mission museum in Hiltrup.

Many other biographies paint the same picture as Meyer’s exemplary beginning as a scholar: Once in the mission field, they started their research, writing – and sending objects. The transferred objects are visual aids to understanding the study fields that the MSC members embraced.

According to Braam, the beginning of the museum showed a strong scientific approach towards the collections. He names the patres Richard Schumm, Otto Meyer and Gerhard Peekel as those who built the museum because of their interest in natural sciences. Schumm also names himself in a letter as a founder of the museum. Schumm and Meyer left Hiltrup in 1902 for the mission field in Niu Briten (former Neupommern), and P. Peekel left in 1904 with the same goal. When they left, the interest for natural sciences continued in Hiltrup, but the quality declined and the documentation of the museum inventory was not done properly anymore.

The life and work of the MSC missionaries Meyer, Schumm, Peekel, Josef Schneider, and Bernhard Bley show the influence on the development of natural sciences. They are portrayed in more detail elsewhere.

817 For a short portrait about Meyer see Mückler, *Missionare in der Südsee*, 274.
819 Howes, "Missionar und Wissenschaft," 149.
820 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. III. Band, 101, ANPMSC. Peekel was Braams' teacher for botany.
822 "Die streng wissenschaftliche Fundierung, die die Generation Schumm, Otto Meyer und Peekel in der ersten Begeisterung für das Missionsmuseum wünschten, ermattete." Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 147, ANPMSC.
823 For a short portrait of Bernhard Bley see Mückler, *Missionare in der Südsee*, 67.
824 Tenbergen and Rehage, "Frühe naturkundliche Nachweise, Funde"
The MSC members made use of the possibility of publication of their work created by the Anthropos Patres. The *Anthropos Journal* was founded so that Catholic missionaries and priest-ethnographers could present their research publicly. Indeed, it seems as though the SVD could have had MSC members in mind when founding the journal. When MSC missionaries published their findings, it was almost always in the *Anthropos Journal* or in their series. And next to (secular) scholars that were in the network of the mission museum in Hiltrup it was the SVD patres Schmidt and Koppers who were named and referred to. This also shows the dissemination of Schmidt’s theories and theses among German scholars. But also lesser-known SVD members were in connection to MSC members.

But the passion for scholarship and especially for natural sciences, must have been questioned because Meyer, as well as Braam in the primary sources, advocates for scholarly engagement by missionaries. Braam names, for instance, the beetle Eupholus Browni, “christened” after a missionary, as an example of the link between natural sciences and mission. Braam also often points out the direct implementation of natural sciences in the mission field. Here is one example:

> It is not only theoretical reasons that can motivate the missionary and the researcher to pursue new plant and animal species. There are also practical reasons. The wood samples in the Hiltrup Museum [... ] remind every visitor how important a precise knowledge of the wood was for the mission of Rabaul since its economic existence during the First World War depended largely on the sawmill at Toriu [...]. As early as 1936, we were assured in Berlin that the print of the almost completed work “Illustrated Flora of the Bismarck Archipelago” [Illustrated Flora of the Bismarck Archipelago, RLN] by P. Peekel would be already worthwhile for reasons of the timber industry.
Clearly, the economic side (sawmill) depended on knowledge of the accessible natural resources around the mission station. Economic and scientific interest went hand in hand. For Braam, there was a connection not only between natural sciences and mission engagement but also with (mission) theology. And Braam sees the mission museum as the place where these two entities encounter each other: “Nature and Revelation meet in the mission museum Hiltrup.”

He constantly points out the junctions between the objects in his museum and Christian theology, as well as domains like Greek mythology. But he remains on a superficial level by only pointing out the junctions instead of coming straight to the point that is the relation between these two entities. His quote on the juxtaposition of nature and revelation is also the title of a journal that he refers to in his catalogue: *Natur und Offenbarung*. Otto Meyer, for instance, published ornithological articles in this journal.

One example of how Braam connected exhibits with his belief system is the short note about the quail.

In the history of religion, even in a strictly biblical-theological sense, the quail very often moves into the consciousness of the praying Church […]. Every year on the eve of Christmas, the mass begins […] with reference to the biblical miracle of quail and manna […]. The quails, which otherwise only touched the area of the wandering Israelites in spring and only in small numbers, came now in great numbers and at such a late time. […] But quail and manna shall give us the greatest Christmas joy and toughen us for the struggle of life. […] Nature and revelation meet in the mission museum.

Braam used the stuffed quail in the mission museum to remind the visitor or the reader of his catalogue that the quail is significant in the Bible and thus the museum exhibit materially refers to an abstract content of Christian belief. That is exactly what Braam is searching for in his work in the mission museum, that is how he legitimises the scientific – especially the natural scientific
– efforts of his confreres. With this, he firstly gets around the problem of addressing the challenges that new scientific findings posed on Catholic beliefs at this time (see Section 7.5). And secondly, Braam’s writing reveals a new characteristic of a mission museum that connects the encounter with objects to religious content, connecting the material to the immaterial. In the other case studies, the ethnographic objects from the mission field represented their “direct” community and area of origin. Only explicit Christian art such as a crucifix or a Madonna linked to Christian belief. But in Hiltrup, this link could also be a stuffed quail.

7.5 Excursus: The Catholic Church and evolution

Besides their anthropological engagement, missionaries were involved in natural science research as well. There are historical examples of scientific clergy in the already named polymath Athanasius Kircher SJ, or Gregor Mendel, or Georges Lemaître, who formulated what is known today as the big bang theory. However, this section enquires into the relationship between the Church and the realm of natural sciences at the time of the mission museum in Hiltrup. I want to briefly outline the framework of the MSC members’ natural science interest and engagement, namely the relationship between the Church and the development of evolutionary theory.

When evolutionary theory spread throughout the educated world during the second half of the 19th century, most Catholic circles merely viewed this as just as another threat to Faith from the materialist sciences.834 This was certainly true for members of the SVD as mentioned in the second case study. And following this perceived threat, some clergy were critical and in opposition to the new theory. The biggest player in the opposition was the influential journal La Civiltà Cattolica in Rome.

Other members of the clergy tried to integrate evolution and the Catholic faith. The Vatican did not have an elaborated plan for handling the case. Although cardinals often demanded such a step, the Catholic Church never published an official condemnation of evolution.835 Clearly, in the time of the MSC mission museum and when the MSC members “collected” birds or wood samples and published on their findings from the New Guinean forests, the Vatican refrained from taking up a stand on evolution.

[...] throughout the first hundred years of Darwinian evolutionary theory, the ecclesiastical authorities seemed to keep a low profile. They seemed to have

835 Artigas, Glick, and Martinez, Negotiating Darwin, 3–5.
learnt their lesson from the Galileo Affair and kept their noses out of scientific debates, at least as far as making any official announcements about evolutionary theory.836

This reticence lasted until 1950, when Pope Pius XII published the encyclical *Humani Generis*, “the first explicit public statement on evolution by a Church authority”. 837 Here, the Vatican “accepts evolutionary theory as a scientific theory as long as it does not contest God’s creation of the human soul or the monogenic origin of mankind”838. These were the crucial issues: soul and monogenic origin (not several “Adam and Eve’s”). The Church had acknowledged “evolution in the animal kingdom as being a fact but, rather arbitrarily, left Adam out of the story of evolution and conceded his special creation by God.”839 So, in plain words: Missionaries could without any problem discover ant species,840 excavate fossils841, transport paradise birds to Europe, and add to the existing scientific knowledge about nature as long as they would not touch upon these two critical issues.

7.6 The mission museum Hiltrup

Having presented the context of the mission museum, my focus lies now on the founding phase and the history of the mission museum. Then the aims of the museum will be discussed, followed by a characterisation of the museum. The next section covers the objects in the collection and finally, the exhibition design is described.

837 Wolters, 458.
838 Wolters, 459.
839 Wolters, 455.
840 Verhaagh and Bihn, “Die Patres Thomas Borgmeier”.
841 Manias, “Jesuit Scientists and Mongolian”.
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7.6.1 Founding and development

Due to the source situation, I can only present a fragmentary history of the mission museum. Nevertheless, the available sources show important developments and changes.

Braam names Provincial Superior P. Hubert Linckens, who founded the mission house Hiltrup, as the founder of the mission museum as well. P. Linckens was earlier involved in organising objects from the German colonies to Germany for an “ethnological special exhibition from the protectorates” \(^{842}\). For what purpose, by whom organised and other circumstances of this special exhibition are not known. Braam writes about the founding of the mission museum:

\[\text{It is obvious that the practical contact of P. Linckens and his missionaries, (e.g. P. Rascher) with the anthropologists in Berlin as early as 1897 would soon lead to the wish of a museum of their own in the new mission house Hiltrup. / One day P. Linckens had one of the main spokesmen, Fr. Richard Schumm, come to him and tell him that the Scholastics should think about how much money they needed to start a museum. Fr. Richard Schumm, Gerhard Peekel, Otto}

\[^{842}\text{“ethnologische Sonderschau aus den Schutzgebieten” (my translation) Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 16, ANPMSC.}\]
Meyer and others discussed the matter and decided to apply for 200 marks. P. Linckens replied: 1,000 marks are at your disposal.\footnote{Es liegt ja auf der Hand, dass die praktische Berührung, die P. Linckens u. seine Missionare z. B. P. Rascher schon 1897 mit den Berliner Ethnologen hatten, im neubezogenen Missionshaus Hiltrup bald den Wunsch eines Museums laut werden lassen mußte. / Eines Tages ließ P. Linckens einen der Hauptwortführer, den damaligen Frater Richard Schumm zu sich kommen und sagte ihm, die Scholastiker möchten mal überlegen, wieviel Geld sie brauchten, um mit einem Museum anzufangen. Fr. Schumm, Peekel, Otto Meyer u. a. setzten sich zusammen und beschlossen, 200 Mark zu beantragen. P. Linckens antwortete ihnen: 1000 Mark stehen Ihnen zur Verfügung.” (my translation) Braam, 16, ANPMSC. This quote also shows that connections to professional anthropologists were established even before the mission museum was founded. For more on this see Section 7.7.3.}

Linckens should, therefore, be seen as the founder of the museum, according to Braam. However, it seems that in his role as the Provincial Superior, he was rather a mentor in the background who used his leading position to facilitate the museum. It might be more suitable to call him the honorary founder of the museum. This is because regarding the practical work and organisation, the mentioned missionaries Schumm, Peekel and Meyer are to be seen as the actual founding figures. Braam very often depicts them as key persons, especially for their focus on “collecting” in the mission fields. Peekel and Meyer are also explicitly named co-founders of the museum in Braam’s catalogue.\footnote{Braam, 234; 265, ANPMSC.}

In any case, the founding year for the museum is 1897.\footnote{Braam, 268, ANPMSC.} That means that the mission museum was established right when the mission house was founded. It was not added later as it is often described in the portraits below. It also means that this mission museum is the second oldest in my list and was founded around the same time as the SVD case study, St. Gabriel.

Provincial Superior Linckens himself mentions the mission museum in his anniversary publication:

> In the first years we had to limit ourselves to a small mission museum in one of the consulting rooms; in the following years the comprehensive museum, which is now admired by all visitors of the mission house with the greatest interest, was gradually completed according to plan in the large corridor on the ground floor.\footnote{(my translation) Linckens, \textit{Die deutsche Provinz der}, 86. Quoted by Sabine Heise, email correspondence, August 2016. I want to thank Ms Heise for her help.}

This “according to plan” that P. Linckens mentions is to be understood literally. Because already the floor plan of the mission house in the years 1896–97 contained a “museum”, next to the entrance area.\footnote{Rommé, “Warum die Herz-Jesu-Missionare nach,” in \textit{Aus Westfalen in die Südsee}, 81.}

Richard Schumm, Gerhard Peekel, and others, who were scholastics at this time, founded an association around 1899 in support of the new museum.\footnote{Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 18, ANPMSC.}
There is sadly no more information available about the activities and goals of this association.

The mission museum was shaped by patres and fratres. Some fratres, like Alois Gross, are named in connection with arranging the display cases, and in caring for the whole exhibition. Some fratres guided visitors through the museum, especially on Sundays, and other fratres who were carpenters built the display cases. But the majority of MSC members I found in the catalogue were patres. The MSC members mentioned by name in the first volume of the catalogue and the chronicle add up to fifty-five, only eleven of whom were fratres, the majority therefore being patres. Although it is true that only fratres are mentioned in relation to practical work in the museum such as building and painting a display case, fratres also sent in objects from the mission field. The division of labour between fratres and patres in the general mission congregation is therefore visible when it comes to the mission museum, although the sources are not detailed enough to reconstruct the situation further.

Around the turn of the century, in 1903, one article in the *Hiltruper Monatshefte*, the monthly published in Hiltrup, gives insights into the museum at this point in time. The “ethnological museum”, as it is named, was on the ground floor, the zoological collection in the main corridor. The guide through the exhibition was a pater, who himself had been a missionary in Niu Briten (former Neupommern) for ten years and who had travelled in Germany and given lectures. Therefore, it can be stated that the guides partly had their own mission experience, which was not the case for the SSPC and partly the SVD.

In 1931, two patres who were bird enthusiasts influenced the mission museum: Paul Weber and Pater Superior Johannes Eichelberg. Also, the fratres Gross, Stadtmann, and Werth were engaged with birds in the museum. Braam highlights proudly that the fratres were familiar with the current ornithological literature.

Johann Braam became head of the mission museum in 1933. Instead of a re-organising, he made an evaluation of the situation in the museum and wrote down a *Museumsordnung*, a recommendation on how the museum should be organised (dating from 28th February 1934). It contains a floor plan and a key

---

850 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 19, ANPMSC.
851 Braam, 107–11, ANPMSC.
854 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 147, ANPMSC.
illustrating which category of objects was to be exhibited in which display case. This plan and key are also included in Braam’s catalogue.855

Who worked in the mission museum, besides Braam? He named the fraters Alois Gross and Godehard Werth. They obviously were involved with the care and maintenance of the collections as they are said to have advised on dissection and conservation.856 Furthermore, the fraters Heinrich Gerkmann, Joseph Hammerschmidt and Hans Heinrich were said to have been active in different practical tasks related to the exhibition.857

Throughout the catalogue, it becomes clear that the mission museum was also shaped by missionaries who were on home visits. Most MSC members who are mentioned in the catalogue are there because they have provided information on the objects.858 It seems that Braam interviewed them and noted down the given information in his catalogue.

P. Oskar Schinle is named as the one who drew attention to the already existing huge zoological and smaller botanical collections.

The seizure of power by the Nazi regime is not noted in the catalogue, but the outbreak of the Second World War is noticeable. Braam mentions a battle and notes that despite the restraints of mail (Postperre), they received a small package from abroad, which contained forty-two beetles.859 The last entry in the chronicle dates from 28th of December 1940 and announces the quartering of unnamed persons for the following January which required the museum to give up rooms. Braam also mentions that objects such as spears and arrows were removed, recalling the same action that was taken by the SSCP in the days of the First World War. The tiger skin was also brought to a different (probably more secure) spot in the mission house.860

In 1941, the Nazi regime seized the whole mission house; the MSC members had to leave not only Hiltrup but the whole Rhineland.861 This confiscation of the mission house also meant the end of the mission museum. The ethnographical objects were brought – as a whole Sammlung Hiltrup – to the Ethnographical Museum Berlin (Museum für Völkerkunde), as was the card catalogue (Zettelkatalog 1933–1941).862 Braam describes this event two years later still under Nazi rule with innocent words: Dr. Nevermann and Dr. Hellbusch “sorted” and “accommodated” the collection.863 Nevermann was not a
member of the National Socialist party; Hellbusch was seen as “unreliable” by the regime. However, 1,641 ethnographical objects from the mission museum were brought to the museum in Berlin.

Braam himself was now also located in Berlin-Dahlem, where he continued with his work for the museum. He tried to get his personal belongings back from the seized mission house, especially his valuable library which included older catalogues from the museum.

In 1943, when Braam wrote his catalogue, he was disillusioned about the current situation of the museum:

Today, in danger of air raids, no one can say what will happen to the collections of Hiltrup. May God save the objects from destruction, as well as the written notes about them in catalogues and books.

The zoological collections came to the provincial Natural History Museum in the zoological Garden (Provinzialmuseum für Naturkunde im Zoologischen Garten) in Münster, where Dr. Ilse Rensch was responsible for the collection. Museum staff had packed up the collections and brought them to Münster downtown. Ilse Rensch stated that they are taking good care of the material and that she, and her husband, who was at the time stationed at the front, personally tried their best with regard to the collection. Some very valuable material – objects sent by P. Otto Meyer – was even stored shellproof. Braam quotes Rensch’s letter from 1941 in the catalogue, and he declares his confidence in Rensch:

May the gratefully caring woman in Münster, a city so often exposed to air raids, succeed in saving the collections from Hiltrup through the perils of war. She is certainly not lacking in goodwill.

Nevermann was part of the network around the mission museum. Frl. Dr. Hellbusch is Sigrid Westphal-Hellbusch (1915–1984).

865 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. III. Band, 153, ANPMSC.
866 Braam, Letter Braam to Staatspolizeistelle Münster (8.4.1942), ANPMSC; Braam, Letter Braam to Petto, ANPMSC; Braam, Letter Braam to Krampe (16.5.1942), ANPMSC.
After the Second World War, Braam tried to re-establish the mission museum, as archival documents show. He obviously attempted until the 1950s but did not succeed. Some patres today remember some showcases reappearing in the mission house although a full-scale mission museum is unlikely to have been reinstalled after the war. 1941, the year of the seizure, is therefore seen as the end of the museum.

The ethnographical collections, however, found their way back to the MSC because they were sold in 1962 to the Museum der Kulturen in Basel. According to Günter Bernhardt, the collections were – with exceptions – sold in the 1970s to private buyers though which collections he means is not clear.

7.6.2 Intention

Braam names explicitly what he saw as the intention of the mission museum at the beginning of his catalogue:

The founders, benefactors, sponsors and caretakers of the Hiltrup museum wanted to serve religion and science, the Church and the fatherland in the same way with their efforts. The following book catalogue is also to remain faithful to this intention in a serving and modest attitude.

The almost poetic series of concerns – religion, science, Church and fatherland – can be seen as an attempt to legitimise the efforts for those “things behind glass” in the mission house. As could be seen in the SVD case study, mission museums also had to legitimise themselves within the bigger context of the mission congregation. The question of intention is always multi-layered. But Braam’s passage above is more likely directed at the external reader. The museum is not only a tool of the congregation but rather its members also serve science and the fatherland. But it must be asked which fatherland is he talking about? In 1943, in the middle of the Second World War and after the seizure of Hiltrup, he hardly wanted to serve Nazi Germany via the mission museum.

---

869 In Sabine Heise’s overview of the archival sources concerning the mission museum, the following numbers are to be found: “1366 – Wegweiser für den Wiederaufbau des Missionsmuseums, von Pater Johannes Braam 1950” and “A 2100 – Geplante Einrichtung eines ethnologischen Museums in Hiltrup 1948, 1954”. Email correspondence with archivist Sabine Heise, February 2019.
870 Email correspondence with archivist Sabine Heise, August 2016.
871 Email correspondence with head of Oceania department in the Museum der Kulturen Basel, Beatrice Voiron, January 2019.
872 Bernhardt, “Kultur oder Strandgut der,” in Reisen, entdecken, sammeln, 169. Bernhardt probably relies for this date on conversation with the archivist of the MSC Sisters.
and his catalogue. Therefore, this passage can also be read as a simple cover-up that pretends he is serving “science [and] the fatherland”.

The mission museum Hiltrup is different from the two other case studies in regard to the milieu within the mission house because the pupils were also located in the mission house. The exhibition was not located in a separate room, which could be closed and locked. Instead, the exhibition is displayed where the pupils are, in their study near their dining hall. The museum is for them a feature of their daily routine, framing their whole experience as students in the mission house Hiltrup. It would have been interesting to know what these students thought about the museum, but there are no sources available to give any insight. There are also other mission houses with mission museums that housed school classes. A most prominent example is St. Ottilien OSB (see portrait St. Ottilien OSB: Missionsmuseum on page 319).

Furthermore, Braam refers to the mission museum according to the title given to it in the chronicle the *Hiltruper Unterrichts- und Missionsmuseums*:

an instruction and mission museum.³⁷⁴ Although this is the only time he uses this title, it represents accurately the museum’s inherent purpose. The aim is that pupils should profit from the museum and the range of objects testifies to this aim.

As will be shown in Section 7.6.4, a certain percentage of the natural science objects were not from the mission fields but were examples of German flora and fauna. “Autochthonous” (i.e. local, from Germany) and foreign exhibits were side by side. The first, locally sourced, category was clearly used for in house teaching since it had less relevance for the future missionaries. This shows another variation of the intention of a mission museum: The features of the mission congregation who housed and founded the museum are of importance. Neither the SSPC nor the SVD had pupils near their mission museums. It was common for high schools at this time to have a collection of local natural history objects, like stuffed animals. As seen in the portrait about the mission museum Hall in Tirol OFM, also the high school there had such a collection for their pupils.

Another intention of the mission museum was documentation of the ongoing mission efforts of MSC members³⁷⁵ and their “successes” in the mission fields. Specific objects represented the history of the Sacred Heart Missionaries of which more will be said in the Sections 7.6.4 and 7.7.4.

7.6.3 Characterisation: scientific, not independent

The primary sources make it clear that the curators saw the museum as a scientific institution in which the goal would be as scientific and professional a museum as possible. Braam often compares his mission museum to state-run museums. Praise for their work and efforts from curators of other “standard” museums made him proud. Braam regularly repeats the ambition to work professionally with the collections. His main concern is the processing and preparation of the “collected” and transferred exhibits. One example is his remark in a passage about the so-called Celebes Collection:

From this careful handling of the collection of the Sarasin brothers, who had even collected with the help of a Dutch warship on Celebes, we could see what the exact processing of a mission museum should look like.

Braam expresses here his affinity with secular, professional “collectors”. It is clear that Braam strove towards a professional organisation of the mission museum. His goals were ambitious since the standard was set for him by state-run museums:

Of course, it would pay off still more if the organiser of a mission museum were to be not only familiar with mission studies, but also specialised in natural sciences and anthropology, for example through a scientific education in these fields or through a practical year-long internship in a major natural history or ethnographical museum.

This specialized grounding at least in anthropology that Braam asks for is described in the St. Gabriel SVD case study, where SVD members were indeed working in the Ethnographical Museum Vienna parallel to their engagement in their mission museum. As a rule, most museum curators had academic training in anthropology. The MSC members in this case study were so to speak one step behind in this striving for a “standard” scientific museum. However,

876 “Der Vergleich der Hiltruper Waffensammlungen mit denen der Völkerkundemuseen konnte bisher nicht in Angriff genommen werden. Aber er ist auf jeden Fall lohnend. Wo Hiltrup 100 Speere und Pfeile vermerkt, können die grösseren Museen wohl mit Leichtigkeit 1000 zum Vergleich anbieten.” Braam, 103, ANPMSC.
878 “Aus dieser sorgfältigen Bearbeitung der Sammlung der Gebrüder Sarasin, die sogar mit Hilfe eines holländischen Kriegsschiffes auf Celebes gesammelt hatten, ersahen wir, wie die exakte Bearbeitung eines Missionsmuseums aussehen müsste.” (my translation) Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 72, ANPMSC.
879 “Freilich würde es sich noch mehr gelohnt haben und lohnen, wenn der Bearbeiter eines Missionmuseums sich nicht bloss missionskundlich, sondern auch natur- und völkerkundlich hätte spezialisieren können, etwa durch wissenschaftliche Fachausbildung in diesen Fächern und durch ein praktisches Arbeitsjahr in einem natur- oder völkerkundlichen grossen Museum.” (my translation) Braam, 265, ANPMSC.
the sources clearly indicate that the mission museum Hiltrup can be described as a rather scientific and professional museum, not as an independent mission museum. Comparing Hiltrup to the St. Gabriel SVD shows that although the SVD members had better training than the MSC, the administrative activities of the SVD museum were insufficient. Hiltrup MSC was different from St. Gabriel SVD insofar Braam in his function as caretaker of the museum documented the museum inventories diligently. He cared for the historiography of the museum. Taken together, these are the features of a professional attitude in a museum.

One basis for Braam’s catalogue was the small object labels that came with many objects, also with the very old ones from the turn of the century. Although Braam often complains about their incompleteness, these labels signify the striving towards professionalism. In Jannelli’s account of wild museums, they lack correct documentation and labelling in their exhibitions, a sign of their being independent museums. Unlike wild museums, the mission museum Hiltrup took the distinction between original and copy very seriously: Braam reports a visitor questioning the authenticity of an ethnographical object because the colour on it was “too good”. Braam argues why the object is definitely authentic. He also states that early on since the 1870s there had been tourism in the South Pacific and therefore locals produced handicraft objects for selling, which are absolutely useless – because unauthentic – for a mission museum.

7.6.4 Objects

Braam’s catalogue gives us a complete inventory of a mission museum from the turn of the century until the year 1943, which is a rare exception among the case studies. Nevertheless, for this section, I give only a general overview of the objects in this museum, with the goal of showing the breadth of this mission museum’s achievement.

The objects in the museum can be roughly divided into an ethnographical and natural science collection. The latter can be split into several sub-collections.

- The ethnographical collection. Exhibits included: weapons, hunting and fishing gear, shields, bows and arrows, knives, kitchen utensils, shell money, dance masks, garments, jewellery, model catamarans, musical instruments, and tools for tattooing.

880 Jannelli, Wilde Museen, 186.
881 Wild museums do not care much about labelling originals and copies. Jannelli, 143.
882 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. II. Band, 208, ANPMSC.
883 Braam, 274, ANPMSC.
The botanical collection. It included typical commercial products from the MSC’s mission fields: copra, betel nuts, pandanus, kapok fibre, also specimens from folk medicine (corals).

The zoological collection. There were, amongst others, the following mammals to be seen: cat, hare, ermine, rat, mouse, mole, zokor, bat, squirrel, weasel, stone marten, hedgehog, hamster, fox, polecat, deer, seal, otter, badger, kangaroos, possums, and flying foxes. There were also reptiles and crocodiles. Some preserved specimens were kept in spirit. The snakeskin of a python was part of the collections as well.

Birds were given special attention: There were subsections like autochthonous (i.e. German) water birds, autochthonous birds of prey, and “mission birds”. Mission birds were simply birds from overseas mission fields. One display case had the name of Rabaul: L ‘Missionsvögel’, Rabaul which shows the importance of the mission station in Rabaul. The birds of paradise from New Guinea are mentioned as extraordinary, as well as colourful doves and parrots, white cockatoo, and hornbill with huge beaks. There was also a collection of eggs and nests. As mentioned, from early on the mission museum was influenced by bird lovers. Braam writes:

The mission museum Hiltrup took the direction of popular ornithology and this was without doubt successful with the pupils [of the mission school, RLN] and mission enthusiasts.

Braam is especially interested in the cassowary, the flightless bird of New Guinea, and dedicates to this bird alone several pages in his catalogue. Braam is especially interested in the cassowary, the flightless bird of New Guinea, and dedicates to this bird alone several pages in his catalogue.

The mentioned monthly journal article from 1903 about the museum by Karl von Raesfeld refers to a stone and mineral collection that was displayed along with around 200 different sorts of shells. There was also a butterfly and beetle collection, but this part of the museum was still under construction while von Raesfeld was visiting. One of the young MSC members is quoted by him as saying that if he is allowed to go into the mission field in the South Pacific, he will set up a herbarium so that the museum can also present the fascinating flora of the South Pacific.

Regarding the ways the natural history objects ended up in the mission museum, one has to distinguish between the “mission field objects”, and those from the environs near the mission house, North Rhine-Westphalia. Some of
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884 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 173, ANPMSC.
885 Braam, 11, ANPMSC.
886 “Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum ist in diesen Bahnen der populärenVogelkunde gewandelt und hat bei Missionsschülern und Missionsfreunden zweifellos einen gewissen Erfolg gehabt.” Braam, 148, ANPMSC.
887 Braam, 191–202, ANPMSC.
these latter “autochthonous” objects as they are called were brought to the museum by people of Münster and surrounding areas. One bird, for example, was bought from an impoverished old lady from Münster who asked the museum to buy her pet. One of the oldest exhibits, a sea eagle from around 1894, was given to the museum by a befriended count, who shot the eagle on his estate in southern Russia.

The animals were sometimes dissected and prepared by the MSC members themselves otherwise this was done by professional taxidermists. The archival folder of P. Otto Meyer includes a short description of how to dissect and prepare small mammals. Therefore the idea was definitely that the missionaries abroad could at least take the first steps in this process more professionally before sending the objects to Europe.

Almost completely absent is the category of Christian Art. Braam notes only one wooden crucifix from Niu Ailan (former Neumecklenburg), made by Paul Lando, in the year 1939. It was a commissioned work and originally planned to be given to the pope. However, there are the trappings of Christian life and rituals, like a stole and a rosary made in the South Pacific.

Overall, the objects predominantly originated in the South Pacific, with the New Britain Archipelago (former Bismarkarchipel) most common. Another area was the mission field in China. Moreover, some few objects came from Japan, Indonesia (Bali), Brazil, Peru, and Australia. And in contrast to the two other case studies, many stuffed animals were from Germany.

### 7.6.4.1 Mission history objects

There are also many objects that belong to the category of mission history related objects or Missionsgegenstände as they are called in the sources. For example, samples of handicraft by children in the mission fields, samples of children’s handwriting in local languages and German, a volume of a grammar in a language from Niu Briten written by P. Bernhard Bley. They directly represent the “successes” of the mission efforts by the MSC.

Objects that were connected to the MSC missionaries themselves were, for example, a Chinese passport, a pennant from a ship (also Chinese), and a sword owned by the murdered China missionary P. Josef Winkelmann. When
using the three categories of relics, trophies, and curios by Jacobs and Wingfield (see Section 2.3), then these objects would fall under the category of relics.

An intriguing object in the category of mission history objects is a blanket made from a tiger and a leopard skin, coming with its own brush made from the tongue of the tiger. P. Hubert Klärener brought this set to the museum, and it should symbolise the China mission by the MSC Hiltrup. It even had its own specially made showcase in the exhibition. The tiger was killed by P. Klärener, in order to protect the people in his parish as well as their livestock from deadly attacks. P. Klärener had to use strychnine because he did not have a hunting gun. An interesting account of this skin is also mentioned by Braam. A visitor saw the tiger skin blanket and offered 200 dollars for it though in the end the “deal” wasn’t closed.\(^{897}\) It shows that the mission museum was not seen as a *professional museum* because it is common knowledge that objects enter a “proper” museum for good. In other words: museums do not sell their objects. *Professional museums*, however, indeed remove selected objects from their stock, which is called deaccession. But the deaccession must be managed carefully, and firstly, other museums are the preferred recipients of such objects. It is not acceptable to use deaccession for monetary gain, to make space, to follow trends in “collecting”, or for political reasons.\(^{898}\) This case shows that despite the missionaries’ striving to professionalise the mission, they always kept a certain element of *independent museum* in their “doing museum”.

There are some highly interesting objects in the exhibition connected with the so-called “Baining massacre” and the “Baining martyrs”. On the 13\(^{th}\) of August 1904, five MSC Sisters, two MSC Patres, two MSC Fratres and one Trappist were murdered on the mission station St. Paul in Baining (near Rabaul). The person responsible was a local, To Maria, who was freed from slavery by the missionaries and grew up on the mission station. Most likely because of a disagreement with the head of the mission station, P. Matthäus Rascher, To Maria decided to murder Rascher and the other missionaries with help from accomplices.\(^{899}\)

\(^{897}\) Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 107–11, ANPMSC.
\(^{899}\) This is the MSC version of the circumstances of the murder case. However, the “Baining massacre” is central to the historical developments of the German rule in this area. Gründler highlights the multi-layered background that led to the murder. This included the enslaving and hunting of Baining by the Tolai, the interference of missionaries, especially P. Rascher, in slave hunting by the Tolai, and the ongoing repression of the Baining death cult. However, it seems as though the Tolai manipulated the Bainings and To Maria into murder the missionaries in order to restore the death cult along with the old order between the two ethnic groups. Gründler, “Die Gründung des Missionshauses,” in *Hundert Jahre Missionshaus Hiltrup und Deutsche Provinz der Herz-Jesu-Missionare*, 32. After the murder, the German colonial administration took retaliatory action against the Baining people. For the MSC and also the MSC Sisters, these martyrs are important and they are working towards beatification of the ten victims. Mückler, *Missionare in der Südsee*, 326–327.
In the exhibition in Hiltrup, portraits of the ten victims were shown, as was P. Rascher’s rifle, which was used by To Maria for murdering Rascher and others, and his bullet pouch. The presence of the “martyrs” in the exhibition are described in some portraits of mission museums in the Appendix (Werl OFM, Münsterschwarzach OSB, Innsbruck OFMCap, and Aachen PWG). P. Rascher was also a “collector” for the mission museum. He was also one of the MSC missionaries who published ethnographical articles and, as Braam reminds us, he documented several local languages. For this reason, Braam concludes that it must have been Rascher and the other murdered missionaries who protected the Hiltrup collections in the storage in Berlin when the ethnographical museum was on fire during the war. It is perhaps worth noting in this regard that the fire stopped at the spot where Rascher’s rifle and other parts of the mission museum collection were stored.900

Clearly, these objects were of significance for Braam, and he even states that those portraits and objects legitimise the museum as a true mission museum.901

7.6.4.2 Human remains

The mentioned article in the MSC monthly journal from 1903 by von Raesfeld reports that in the exhibition also human remains (skull and lower jaw) and weapons that come from the “period of cannibalism” were on display.902 Certainly, the purpose of mentioning these objects in the exhibition is to excite and shock the reader and potential visitor of the museum. The article, in keeping with its times, does not problematise the human remains nor does it overemphasise their existence. These exhibits are named in a row together with other (by today’s standards “normal”) ethnographic and natural history exhibits. Clearly, from early on, the mission museum had human remains in its possession and in its exhibition too.

More than thirty years later, in 1938, Braam notes that the physician Dr. Evers visited the museum and asked if the MSC could “arrange” to obtain for him a skull of a native Australian. Braam matter-of-factly directed the physician to the Pallottines who were the only German missionaries with mission stations in Australia at that time. Dr. Evers also provided information on the

900 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 87, ANPMSC.
901 “[…] das Museum, das sich durch jene Bilder und Gegenstände ohne weiters als wahrhes Missionsmuseum legitimierte.” Braam, 87, ANPMSC.
skulls and human remains that were already in the MSC collection. It is not clear from the source if the human remains were displayed in the exhibition or kept “behind the scenes”, in a depot or similar. Several points are of interest here: first, the existence of human remains was in the 1930s still normal as, apparently, was Dr. Evers’ request. Secondly, a mission congregation was seen by this physician as a possible means of gaining possession of a human skull from Australia.

Thirdly, inside the MSC no one knew how to “process” the skulls since it was Dr. Evers who informed P. Braam about it. Different from the SVD case, where the Anthropos Patres had sufficient experience to “use” human remains in accord with the then academic questions, human remains seem more out of place in Hiltrup. The anthropological “processing” was absent. Some of these notes are written down in the catalogue, but the further benefiting from it is missing. Braam simply writes “Interest in the collection of human bones and skull parts was keen around 1904.” That can be interpreted that at the time of his writing (the 1930s, 1940s), scientific interest and knowledge in such topics did not exist anymore.

However, five skulls and three human jawbones are mentioned in the inventory list of objects transferred from Hiltrup to Berlin. They were listed right after bamboo drums and followed by the woven bowl. In other words, human remains were treated as standard ethnographical objects.

One of the skulls was of special interest because it was said to have been the skull of To Maria, the murderer of P. Rascher 1904. Braam himself is at that time not certain of the authenticity of the skull. First problem: there are two explanations of how the skull ended up in Hiltrup. (One story, told by P. Arnold Jansen MSC between 1936 and 1938, narrates that fratres dug up the skull from To Maria’s grave because it “could become a highly interesting mission and museum memento”. Jansen himself sent the skull in a box – together with another murder weapon, a bush knife – to Hiltrup. The other story, told by Fr. Johann Weber in 1937, tells how the head was parted from the body after the execution, sent to a museum in Berlin and somehow ended up in Hiltrup.) The second problem was that according to Dr. Evers this skull was

---

904 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. II. Band, 124, ANPMSC.
905 “Das Interesse zur Sammlung menschlicher Knochen- und Schädelreste war um 1904 sehr lebhaft.” (my translation) Braam, 129, ANPMSC.
906 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. III. Band, 134, ANPMSC.
907 Arnold Jansen MSC is not to be confused with Arnold Janssen SVD, the founder of the SVD. For a short portrait of Arnold Jansen MSC see Mückler, Missionare in der Südsee, 216.
peculiar in that the jawbone looked “like that of a modern-day European”. Braam investigated in ethnographical museums and institutions in Berlin but could not find satisfying explanations for the questionable route of transfer of the skull. All in all, it is certain that the then attitude allowed the museum to exhibit human remains, moreover some had a fascination derived from the murder case and what seems grotesque today – presenting the skull of the murderer – was not problematic in those days.

7.6.5 Exhibition design

According to the mentioned article from 1903, the exhibits were kept in display cases as well as being presented on the wall. Weapons, for example, were “picturesquely” grouped on the wall, as Karl von Raesfeld describes his impression of the exhibition.

Braam’s floor plan gives a good insight into how the exhibition in Hiltrup looked between 1933 and 1941. It was situated in the long corridor in front of a chapel. At the end of the corridor, the study, the theatre and the dining hall for the students were located.

Braam is less detailed about the exhibition design. He uses the word Schrank (cupboard or cabinet). We know the “cupboards” were locked since Braam writes about having to deal with thirty-nine new keys for the museum. This is related to the fact that for some visitors to the museum the “cupboards” were to be opened and the exhibits could be examined from a closer perspective.

The walls were used as well. Braam notes that it looked “majestic” as the raptors were arranged high above the display cases on the wall.

The photograph of a glimpse into the museum from probably around 1900 (see Figure 16) agrees with Braam’s few descriptions of the exhibition: the display cases line the walls of the corridor and huge objects are located on top of the “cupboards”. Important to note is the existence of curtains which protected the objects from the sunlight that came through the windows on the opposite side. The arrangement of the objects inside the cases is not clearly visible but the cases look rather full.

The display cases were often accompanied by briefer catalogues or brochures about the exhibits in the cases. They hung next to the display cases. These were often written by the “experts” in this field. Such a catalogue is for

---

910 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 10–11, ANPMSC.
911 Braam, 12–13, ANPMSC.
912 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. III. Band, 111, ANPMSC.
913 “Die Gruppe wirkte majestatisch über die ganze Flucht der Schränke C-H.” (my translation) Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 154, ANPMSC.
example mentioned with P. Peekel as the author, including his hand draw-
ings.914

7.7 Networks and “collecting”

Braam’s catalogues are full of names. The whole mission museum appears as the result of many actors. Now, we first look at the general “collecting” for Hiltrup. Then the internal actors, meaning the interaction of MSC members with the mission museum, are of interest. Afterwards, external actors are presented. Finally, the nexus between “collecting” and destruction of local cultural forms is analysed.

In this text, Braam is clear on one thing: he aims for high standards. Just as at the Ethnographical Museum in Berlin, he would like to know the answer to two questions about every ethnographical object in his museum. How did the object find its way into the museum? Is this object or a similar one known in the literature? For zoological objects, he adds a third question: Is the exhibit connected to any myth or legend? However, Braam had a realistic view on the matter; he was aware that the mission museum could not achieve the same high standards as a state-owned museum in the German capital because the MSC could not build on the same resources and knowledge:

What we have said about the whooper swan […] may serve as an example of how every object should be treated. But it is asking too much from a single man to do this [processing, RLN] for every object in the museum in Hiltrup. Though it is worth something that at least this high ideal is acknowledged.915

This shows that Braam was oriented toward a professional and scientific mission museum. Included in this striving for scientific accuracy is the interest in the past of the objects before they entered into the mission museum. He asks when and how an object ended up in the mission museum, but only a few times is he able to give more information on these questions. Braam excuses missionaries who brought objects with them from the mission field while not exactly knowing their value for anthropology in Europe. He states that missionaries cannot be expected to be acquainted with the entire anthropological literature about their mission field.916

914 Braam, 19–20, ANPMSC.
915 “Was wir z. B. beim Singschwan […] gesagt haben, möge als Muster dienen, wie jeder Gegenstand bearbeitet werden müßte. Aber es so für sämtliche Gegenstände des Hiltruper Museums durchzuführen, geht wohl über die Kraft eines einzelnen Mannes hinaus. Doch ein hohes Ideal wenigstens erkannt zu haben, ist ja auch schon etwas wert.” (my translation) Braam, 23, ANPMSC.
916 “Dass es sich bei den hübschen Holzmodellen aus Central-Celebes, um die sich P. Spelz bemühte, um mehr als liebe Reiseandenken handelt, war, soweit wir uns erinnern, für ihn selbst eine freudige Überraschung. […] Doch kann niemand verlangen, dass ein Missionar erst die
7.7.1 Networks within the MSC

Missionaries of the MSC were responsible for organising the non-European objects, both patres and fratres. The networking for acquiring objects through the MSC internal connections was done cooperatively. For example, the Dutch provincial P. Verhoeven advised Braam to contact a certain P. Drabbe, who was sent to Mimika for linguistic research. Braam got “some suitable objects for the museum” from him.917 Clearly, the MSC members in higher ranks were supporting the museum and its acquisition with the creation of new edges between actors, also from Europe to the mission fields.

One of the “object organisers” was P. Gerhard Peekel (1876–1949), already named as one of the founding figures of the museum. Peekel was sent in 1903 to the German colony in New Guinea where he founded mission stations for the MSC. He was interested in linguistics and anthropology and published at least two books (one about religion and sorcery in Niu Ailan, former Neumecklenburg, and a grammar of local languages) and one article in the *Anthropos Journal*.918 With this, he is one of the many MSC missionaries, who seized the opportunity to publish in Schmidt’s journal, and he established one connection from the MSC network to the SVD network. However, Peekel is mainly mentioned in the primary sources due to his work on a botanical showcase (*sog. Botanische Schrank HH*). He ordered the collection from Niu Ailan (former Neumecklenburg) which was already in the museum and brought his own collection in 1928/29 when he was on a home visit.

Furthermore, Peekel is responsible for the ethnographic display cases with the designations R, S, and T. He arranged them according to myths of the moon (*Mondmythos*). He wrote a special brochure about this topic, which hung next to the display case between 1929 and 1941. Braam highlights that it was a missionary who had written this brochure, who had personal experience from his mission engagement in the area where those objects originate.919 This shows again that Braam emphasised the personal experience of his co-curators in the mission museum.

The so-called Celebes Collection is given much attention in Braam’s first catalogue. Celebes is the former name of Sulawesi, an Indonesian island. We can learn much about the collections and the general “collecting” from this example. The collection was
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919 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 19–20, ANPMSC.
brought from both Celebes missionaries Hubert Kapell MSC (from Eastern Celebes […]) and Johannes Spelz MSC (from Central Celebes […]) 1933 and both explained [them] verbally in early February 1934 in the museum in Hiltrup, on the basis of exhibits.920

The listed exhibits are then things such as jewellery (such as pearls and seashells), etuis, instruments, carvings, knives, boat models, medicine, and the skin of a python. Braam notes many details about the objects, mainly when and which of the two “collectors” brought them to the museum. Braam points out a contradiction in the verbal specifications of some objects. He also reflects on the “collecting” and the transfer into the museum, the fact that these objects were brought from the mission fields:

As the notes above and our catalogue [...] sufficiently show, we adequately questioned the two informants P. Spelz and P. Kapell about the name, place of origin, meaning and purpose of the objects they brought with them in February 1934 and even more frequently after that. It was a great test of patience for both gentlemen; on the other hand, they were visibly pleased that someone found it worth the effort to determine something about the care and effort that they had subjected themselves to in the interest of the museum.921

The scientific approach towards the objects is clear in this statement, and even more so when Braam comes back to the contradiction between the two missionaries concerning one object. He laments over the reduced value of a museum exhibit for further processing with geographical and anthropological literature when the place of origin is questionable or incorrect.922 Again, Braam wanted to manage a professional and scientific mission museum.

Similar to the established categories of “collecting” in the SVD case, Braam’s catalogue gives insights into how the MSC missionaries acquired the objects for the mission museum:

920 “Mitgebracht von den beiden Celebes-missionaren Hubert Kapell MSC (aus Ost-Celebes […] und Johannes Spelz MSC (aus Central-Celebes […]) 1933 und von beiden erläutert durch mündliche Angaben Februar 1934 im Museum zu Hiltrup, an Hand der Gegenstände.” (my translation) Braam, 65, ANPMSC.
921 “Wie vorstehende Notizen und unser Katalog [...] hinreichend zeigen, haben wir im Februar 1934 und dann noch öfter die beiden Gewährsmänner P. Spelz u. P. Kapell hinreichend genug ausgefragt über Name, Herkunftsort, Sinn und Zweck der von ihnen mitgebrachten Gegenstände. Es war für beide Herrn eine grosse Geduldsprobe; andererseits freuten sie sich sichtlich, dass jemand es der Mühe wert fand, über die Sorgfalt und Anstrengung, der sie sich im Interesse des Museums unterzogen hatten, einiges festzulegen.” (my translation) Braam, 71, ANPMSC.
922 “Es liegt auf der Hand, dass irrige Herkunftsangaben, wenn sie nicht berichtigt werden können, den Wert der Museumsgegenstände sehr herabmindern und ihre Bearbeitung mit der ziemlich verzweigten geographisch-völkerkundlichen Literatur sehr erschweren, […]” Braam, 71, ANPMSC.
Purchased objects: Notes clearly show that objects were purchased. Sometimes also the name of the local seller is named. A certain Otto Kida, for example, sold a self-made shield to P. Kapell (“bought by P. Kapell from Otto Kida, a native from Tempalang”923). 924

Objects as presents: Some objects were gifts (one object “was given P. Spelz as a present”925). On one occasion, a woman’s string instrument was given to P. Kapell as a valuable gift in the course of a baptism of a child.926 Another example expresses the transfer of a religious object to a mission museum in a direct conversion context: P. Baumeister announced in a letter that he received “Eight Buddha statues from pagans, who converted”927 and plans to send them to Hiltrup. Interestingly, Braam seems more excited about receiving these Chinese bronze objects than he is about the special context of their change in possession. These objects show that also the mission museum in Hiltrup had exhibits that can be read as trophies as described above in Section 2.3.

Some objects were somewhere between a purchase and a present. One case is a model boat from Lokotoy, today Indonesia, whose story Braam noted down. P. Kapell obtained the model in addition to the normal size proa (sailboat) he had commissioned after having seen some fine examples of these on the beach.928

Just once, the sources mention a local intermediary as being Ms. Oström (Lucia Gendersen) who is portrayed as “half-white” and as a former pupil of P. Arnold Jansen in the boarding school for “half-whites” in Vunapope. She bought and bargained for objects from Niu Ailan (former Neumecklenburg) on behalf of P. Jansen who sent the objects to Hiltrup in 1912. Because of her language skills, Pidgin and a local language, she was said to have been excellent in bargaining with the locals.929 With this account, Ms. Oström is portrayed as literally between the spheres, an intermediary because of white and coloured background and having been to a mission school. This made her the perfect person to organise objects for the European mission museums.

The agency of local people is also noted in the catalogue. One time, P. Kapell wanted to buy a certain kind of knife which had high value and was “hard to get”. He offered ten guilders for it, four times more than the current

923 “durch P. Kapell gekauft von Otto Kida, einem Eingeborenen von Tampalang” (my translation) Braam, 67, ANPMSC.
924 Braam, 80, ANPMSC.
925 “wurde dem P. Spelz geschenkt” (my translation) Braam, 69, ANPMSC.
926 “Bei Gelegenheit der Taufe eines Kindes des Paulus Loembon in Saiampoean schenkte dieser das Instrument als kostbare Gabe dem Pater.” Braam, 78, ANPMSC.
927 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. III. Band, 70, ANPMSC.
928 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 70–71, ANPMSC.
929 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. II. Band, 206, ANPMSC.
price. But the owner rejected the deal with the argument that this was a family heirloom.930

More insights show that the act of “collecting” was not always as professional according to the ethnographic standards at their time:

When we occasionally were able to update our two informants, P. Spelz and Kapell, of some highly instructive information about the objects they had brought with them, about which they were surprised, P. Spelz answered one day quite rightly: [“]When I said mass for Catholic soldiers in military camps in Central Celebes (‘business trip’), I had no time first to make detailed ethnological inquiries. I was satisfied when people gave me art objects of the natives as souvenirs!”931

This account differs decidedly from the carefully prepared and executed field research trips of the Anthropos Patres. However, I argue that despite these differences, the mission museum in Hiltrup must also be seen as a scientific museum with scientific aims in its manner of “doing museum”. It simply shows that there were multiple degrees of professionalism at that time and the SVD missionaries were definitely on the most professional end. The MSC members’ “collecting” might have lacked a high standard sometimes, but the careful handling in Germany went some way to make up for this lack. Braam often notes the efforts he undertook to find out more about the objects. His catalogue is full of literature for further reading and names of experts and institutions in Europe he had been in contact with. However, as the case of the human remains show, the attempts to achieve a good further treatment were also limited within the MSC.

Also signalling a difference in the two case studies is the fact that MSC missionaries published articles in the *Anthropos Journal*, whereas SVD members founded and edited this journal and with that, paved the way for much of the scientific engagement of the MSC missionaries.

Furthermore, some MSC missionaries seemed to have served as a source for information about museum exhibits, after their experience in the mission field or while they were on vacation in Europe, without having acquired and

---


sent objects to Germany. Not every missionary was enthusiastic about “collecting” and researching in the mission field.932

The mission museum in Hiltrup had connections (edges) to other mission museums by the MSC, such as to Liefering, Austria, which was of similar age. But also to the mission house in Oeventrop, Germany. There are some notes in the primary texts indicating that objects were distributed to Liefering and Oeventrop.933 For example, according to Hermann Mückler “collected” P. Richard Schumm also for the mission museum Liefering.934

7.7.2 Networks within the Catholic Church

The mission museum in Hiltrup was also involved in equipping the Vatican Mission Exhibition in 1925, primarily organised by SVD members. Some objects which returned to Hiltrup afterwards still bore the label from the exhibition in Rome. It seems that some museum curators, including P. Braam, were proud of this connection to the Vatican exhibition:

When the carefully guarded labels M.T.D. and L. one day gained a meaningful content, and the connection of the Hiltrup Museum with the Vatican Mission Exhibition of 1925 shone very clearly on us, we felt an understandable satisfaction and joy.935

Braam even transcribed texts which explained a whole collection of shell money from the Duke of York Islands (former Neulauenburg) at the Vatican exhibition in his catalogue.936 However, there were also missionaries who were unhappy with the request of P. Wilhelm Schmidt SVD to “collect” for the Vatican.937 As I show later, the request to “collect” meant that the missionaries encountered some problematic situations.

932 One such example is P. Jakob Schmitz as an informant: “Auch P. Jakob Schmitz M.S.C., der alte Marshallaner, war zwar kurz nach seiner Ausweisung von den Marshallinseln [...] ethnologischen Dingen sehr verschlossen, aber später gab er sehr wertvolle Auskunft, besonders über das große Bootmodell, das in Hiltrup über der Tür des Schülerspeisesaales hing und über das als einziger Mann in Deutschland auch nur P. Jakob Schmitz solche Auskunft geben konnte (3. 9. 34.).” Braam, 20–21, ANPMSC.
934 Mückler, Missionare in der Südsee, 354–55.
936 Braam, 47–50, ANPMSC.
937 Braam, Das Hiltpurer Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. II. Band, 268–69, ANPMSC.
In the course of the catalogue, it is sometimes mentioned separately when an object was exhibited at the Vatican mission exhibition. Some objects were even made entirely for this occasion but later returned to Hiltrup.

MSC members also “collected” for the MSC Sisters, the already mentioned sister congregation that was founded in Hiltrup as well. Thus the patres brought the objects to Europe then gave them to the sisters. So far, it looks like that the collections in the sisters’ motherhouse in Hiltrup were mainly “collected” by the male MSC missionaries.

In the Historical Network Research, missing links are to be observed as well. Therefore I found that there are no direct contacts to missionaries of other Catholic (or Protestant) mission congregations when it comes to organising the objects. The SVD played a role in orienting work in accord with the scientific standard in the area of ethnography, and the Franciscans in Dorsten are mentioned when Braam writes about their own small coin collection. The only other Catholic missionary who appears in the sources is Prof. Dr. Thomas Ohm OSB who visited the museum twice but seemed only to have worked on his own research. Ohm was a student of Joseph Schmidlin and was appointed to the important Chair of Missiology in Münster. He leads to a “missing actor” in the network, Joseph Schmidlin, who was not only the founder of this chair in Münster but is named the founder of Catholic mission studies per se. He is absent from the primary sources, except for one line where Braam mentions that he wrote a review of Nevermann’s book in Schmidlin’s Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft. It is noteworthy that such a prominent figure in Münster does not show up more often in the primary sources written by Braam.

7.7.3 Networks with external actors

Braam mentions an external donor to the museum right after his narration of the founding of the museum. Count Boni von Hatzfeld was a generous donor of birds of various kinds (eagles, crows, heron, and cuckoos) to the mission museum. They came from the count’s estates in Germany and Russia. As Braam points out, these objects are among the oldest in the museum as their

938 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 185; 202, ANPMSC.
939 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. III. Band, 7, ANPMSC.
940 Bernhardt, “Kultur oder Strandgut der,” in Reisen, entdecken, sammeln, 169; Tenbergen and Rehage, “Frühe naturkundliche Nachweise, Funde”.
941 Braam is – again – interested in how professionally the Franciscans are treating their Chinese coin collection. Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. III. Band, 71, ANPMSC.
943 Pulsfort, “Ohm, Thomas”.
944 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. II. Band, 229, ANPMSC.
labels show that they came to the mission house from the late 19th century until shortly after the turn of the century. Braam is indeed correct when writing that the museum got – through those donations from South Russia – a definite bent towards zoological and geographical collections.  

As mentioned in Section 7.4, the mission museum was decidedly a scientific one. Similar to the SVD case study, the network around the mission museum in Hiltrup also included scholars at state-owned institutions. Dr. Hans Nevermann is mentioned the most. He was the curator of the South Pacific Department at the Ethnological Museum in Berlin. Nevermann visited the mission museum before the Second World War and gave further information about exhibits. Braam writes that one day they received exactly 134 single pieces of information. However this exact number should be interpreted, the point is that such a profound expert like Nevermann visited and supported the mission museum with his knowledge. Moreover, Nevermann had contact not only to the MSC in Germany but also while on a field trip in southern New Guinea (Dutch area), where the local MSC missionaries supported his ethnological “collecting”. He also studied ethnological objects in Hiltrup for his own use in Berlin. The relationship was, therefore, definitely a close one as each benefited from the other. 

Another visitor was the director of the Linden-Museum in Stuttgart, Heinrich Fischer. He visited the mission museum in 1935 and it speaks for itself that this man, the director of one of the biggest ethnographical museums in Germany, paid a visit to the mission museum. The Linden-Museum also owned South Pacific collections, including a Baining collection. Fischer could immediately spot the area of origins for several weapons. Braam took sixty-one notes about objects. This makes clear that the value was not only in the visits by high ranking museum directors, but the museum curator gained valuable insights and information from these visitors. Besides this, it is also noteworthy that Braam learned a thing or two about the work of professional museums (“doing museum”) via these encounters. 

Another anthropologist mentioned several times is Dr. Hubert Kroll from the Ruhrland Museum in Essen. He published about iniet figures. Braam  

945 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 17–18, ANPMSC. Braam was unsure about the count’s name and so he added a question mark to the name. 
946 “Unsere eigenen Bemühungen um einen kritischen Katalog des Hiltruper Missionsmuseums (1933–1941) wurden nicht nur durch die Besuche von Missionaren und Forschern bestimmt – unter den letzteren war wohl der entscheidendste der Besuch von Dr. Hans Nevermann, Kurator am Museum für Völkerkunde in Berlin und Direktor der dortigen Südsee-Abteilung. Er gab uns bei einem zweimaligen Rundgang durch das Hiltruper Museum an einem Tag 134 Auskünfte (2. 2. 37.).” Braam, 21, ANPMSC. 
proudly notes that Kroll assured him that one of their iniet figures was “amongst much iniet material in European museums really ‘unique’.”

It becomes clear through his quoting their statements, often word for word, that these secular scholars were of great importance for Braam, as they were the ones whose opinion counted.

Now we turn towards the natural science focus of the mission museum. The impact of MSC missionaries on the progress of exploring the fauna and flora of the South Pacific should not be underestimated. P. Peekel, for example, sent 1,254 samples of plants to Berlin. Of those, ninety-two were first discoveries for Western botany.

There are several names of scholars that appear in the sources: Prof. Hestermann, Dr. Reschke, Prof. Dr. Diels (Botanical Gardens in Berlin), Prof. Harms, and the ornithologist Prof. Erwin Stresemann. This group of people had had years of cooperation with Sacred Heart Missionaries from Hiltrup who stayed in the South Pacific. The missionaries sent objects to these scholars in Berlin, sometimes directly, sometimes via Hiltrup.

The couple Dr. Ilse and Dr. Bernhard Rensch were employed at the zoological museum and garden in Münster (Provinzialmuseum für Naturkunde – Zoologischer Garten). MSC missionaries also sent objects to them, for instance in 1937 and 1938 several boxes arrived in Hiltrup and had to be forwarded to Dr. Berhard Rensch. Those sending them from the mission fields were, among others, Provincial P. Hepers and P. Schneider. Ilse Rensch also worked inside the mission museum; she controlled shells and dictated several notes on them. Later, Rensch gave a small box of freshwater molluscs to the mission museums, which were part of a collection sent by P. Schneider (Mope). So thanks to the missionaries in Rabaul and their shipments, Ilse Rensch and initially also her husband could describe between thirty-two and thirty-five new species of snails, according to Braam.

---


950 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. III. Band, 105, ANPMSC. For the external networks of the patres Meyer, Schumm, Peekel, Schneider, and Bley, see Tenbergen and Rehage, “Frühe naturkundliche Nachweise, Funde”.

951 “Wir lernten bei Prof. Dr. Diels (Generaldirektor des Berliner Botanischen Gartens) und Prof. Harms (ebda) und bei Professor Erwin Stresemann (Spezialist für Ornithologie) und bei Dr. Bernhard Rensch u. seiner Gemahlin Dr. Ilse Rensch (am Zoologischen Museum der Universität Berlin) die gewaltigen Forschungsmittel kennen, über die die staatlichen Institute verfügen. Die genannten Forscher standen seit Jahren mit den Hiltruper Missionaren der Südsee in Beziehung, da letztere, vor allem P. Peekel, Otto Meyer und Jos. Schneider (Ascheberg), Beobachtungsmaterial entweder unmittelbar oder mittelbar über Hiltrup nach Berlin sandten.” Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 22, ANPMSC.


953 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. III. Band, 41, ANPMSC.
the cooperation between the Rensch couple and the mission museum had many aspects. This is also the background for the historical development because as mentioned in Section 7.6.1, Ilse Rensch was the one who cared for the natural history collection from Hiltrup after the confiscation.

Patres Peekel, Meyer and Schneider are specially mentioned as having been involved in this cooperation for sending objects of natural history. And indeed, as Braam describes the matter, it seems to have been a two-sided cooperation. Thus, he refers in notes from 1936 to “hints and advice of the named researchers”, about the material which was sent by the missionaries to the mission museum. These hints and advice were very valuable for the mission museum, he continues. “Only the correspondence we had in Hiltrup with the state museums made us familiar with this type of literature and the initial zoological assessments”.954

Prints (Sonderdrucke) by scholars and missionaries in anthropology and natural sciences were carefully archived in Hiltrup until 1941. The mission museum was apprehended as a scientific institution, at least by Johann Braam.

7.7.4 “Collecting” and destruction
Due to Braam’s detailed accounts in the catalogue, we also get the insight into “collecting” practices which reflect the oppressive colonial setting or were related to the destruction of local cultures. These accounts allow us to zoom in closer to the encounters and add to the acts mentioned above of “collecting” that can be categorised as purchasing and receiving presents.

A first example shows the forced conditions under which objects were sold to missionaries. Moreover, this example is in connection with the acquisition of the Vatican mission exhibition/Lateran mission museum. P. Karl Borchardt relates his experiences following the request by P. Wilhelm Schmidt SVD that Borchardt “collects” ethnological objects “for the pope”. Borchardt claims that even at that time the most valuable objects were “family heirlooms, which one only parts with when the Control Officer collects the head tax and no other way is possible to pay this tax”.955 This short sentence shows the whole colonial setting: cultural objects of high value (in the eyes of the local owners as well as foreign buyers like missionaries, scholars, and colonial officers) were purchased. Such a transaction could be represented in the West as a voluntary act, as the objects were bought, not stolen. However, the only reason for selling the objects was the pressure to pay taxes to the colonial state. It is the only

955 “Die wirklich kostbaren Ethnologika sind nach P. Borchardt bereits Familienerbstücke, die man nur dann weggibt, wenn der Control Officer Kopfsteuern einfordert und man diese Steuern sonst nicht mehr begleichen kann.” (my translation) Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. II. Band, 268–69, ANPMSC.
time in the catalogue that this oppressive background situation is mentioned, and P. Borchardt also hints at the dilemma that this poses for the missionaries. The locals who had to hand over their valuable objects had rightful “resentments” that were also directed at the missionaries who in turn felt unfairly blamed in this dynamic. Therefore, Borchardt makes it clear: in choosing between getting ethnological objects for the pope in Rome as one of the benefits of the taxation system, or refusing to “collect” and consequently avoiding local resentments towards their mission engagement, they gladly choose the latter and abstained from purchasing sensitive material.956

The primary sources also tell of suppression and destruction. One example is the background story of the object V28, a *Penismuschel, ovula ovum* (a species of sea snail), which is described in the catalogue as being traditionally used by men for protecting their penis during dances, for example on the Admiralty Islands. Braam was interested, whether the object V28 was authentic (made ready for use) because certain adaptations were missing on this piece. He asked the outspoken missionary P. Bernhard Van Klaarwater957 about it. Van Klaarwater discreetly said that he has no knowledge about these things because he avoids – for pastoral reasons – everything around this tradition:

According to P. Van Klaarwater, the shell is used for an immoral dance (according to the feeling of the natives who have become Christian), which the mission has now almost eliminated. Unfortunately, the whites in particular want to keep the dance and the immorality. The object (V28) is thus a memento of the moral progress that mission has happily already achieved.958

The sexual connotation would be for most visitors of the mission museum in the 1930s the most obvious factor about object V28. However, for Braam, it was foremost an interesting example of how “successfully” missionaries

---


957 For a short portrait see Mückler, *Missionare in der Südsee*, 233.

958 “Nach P. Van Klaarwater wird die Muschel gebraucht für einen (nach dem Empfinden der christlich gewordenen Eingeborenen) unsittlichen Tanz, den die Mission nunmehr fast beseitigt hat. Leider hängen die Weissen am meisten darauf [sic], dass der Tanz und die Unschlichkei beibehalten wird. Der Gegenstand (V28) ist somit ein Erinnerungsstück an den sittlichen Fortschritt, den die Mission erfreulicher Weise bereits erreicht hat.” (my translation) Braam, 239, ANPMSC.
changed local cultural practices such as “sinful dances” where men wear these shells. The MSC members were very interested in the ethnographic study of such traditions959, but more important was their “pastoral care”. The material “evidence” of the elimination of the practice of this dance was the shell V28. It was a symbol for the dancing, and its presence in a European mission museum showed that this tradition has changed. In this regard, the Penismuschel was indeed a trophy, as discussed in Section 2.3. The “victory” here is that the missionaries worked against the custom of these dances and now the local Christians also see them as sinful.

The last example includes “one of the greatest treasures of the mission museum”960 in the form of stone figures (Hiltruper Iniet-Steinbilder-Sammlung), and a murder case. This event, taking place three hours from the mission station Vunapope in 1902, had all the elements of a colonial missionary drama (eruptive violence, colonial police versus local secret society, the flight and deliverance of an MSC member, and an ex-missionary as police chief). Part of the background to this story is that on islands like Vuatom, Vurar or Masikona and on the Gazelle Peninsula, men’s secret societies crafted stone iniet figures that were used in different rituals as well as traded.961

Primary sources tell that such a secret society plotted the murder of Mr Wolff, a German plantation owner. Wolff had annexed to his plantation a burial ground belonging to the locals. The missionary P. Eberlein warned Mr. Wolff about this action, but he would not listen. When the attack started, Mr Wolff was able to flee his home on a horse while his wife and their child were murdered. To Kitta, a befriended chief, helped P. Eberlein who happened to ride in the area to flee as well. The police arrived at the scene, led by the ex-missionary Père Atunto, but came too late for Mrs Wolff and her child. They were buried in the mission cemetery at the MSC mission station Vunapope. The consequences of this murder case were that the secret societies were banned by the German government. This was mostly done at the request of MSC missionaries. They argued that the safety of Europeans in the affected areas could no longer be guaranteed, and they also noted the immorality of these societies. This murder case has two connections to the mission museum. The first is a piece of art: To Kiga, a worker, made several pyrographies on a bamboo stick with scenes of the deadly attack and one bamboo stick was exhibited in the mission museum Hiltrup (“Bambusstab mit Brandmalerei: Ermordung der Frau Wolff 1902”). Missionaries, like P. Kleintitschen or P. Jansen were able to explain and interpret the “drawings” on the stick.962 And

959 Braam cites articles by Nevermann and Parkinson about the Penismuschel.
960 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 42, ANPMSC.
961 An MSC missionary who wrote in detail about this iniet figures and its usage is Joseph Meier. See Meier, “Steinbilder des Iniet-Geheimbundes bei”.
962 Braam, Das Hiltruper Missionsmuseum 1933–1941. I. Band, 40-42; 51-54, ANPMSC.
the second connection is via the many iniet figures in the mission museum: Iniet figures became a monument to

a now almost entirely Christianised tribe, as a *memento to apostolic zeal* in the fight against immorality and pagan superstition, but also as a *palpable reminder of the missionary efforts for science*, even in the rush of the most severe war times. 963

Although many details of this event are not known and the account is only told through the missionaries’ sources, the influence the missionaries had on the political decision-makers in Berlin is undeniable. Taken together with the material transfer to the museum, the dynamics are clear: the missionaries used an event like the murder in 1902 to get rid of the secret societies, which they saw as a sinful element (even the accusation of paederasty is raised) and at the same time they investigate the iniet figures from an ethnological point of view (article by P. Meier and the quoted “missionary efforts for science”). They furthermore “collect” 964 and bring those figures to the mission museum. The removal of the iniet figures and their transfer to European museums served two goals: it attempted to destroy the secret societies in the South Pacific and the figures represented and documented in Europe, as quoted above, the “successes” of the missionaries. Again, the iniet figures were trophies for their efforts. The language is clear hear, Braam uses the word *Denkmal*, monument or memento, when referring to the iniet figures. For the visitor, the function within the exhibition setting is obvious: the anthropological knowledge about the figures, their meaning and use by the source community and so forth is now secondary. Instead, the figures stand for the “fight against immorality and pagan superstition” as Braam writes.

Another example of the removal of such an iniet figure is told in 1917 when P. Josef Winthuis describes in the monthly journal his “fight against paganism”, which is the title of his article. Children brought him triumphantly a figure named To Mora. However, it was in the missionaries’ eyes only a “misera-bly misshapen dog figure”. The figure was exposed at the mission station to dishonour and to demonstrate its powerlessness to all. Then it was carefully packed and sent “as a curiosity” to the Hiltrup mission museum. 965 Although

963 "Aber wegen der Dauerhaftigkeit des Materials hoffen wir, dass sie als Denkmal eines jetzt so gut wie ganz christianisierten Volksstammes, als Denkmal apostolischen Eifers im Kampf gegen Unsittlichkeit und heidnischen Aberglaubens, aber auch als handgreifliche Erinnerung an die missionarischen Bemühungen um die Wissenschaft erhalten blieben, selbst im Wogendrang schwerer Kriegszeiten." (my translation, my emphases) Braam, 42, ANPMSC.


here the figure gets called a curiosity, it was clearly seen as a trophy by P. Winthuis.

The efforts to eliminate the societies were obviously quickly crowned with success, because by 1911 P. Meier reports that he had trouble buying the figures that were left. The locals did not want to sell them to him the reason being that there were only very few left.

7.8 Summary and conclusion of the MSC case study:

natural science pioneers and colonial politics influencer

The mission museum in Hiltrup was founded in 1897 and closed in 1941. The abrupt closure due to the Nazi regime was shared by many other mission museums in Germany and Austria. Geographically speaking, this mission museum was with only a few exceptions dedicated to the South Pacific. The objects from the former Bismarck Archipelago dominated the museum, especially the Gazelle Peninsula with the mission station in Rabaul. This emphasis in itself reveals the close connection of the MSC congregation in Hiltrup with the German colonial empire.

This case study shows that next to the focus on ethnographical objects seen especially in the second case study (St. Gabriel SVD), mission museums also housed objects from the natural history sphere, like birds, mammals, insects, seeds and plants. The Sacred Heart Missionaries were particularly interested in natural science. They were involved in the search and description of new species in their mission fields. That is why the Latin name of some species includes a missionary’s name (for example the patres Peekel and Meyer had their names used in this way). The composition of natural science and ethnological objects side by side shows that the MSC members had a “holistic” approach to the mission fields, meaning that they wanted to encounter, understand and present all parts of the new environment.

MSC missionaries cooperated with “professional” scholars in Europe, meaning scholars employed at universities or other research institutions such as botanical gardens, for instance in Berlin and Münster. This cooperation mainly involved shipments of samples and specimens by the MSC members.


967 Bernhardt, “Kultur oder Strandgut der,” in Reisen, entdecken, sammeln, 171.
The routes were from Vanuapope to Berlin, for example. The MSC also supported scholars who were on field trips with their mission-related infrastructure in situ. Other mission congregations in this study also transferred specimens from flora and fauna of the mission fields to Europe. But the MSC case shows how the missionaries were also eager to study and process this kind of objects.

Additionally, the Hiltrup mission museum also had natural history objects from their direct surroundings, meaning German flora and fauna. The intention of the mission museum was also to educate the pupils in their school. These local and European objects differ the third case study from the previous two, as it was not only a Missions- but also a Unterrichtsmuseum (museum for instruction). In Hiltrup, the mission museum also served as a resource for the formation of younger pupils; in St. Gabriel, the collections were also used in education but starting with the future missionaries, the scholastics.

For one of the MSC members, P. Johann Braam, there was a direct correlation between the fields of anthropology and natural sciences together with (mission) theology, at least in his documenting of the objects in the catalogues. He constantly tried to establish links between them in the different written sources of his that I analyse. The SSPC and SVD presented only Christian art from the mission fields as direct religious expressions by “new” Christians, whereas Braam sees links to the Christian message in natural science objects as well. An example is the stuffed quail, which prompts Braam’s reference to the mention of quails in the Bible.

The objects from the outer-European regions were all brought and sent by MSC members. Braam’s catalogue lists many names of the responsible “collectors”. On their vacations or after their return to Hiltrup, they gave information and explained the objects. The sources also give insights into the act of “collecting” itself. Many objects were given as presents (for example, on the occasion of a baptism), many objects were purchased, some were made on commission. As shown, the power-related circumstances of purchase were often unequal as when locals were forced to sell their most prized possessions (here iniet figures) to be able to pay taxes to the colonial administration. With some examples in the sources, light can be shed on the connection between “collecting” and destruction of traditional practices in the mission fields. This case study shows like no other how the objects were also seen as trophies. The missionary P. Van Klaarwater cannot give further ethnographic information about the so-called Penismuschel, but he sees the exhibit in the museum as a symbol that the mission eliminated these in his eyes sinful tradition. The example of the iniet figures and the bamboo stick, which were connected to the murder case of Mrs. Wolff and her child, shows again, how artefacts from the mission field could be presented as “as a memento to apostolic zeal in the fight against immorality and pagan superstition”, as Braam expressed it. The murder case also reveals how the MSC influenced German colonial politics.
Concerning the networks that the mission museum was integrated into: Hiltrup was also involved in equipping the Vatican mission exhibition in Rome, organised by P. Schmidt SVD. There was also cooperation between the SVD and MSC that let MSC members publish in the *Anthropos Journal* their findings from anthropological studies. Adding to these inner-Catholic edges, the multiple edges to professional scholars in Germany are noteworthy. As mentioned earlier, through cooperation with figures like Hans Nevermann (Berlin), Hubert Kroll (Essen), Erwin Stresemann (Berlin), Ilse and Bernhard Rensch (Münster), the close involvement of MSC missionaries and their research within the German ethnographic and natural science milieu becomes obvious. The networking included not only their support for the scholars in Germany through equipping with new objects from the South Pacific, but also the German professionals offered their learning to the mission museum.

The mission museum in Hiltrup reveals new characteristics of a mission museum. Amongst them, the strong focus on natural sciences and the involvement in the colonial politics of Germany are the most eye-catching.
8 Conclusio

Our museum should be a real mission museum, not only in-so-far as just objects from our mission areas are collected, and the whole collection has the purpose of bringing our missions into living memory; it has also been our main aim to preserve such pieces which in one way or another shed light on the work of our missionaries and bring them closer to the understanding of the people. [...] Everything that bears witness to the religious and moral aberrations of the pagan peoples and thus points to the necessity of mission is collected in the first place. As an example, I want to mention idols and offering devices, prayer drums and bells to wake up the idols, magic and protective means against evil spirits and temple pictures. [...] Furthermore, in contrast to this picture of pagan misery, everything that demonstrates the blessed cultural and salvific work of the missionary has been compiled; for example: samples from the mission schools, handicrafts made by the school children and apprentice craftsmen, statistical tables, and pictures from mission life, etc. In the third place, we collected what characterises the country and the people of the mission field, which is also important for understanding the mission work.968

This quote describes the intentions in around 1915 of the Franciscans in Dorsten for their mission museum (Werl OFM), and it points us towards the analytical research question. In Chapter 4, in the three case studies, and in the portraits in the Appendix, I answer mainly the descriptive research questions. The fifth descriptive research question also asks about the intentions, but it mainly presents those intentions from the missionaries’ point of view. (Therefore the intentions are discussed in the chapters so far and in the portraits.) In contrast to this descriptive question, the analytical research question asks about the intentions behind the mission museums as I interpret them, not as they have been proclaimed.

On the one hand, the statement from 1915 above shows clearly how the intentions are expressed in the primary sources, and I chose it because it includes several of the intentions that I found in the material. On the other hand, some museums did not express their aims explicitly. The museum curators did not reflect on this topic; for them, the intention and motives were self-evident. If there were no explicitly stated functions, I had to read the sources against the grain. Otherwise, I argue on the basis of the missionaries’ statements and remarks.

The quote above shows that the intentions behind the operation of such a museum at the beginning of the 20th century were diverse. There was never one single reason but a multitude of them. These intentions could overlap and be connected to each other, and they could change over the course of time. Some reasons gained in importance and some were dropped completely. Angela Jannelli describes how different museum curators of the same wild museum could have different opinions about the motives of their museum. Thus, the intentions are clearly a contested terrain.969

8.1 Intentions

I present here ten intentions that emerge from my analysis. The order of the ten intentions below does not express a hierarchy. It starts with the most often named – and therefore important – intentions, but it is not a list based on measurable characteristics because the aims of museums are not clear-cut.

I. The intention to make propaganda for the mission engagement overseas, to awake the interest for Catholic mission worldwide. This intention is the basic goal for all mission museums since it is part of every public appearance of mission congregations. Even if it is not expressed distinctly in the primary sources or literature, to raise the awareness for foreign mission was a self-evident task for all missionaries. Two of the four definitions of mission museums that I presented at the beginning of this study (Section 1.4.1) mention this express intention.

This advertising for mission also included the pointing out of the assumed need to evangelise. In the words of the quote mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, it says: “Everything that […] points to the necessity of mission is collected in the first place.”970 In the eyes of the missionaries, certain objects could show the visitor how urgently non-Christians needed to be converted. In a milder form, this necessity can also be depicted as a potential, a potential for more conversions. Here, we can see parallels with secular views on the potential for gain in other contexts. Johannes Fabian states in his writing about early anthropological “collecting” that the objects which were brought to Europe “demonstrate[d] to rulers, investors, and the European public at large the potential of Central Africa as a target of imperialism.”971 I argue that similar to this drawing attention to the potential for political and economic conquest, the intention behind presenting objects from the mission fields was to convince the European Christians to support the “conquest” of the souls in these foreign areas.

969 Jannelli, Wilde Museen, 175.
Especially in the SSPC case study, the striving for greater mission awareness in society was shown as the main goal of their efforts. This intention was named clearly in their publications. At first, it was about both the anti-slavery engagement and Christian mission in Africa, and later “only” about evangelising. The SSPC Sisters listed the museums and exhibitions amongst other forms of their propaganda, like their journals. In the SVD case study, this intention turned up more clearly in the second half of the 20th century. The young members who were museum guides should speak to the European visitors on behalf of the missionaries abroad and the whole “faithful Church”.

The term that is used by several congregations for this aim is propaganda, for example by the SSPC and for the mission museum Knechtsteden CSSp. It must be mentioned that the term propaganda comes from the Catholic sphere, from the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, founded in 1622. Later the term was used in a secular meaning and then got its negative – manipulative – connotation. Especially in Germany and Austria, the word is associated with the operations of the Nazi regime. However, because of the ecclesiastic origin, for missionaries this term could have a positive association even after 1945.

Connected to this intention of advertising for the cause of the mission is also the striving to convey the current theology or understanding of mission. The case of Limburg SAC shows that, for example, the Pallottines in their museum presented the concept of inculturation to the visitors. Limburg SAC is the only museum so far that also displays a critical standpoint inside their exhibition and explicitly says that mission (like colonisation) had negative effects for the locals in the mission fields as well and that the visitors should reflect on this.

Bernard Arens SJ, who wrote the standard work *Handbuch der katholischen Missionen*, mentions mission museums and (travelling) mission exhibitions as one among several means of advertising for mission engagement. That stresses this first intention not just from within the congregations (for example as the SSPC Sisters saw it), but also from the perspective of a missiologist like Bernard Arens.

2. The intention to present and document the engagement and history of the congregation. Here it must be reminded, that mission history was from early on a history written by the missionaries themselves. This second intention overlaps the first because of commonalities in presenting mission *per se* and presenting their actual mission engagement. Giving at least some information about the organisation that housed the museum is not surprising. Indeed, it is the basic goal of opening a museum *per se*: As Angela Jannelli phrased it, the basic intention of opening a museum is the wish to represent the museum’s

---

972 Schlegel notes as well that this term was used by the congregations. Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland,” 30.
own identity and engagement. Friedrich Waidacher states that the meaning of all museums was and still is to express a specific mindset or attitude. Consequently, by presenting the congregations’ own raison d’être and their history, mission museums are in line with these first two intentions that are also mentioned by Jannelli and Waidacher.

At first sight, these two intentions seem to be only directed towards the outer sphere, the visitors of the museum. But I argue that this presentation to the public is at the same time the curator’s attempt to formulate the congregation’s own identity. In creating an exhibition, in writing texts and selecting suitable pictures, the missionaries are also internally reflecting on themselves. In deciding how they want to be seen from the outside makes them also ponder on themselves. Thus, this is an intention that works both ways, for the public but also for the congregation itself.

Into this second category of intention I also subsume the intention to present objects that should show the “successes” of the missionaries. This aspect is connected to the above-mentioned presenting of objects that can point out the potential for mission. It is an intention that is mentioned in the literature as well. Especially Jacobs and Wingfield express this when writing about trophies in mission museums. They identify the so-called “family idols” that were given by the Tahitian chief Pomare II to the London Missionary Society in 1816 as “missionary trophies par excellence”. For the missionaries, these idols symbolised their victory: the conversion of Pomare II to Christianity. Now the “idols” were no longer needed for the newly converted, and they could be sent away. Some Catholic mission museums of this study also had such trophies on display, for example museums of the MSC and SSPC. But these objects were not presented in a similar prominent way that one could compare them to the Tahitian objects. Exhibits that changed owners in the course of the owners’ conversion to Christianity were definitely also part of exhibitions in Catholic mission museums.

It was the many mission history objects, and photos of mission houses and mission stations, as well as maps and tables which fulfilled the fundamental intention of presenting the work and history of the congregations. The focus on the printing press machines and tools that took up much space in the mission museum Maria Sorg SSPC is a striking example of this goal.

975 “Die Popularität des Museums als kultureller Äußerungsform könnte meiner Ansicht nach aber auch als Ausdruck eines gesellschaftlich weit verbreiteten Repräsentationsbedürfnisses interpretiert werden, einer Lust am Sammeln, am Zur-Schau-Stellen und am Erzählen über die eigenen ‘Dinge von Belang’.” Jannelli, Wilde Museen, 345.
976 Waidacher, Museologie – knapp gefasst, 15.
977 Jensz, “‘Kurze Anweisung Naturalien zu,” in Missionsgeschichtliche Sammlungen heute, 23–24.
978 Jacobs and Wingfield, “Introduction,” in Trophies, relics and curios?, 12. For more on these idols see Nuku, “The Family Idols of”.
This intention also has to do with the ages of the missionaries. In the case of Neuenbeken CPS, the old age of the returning sisters is mentioned as a reason behind the opening of the museum. It is stated that their goal was to share their experiences from Africa with the locals in Germany, now that they have returned to Europe after many years in the mission field.

3. **The intention to present the “other”**. This intention is often mentioned because it is the clearest intention that can be read from the existing ethnographical objects in the mission museums. This would be the first logical conclusion based on the presence of objects from the mission fields: That the peoples and countries far away should be presented with the display of ethnographical objects. The natural history objects, on the other hand, presented the natural environment around the people. The seashells, the stuffed crocodile, the dance masks and the woven mats should educate the European public about the cultures, the societies, the religions, and the environment of the people that the missionaries wanted to evangelise. Here it is the encounter with the “other” that the mission museums also enabled: They established a link between the European visitor and a foreign world, all represented through the diverse objects in the museums.

The museum curators saw this presentation of the “other” as a neutral act, as an innocent provision of exhibits. For the missionaries, they were just showing some objects, everyday items like jewellery or hunting gear. The active construction of an image of the “other” was not acknowledged. This image could be bluntly racist, or paternalistic or “just” creating a stark division between “them” and “us”. In this regard, the independent mission museums did not differ from other ethnographical museums of the past.

As can be seen, curators updated the exhibitions of mission museums in the course of time, when for example the figure of a black man was removed from the exhibition (see case study St. Gabriel SVD).

4. **The intention to create dialogue**. An intention directed to the public and following the aim of presenting the people abroad is that of establishing a dialogue between the European Christians and the new Christians in the mission fields. It is a step further than just educating the European public. Only a few museums expressed this intention and undoubtedly, it is a recent development. But still, it shows that the museums became a mean of transport for new developments when the understanding of mission changed in the second half of the 20th century.

As mentioned above, the changes in the overall attitude towards the mission countries and the young churches were absorbed into the museums, and the exhibitions adapted accordingly. The coherence and speed at which these developments happened were different. It is also doubtful, how “successfully” this intention could be achieved, given the fact that only some objects had to
represent whole cultures. A humbler goal, to create understanding and empathy beyond basic factual knowledge about areas like China, India or Brazil, would be a more plausible intention for a mission museum.

5. The intention of commemorating past missionaries, founders, and martyrs. Angela Jannelli describes the intention of remembering dead members of a certain community in her case study of the McNair museum in Berlin. This museum was not meant as a space of representation directed towards the public, but an internal space for remembering (Erinnerungsraum). And the same also happened in mission museums where the goal was to commemorate single missionaries of the past, the founders of the congregation or martyrs. This intention is connected to the general aim of congregations to present their own history. It has an inward as well as an outward function. It broadens the presentation of the congregation’s history by displaying concrete aspects of this history. And it also functions as a means of shaping the identity of the members, in creating a community based on remembering past confreres and fellow sisters.

The founders of mission congregations were often portrayed in mission museums. For example, Saint Vincenzo Pallotti, the founder of the Pallottines, was remembered in their mission museum Limburg SAC. The foundress of the Menzinger Sisters even had an exhibition dedicated to her, which was located in the room next to the mission museum. The SSPC Sisters plan to dedicate a former room of the mission museum in Maria Sorg to their foundress, Maria Theresia Ledóchowska.

The presentation in the museum Innsbruck OFMCap gives several examples of this intention. In Innsbruck, not only missionaries were remembered, but also the whole mission field that was lost to them after the First World War. In the middle of the room, a special display was erected. It showed a huge crucifix carved by P. Kosmas Glader in 1891. He died as a missionary in India and was buried there. But some small remains of his body were placed in the mission museum, at the bottom of the crucifix. Together with palm leaves, grass, a snakeskin of over three metres, a young panther and a lizard, they constitute a space for remembering this local missionary. A photo of this arrangement is printed in this article. There is also a photo of this arrangement, slightly changed and without the palm leaves, in the Capuchin’s archive in Innsbruck (see Figure 17).

Thus sources suggest that in Innsbruck OFMCap and in St. Ottilien OSB “real” relics were on display. This means they were close to the Catholic definition because these relics were human remains from “normal” missionaries, not from officially recognised saints. However, the intention of presenting an ideal missionary as a role model was very likely the case. Such presentations

979 Jannelli, Wilde Museen, 159–60.
showed a narrative framing of an isolated, heroic missionary, much as Rebekka Habermas points out for the general historiography of missionaries. Innsbruck OFMCap is a suitable example of this when tribute is paid to a missionary who was killed by a tiger.

I found that also martyrs are an important topic in at least six mission museums. The case study of Hiltrup MSC shows in detail how a mission congregation could include the presentation of martyred missionaries. Whether or not the missionaries were martyrs officially recognised by the Church did not play a role in their presentation.

6. The intention to raise funds for mission. The goal of fundraising is closely connected to the intentions named above. As I showed in the SSPC case study in detail, the Sisters’ goals for the visitors was to first raise their interest in the topic of mission, and secondly to awaken their sympathy for the new converts and the “target group” of the mission. As a third step they aimed to find support for the mission cause, in other words, they sought donations of money or material goods.

Some mission museums did not express this intention openly since it was self-evident. Primary sources reveal that in the second half of the 20th century,

---

collection boxes were ready for donations even in such a *scientific museum* as St. Gabriel SVD (see Section 6.5.2).

St. Gabriel SVD points towards another crucial issue. As a petition from 1949 shows, some of the SVD members responsible for the museum understood the reality of the financial situation of such an institution. They pointed out that the museum in St. Gabriel would need a continuous supply of funding since it would not be able to finance itself, much less to generate a surplus for the mission engagement abroad (see Section 6.5.2). The contradiction between this statement and the collection box in the exhibition can be explained by the fact that the missionaries estimated the income of the museum (through indirect advertising for the mission) considerably higher than the income from the collection boxes in the museums themselves.

Additionally, it was possible for mission museums which were highly *independent museums* to operate on such low budgets that donations which they indeed received exceeded the costs of running the museum. In other words: the more *independent* they were the more money for the mission cause could be raised, because *independent museums* are not so costly to run. Jannelli states that, in fact, it is simple to open an amateur museum because one would basically need a collection and one room to arrange them. The *wild museum* does not require any expensive technical assistance or elaborate exhibition design.982 That means for the context of mission congregations, the founding of smaller *independent mission museums* was in some regards indeed a feasible and relatively cheap undertaking. Apart from the bigger mission museums like St. Augustin SVD, many congregations had non-monetary resources to establish such an institution: In their big mission houses they could make room for displaying a collection, the members could integrate the working tasks inside the museum into their daily work routine and – most importantly – the available networks with missionaries abroad allowed it to “collect” and transfer the needed objects at a relatively low cost.

All in all, *scientific mission museums* could ask for financial support from the visitors as well, just as congregations had diverse means for fundraising, like publishing journals or organising bazaars.

7. The intention of recruiting new members. Some *wild museums* show the intention of recruiting new members for support of the museum’s general subject, as Angela Jannelli showed in her case study of the bee museum where the curators hoped to recruit new beekeepers.983 This is also the expressed intention of some Catholic mission museums. In the course of a century, the recruiting of new members was done in different ways; mission museums and temporary exhibitions were only one way. From the Protestant mission history, there are similar intentions to be found: The aim of recruiting young man

---

983 Jannelli, 225–34.
from rural areas was also shown by the *Missionsförbundet* (Swedish Missionary Society), for example, where so-called Congo busses toured the large country and their stops were eagerly anticipated events for the remote villages. Next to fundraising, the intention was to encourage young men to join the mission force.  

These recruiting drives worked in some cases; Fr. Gebhard Rahe came into contact with the SVD at a mission exhibition in Osnabrück and indeed he joined the SVD. In the course of his career in the SVD, he even served as director of the mission museum St. Augustin SVD.  

8. The intention to publicly present the scientific study collection. Obvious cases of this intention are St. Gabriel SVD and St. Augustin SVD for their “pure” ethnographical collections. Additional examples are Hiltrup MSC and St. Ottilien OSB for their “mixed” collections. It was a decidedly external intention and meant to involve the public.  

As shown in the case study of St. Gabriel, the mission museum was one piece in a “scientific infrastructure” of the SVD, as I call it, which included a journal, a research institute, and a library as well. The founding of the museum was aligned with the standards of the times for *scientific museums*. In this sense, the mission museums were used to situate the scientifically active missionaries within the wider scientific circles. The museums enabled congregations to take part in the scientific discourse at their time and to show the strengths and advantages of the global institutions of their mission endeavours. Some few mission museums, those that were especially oriented toward becoming a *scientific mission museum*, were, therefore, less oriented toward the general public and more toward the scientific community.  

The presentation of their collections aimed also to encourage missionaries when they were on a home visit to take up further “collecting” and researching once they returned to their mission fields again, which adds an internal function.  

An intention that is mentioned in the same breath with this scientific aspect of exhibiting is for the mission museums potentially to save objects from destruction. Here, potentially can only mean that events taking place in the mission fields after the objects had been “collected” and transported away to Europe would have posed a risk for the material survival of the objects. Therefore, any object removed prior to these developments were considered safe in a European mission museum. These risks could have been natural, such as

---

984 Gustafsson Reinius, “Touring the Congo,” in *History of participatory media*, 87.  
985 Finke, “Aus Liebe am Dienst”.  
986 Jerzy Skrabania states this intention as the second function of St. Augustin SVD. Skrabania, “Haus Völker und Kulturen,” in *Missionsgeschichtliche Sammlungen heute*, 46.  
climate or termites,\textsuperscript{988} or could be due to human actions, such as the burning of artefacts or the bombing during the Second World War.\textsuperscript{989}

However, I want to stress that this intention is unlike the others here mentioned because the fact that placement in Europe would indeed save the objects was not to be known at the moment of “collecting” and was not the ultimate goal at this point. It is, however, a function that with hindsight can be nowadays taken up. When keeping in mind the ICOM definition of a museum, mission museums can today embrace the purpose of conservation, research and communication together with the exhibition of objects that they have acquired decades ago and which might be the last ones of their kind still existing. But to state that this conservation aspect was an original intention of mission museums would be misleading.

9. The intention to educate young members. A completely internally focused intention is to use the collections in the instructions for the educations of new members of the mission congregation. The more scientific the mission museum the more scientifically accurate the education was. Note that public accessibility and internal use were no contradiction since both could be harmonised. A quote from primary sources in the case study of St. Gabriel SVD showed above that for some missionaries this intention was indeed the main motive behind the museum.

Not only the young members of the mission congregations were to be trained through study of the museum objects but also pupils from the enclosed high schools could profit from the collections, for example, in the MSC case study or Hall in Tirol OFM. Therefore, also natural history objects from Europe could be added to the collections. But the common case was that the foreign exhibits would prepare the soon-to-be-missionary for encountering life in the mission fields. This intention is also verified for the Protestant mission museum in Basel.\textsuperscript{990}

Apart from educating missionaries by showing exhibits that thus provide visual instruction as at universities, the mission museums served as a place where the young missionaries could have their first visual impressions of their future experiences in the mission fields.\textsuperscript{991}

\textsuperscript{988} “Here you can also see what function our museums had. If African art objects hadn’t been collected very early, they probably wouldn’t have survived time in Africa itself. They would have perished at an early stage due to climate and termites.” (my translation) Thiel, “Führer 1977,” 36.

\textsuperscript{989} For example, Franz Kirschbaum SVD opened a museum in Rabaul in New Guinea containing local ceremonial and religious art objects. This museum was destroyed in 1943 through an air raid by the US forces. But Kirschbaum had been “collecting” in this area from 1909 onwards. He had sent a collection of Oceanic art, containing at least 800 pieces, to Rome for the Vatican mission exhibition in 1925. Piepke, “The Kirschbaum Collection”.

\textsuperscript{990} Unseld, “‘Bilder vom Leben und,” in Der ferne Nächste, 185.

\textsuperscript{991} Catherine Elliott Weinberg describes how the London Missionary Society member Robert Moffat visited the London Missionary Society museum before he embarked on his travel. He
10. The intention to evangelise in Europe. In only one single case, the intention of mission in Europe is mentioned. Despite this unique direct occurrence, I see it as an important intention, since it can give a glimpse into the future of mission museums. In the case of Neuenbeken CPS, the sisters wanted to evangelise “a little bit longer” in Germany after they returned from Africa. This case is a striking exception because this is a 21st century mission museum that was opened in 2016, twenty-one years after the second to last foundation. That explains why this museum in itself has integrated an updated perspective on mission in the 21st century. Neuenbeken CPS symbolises the changes in mission museums from the late 19th century, when the first Catholic mission museums opened their doors, to the present time. These changes seem to include the perceived necessity of missionary engagement now in Europe, rather than ongoing work in Africa.

This list of ten intentions is meant to be inclusive of as many possible explicitly and implicitly expressed intentions as possible. Various special mission museums might have special intentions that are not included in this list, but I claim that the list covers the main trends. Felicity Jensz mentions for the Protestant mission museums in Germany six motives. Only one of them, the motive to raise awareness in German society for the colonial enterprise of the empire, was not to be found amongst the mission museums of this thesis. Ger- rit Schlegel’s three intentions are covered by my list, as well as the intentions which France Lord states in her work on the Jesuit mission museum in Quebec (education, edification, the inspiration to vocation for the Canadian Catholics, and fundraising).

8.2 Definition

After answering the descriptive research questions in Chapter 4, and having presented the case studies, and after working out the intentions behind the mission museums as a way of addressing the analytical research question concerning the intentions, I can now articulate a refined definition. The working definition that I established at the beginning of this study, which helped me to identify my objects of study in the course of this research process, has been enriched by the findings of the study.

The definition is as follows. European mission museums are permanent and publicly accessible museums, established by mission congregations located in their mission houses in Europe, and displaying typically ethnographical and told his parents about this visit and how the ritual objects strengthened his decision to become a missionary. Elliott Weinberg, “Moffat’s model house,” in Trophies, relics and curios?, 149.

992 Jensz, “‘Kurze Anweisung Naturalien zu,” in Missionsgeschichtliche Sammlungen heute, 23–24.

993 Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland,” 27–35.

natural history objects. These objects were “collected” and transferred from non-European mission fields mostly by missionaries with the intentions inter alia of advertising for the mission cause (propaganda), and of presenting themselves, their missionary engagement, their history and past missionaries, and the people they are converting. Further aims were to fundraise, to recruit and educate new members, and to present their scientific collections.

The enigmatic circumstances of the letter exchange that I quoted at the beginning of this thesis, between the missionaries Ferdinand Altnöder in St. Gabriel in Austria and Imre Nagy in Madang in Papua New Guinea, have now been cleared up. The crocodile that Altnöder wished for in 1976 could have been for example a *Crocodylus novaeguineae*, a species only found on the island of New Guinea. Moreover, this crocodile stands for thousands of objects – ethnographical artefacts, natural history specimens, religious art – which were “collected” by European missionaries as actors in vast networks behind the mission museums.

This hypothetical crocodile would have a fascinating afterlife that would take it around the world. Having started its journey in the freshwater swamps of the Sepik river area, it would end in a vitrine in a mission museum in Germany, Austria, or Switzerland. Along with the stuffed reptile, other travellers would have arrived by a similar route, for example some African masks or Asian Madonnas.
Appendix: Portraits of mission museums in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland

In this Appendix, I portray the individual mission museums from my above-discussed list. These portraits show the basic work for this study, especially for Chapter 4. In order to be able to summarise on common features and developments, I had to reconstruct the history of all the thirty-one mission museums of my list. These portraits answer the basic research questions, that is, simply what mission museums looked like, what they offered for the visitors, what was their history. The aim is to show the plurality of the phenomenon of mission museums as well as their common features. Also, the congregations which housed the museums are presented to give insights into the institutional setting of the museums.

The reason for placing these portraits in the appendix is that the detailed history of each and every mission museum in itself is not necessary for the understanding of the study as a whole. The goal of this Appendix is also to offer basic information for future research. As collecting the data for the previous facts-and-figures chapter was already helpful, this Appendix gives a more detailed and quick orientation on single cases, especially because the literature and primary source situation is difficult to come by.

At the beginning of this Appendix, I provide an alphabetical list of the museums, sorted by their names used in the dissertation and indicating the page number of their portrait. With this list, the finding of portraits of individual mentioned cases when reading through the main study is simplified.

The order of the portraits is then not alphabetical but has its own logic. Mission museums that belong to the same congregation or “family” of religious institutes are presented together because the congregations are also described. Congregations with more than one mission museum are at the top of the sequence of portraits. Then the congregations with just one mission museum in the German-speaking world follow, starting with the oldest, ending with the most recent opening date.

I analyse the museums along with the key issues of this study within the limits of the available primary sources. Where it is appropriate and helpful, I use Jannelli’s notion of the wild museum concept to work out characteristics.

The richness of how mission museums were shaped is evident but there are also recurrent features, traits that appear in several mission museums. Both pluralities and recurrences, are revealed when casting light on the main facts
of the mission museums. Noting similarities and differences, in other words, comparing them to each other, is another goal of this chapter, although because of the available sources this task has its challenges.

It was not easy to find relevant primary source material about the mission museums, let alone literature. This means that the used material is highly different from case to case, reaching from newspaper snippets to contemporary internet websites. Also, the experience of my personal visits to a couple of still open mission museums is woven in and this allows an additional angle on the museums and the actual exhibitions. A significant source is email correspondence with members of the congregations some of whom were responsible for the museum. Their ability and readiness to give information influences the length and depth of the portraits as well. Archivists were an additional important source of information.

All in all, the portraits may seem like a bricolage because they vary a lot. However, they reflect the diversity of the mission museums themselves. To master the challenge of this plurality, each portrait follows a grid as far as the source situation allows. With this grid, at least a minimum of comparability is provided. The ideal grid for presenting the mission museums looks like this: Under the heading with the name of the congregation, a short description presents the congregation. Then the individual mission museums are portrayed, with their given name in this study as the headline, followed by the original German name of the museum. The address and the website of the mission museum or mission house is given. The portrait starts with some information about the mission house or branch where the museum is located. Then the source situation for the individual museum is introduced.

The portrait then answers the main questions regarding the museum and its exhibition: When and where was it founded? What were the circumstances of the beginning phase? How did it develop and, if it was closed, when and why? Which geographical area is to be found represented in the museum?

The primary focus is on the museum founders or persons who were especially influential such as scholars.

The second focus is on the objects and their preceding transfer. This is linked to the whole theme of networks. Missionaries as “collectors” or locals who “collected” in the mission fields are presented.

The last focus is an analysis of the intention: Do the sources reveal a specific motivation for having a mission museum in this place, instated by this congregation? This main body of content of the portraits is often challenging to structure because these points of focus are always intertwined. For example, a scientific interest, expressed by the whole museum’s collection, can be the result of the work of a particular missionary whose interest might have led to certain kinds of networks. It is often impossible to unravel the tangle. However, the portraits start with the attempt to define a chronologic development
by highlighting personages within the “tangle” as well as the objects and their areas of origin, their transfer and the question of motivation for the museum.

Special features of each mission museum that I came across are mentioned as well, but the main grid is kept in place, in order to help the reader through this lengthy Appendix. The consequences of a problematic source situation, as well as the entanglement of the focus points undermine the ideal grid of the portraits.

The list of portraits also includes the museums of the three case studies, with the goal to have an as much complete list as possible. Their portraits are kept short to avoid repetition.

Because of the working definition, some institutions I found during the early stages of research were not included in the list and were therefore omitted from these portraits because they were not strictly mission museums according to the working definition. For example, the SVD also had a collection and exhibition of ethnographical objects in their mission house St. Johann, in Aulendorf-Blöried (Germany). It is referred to as a collection and there is a “museum guide” written about it, but this source makes it clear that it was in fact, “only” an exhibition in the mission house and gymnasium, but not a permanent museum. Another example is the collection and the exhibition of the MSC Sisters (Missionary Sisters of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus of Hiltrup), the female “twin” congregation to the MSC missionaries in Hiltrup. In their motherhouse in Hiltrup, a collection of ethnographical and natural history objects developed, “collected” by the MSC patres and fratres and, less actively, also by the MSC Sisters. This collection was, however, not open to the public, a crucial factor in my working definition.996

Some mission museums could not be integrated into the list because of the simple lack of accessible primary sources or literature. One example is a mission museum in the mission house Oeventrop (Germany) run by the MSC. It was in close connection to Hiltrup MSC and the same actors were involved in Oeventrop as in Hiltrup, a case study in this thesis. At the time I researched it, it was unclear how many primary sources would be available for a well-grounded portrait.997

995 Huppertz, Neue Weltsicht, Ahnenkult und.
996 Bernhardt, “Kultur oder Strandgut der,” in Reisen, entdecken, sammeln, 168–71. About the natural history objects: Tenbergen and Rehage, “Frühe naturkundliche Nachweise, Funde”. The archivist of the Sisters verified that the collections are only accessible for the Sisters and their private guests.
997 I want to thank the archivist Sabine Heise from Hiltrup who informed me about this museum that she just recently archived herself (April 2019). It shows that there are still new documents being found.
Alphabetical list of mission museums in this study

This alphabetical list is meant to simplify finding any mission museums because their presentation in this Appendix is in a different order, namely the museums are firstly grouped together according to their congregations and secondly ordered depending on the date of foundation. Different from this, the following alphabetical order is based on the names used in this study. If when reading the study the reader needs further information on a mentioned mission museum, this list makes it easier to find the relevant portrait’s page number.

Many dates of the opening and closing must be seen as approximate dates as discussed already in Section 4.5. Many museums listed here as open may, in fact, be open in a very restricted form (in terms of opening hours) or the exhibition is somewhat slimmed down from a former bigger exhibition (for example, see the case of Aachen PWG). For the reasoning behind these dates and further details, see the individual portrait.
Table 4. Chronological list of all Catholic mission museums in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name in the dissertation</th>
<th>German name of the museum</th>
<th>Congregation</th>
<th>opened</th>
<th>closed</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>GER</th>
<th>AUT</th>
<th>CH</th>
<th>Portrait on page:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aachen PWG</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum Aachen</td>
<td>PWG – Pontifical Mission Societies/missio</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamberg CMSF</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>CMSF – Congregation of the Franciscan Missionary Brothers</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardel OFM</td>
<td>Brasilienmuseum Bardel</td>
<td>OFM – Franciscans</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benediktbeuren SDB</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>SDB – Salesians of Don Bosco</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dachsberg OSFS</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>OSFS – Oblates of St. Francis de Sales</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiecht OSB</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>OSB – Missionary Benedictines</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall in Tirol OFM</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>OFM – Franciscans</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiltrup MSC</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>MSC – Sacred Heart Missionaries</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hünfeld OMI</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>OMI – Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immensee SMB</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>SMB – Bethlehem Mission Society/ BMI – Bethlehem Mission Immensee</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innsbruck OFMCap</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>OFMCap – Capuchins</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knechtsteden CSSp</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>CSSp – Spiritans</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liefering MSC</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>MSC – Sacred Heart Missionaries/ Bondeko</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limburg SAC</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>SAC – Pallottines</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Sorg SSPC</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>SSPC – Missionary Sisters of St. Peter Claver</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menzingen</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>Menzinger Sisters</td>
<td>1984–85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Münsterschwarzach OSB</td>
<td>Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>OSB – Missionary Benedictines</td>
<td>1925–27</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary Organization</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuenbeken CPS Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>CPS – Mariannhill Sisters</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riedegg CMM Afrikamuseum</td>
<td>CMM – Mariannhill Missionaries</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg SSPC Afrikamuseum</td>
<td>SSPC – Missionary Sisters of St. Peter Claver</td>
<td>1901-1938</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schönstatt S MS Schönstatt in weiter Welt</td>
<td>SMS – Secular Institute Schönstatt Sisters of Mary</td>
<td>1965-1970</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schönstatt S MS Afrikamuseum Schönstatt in weiter Welt</td>
<td>SMS – Secular Institute Schönstatt Sisters of Mary</td>
<td>1965-1970</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwerikberg OSB Haus Völker und Kulturen – St. Augustin</td>
<td>OSB – Missionary Benedictines</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Augustin SVD Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>SVD – Divine Word Missionaries</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ottoline OSB Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>OSB – Missionary Benedictines</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Wendel SVD Missionsmuseum St. Wendel</td>
<td>SVD – Divine Word Missionaries</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werl OFM Forum der Völker – Völkerkundemuseum der Franziskaner</td>
<td>OFM – Franciscans</td>
<td>1913-2013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werthenstein MSF Madagaskarmuseum</td>
<td>MSF – Missionaries of the Holy Family</td>
<td>1995-2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Würzburg CMM Missionsmuseum</td>
<td>CMM – Mariannhill Missionaries</td>
<td>1930s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zug SSPC Afrikamuseum</td>
<td>SSPC – Missionary Sisters of St. Peter Claver</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Order of Franciscans (OFM and OFMCap)

The First Order of Franciscans\(^{998}\) abides by the rules of the Italian Saint Francis of Assisi from 1221 and inscribed in the *Regula non bullata*. The first Order includes not only the Order of Friars Minor (OFM) who are usually addressed as Franciscans but also the Capuchins (Order of Friars Minor Capuchin, OFM-Cap) and the Order of Friars Minor Conventual (OFMConv), better known as Minorites.

Highest priority among the evangelical councils is given to poverty, both by the community and the individual. Main occupations were, through the centuries preaching, pastoral care and sciences, also work in connection to the emerging universities. The Order had to adapt constantly to change and the Capuchins are one result of efforts to reform the Order. The splitting of the Capuchins happened in 1525 and 1538. The main concern was to remember the basic rule of strict poverty. Connected to their preferred locations within the emerging urban spaces and their early mission endeavours, the connection to scientific developments, schools and early universities started already in the 13th century.\(^{999}\)

As itinerant preachers, the Franciscans spread from Italy to many parts of Europe, Northern Africa, and Palestine. Already the rule from 1221 included the aim to preach among the Saracens and other non-Christians. Forms of mission are to be found as a characteristic of the Franciscans before modern times. The Near East, northern Africa and as far as Mongolia were the extent of their goals. Their mission to China ended in the 14th century. In the 15th century, Franciscans travelled to the Congo and Mozambique. In the modern era, notably the mission to Latin America started as well as to Japan (16th/17th century) and again to China.\(^{1000}\)

In the 1990s, the Franciscans had around 18,500 members in 114 provinces with four of these in Germany.\(^{1001}\) Austria and South Tyrol form the province Austria.

The same is true for the Capuchins, who formed an Austrian and South Tyrolian province in 2011. Since 2010 there is only one Capuchin province in Germany.

---

\(^{998}\) The Order of Saint Clare (or the Poor Clares) constitutes the second order of Franciscans, who are the female Franciscans. The Third Order (Ordo Franciscanus Saecularis) is mostly addressed as Franciscan communities, consists of communities of men and women of various kinds. *Klosterführer*, 14. The Congregation of the Franciscan Missionary Brothers and the Meininger Sisters, which are part of this study belong also to the Third Order of St. Francis.

\(^{999}\) *Klosterführer*, 14; Frank, “Franziskaner”.

\(^{1000}\) Frank.

\(^{1001}\) Frank, col. 31.
The Franciscans and the Capuchins had together four mission museums in Germany and Austria: the Forum der Völker – Völkerkundemuseum der Franziskaner Werl, the Brasilienmuseum in Bardel, and two mission museums in Innsbruck and in Hall in Tirol.

Werl OFM: Forum der Völker – Völkerkundemuseum der Franziskaner Werl
Address: Melsterstraße 15, 59457 Werl, Germany
Website: www.forum-der-voelker.de

In Werl, the Franciscans founded a monastery in 1849 but Capuchins had been on this spot from the 17th century. The monastery in Werl was the provincialate of the province Saxonia. Today, the shrinking number of brothers demands attention, the future of the Franciscans in Werl is in question as is also the future of the mission museum at this location.

The history of this mission museum has been researched, and some articles have been published. The museum itself, especially under its head P. Reinhard Kellerhoff, published general guides and single brochures concerning special collections, such as the Chinese collection or the collection from Mesopotamia and Palestine. There is also a thick catalogue with hundreds of black-and-white and coloured photographs of objects from 1989. The present portrait uses these publications, articles, and the website of the museum as sources. For the development of the mission museum of Dorsten, which collection ended up in Werl, I refer to an insightful brochure from 1921.

The history of the museum in Werl starts in fact in another Franciscan monastery, in Dorsten. From this monastery, which was already founded in the 15th century, missionaries were sent out. They first shipped objects from their new location back home to Dorsten, and these objects were displayed at the entrance of the monastery. Objects initially came from Brazil and China and interest in them grew. Therefore, mission procurator P. Nikolaus Hasberg founded the first mission museum in Dorsten by organising a suitable space, which had to function in accordance with the enclosure of the monastery. The vitrines were made following the examples of the Ethnographical Museum Cologne. First efforts to open the museum started in 1909 and in 1912 a gen-

---

1002 Deutsche Franziskanerprovinz, “Franziskaner in Werl”.
1004 Erzbistum Paderborn, “Zukunft der Franziskaner in”.
1005 I want to thank P. Kellerhoff for sending me brochures and other printed material.
1006 Interestingly, in 1915, they were well aware that Werl would have been a better location for the museum. Prokuratorenkonferenz 23. Juni 1915. Quoted by Kellerhoff, “Einführung,” in Forum der Völker, 10.
eral mission exhibition in Aachen was held with the museum in Dorsten participating in this event. The museum within the monastery compound was finally officially opened in 1913, at first with free admission, then with a low entrance fee.\textsuperscript{1008}

During the Second World War, air-raids damaged the monastery and the mission museum. Most collections had been removed as a matter of prudence and were therefore spared. It was decided to move the museum to a new building in the monastery in Werl. P. Januarius Grewe, a returned missionary from China, led the new founding and in 1962 the new building was officially opened.\textsuperscript{1009}

In 1987 it was renamed \textit{Forum der Völker}.\textsuperscript{1010} The new supplement \textit{Völkerkundemuseum der Franziskaner in Werl} explicitly mentions an anthropological approach. The collections became bigger: new objects from other order-internal museums were requisitioned or externally purchased, and new geographical regions were covered. The new name symbolised a new program: Dialogue with peoples, cultures, and religions.\textsuperscript{1011} Nevertheless, the brochures from the 1990s to 2012 show that mission history was still important and that for example the commemoration of Franciscan martyrs was not entirely dispensed.\textsuperscript{1012} The 2012 brochure mentions personal belongings from missionaries such as suitcases or eyeglasses symbolising their modest lifestyle.\textsuperscript{1013} These personal objects can be categorised as mission history objects. The focus switched, however, toward a more scientific presentation, especially regarding, for example, their numismatic collection, but the narration of the Franciscan’s mission history is still strong in this mission museum.

The over one-hundred-year long history of the Franciscans “collecting” and running a museum has come to an end now. At the moment, the Franciscans want to leave the branch in Werl, and therefore, the museum is in a transformation phase. This process is taking place in cooperation with the state museum authority (LWL-Museumsamt für Westfalen).\textsuperscript{1014} In February 2019 the museum was closed though at the time of writing (August 2019) it seems that the future of the museum is secure. A regional private assembly plans to ensure the continuity of the museum in Werl financially. But it is clear that the Franciscans have withdrawn from running the museum. It will continue in another form, split off from the missionary origin.\textsuperscript{1015}

\textsuperscript{1008} Balthasar, 21–28.
\textsuperscript{1010} Kellerhoff, 13.
\textsuperscript{1012} See for example the German Archbishop Cyrillus Jarre (1878–1952), missionary in China. Wilms-Reinking, “Chinesische Abteilung,” 69.
\textsuperscript{1013} Museum Forum der Völker, \textit{Völkerkundemuseum der Franziskaner in Werl}, 15.
\textsuperscript{1014} Ulrike Gilhaus describes the processes and discussion of this transformation. Gilhaus, “Das Forum der Völker”.
\textsuperscript{1015} Telephone conversation with P. Kellerhoff, August 2019.
As for the earlier regions of origin, we can name China, Brazil, Palestine, Anglo America, and – to include also a European country that was a mission field for the Franciscans – Albania. During the 1990s, after the museum changed its approach to an ethnographical one, the collections for Papua New Guinea and for Africa were established. Part of the collection was also an ancestral skull (Ahnenschädel der Asmat) from New Guinea, which is a decorated human skull. It is not clear if it was ever exhibited.

In Werl, the coin collection is definitely a special type of exhibit. In the Chinese collection alone there are more than 3,100 coins. The collection was founded by P. Remigius Goette who became a missionary to China in 1881. P. Canutus Hanfland brought Goette’s collection in 1927 to Germany. The value of the collection, according to the brochure, lies in the fact that it covers all dynasties and even with examples from as early as the 7th century BC. Chinese numismatic history for almost 3,000 years can thus be studied in a European mission museum and indeed external experts have published studies of the collection.

The brochures concerning the different collections from the 1990s address the topic of how the objects ended up in Germany. Next to often detailed information about the objects, such as naming the “collector” and an inventory number, they almost all present some aspects of the history of the collection. One explains the decisions behind the “collecting” and presenting:

The selection of the collection was determined by the religious sense of mission of the missionaries. They wanted to show what the “pagans” believed in and how they lived.

The context of “collecting” is described as involved with the religious sense of mission (Sendungsbewusstsein) of the missionaries. The missionaries did not act as European scholars or anthropologists which would apply to a scientific museum. Quite the contrary, sources refer to religious actors who “collected” with the objective of presenting the foreign cultures and religions to the people in Europe.

The available sources for this museum allow it to reconstruct some ways of transfer to Germany. Many names and for some even more detailed biog-

1016 Balthasar, Franziskanerkloster und Missionsmuseum zu.
1018 This skull is pictured in Bernhardt and Scheffler, Reisen, entdecken, sammeln, 86–87. It is mentioned that the skull is not on display.
1019 Already in 1935 a publication of over hundred pages was addressed to present the Chinese coins to the German audience. Schlösser, Chinas Münzen.
1022 (my translation) Wilms-Reinking, 71.
raphies of the missionaries who “collected” and sent the artefacts are available, for example, Anastasius Schollmeyer (Assyrian objects), Vitalis Lange\textsuperscript{1023}, Arsenius Völling, and Meinolphus Hüffer (exhibits from Shandong). For Brazil, we can name Damian Klein and Candidus Spannagel. Furthermore, the following two missionaries were organising and transferring objects: P. Hermann Josef Steins\textsuperscript{1024} and Fr. Felix Zilas.\textsuperscript{1025} The first was responsible for the beginning of a Tibetan collection, and the second started the New Guinean Collection in the 1960s.

There was also a network of Franciscans in Europe that allowed the museum to be filled. Objects from the province of Shanxi but also other objects that ended up in Werl, such as a mummy and sarcophagus bought by a Franciscan in Egypt, were obtained from the Dutch Franciscan province. It should be noted that the mummy was initially used for education at a Franciscan school in Vlodrop, Netherlands.\textsuperscript{1026}

The Franciscans were also cooperating outside their Franciscan network: For objects from Palestine, they cooperated with P. Heinrich Häussler OSB who founded a Benediktinermuseum in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{1027} His network link to the mission museum was P. Albert Rittner.\textsuperscript{1028}

But it is not only this networking with other missionary orders that equipped the museum. Around a hundred objects were donations from a German parliamentarian, Dr. Ernst Majonica. He donated objects from Tibet in 1997 to Werl.\textsuperscript{1029} Egyptian objects came from the private collection of Dr. von Hebentanz, a German who spent years in Cairo and with Egyptian archaeology. He also surveyed the objects from the Egyptian collection, which were organised by P. Romuald Uhrich.\textsuperscript{1030}

As mentioned above, the mission museum in Dorsten already was in an exchange with state museums, as they built the museum’s interior furnishing following the model of the Ethnographical Museum Cologne. The cooperation


\textsuperscript{1024} P. Hermann Josef Steins (1912–1982): He left the order but remained close and parts of his estate were given to the museum in Werl, especially religious objects for the Tibetan Collection. Wilms-Reinking, 98.

\textsuperscript{1025} Literature about Fr. Felix Zilas (1905–1990) mentions the sending of objects out of gratitude for donations. For a short biography see Wilms-Reinking, 98–103.

\textsuperscript{1026} Wilms-Reinking, “Chinesische Abteilung,” 70–71; Wilms-Reinking, “Gesellschaft der reisenden Brüder,” in Reisen, entdecken, sammeln, 91. The guide from 2012 reveals more information about this mummy: In 1912 the sarcophagus was bought in Cairo by P. Maternus Jungmann OFM and was kept until 1962 in St. Ludwig in the Netherlands when it was transported to Germany. The mummy was indeed the human remain of a 14-16 year old girl, likely of middle class origin. Schoplik, “Palästina – Ägypten”, Museum Forum der Völker – Völkerkundemuseum der Franziskaner in Werl, “Ägypten”.

\textsuperscript{1027} Balthasar, Franziskanerkloster und Missionsmuseum zu, 24.

\textsuperscript{1028} Kellerhoff, “Einführung,” in Forum der Völker, 7.

\textsuperscript{1029} Wilms-Reinking, “Tibet,” 7–8.

\textsuperscript{1030} Balthasar, Franziskanerkloster und Missionsmuseum zu, 24. P. Uhrich is only mentioned by Kellerhoff, “Einführung,” in Forum der Völker, 7.
was also directed toward a state museum. P. Lange, a missionary in China, also organised objects for Adolf Fischer, the co-founder of the museum of East-Asian art in Cologne.1031

The early report about the mission museum in Dorsten, opened between 1909 and 1913, mentions that there was no entrance fee because the museum should not function as a source of income, rather “to raise and deepen interest and understanding of the mission engagement in wider circles [of the society].”1032 The brochure from 1921 interestingly integrates the First World War into the message to its visitors. It appeals to a national team spirit or even a shared identity in which the German missionary is now highlighted, needing the support of the German public.1033 The brochure explicitly demands repayment for the objects that the visitor can enjoy: “Every piece from afar that you see brings you a greeting from them and a heartfelt request to remember them and not to abandon them.”1034 Repayment for enjoying the museum1035 is meant literally in the sense of giving a donation to the Franciscans, but also in a national sense of togetherness between the visitor in Germany and the German missionary in the wider world. This connection is clearly expressed in this text. The monetary reimbursement is suggested as becoming a member of the assembly Franziskaner-missions-Verein, promoting the museum, funding the freeing of “heathen children” through bringing old stamps, silver paper, and tinfoil. Interestingly, the brochure does make no mention of joining the Franciscans and becoming a missionary. The goal of this first museum in Dorsten was therefore not for recruiting (or for scientific goals), but solely for fundraising and propagation of the missionary idea.

To understand the purpose of the mission museum in Werl after the Second World War, it is essential to note that the director had been previously active in China. As it is also stressed by Wilms-Reinking, this time the objects were in remembrance of the persecuted and murdered missionaries and the mission to China that was lost in 1949. Special attention was given to Archbishop of Shandong, Cyrillus Jarre, who died in prison 1952.1036

Later, the intention for this mission museum was stated as presenting the culture, everyday life, the mindset, the religions of the peoples whom the Franciscans encountered in their missionary endeavours. Phrases like “opening

1031 Kellerhoff, 7.
1032 (my translation) Balthasar, Franziskanerkloster und Missionsmuseum zu, 28.
1034 (my translation) Balthasar, 41–42.
1035 “Vergilt ihnen den Genuß, den sie dir bereitet, durch eifrige Beteiligung an ihrem Werke.” Balthasar, 42.
1036 Wilms-Reinking, “Gesellschaft der reisenden Brüder,” in Reisen, entdecken, sammeln, 94.
hearts for the incomprehensible” or “valuing the difference”, as well as terms like dialogue are used in describing the goal of the mission museum.1037

Bardel OFM: *Brasilienmuseum*

Address: Klosterstraße 11, 48455 Bad Bentheim, Germany
Website: www.bardel.de

The South American continent constituted a more and more important mission field for the Franciscans and Brazil was the starting point when first missionaries arrived in 1500. The monastery in Bardel, located in Germany only meters from the Dutch border, was founded in 1922 for educating young missionaries for the mission in the northern parts of Brazil. Around 300 Franciscan friars have indeed been sent to Brazil since then. A school developed from this, still operating as a *Missionsgymnasium*.1038

The written records of Bardel do not compare with Werl’s. But thankfully upon my inquiry Fr. Frank Schmitz dug out an old guidebook from the interwar period written by the founder P. Clemens Anheuser himself.1039 This portrait is based therefore on this guide, as well as on the description in Schlegel, the short description on the monastery website, and email correspondence with Fr. Frank Schmitz from Bardel.

The origin of this museum lies in the engagement of P. Clemens Anheuser, who started the museum after he had to return from Brazil to Bardel due to illness. In 1926, the first rooms in the school building were converted into the museum which then began to operate. During the Second World War, when the whole monastery suffered from confiscation by the Nazis, and in the postwar years, the museum was also the target of raids. In this time, written sources about the museum were destroyed as well.

According to Fr. Schmitz, the acquisition, that means “collecting” and transferring of objects to Germany, started from scratch.1040 The new exhibition was presented in other rooms in the school which resulted in an exhibition that can still be seen in parts of the monastery provided a guided tour is booked.1041

---

1037 For example: “Das Ziel des Museums ist es heute, durch die Ausstellung fremdländischer Kulturgüter das Alltagsgeschehen, das Denken und die Religionen anderer Völker darzustellen und die Herzen zu öffnen für das Unverständliche. Es will lehren, andere Kulturen in ihrem eigenen Wert zu erkennen und zu respektieren sowie in der Differenz das eigene Selbstverständnis zu stärken.” Wilms-Reinking, “Chinesische Abteilung,” 71.

1038 Franziskanerkloster Bardel, “Kloster Bardel im Wandel”.

1039 Similar to other guidebooks of this kind, Anheuser’s text also includes a clear nationalistic message, when he stresses the good influence of pronounced German missionaries in Brazil and condemns French propaganda against Germany during the First World War in Latin America. It is of interest how he chose the media of the guidebook to spread his view on that matter and to clearly defend his nationalistic notion of the Franciscan mission in Brazil.

1040 Email correspondence with Fr. Frank Schmitz, June-July 2016.

1041 Franziskanerkloster Bardel, “Das Brasilienmuseum”.
For this museum, P. Clemens Anheuser (1887–1968) can be named as the founding person. He himself “collected” with confreres already in Brazil for the purpose of establishing a museum.\(^{1042}\) He is also the author of the rather detailed museum guide, which shows his responsibility for the museum and its outreach, as well as his knowledge about the exhibits. It must also be mentioned that the enthusiastic stamp collector P. Anheuser additionally saw stamps as another medium to convey mission history and to impart the gospel. Therefore, the monastery also houses a stamp museum, the *Pater-Clemens-Anheuser-Briefmarkenmuseum*.\(^{1043}\)

As the name is *Brasilienmuseum*, and the monastery Bardel is part of the Franciscans’ Brazilian province of Saint Antony of Padua, the question of where the exhibits came from, is superfluous: the content of the museum is solely dedicated to Brazil, all the objects come from this mission field.

The website today mentions natural objects such as fossils, precious stones and stuffed animals (birds, crocodiles, snakes, turtles, fish), ethnographical objects, local art, and objects from a religious context, especially from Candomblé.\(^{1044}\) A similar range of objects was on display before the Second World War, according to the guidebook from the interwar period.

Since the beginnings of the German Franciscans’ mission to Brazil, the first objects were sent to Germany, but this process had to be repeated because of the loss during the turmoil of war. Fr. Schmitz mentions that this transfer often happened when missionaries were on vacation to their home country. Together with Anheuser, the name of P. Thomas Borgmeier OFM (1892–1975) is relevant. He left Germany to join the Franciscan Order in Brazil, was ordained in Rio de Janeiro, and became a prominent researcher in the field of myrmecology. He published numerous papers about ants and other insects in Brazil and worked at state museums.\(^{1045}\) It is mentioned that Anheuser was in correspondence with Borgmeier who lived in the south of Brazil and that supposedly, this connection led to the transfer of objects from Southern Brazil. Furthermore, one stuffed jaguar was supposedly shot by a Franciscan, P. Hugo Mense OFM (1878–1944) who presented the jaguar as a gift to the museum.\(^{1046}\) With all these examples, and regarding the number of Franciscans in Brazil, it seems likely that the *Brasilienmuseum* in Bardel was equipped solely by Franciscans. The jaguar is furthermore an example of a hunting trophy as a mission museum exhibit.\(^{1047}\)

P. Anheuser formulates the intention of the museum like this: “The museum was established in order to give students, brothers, and visitors a broad

\(^{1042}\) Franziskanerkloster Bardel.

\(^{1043}\) Franziskanerkloster Bardel, “Das Briefmarkenmuseum”.

\(^{1044}\) Franziskanerkloster Bardel, “Das Brasilienmuseum”.


\(^{1046}\) Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland,” 94.

\(^{1047}\) See Wingfield, “Giraffe, South Africa”. 
insight into the country and its people." Thus, the imagined audience is general visitors, pupils, and Franciscan brothers. General education about Brazil was one goal and as well a function of outreach and recruiting can be assumed because Anheuser’s guide book ends with an invitation to boys and young men to join the order or to support any one of them who wishes to become a missionary.

Hall in Tirol OFM: Missionsmuseum
Address: Stadtgraben 7, 6060 Hall in Tirol, Austria
Website: www.franziskaner.at

The presence of Franciscans in Tyrol, Austria, goes back to the years around 1580 when the Tyrolian province of St. Leopold was founded. The monastery in Hall in Tirol was established in the 17th century. Missionaries from Hall in Tirol went to Anglo America (Cincinnati), Latin America (Bolivia) and China.

For this portrait, I rely exclusively on one article that covers all the existent research about this museum because the primary sources were only recently rediscovered and research is currently being undertaken. The established, as well as the announced research differ in their research questions from those in my study. Nevertheless, through this one publication we gain indirect access to some primary sources like missionaries’ letters from between 1921 and 1945, and photographs from 1900 to 1930s.

The mission museum in Hall in Tirol was officially opened in 1935. But the “collecting” started earlier, before the First World War. In 1929 a brother mentioned his hopes for the soon realisation of a museum, so the preparations must have taken years although during this time there is mention of additionally organised travelling exhibitions for Vienna, Salzburg, and Innsbruck.

The first objects of natural history were sent to Austria from 1909 onwards, increasing during the 1920s. Then the museum, finally opened in 1935, was only open to the public for five years. In 1940 the Nazis confiscated the property of the Franciscans including the monastery in Hall in Tirol together

1051 Franziskaner Österreich, “Hall in Tirol”
1052 Zanesco, “Recovering histories of hunter-gatherers”. 
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with the museum which was never to open again though parts of its collection were rediscovered decades later.1053

After the rediscovery of the objects in the attics of the monastery of Hall in Tirol, over 150 ethnographic objects were examined, coming from Latin America, China, and Palestine.1054 Single objects from Bolivia that are mentioned in the article were every-day goods like hammocks, bags, baby slings, tobacco pipes, buttons, buckles, and combs. Also, weapons like bow and arrows, or harpoons were among the objects.1055

As the good quality of primary source material for at least Bolivia allows insights into the “collecting” in the mission field, it is possible to state that some parts of the collections were the result of “punitive expeditions” following attacks by the Ayoreode groups on missionaries.1056 This shows clearly the violent circumstances in which European “collectors” gathered objects for European (mission) museums. Another aspect that can be shown by the sources is how the acquisition and transfer revealed processes in the mission fields: When in 1928 the village of the Siriono group burnt down, their possessions were destroyed. “Consequently, in 1929 the padres [Franciscans, R LN] stopped asking for aboriginal objects so as to not overburden their proté géés.”1057

Networks existed around this museum since one network connection led to the discovery of the forgotten collection and the primary sources, like photographs in the monastery. It was the Ethnographic Museum Vienna (VKM) that traced back the provenience of a head trophy which may have previously been a part of the collection of the Franciscans from Hall in Tirol.1058

The origins of the objects were twofold: private benefactors are mentioned but the majority of the objects were clearly sent to Tyrol by missionaries from the Franciscan order.

Apart from the network for transferring objects, the Franciscans were also active in academic networks that included researchers like Martin Gusinde SVD, Erland Nordenskjöld, Theodor Herzog and Hans Krieg.1059

1053 Zanesco, 223–30. Alexander Zanesco connects here the end of the museum with the secularisation of the Guarayos missions in 1939. As he writes, the Bolivian collection was only one source among all the objects, and other arguments for this direct link are missing. I am more of the opinion that the confiscation during the Nazi period was the only reason for the end of this mission museum. As this study shows, it was not the only affected mission museum.

1054 Zanesco, 222.

1055 Zanesco, 228–29.


1057 Zanesco, 234.

1058 Zanesco, 221–22.

1059 Zanesco, 228.
The Tyrolian Franciscans were included in the network around the big Vatican Mission Exhibition in 1925. Judging from letters, they were sending objects from Latin America to Europe, starting in 1923. According to the article it seems as if those shipments were first going to Austria and then taken to Rome, so there was no direct link in the transfer between the Franciscans mission in Bolivia and the exhibition organisers in Rome.

Zanesco suggests the following functions for the mission museum: “helping to attract future missionaries, maintain and fund overseas facilities.” Education played a role too: the Franciscans ran a high school in Hall in Tirol, and a collection of natural history objects were given to the school for their teaching there.

Innsbruck OFMCap: Missionsmuseum
Address: Kaiserjägerstraße 6, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria
Website: www.kapuziner.at

The Capuchins of the province Austria and South Tyrol have their provincialate in Innsbruck, the capital of Tyrol. This monastery in Innsbruck is the oldest Capuchin monastery in Austria and Germany (established in 1593/94). During its long life, the museum was closed down for some intervals, the last time during the Second World War, 1940 – 1945.

This mission museum in the city centre of Innsbruck has until now not been subject of published research, but the current archivist is interested in the topic and she could provide me with some information. This portrait is additionally based on my personal visit to the archive to see the rediscovered objects (27th of August 2014) and primary sources such as three newspaper articles which were copied by Fr. Cunald from the originals in the city archive of Innsbruck in 1984. Although the sources are in fact published (with the exception of the photographs), I had access to these sources only through the help of the archivist.

The mission museum was founded before the First World War by A. R. P. Celerin. The location was inside the monastery. This meant that the mission museum was only open for male visitors because women were not allowed inside the Capuchins compound. This exclusion was gender discrimination,
and it contradicted the definition of a museum as a public space, open for the whole population.

After the First World War, the museum was closed and the objects were stored away until a dedicated building was constructed which took place from 1927 onward. If women were not allowed inside the museum before 1918, now they were more than welcome, as helpers: several Fräuleins (unmarried women) are mentioned, including an enthusiastic Missionsfreundin from Switzerland, who contributed to the building of the museum um Gottelslohn which means without payment. Finally, in 1928 the mission museum was opened again, this time for all visitors. Therefore it is also 1928 that counts for this study as the first “real” opening of the museum. There was no entrance fee, but a good sum of donations was given at this opening.1065

In 1940, during the Second World War, the museum was closed. The objects were brought to safety from Innsbruck to the Capuchins’ monastery of Imst because Imst was not confiscated by the Nazis like their Innsbruck house. After the war, the objects apparently moved with the changing location of the mission secretary of the Capuchins. Stations were Bregenz, Feldkirch, and again Imst, where the material – what remained after the years of wandering – was eventually recovered in 2014. But as P. Josef remembers, the idea of reconstructing the mission museum often came up from time to time, so the objects were never really forgotten inside the order.1066

The objects were brought back to Innsbruck, unpacked and inspected. Finally, since June 2015 the archival depot has a few objects in vitrines. In the entrance area of the monastery are additionally some of the objects from the mission museum on display. This small presentation also includes digital photographs of the mission museum from the 20th century.1067 This new presentation is in general about the work of the order, and its mission activity is an important part of that. The objects brought from the mission fields are used as symbols for this engagement.

The objects one could admire in the mission museum of the 20th century were categorised into ethnographic, natural history, geological, and numismatic collections. Single objects like weapons, clothes, jewellery, everyday items are named. Regarding the stuffed animals, a gharial, and a young panther which is said to have been raised by a missionary seems unique beyond other animals that also could be encountered in other mission museums. Areas of origin are India, Nepal, China, and Japan.1068

to the mission museum. This means, the museum was directly accessible from the street level. If this undated photo is indeed from the interwar years it would explain that visitors now could enter directly into the museum, which would mean that technically speaking women were not really inside the enclosure, only inside the “public” space of the museum.

1065 Fr. S., “Die Eröffnung des Missions-Museums”.
1066 Email correspondence with archivist Miriam Trojer, August 2015.
1067 Email correspondence with archivist Miriam Trojer, August 2015.
1068 N.N., “Im Missionsmuseum der Kapuziner”.
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The history of the Capuchin Order includes the merging of entities. That means that the South-Tyrolean province in Italy also belongs to the Austrian province. Therefore, objects from Indonesia which were brought by South-Tyrolean Capuchins to their monasteries in Italy, because of structural changes, now find their way to Innsbruck. Obviously, the networks within the Capuchin Order allow that objects may rest for a long time at one location but move eventually to others.\(^{1069}\)

The exhibits are described as “collected” and brought by the Capuchins themselves from the mission fields.\(^ {1070}\) The closing in 1940 did not mean the end of “collecting”. Apparently, the missionaries continued with their “collecting” and sending to Innsbruck, because there is a collection from Madagascar as well.\(^ {1071}\) Areas of origin that were added later are Indonesia and Madagascar.

There is one source that stresses that the missionaries were men of profound knowledge and education, a fact that the visitor would see while admiring the collections. That means that the authority, the interpretational sovereignty, must be reinforced by this statement: The missionaries have been there, they “collected” the material, they know better. Next to the objects, this museum is also described as offering further ways to inform oneself than “just” encountering objects: Mission literature and photographic albums are welcoming to be read in the rooms of the museum.\(^ {1072}\)

All sources that I used give insights into the motivation for establishing a mission museum. For example:

But through the mission museum our eager India and China missionaries have set up a wonderful monument for themselves and the whole province. This monument speaks louder than many words of the love of the Tyrolean Capuchins for the immortal souls; it speaks of the missionary love of the Tyrolean province.\(^ {1073}\)

\(^{1069}\) Email correspondence with archivist Miriam Trojer, August 2015.  
\(^{1070}\) “Neben den schwierigen und vielfachen Missionsarbeiten hatten die Patres in Indien noch Zeit gefunden, kulturelle, ethnographische, naturgeschichtliche, geologische und numismatische Sammlungen anzulegen, die sie in ihre Heimat brachten und museal verwerteten. Man muß über die Reichhaltigkeit dieser Sammlungen und über den Sammlerfleiß der wackeren Tiroler Missionäre staunen.” N.N. Another article stresses the origin again: All the objectere “collected” by missionaries. N.N., “Indisches in Innsbruck”.

\(^{1071}\) As the archivist informed me, during the opening of their new small exhibition in the archive, one brother who was a missionary in Madagascar for fifty-two years discovered the head of an alligator which he says he himself hunted back in the days. Email correspondence with archivist Miriam Trojer, August 2015.


The museum is portrayed as a monument for the Tyrolean missionary engagement itself. It is not Christian, nor Catholic, nor Austrian, but the passion of the Tyrolean Capuchins that is responsible for mission “successes”. The museum, for example by mentioning a specially commissioned crucifix including Indian flora and fauna, is presented as the bridge between the Tyrolean Capuchins as well as the Tyrolean locals and the far-away mission fields of China and India.

A source from 1929 adds another aspect to the monument as a symbol of the Tyrolean passion: the mission museum as a compensation for a lost mission field. In 1915, the British Empire forced the Tyrolean missionaries to leave India and Nepal. Soon after the ejection, it became clear that there was no possibility to return to India after the First World War:

Expelled from the place of their eager and faithful engagement, the Tyrolean missionaries built with the mission museum a beautiful memorial in their homeland.1074

In this expression of motivation, the focus changes from the audience, the people of Innsbruck, to the members of the Capuchin Order. The missionaries built the museum (also) for themselves, to remember a place they cannot go back to anymore. The visitors suddenly are not the main target audience anymore. The museum has an internal function. But it is not a paradise they want to remember since the description of the lost mission field is negative.1075

The tone changes in sources from the 1930s. Here, the mission museum is not only a way to almost personally experience being in the mission fields, but it is also a way to contribute, to help the Tyrolean missionaries.1076 New is also the connection between domestic politics and mission field: it was said that the already mentioned chancellor Engelbert Dollfuß (in office from 1932–1934) himself had donated an Austrian flag for the mission house in the new mission field in Manchuria.1077 With this, the mission history of the Tyrolean Capuchin missionaries, a new mission field in China and the remembrance of an assassinated fascist politician get mixed up in the mission museum in Innsbruck.

---

1074 “Vertrieben von dem Orte ihres glaubenseifrigen Wirkens, schufen sich die Tiroler Missionäre in ihrer Heimat in dem Missionsmuseum ein schönes Denkmal der Erinnerung.” (my translation) N.N., “Im Missionsmuseum der Kapuziner”.

1075 Also the locals are seen as problematic in the description about the mission engagement: “Das für Europäer mörderische Klima, die Lebensgefahr, in der die Missionäre wegen der vielen Giftschlangen un[d] der wilden Tiere beständig schwieben, das Kastenwesen und die Zähigkeit, mit der der Hindu an seiner Religion festhält, waren gewaltige Hindernisse, die dem Wirken der Glaubensboten Schranken setzten.” N.N. But narrations about the “successes” of the missionaries accompany these negative sentiments, like a high number of baptisms.

1076 “[...] und wer ein kleines Scherflein in die Büchse dort werfen will, hilft da draußen weit unseren Landsleuten bei ihrem harten Werk.” N.N., “Indisches in Innsbruck”.

1077 N.N.
Missionary Benedictines (OSB)

The order (*Ordo Sancti Benedicti*), whose motto *Ora et labora* is well known, also contributes to the history of mission museums. The Missionary Benedictines (or also known as St. Ottilien congregation) had two mission museums (Fiecht in Austria and Münsterschwarzach in Germany), and still has two open museums, Schweiklberg and St. Ottilien.

The history of the Missionary Benedictines, who are one of the nineteen congregations that make up the Benedictine Order, starts with the history of St. Ottilien. The Swiss Benedictine P. Josef Amrhein established St. Ottilien in 1884 as the first mission house in modern times in the German empire. In fact, St. Ottilien was a monastery. Amrhein managed to seize the chance that imperialism, a new colonial spirit in Germany, and German nationalism, offered as a supportive context for his plans and founded his missionary endeavour in Bavaria. At first, it was conceptualised as a society to evade laws against founding congregations. Josef Amrhein revitalised the missionary aspect of the Benedictine vision and tried to combine the monastic lifestyle with missionary engagement. According to the tradition of Benedict of Nursia, the monastery plays an important role, also in the mission field. The same is true for the collective, not the individual missionary. During the 1880s, Amrhein founded in parallel the *St. Benediktus-Missionsgenossenschaft* (which became the congregation of St. Ottilien) and the Missionary Benedictine Sisters of Tutzing (today *Missionsbenediktinerinnen von Tutzing*). Beginning from St. Ottilien, which became a fast-growing *Klosterdorf*, a whole village around the monastery, a monastic network, especially in Bavaria, followed. This included the monasteries (abbeys later) in Schweiklberg bei Vilshofen (1904) and Münsterschwarzach (1913). In 1914, the Bavarian government accepted the form of congregations – the abbeys under the leadership of the archabbey St. Ottilien. The Benedictine abbey of St. Georgenberg-Fiecht in Austria joined the congregation in 1967.

The first group of Benedictine missionaries, female and male, who left Bavaria reached then German East Africa in 1887. After some struggles with domestic politics and inside the Catholic Church, St. Ottilien received its own mission field, the Apostolic Prefecture of South Zanzibar, in what is today Tanzania.

---


1079 On a side note it must be mentioned that P. Amrhein was particularly influenced in his endeavour to become a missionary by attending the World Fair in Paris in 1867 where he encountered ethnographic objects exhibited by Wesleyan missionaries. Egger, *Transnationale Biographien*, 56.

1080 Egger, 52–64.


Nowadays, the St. Ottilien congregation is located globally in nineteen independent monasteries and fifty-six branches and is home to around a thousand monks. Their focus is on pastoral care, evangelisation, education, health care and poverty reduction.\textsuperscript{1083}

St. Ottilien OSB: \textit{Missionsmuseum}
Address: Erzabtei 1, 86941 St. Ottilien, Germany
Website: www.missionsmuseum.de

The archabbey St. Ottilien houses the most famous mission museum known to German-speaking missionaries (followed by St. Augustin SVD in Bonn) because several times it was pointed out to me in email correspondence as “the best example” of a mission museum. It is also the mission museum that has received most attention from scholars so far and it holds currently the web domain www.missionsmuseum.de.

The body of source material about the mission museum in St. Ottilien is indeed better than for most mission museums. During my visit in May 2013, I had access to the archive and received a first impression of the material including inventory list books, construction plans, photographs, and a “museum box” (Nr. A.15/Varia Museum). Because the mission museum in St. Ottilien has received some attention by scholars, especially during the last couple of years, I can refer to that literature for this portrait, mainly Christine Egger’s dissertation, as well as some brochures and guides from St. Ottilien. Although there is much more detailed information available for this mission museum, I restrict this portrait to the basic information for the purpose of comparison with the other portraits.

There are similarities between St. Ottilien OSB and St. Gabriel SVD. These two congregations, the St. Ottilien congregation and the SVD, saw themselves both as developing distinctly German missionary endeavours, had a focus on scholarship and research and claimed to enjoy a friendly relationship.\textsuperscript{1084}

The history of the foundation of the museum shows that the development from the first “collecting” and shipping until the establishment of a publicly open museum took several decades. The literature agrees that it was from the early beginning of the congregation itself onwards – that is in 1887 – when the first objects were sent back to St. Ottilien. From around the turn of the century, small exhibitions were arranged with these objects in St. Ottilien.\textsuperscript{1085}

The current website states that in 1896 an “Afrika-Museum” is mentioned in

\textsuperscript{1083} Benediktinerkongregation von St. Ottilien, “Benediktinerkongregation von St. Ottilien”.

\textsuperscript{1084} The close relationship between the OSB from St. Ottilien and SVD is for example visible in the correspondence between the founders, P. Josef Amrhein OSB and P. Arnold Janssen SVD. Bornemann, \textit{Ein Briefwechsel zur Vorgeschichte}.

\textsuperscript{1085} These exhibitions are mentioned by Egger, \textit{Transnationale Biographien}, 320 and沃尔施克, “Missions-Museum St. Ottilien,” 1.
archival sources. In 1911, the exhibition moved into the part of the building where it has been located ever since. 1086

The first objects came from their first mission field in Tanzania and so the first assembly of exhibits was called Afrika-Museum. When Korea became a mission field and missionaries sent objects from there, this title was dropped. St. Ottilien OSB became a “normal” mission museum. 1087

This museum became an enduring institution within the framework of the abbey and it came to occupy more and more space. During the expansion of the abbey (1910 to 1912), it received suitable rooms and since 1911 until today it has occupied the same spot within the abbey. 1088 In this phase, the museum already took up 600 square meters of exhibition space and was opened more and more for visitors from outside the order. 1089 In 1922 it was opened for the general public, until then it was only internally used and shown to special guests. 1090 By then, some objects were already put behind glass, and the first object descriptions appeared, some of them kept until today. 1091 That means, following the working definition in this thesis, 1922 is the founding date of St. Ottilien OSB.

For the years before and during the Second World War, not much is known about the fate of the museum. As the archabbey was requisitioned by the Nazis in 1941, 1092 it can be assumed that the museum was not left untouched. But the literature so far does not offer insights into this period.

After the Second World War P. Arnold Walloschek (1935–2015) was head of the museum for almost fifty years. Such a position in a mission museum meant that he had to do everything: being a guide, janitor and cleaning staff, publishing the guidebook, doing research (e.g. about Makonde wood carving), and expanding the butterfly collection. 1093

The “collecting” continued up to the 21st century; additions also came through purchases and donations. 1094

---

1086 Missionsmuseum der Erzabtei St. Ottilien, “Museumsgeschichte”.
1087 Missionsmuseum der Erzabtei St. Ottilien, Das Missionsmuseum zu St. Ottilien, ca. 1927, quoted by Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland,” 46.
1089 Schuster-Fox, “Renovierungsbedarf: Missionsmuseum der Erzabtei”.
1090 Egger connects the date of this opening with the decrease of donations because of the First World War. Egger, Transnationale Biographien, 320–21. Because no less than nine mission museums opened between 1918 and 1930, St. Ottilien’s opening to the general public was in line with this trend. See Section 4.5. Also, the current website of the museum names 1922 as the date of opening to the public.
1091 Schuster-Fox, “Renovierungsbedarf: Missionsmuseum der Erzabtei”.
1093 “P. Arnold Walloschek OSB”.
In 2010 it was decided that the exhibition was outdated (general concept, presentation, etc.) and barrier-free access would be needed. The whole mission museum received a profound “make-over”, with external help, foremost by Angelika Schuster-Fox. The long process that also cost over a million euros was accompanied by newspaper articles, email newsletters and an online presentation, as well as the attempt to keep parts of the exhibition open while renovating other parts. Content related, much work was put into making an inventory and research about objects, where it was possible also to try to reconstruct the provenance of objects.

As I visited during the renovation period (2011 till 2015), it became clear that the “make-over” was not only seen as a renovation of the surface but also the purpose of the museum was discussed. The output of this whole project is firstly a renewed intention and secondly a new interest in its own history which resulted in several published studies and a conference in 2016 in St. Ottilien.

Before we turn to the topic of objects, the history of the museums offers some names that can be seen as influential figures. First, there is Archabbot Norbert Weber (1895–1956) who had a personal fascination for Korean culture and travelled there several times while drawing, photographing, and even filming. He started to acquire objects for St. Ottilien systematically and 200 items are attributed to his purchases. He published literary descriptions of his travels in which he also narrates some of his purchases for the museum with clear admiration for their art and craftsmanship.

Next to Weber, who, with P. Meinulf Küsters (see below) was a founding figure for the museum, we know several more names of “collectors” for the museum: Fr. Bonaventura Schuster, Abbot Primate P. Notker Wolf, P. Bonifaz Sauer, P. Dominikus Enshoff.

A consequence of the relatively good records is that we also know a lot about the range of objects. However, I restrict my discussion to only basic information and certain aspects that I find special about this museum.

1095 Schuster-Fox, “Renovierungsbedarf: Missionsmuseum der Erzabtei”.
1096 For example “Startschuss zur Sanierung des”.
1097 Some special objects are also presented, together with their “biography” on the website (for example which missionary collected or hunted the animal, who brought it to St. Ottilien, etc.). Missionsmuseum der Erzabtei St. Ottilien, “Das besondere Exponat”. Also a new small brochure presents some special objects but it is not a common museum guide because it does not present the museum, only some objects. The new focus on the material is clearly visible. Gaus, Kleiner Museumsführer.
1098 The conference was called “Studientag zu den ethnologischen und missionsgeschichtlichen Sammlungen in katholischen Ordenshäusern Deutschlands”. This conference was also in connection with the DOK list that was discussed earlier.
1100 Schuster-Fox, 149–51.
Today, the museum covers three main collections: the zoological collection (around 500 objects), a collection of memorabilia from missionaries and from mission history, and the ethnological collection (more than 5,000 objects).1101

As mentioned, the objects came at first from African countries (today’s Tanzania, Southern Africa) and then from Korea, which were mission fields of the congregation. Interestingly, a museum guide from 1927 mentions also exhibits from the Philippines (for example, weaving loom, pipes and cigar holders for women), which were brought by the archabbot after visiting.1102 The congregation established its first branch in the Philippines only in the 1980s1103, but the Missionary Benedictine Sisters of Tutzing had a monastery there. Therefore, it must have been a visit to the sisters that gave the opportunity to equip the museum. That means the mission museum does also cover a region where the monks were not active, only Benedictine Sisters.

Stuffed animals constitute a significant part of the exhibits. The missionaries sent such a great number of objects back home (some hunted by them as well) that a taxidermist’s workshop was added to the museum. We find here for that matter, real hunting trophies. The animals are often referred to as a main attraction of the museum1104, to be seen in a diorama, with a painted landscape depicting a stereotypically “African” scene.1105 A certain fame – in the memory of students from St. Ottilien – was given to a hollowed elephant’s foot, which ended as a wastepaper basket.1106

One of the special characteristics of this mission museum is the huge Korean collection (around 1,000 objects), which is well-documented in some publications. It places St. Ottilien amongst other significant Korean collections in Germany.1107 P. Andreas Eckardt from St. Ottilien is even said to be the founder of the discipline of Korean Studies in Germany. His input on the mission museum is of importance since he was one of the middlemen in situ, a “buying agent” as Schuster-Fox calls him, for the mission museum. A good number of objects of the Korean collection can be ascribed to him. He was the

---

1101 Schuster-Fox, 146.
1102 Das Missionsmuseum zu St. Ottilien, ca 1927, quoted by Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland,” 46.
1103 Benediktinerkongregation von St. Ottilien, “History”.
1104 While visiting, I was told that students from the high school on the compound often visit the museum during their breaks. For them the animals are the main attraction. Also Egger states that the East African flora and fauna became the main attraction. Egger, Transnationale Biographien, 326.
1106 Egger, Transnationale Biographien, 327.
1107 Cha, Koreanische Kunstsammlung im Missionsmuseum, Schuster-Fox, “Das Museum der Missionsbenediktiner”.
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one in the mission field who purchased, especially ceramics, for the mission museum.\textsuperscript{1108} 

The objects from Korea seem to be the most researched in the museum, regarding their “biographies”. Even four staff members from the Folk Museum in Seoul came to make an inventory.\textsuperscript{1109} Regarding this exchange and the co-operation between St. Ottilien and the Overseas Korean Cultural Heritage Foundation in Seoul, it becomes clear that the network around St. Ottilien continues to expand in the present time as well.

The main issue in the context of the mission museum in St. Ottilien is the scientific interest some missionaries have for the congregation, as it became already clear with the focus on the Korean collection. This means that St. Ottilien was an actor in a network of scholars, private “collectors” and (state) institutions in Germany and Austria. There has been linguistic research as well\textsuperscript{1110}, but this portrait focuses on anthropological research.

P. Meinulf Küsters (1890–1947) was responsible for the African collection and he constitutes a node in the network that connects St. Ottilien to St. Gabriel and the SVD. Küsters studied anthropology in St. Gabriel under P. Wilhelm Schmidt SVD (see Section 6.4.1) before he obtained his doctorate in Leipzig. On his missionary engagement in the 1920s in South Africa, Küsters also conducted fieldwork. Back in Germany, he started working in the African department of the Ethnological Museum in Munich (Staatliches Museum für Völkerkunde München). Küsters then continued with his research in present-day Tanzania. He “collected” as well, but for the Ethnological Museum in Munich, where he processed the collection after returning to Europe again. He is said to have “collected” several hundred objects for this state museum.\textsuperscript{1111} Küsters is, therefore, a figure who connected a mission museum to another mission museum (OSB to SVD), plus connecting a mission museum to a state-run ethnological museum.

This network with Munich also included archabbot Weber. The exchange through the network between St. Ottilien and Munich was manifold: There was an exchange in immaterial terms such as knowledge because Küsters must have learned a lot from the state museum concerning management and care for a collection and a museum. There was access to a region in Africa for

\textsuperscript{1108} Schuster-Fox, 150–51; Cha, \textit{Koreanische Kunstsammlung im Missionsmuseum}, 10. Next to these purchases, P. Eckardt also donated personal objects to the museum, such as clothes, everyday items, musical instruments, books, and books written by him.


\textsuperscript{1110} One example is Joachim Ammann, whose research was mainly addressed towards educating new missionaries. Egger, \textit{Transnationale Biographien}, 323.

\textsuperscript{1111} Egger, 322–23. Küsters also conducted “fieldwork” in Europe when he saw a chance: During the \textit{Oktoberfest} in 1930, as an “attraction”, African women were exhibited like objects or animals. He recorded the women. This example shows the attitude of ethnological research in this time: the encounter with the research object did not have to be “authentic”, that means in Africa, it could also be in Munich, surrounded by curious Europeans who were not bewildered of having people presented like exotic objects.
“collecting” that the state museum gained through the missionary frame of the congregation when Küsters “collected” for them. Moreover, there was also the exchange of material goods, meaning that exhibits were exchanged between the two museums.\footnote{This issue was pointed out to me during my visit in 2013. I have not found a hint in the literature so far as the focus on this topic of exchange is absent.}

Another example of an actor in the scientific network of St. Ottilien is the Munich resident Johann Nepomuk Ertl who used missionaries from St. Ottilien\footnote{Other sources state that he used missionaries from Münsterschwarzach, but in any case it were members from the St. Ottilien Congregation. See Scherer, “Chronik der Sektion Coleoptera”.} to expand his collection of insects. In letter correspondence, he instructed them on how to “collect” and care for the beetles.\footnote{Egger, Transnationale Biographien, 327–28.} As he paid for their services, it was first business but also an exchange of knowledge. Missionaries contributed in this way to a private collection that is now in the possession of the state (Zoologische Staatssammlung München) and this also explains how an insect, the Haefligeri,\footnote{Xylocopa haefligeri Friese, 1909. “Carpenter bee”.} came to be named after a missionary, P. Johannes Häfliger.

Having discussed objects and networks, let us have a closer look at the aims of the mission museum. The earliest source speaks of remembering the history of the congregation as the main goal. This aim should be achieved with pictures from mission stations that were destroyed and with displays of clothing and letters. Next to these common mission history objects, even bones of killed missionaries were on display.\footnote{Das Missionsmuseum zu St. Ottilien, ca. 1927, quoted by Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland,” 46.} The bones are mentioned amongst every-day objects and clothes, so they are not treated as some special exhibits in the source from 1927. As Schlegel also does not comment on this fact, I have to remain sceptical about the display of bones. However, if there had really been pieces of bones from murdered missionaries it would mean that in the Catholic sense these pieces of human remains were a special type of relics, not like the category of relics in Jacobs, Knowles and Wingfield (2015).

This early aim to commemorate history was retained even after the renovation in 2011 with the so-called Commemoration Room. It was dedicated to the Missionary Benedictines (male and female), who had been killed in Korea during the communist era and in German East-Africa during the Maji Maji rebellion from 1905 to 1907.\footnote{Schuster-Fox, “Das Museum der Missionsbenediktiner,” in Entdeckung Korea! Schätze aus deutschen Museen, 150.} The museum guide from 1982 gives all the missionaries’ names and years of death\footnote{Walloschek, “Missions-Museum St. Ottilien,” 13–14.}, so the remembrance of martyrs in the congregation is an important goal of the museum, into the 21st century.
Imparting the general history of the congregation is done by wallcharts and maps, from European and outer-European networks of monasteries and abbeys. Maps are also shown in the guidebook from 1982.

It seems that through the renovation the St. Ottilien congregation resolved to re-establish the early aim of informing viewers of their mission. They present themselves like this:

In the years 2011–2015 the museum will be extensively renovated. The missionary character of the museum will now be emphasised, with an additional documentation of the lives of the missionaries.1119

Thus the early aim was brought back, including again displaying objects owned by missionaries such as shoes or a tropical helmet. But the literature also mentions other goals: to gain donations and to recruit new members.1120

Now I turn to the question of where to locate the mission museum in St. Ottilien along the axes of non-scientific/scientific and professional/amateurish. On the one hand, the museum had connections and cooperation with academic institutions, as well as “professional museum-trained” curators and an inventory book from as early as 1909.1121 The museum is therefore in the early days undeniably oriented toward scientific and professional museum work. On the other hand, the prominent display of an “exotic” environment through stuffed animals is also significant. These dioramas were also meant for entertaining children. Judging from my visit and archived photographs, St. Ottilien was definitely more of a professional museum with dioramas and the exhibition furniture oriented to a professional standard for museums of the time. A hint for a more independent attitude, however, may be the tip on the current website: bring the children to the museum before Christmas Eve, so that the parents can set up the Christmas tree in the meantime without being bothered.1122

Münsterschwarzach OSB: Missionsmuseum
Address: Schweinfurter Straße 40, 97359 Schwarzach am Main, Germany
Website: www.abtei-muensterschwarzach.de

1119 (my translation) Missionsmuseum der Erzabtei St. Ottilien, “Museumsgeschichte”.
1121 Mentioned in Schuster-Fox, 149.

325
Since 1913 the Mission Benedictines have revitalised the monastery in Münsterschwarzach, which looks back to its origins as a nunnery in the 8th century.\textsuperscript{1123}

Sources for this museum are rare and so I draw mainly on a museum leaflet probably from the 1980s or 1990s and one journal article from 1993.\textsuperscript{1124} This anonymous article is especially of interest because it was written to make the museum more popular and to invite new possible visitors to the abbey. But nevertheless, it is – regarding its purpose of inviting visitors into the museum – quite openly critical towards the exhibition and its message as well as its contemporary feel.

The mission museum in Münsterschwarzach was opened 1925\textsuperscript{1125} or 1927\textsuperscript{1126}. In 1982 it was remodelled and reopened, and as the journal article states, it showed the “missionary state of mind in the late 1970s.”\textsuperscript{1127} For the early 1990s, 20,000 visitors per year were claimed.\textsuperscript{1128} In 2012 the museum was closed.\textsuperscript{1129}

Regarding the origins of the collection, Schlegel mentions Tanzania, Kenya, South Africa, China, Korea and the Philippines.\textsuperscript{1130} A guidebook names Africa, Arabia and Korea as origins of the collection.\textsuperscript{1131}

The following exhibits are mentioned: stuffed animals (lion, warthog, hippopotamus head), butterflies, snakeskins and elephant teeth; colonial currency, a Buddha statue, diverse clothes, and furniture.\textsuperscript{1132} Special attention is given to art: wood carvings from the Makonde people (Tanzania) are highlighted. The wood carvings are mentioned in the journal and have their own brochure.

The genesis of the collection and the transfer of the objects are also described: Pioneers, as the missionaries “decades ago” were called, had sent these objects to Germany whenever it was possible.\textsuperscript{1133} The organisation, gathering and the transfer of these exhibits are exclusively ascribed to the Benedictines of Münsterschwarzach\textsuperscript{1134} or to the order as such; no other actors are

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1123} Klosterführer, 129.
\item \textsuperscript{1124} N.N., “Willkommen in Münsterschwarzach”.
\item \textsuperscript{1125} Das Museumsportal, “Abtei- und Missionsmuseum”; Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland,” 103.
\item \textsuperscript{1126} Email correspondence with P. Dr. Franziskus Büll OSB, October 2016.
\item \textsuperscript{1127} (my translation) N.N., “Willkommen in Münsterschwarzach”.
\item \textsuperscript{1128} N.N.
\item \textsuperscript{1129} Email correspondence with P. Dr. Franziskus Büll OSB, October 2016.
\item \textsuperscript{1130} Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland,” 103.
\item \textsuperscript{1131} Klosterführer, 129.
\item \textsuperscript{1132} N.N., “Willkommen in Münsterschwarzach”.
\item \textsuperscript{1133} “Diese Pioniere haben dann, immer wenn es möglich war, Schlangenhäute und Elefantenzähne, Kolonialgeld, Tierschädel, Kleidung und Möbel in die Heimat geschickt, in den Zeiten, als noch kein Fernsehen und keine Medienflut den Horizont über den eigenen Tellerrand hinaus zu erweitern vermochten.” N.N. Heimat, an important term in discussion the known and the unknown, the self and the other, is translated here with Germany, which misses the emotional content of the term Heimat.
\item \textsuperscript{1134} Once referred even to “men from Münsterschwarzach”.
\end{itemize}
mentioned. Because there is also no reference to any scientific approach towards the objects, this museum can be located closer to the non-scientific museum than to the scientific museum – at least regarding the exhibition that the above-mentioned article from 1993 describes. The author expresses hesitantly that the exhibition seems outdated or out of place because the whole museum is presented as a relict. “The museum is a piece of mission history.” And: “the exhibits [...] make it understandable under which conditions the men of Münsterschwarzach were setting out, before the time of the jet-set.” Mission is interpreted here as something in the past, before the time of meaning modern means of transport like aeroplanes and mass media. But then the Benedictines’ mission had local men as superiors and bishops. This change, from the European mission to a local Church, is expressed through the Tanzanian art in the museum. Just as Jannelli describes one characteristic of the wild museum, to narrate or relate to an object (Erzählen über Dinge), the article tells of Fr. Theodor, who used the Makonde art in his guided tour to narrate to the author of the article what he sees as a success story of the Benedictines’ mission.

Apart from portraying the general history and “success” of the missionaries, the topic of martyrs was also to be found in the exhibition. Photos of murdered Benedictines were shown with the slogan: “The martyr’s blood is the seed of new Christians.” The intention of the mission museum was therefore convincingly to be found in telling the history, struggles – even martyrdom – but finally the “successes” by the missionaries from Münsterschwarzach.

The article mentions that the mission museum “on the first sight presents a rich Sammelsurium from the diverse cultures of the earth” The term Sammelsurium can be translated into English with mishmash, hotchpotch or smorgasbord. It expresses a total contrast with a visitor’s expectations of a professional museum. If Sammelsurium is the choice of word to describe this mission museum, the label independent museum seems suitable.

Fiecht OSB: Missionsmuseum
Address: Abbey St. Georgenberg-Fiecht, Vomp 4, 6134 Vomp, Austria
Website: www.st-georgenberg.at

The mission museum of the St. Ottilien congregation in Austria was situated in the venerable abbey Fiecht, Tyrol, a site that traces its religious connotations back to as early as the 10th century. Fiecht was until recently in an

1135 (my translation) N.N.
1136 Jannelli, Wilde Museen, 345.
1137 (my translation) N.N., “Willkommen in Münsterschwarzach”. This phrase goes back to Tertullian.
1138 N.N.
1139 St. Georgenberg, “Unsere tausendjährige Geschichte”.
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association with St. Georgenberg, the pilgrimage monastery which is located in foot walking distance up the mountains. St. Georgenberg-Fiecht refers to both abbeys, but the mission museum was located only in Fiecht, and therefore only Fiecht is the focus of this portrait. Until 1967 the abbeys belonged to the Austrian Benedictines, then they joined the St. Ottilien congregation.

This portrait bases itself on an informative brochure of all museum facilities in the abbey Fiecht (museum and Informationsgang), as well as my visit on the 8th of April 2013 and my email correspondence with P. Thomas Naupp OSB, the archivist and librarian of the abbey. He has also published reports about the state of the museum in the 1980s which are also used for this portrait.

When the abbey St. Georgenberg-Fiecht became part of the St. Ottilien congregation in 1967, the then subprior P. Edgar Dietel wanted to open a mission museum as well. African objects were brought from St. Ottilien to Fiecht. They were put on display in the corridor on the ground floor, and it was therefore called Informationsgang (information corridor). That means, from 1967 onwards, right after joining St. Ottilien, they opened a small mission museum. At this point, the objects did not occupy their own space inside the abbey, this step came later. In 1988 the abbey celebrated 850 years of Benedictines in St. Georgenberg-Fiecht. That was the reason to open a Heimat- und Missionsmuseum in Fiecht. Only one of these twenty-four display cases was dedicated to mission. It presented mainly different local missionaries, their journeys, achievements, and also martyrdoms. This whole museum had to be moved into a more suitable place and was renamed simply to a Stiftsmuseum (abbey museum). However, the “mission part” was split up in this reorganisation. From then until 2016, the Stiftsmuseum contained objects from the history of the abbey: art, science, liturgy and history, including a papal bull from the 12th century, Bible manuscripts and a Bible dating from 1546. The missionary part was again transferred to the corridors, the place where the objects from St. Ottilien had been presented in the beginning.

In 2016 the Benedictines decided to abandon the abbey Fiecht and to use only St. Georgenberg for their decreasing number of members. During the writing of this thesis, the mission museum was closed down having been open from 1967 to 2016, and its objects were moved or indeed returned once more to St. Ottilien OSB.

With the splitting up of the Stiftsmuseum and the mission-related exhibition, we see here a unique combination: there is storytelling about the history of the abbey on the one hand and, on the other, about the missionary activities. The two parts are separated: the abbey museum and the mission exhibition in the

1140 For explanation of a Heimatmuseum see Section 4.3.
1141 Email correspondence with P. Thomas Naupp OSB, August-September 2016. I want to thank P. Naupp for answering my questions and providing literature.
1142 Naupp, Stiftsmuseum Fiecht, 65.
1144 “Mönche geben Stiftsgebäude in“.
corridors. The latter should give the visitors “a small overview of the work of the Mission Benedictines in the young Churches in Asia, Africa and South America.” That means the presented function of the museum was the information about their missionary work in the world.

When I visited the museum, the first room of the corridor was dedicated to Korea, the second to Latin America and three rooms to Africa. The missionary congregation of St. Ottilien overall, plus the female branch (Missionary Benedictine Sisters of Tutzing) and their work and efforts, are all mentioned in the brochure as well as in texts accompanying the exhibition. Thus, the emphasis in this mission museum is definitely on mission activities rather than on a pure presentation of objects from these three continents. This is also obvious because the next room after “Africa” is called the congregation room (Kongregations-Raum) where the global activities of the St. Ottilien congregation are presented together with a world map and the coat of arms.

Of special interest is the presentation of Benedictine abbeys, in Europa and in mission fields such as Tanzania or Kenya. Photographs and some information like founding dates are given on installations. The next room is called the “mission room” and pays tribute to individual missionaries each with either a large photo or a painting and a short biography. The selection of portrayed missionaries here is interesting: the “Apostle to the Gentiles” Paul, is presented next to Saint Francis Xavier and to the Saint Thérèse of Lisieux. There are also Benedictines who were murdered during their mission engagement, for example, Cassian Spiss OSB. Three more rooms follow; one dedicated to the associated monastery of St. Georgenberg, the next one to the abbey Fiecht, and the last one to Saint Benedict.

This example of a mission museum clearly has a broad approach to the topic of mission, expressed through the various rooms without ethnographic objects, the presentation of abbeys in Europe and the mission fields next to each other and also through a general emphasis on art, for example, African artists.

1146 Interestingly, the brochure very casually mentions that some displayed vessels from the Silla dynasty are, at 1400 years, the oldest objects in the whole abbey. It is to be understood that more attention is paid to much younger objects in the abbey museum than to these funerary objects from pre-Christian Korea. Benediktinerstift St. Georgenberg-Fiecht, 52.
1147 An example from the South America Room explains when the first monastery of the St. Ottilien Congregation was established and in which South American state. Another informs visitors that the abbeys Münsterschwarzach and St. Georgenberg-Fiecht support a group of Fair Trade producers in Peru. Visit in Fiecht on April 8, 2013.
1148 Martyrs of the congregation are mentioned also in the brochure.
1149 Benediktinerstift St. Georgenberg-Fiecht, 50–71.
1150 One example is the work of Rina Nansukusa Kasuja, whose naïve paintings refer to the AIDS crisis or traditional division of labor between the genders. Benediktinerstift St. Georgenberg-Fiecht, 58–59.
Neither the texts in the exhibition nor the brochure touch upon the presence of the objects in the abbey. Their path from Korea, Peru or Kenya to the Tyrolian valley is not mentioned. However, the archivist and librarian of St. Georgenberg-Fiecht, P. Naupp OSB, pointed out that indeed there were objects from Africa brought to Tyrol before the opening of the museum. But afterwards, the connection to the bigger and hierarchical higher St. Ottilien is decisive for the collection in Fiecht.

As a consequence of the scarcity of historical information, a clear sense of the intention for founding a mission museum is missing. But apart from the above-quoted broad motivation – to give the visitor an insight into the cultures – we have something quite unique to highlight in the abbey of Fiecht, namely, the remark that after joining the St. Ottilien congregation, the subprior wanted to open a mission museum as well. This suggests that mission museum was felt to be a “must-have” for the abbey after joining the mission congregation. As the mission museum in St. Ottilien was indeed famous, this mindset – to imitate the abbeys they have joined – seems reasonable.

Schweiklberg OSB: Afrikamuseum

Address: Schweiklbergstraße 1, 94474 Vilshofen an der Donau, Germany
Website: www.schweiklberg.de

In 1904, in the Bavarian town of Vilshofen, the monastery Schweiklberg was founded within the network of St. Ottilien. In 1914, Scheiklberg became an abbey. Here, we find a museum that is sometimes called Afrikamuseum, sometimes Schwarzafrikamuseum because it focuses entirely on sub-Saharan Africa. However, I use the more frequently used name Afrikamuseum which is also used in the entrance to the museum.

Available literature on Schweiklberg is limited. For this portrait, I rely primarily on my own notes from my visit on the 27th of March 2013 and on the several pages long self-representation of the museum on the website www.schwarz-afrika-museum.de. This site gives information on the museum in general and describes some objects that would be seen in a tour through the exhibition rooms.

The exhibition was opened in 1990, but the collection is older since there was for “many decades” a former much smaller mission museum though no more information is available on this forerunner museum. Today, the mission museum is situated in one of the many buildings of the abbey complex, next to the cafeteria and the shop, where you can also buy the best-known

1151 Klosterführer, 189.
1152 Only Schlegel mentions this date as the founding date of the museum, other sources remain silent on this question. Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland,” 115.
1153 Missionsbenediktinerabtei Schweiklberg, “Schwarz-Afrika-Museum Schweiklberg”.
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product of the monks, *Schweiklberger Geist*, a distilled drink. The museum opens daily and has free entrance. The shop, the cafeteria and the museum seem to form a “welcome entity” as the areas of the compound directed towards visitors. The comparably new exhibition, split into two rooms, is located in a former chapel and so the ceiling is high, and there are large coloured windows.

There are around 800 objects on display in the vitrines and on the walls almost all of which originated in Africa.

The museum in Schweiklberg has a unique feature that distinguishes it from other mission museums. The objects brought by the missionaries are in fact a minority and the bulk of them come from private sources. Through gifts by donors and purchases from private collections, this collection reached the size that it has today. That means that the network that was responsible for equipping this mission museum looks different from others because it includes one main – and private – donor.

This main donor, according to my inquiries during my visit and also online resources, was Manfred Zirngibl (1938–2014), a local “Africa enthusiast”. He (co-)published four books on African weapons and shields. The influence of this largely private origin on the whole of the objects in the mission museum is crucial since Zirngibl was mainly interested in African weapons and I argue that this interest is visible in the museum. There are a good number of weapons in the vitrines and the guiding text from the website describes different weapons in detail. Other mission museums also present African weapons, but in Schweiklberg they have definitely a prominent status.

Besides weapons, the following object groups are mentioned: masks, instruments, ancestral figures and magical figurines, furniture (clan stool), a precious Yoruba coat, a totem pole, and jewellery. As seen during the visit, there are several more types of objects in the vitrines, but I estimate that two-thirds of the whole were masks and weapons. If visitors had to judge only from this mission museum, the whole of sub-Saharan Africa is predominantly associated with masks and weapons.

---

1154 Missionsbenediktinerabtei Schweiklberg.
1155 Only to name one example: Fischer and Zirngibl, *African weapons*.
1156 Weapons mean here a broad range of items and include in this context also so-called *Prunkmesser*, decorated knives, or throwing knives. The significance is that these knives are not household goods, everyday items, because those were not of interest for the “collectors”.
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The different sources of the objects (both private and missionary) make this Africa museum an independent museum. The choice of objects in the exhibition is in line with personal preference by a private “collector”, not with other issues, for example, connections to the Benedictines’ mission in Africa. And those objects that were indeed brought to Germany within the missionaries’ frame are only referred to as souvenirs. The text on the website furthermore focuses on technical details and specifications as well as references to famous men, be they European travellers, soldiers\footnote{For example: “Der ehemalige Afrikasoldat Heinrich Hautmann aus Passau († 1959) erzählte oft davon, wie die Pygmäen damit zielrichtig aus 20 Meter Höhe Tiere vom Baum holten.” Missionsbenediktinerabtei Schweiklberg.}, or scientists (like Robert Koch or Leo Frobenius). Apart from the souvenir-connection, missionaries or the topic of mission do not play a role in the text at all. There is no explanation of the existence of an Afrikamuseum in Schweiklberg. The question of why and how these objects found their way to the Bavarian abbey is not addressed in the museum and on the website. Why the abbey bought the objects from a local collector and opened the museum is not explained. Therefore, also nothing can be said about the intention of the museum. What is more astonishing,
the website text ends by focusing on value and prices of ethnographical objects and art from Africa.1159

According to the website, the objects are Mitbringsel from returning missionaries from Eastern and Southern Africa.1160 Mitbringsel, that means something you bring back with you, is an equivalent term for a souvenir. Therefore, for the objects from missionary sources, no scientific reason for “collecting” and transferring the objects to Germany is given. To exhibit some Mitbringsel can be seen as the exact opposite of a scientific museum, comparable to the Sammelsurium by the Benedictines in Münsterschwarzach.

As mentioned, the available sources do not connect the exhibition to the Benedictine’s mission – they focus on technical facts rather than on actual people on the African continent. In the exhibition then, I encountered the same tendency. At first sight, the Afrikamuseum seems like a professional mission museum. It is well designed when it comes to the colour scheme, for example, as well as a consistent style and design of the vitrines, together with object descriptions in the main room and the smaller adjunct room. There is no extreme abundance of objects, which would be typical for independent museums. However, Schweiklberg is indeed independent although it may not seem so in the first place because of its rather neat, ordered and therefore more commonly seen “professional” appearance. But the exhibition – like the website content – lacks a clear contextualisation of itself and its objects and no explanatory writing is inside the museum. Item labelling focuses on details, as I showed for the website text. There are no didactical objects, except for a map of Zaire.1161

Some of the photos depicting African people are only for decoration, the depicted persons do not stand for themselves. They are unnamed, and no personal reference is given to them. They represent, for example, a whole group, like “the Massai” (see Figure 18). As the website does not connect the museum to the Benedictines’ work or to the topic religion in general, the exhibition in the main room also omits to refer to the Benedictines in any way. The much smaller second room is not mentioned on the website. It is constructed in the same colour scheme as the main room but is fully dedicated to Christianity. On display is Christian art: wooden pietas, Madonnas, and crucifixes.

1159 “Zusammenfassend kann man sagen, dass dieses Museum sehr gute Einblicke in die alte afrikanische Stammeskunst gibt und die vorgestellten völkerkundlichen Gegenstände manchem Betrachter beweisen, dass die afrikanischen Völker in früheren Zeiten zu Unrecht als ’primitiv’ und nicht beachtenswert abgestempelt wurden. Gerade in den letzten Jahrzehnten ist das Interesse an afrikanischer Kunst weltweit enorm gestiegen, was die Preise in den Auktionshäusern in Bezug auf diese Kunstrichtung in ungeahnte Höhen trieb.” Missionsbenediktinerabtei Schweiklberg.

1160 Missionsbenediktinerabtei Schweiklberg.

1161 It remains unclear to me why a map of Zaire (today Democratic Republic of the Congo) is on display. For the African context, the Benedictine missions are engaged mostly in Tanzania, also South Africa, Kenya, Uganda, Zambia and Togo. Therefore, the Zaire map seems random.
ivory works, paintings, and nativity scenes. Some of the objects here are of Latin American origin, contradicting the name of Afrikamuseum.

Typically, mission museums integrate both ethnographical objects and indigenous Christian art, and therefore Schweiklberg constitutes a different way of approaching this issue. It separates these two spheres spatially: masks, spears and wooden spirit figures in one room, nativity scenes and wooden carved crucifix in the other much smaller room. But both spaces have a consistent exhibition design under one roof thus constituting the Afrikamuseum as a unity.

Society of the Divine Word (SVD)
The SVD had many mission museums. The one in Austria, St. Gabriel SVD, is the second case study in this thesis and so it is presented here only in a very short portrait. For the history of the SVD, see Section 6.2 in the case study above. Apart from St. Gabriel, we find mission museums in St. Wendel, St. Xaver, and St. Augustin in Germany. For the sake of completeness, it must be mentioned that there is also a mission museum in Steyl, the founding place of the SVD in the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{1162} As this museum is located outside of the German-speaking world, this mission museum is not included in my study.

St. Gabriel SVD: Missions-Ethnographisches Museum St. Gabriel
Address: Gabrielerstraße 171, 2340 Maria Enzersdorf, Austria
Website: www.steyler.eu

This mission museum in the mission house St. Gabriel, located in the city of Mödling, Austria, was opened around 1900 and closed in 2005. The museum was connected to the work of the so-called Anthropos Patres, a group of SVD members who were professional anthropologists and missionaries at the same time. The central figure in this group was P. Wilhelm Schmidt who had a profound impact on the development of the field of anthropology, especially at the University of Vienna and later in Switzerland. He is also named retrospectively as the founding figure of the museum. St. Gabriel SVD is oriented toward being a professional and scientific museum.

Most “collecting” was done according to the academic standards at the time, and most “collectors” had studied anthropology at universities and were active researchers. The network around the mission museum included scholars

\textsuperscript{1162} The mission houses of the SVD were given patrons and named after these, like St. Gabriel or St. Michael. These patron names are in this thesis also used for the mission museums they are homes to.
from international universities and curators from state-run ethnographical museums. The network was closely knit with the Vatican, the Vatican mission exhibition (1925), the subsequent Lateran mission museum, the University of Vienna, and the Ethnographical Museum Vienna.

St. Wendel SVD: Missionsmuseum
Address: Missionshausstraße 50, 66606 St. Wendel, Germany
Website: www.steyler.eu

The mission house is located in the city which bears the same name, St. Wendel, in the south-west of Germany. Originally a farmhouse, it was established in the 1890s with the aim of educating young members. The Arnold-Janssen-Gymnasium, starting in 1899, is until the present day a private Catholic high school, and an important part of the SVD’s outreach. Pastoral care is today often accomplished by priests from former mission fields.1163

The source situation for this mission museum is limited and so this portrait is based on online resources. In general, it seems that St. Wendel is the least investigated amongst the mission museums of the SVD.

This mission museum was founded in 1920. Like the mission house, the museum suffered when requisitioned by the Nazi regime. After the war, furniture in the museum had to be rebuilt. In the 1960s, a building was constructed dedicated for the museum and the bookshop. In 1964 new exhibits were added and the whole exhibition rearranged. In the beginning, the focus was on China and New Guinea, two mission fields that were crucial for the SVD. Now, the majority of the collections originates from New Guinea. Other regions that are covered are Indonesia, the Philippines, India, China, Japan, and various African countries.1164

In documentation, the topic of transfer is not addressed; the collection itself is taken for granted. Only the type of objects is mentioned: stuffed animals, woodwork, jewellery, weapons, musical instruments, masks, everyday items, textiles, paintings. Nevertheless, it is clearly stated that the mission fields of the SVD missionaries are concerned.1165

This museum is still open to the public; the opening hours, as well as the possibility of guided tours outside of the regular hours, are mentioned on the museum’s website. The aim of the museum is stated on the same page in the short description:

1163 Maldener, “Die Geschichte des Missionshauses”.
1164 Maldener; Steyler Missionare, “Missionsmuseum St. Wendel”.
1165 “Das Museum zeigt in erster Linie, wo und wie die Steyler Missionare arbeiten.” Steyler Missionare.
Our museum wants to be a window to the world, a bridge between the home country and the peoples of the wide world. Visiting the museum will thus contribute to the understanding among nations because one can learn to understand other cultures in a better way and learn to acknowledge their lives and work.\textsuperscript{1166}

The focus of this mission museum is to establish a link between the local visitors and the people overseas. Even the term \textit{Völkerverständigung} (understanding among nations) is explicitly used. The short description on the webpage does not mention the scientific work of the SVD. This shows the range of goals of mission museums, even within one congregation.

\textbf{St. Xaver SVD: Missionsmuseum}

\textbf{Address:} Dringenbergerstraße 32, 33014 Bad Driburg, Germany

\textbf{Website:} -

This mission house, established 1915, was located in Bad Driburg near Paderborn, in a rather remote and calm surrounding. Some pioneers of the SVD congregation to New Guinea were educated in St. Xaver, as well as some bishops in the mission fields.\textsuperscript{1167} The, not even 100-year-long history ended when the mission house was closed in 2008.\textsuperscript{1168}

Information about St. Xaver is hard to acquire. About the mission museum in St. Xaver, only one article by Brigitte Wiesenbauer was published in 2001, which will serve as the main source for this portrait.

The first ethnographic objects arrived in St. Xaver in 1923 and therefore this is held to be the founding year of the mission museum, only eight years after the founding of the mission house itself. The initial point of the collection was not the mission house itself since the first ethnographic objects came from Steyl, not from the mission fields directly. More information about this transfer to St. Xaver via Steyl is not available.\textsuperscript{1169}

As the mission house was closed in 2008 and there is no evidence for an earlier date, this must be seen as the latest possible date for closing the mission museum.

Regions covered were New Guinea, Japan, China, African countries (foremost Zaire and Togo), Philippines, and Indonesia;\textsuperscript{1170} the collection included everyday items, weapons, jewellery, clothes and Christian art.

From a specific object, a skull of a fish with an artistic drawing of Jesus Christ on the crucifix, the “collector”, Fr. Patroklus, is known. Except for the

\textsuperscript{1166} (my translation) Steyler Missionare.
\textsuperscript{1168} Häußler-Eisenmann, “Steyler Missionare ziehen sich”; “Schulgeschichte”.
\textsuperscript{1170} Wiesenbauer, 106.
European “collector”, nothing more about locals engaged with this special item is documented.

In her article, Brigitte Wiesenbauer argues for a strong influence of Christianity on the artistic handicraft of New Guinea. Other – and newer – objects show how European skills and techniques such as knitting changed traditional crafts. Apart from these few examples, not much is known about the transfer of objects to Bad Driburg. Wiesenbauer, however, indicates that the “collecting” and transfer by St. Xaver missionaries was aimed at especially typical or extraordinary objects from the mission field, which were connected to the previously practised faith and were no longer necessary or used any more.

Although Wiesenbauer does not give examples she also makes the point that art with Christian symbols should document the “success” of mission activities and in my opinion this is valid. The narrated story is also clearly along the lines that the indigenous religious life ended and the whole community embraced Christianity. Having such a view on missionary activities with a clear watershed (before and after) also elides the discussion of why the objects are now in Europe. The explanation offered is simple: the newly converted Christians did not need the old religious objects anymore.

The intention Wiesenbauer sees in the mission museum is to impress and educate students, and therefore potential missionaries, in the culture they would encounter if going on mission. She sees no “pure” scientific goal in “collecting” because only rarely is more information about the origin, age and “collector” of an object documented. Instead, she stresses the missionary aims of the museum. However, this contradicts another interesting fact about the St. Xaver museum that she mentions: P. Johannes Maringer SVD gathered a zoological collection of local and “exotic” animals, a butterfly collection, a collection of minerals, and a pre- and protohistoric collection. That means members of St. Xaver indeed had scholarly interest, here obviously in natural history, at home and in the mission fields. The intention of “collecting” for the mission museum must have been, at least to a certain extent, linked to this scientific interest.

Although the mission house was closed, the high school of St. Xaver is still open signifying that the educational aspect that mission congregations like the SVD covered is not to be forgotten when it comes to mission museums.

---

1171 Wiesenbauer, 106–14.
1172 (my translation) Wiesenbauer, 108.
1173 “Zwar haben Missionare durchaus auch ethnographische Sammlungen nach wissenschaftlichen Aspekten systematisch zusammengestellt, aber für die Missionare in St. Xaver stand offensichtlich nicht das Sammeln oder das Interesse an diesen materiellen Überlieferungen im Vordergrund, sondern die Missionstätigkeit.” Wiesenbauer, 108.
1174 Wiesenbauer, 106.
What is today seen as the main location of the SVD congregation in Germany was founded rather late. The mission house at the outskirts of the city Bonn was founded in 1913. In the beginning, it was meant for retiring members, but since 1918 the training of new missionaries took place in St. Augustin. The mission house grew, with a seminary and a study program for philosophy and later theology (Philosophisch-Theologische Hochschule). Since the 1960s, St. Augustin housed the Anthropos Institute and the mission study institute of the congregation.\textsuperscript{1175}

The source situation for the mission museum in St. Augustin is relatively good since the museum is one of the biggest and most famous ones. This portrait bases on guidebooks as primary sources, some articles, and on my personal visit on the 22\textsuperscript{nd} of April 2013.

The origin of this mission museum in the mission house St. Augustin is traceable to the Anthropos Institute which moved from Switzerland to St. Augustin in 1962. The first ethnographic objects were brought by the members of the Institute and these were shown in their new offices as well as in some rooms of the seminary of the mission house. This display of the objects was at that time without a systematic order. Since the idea of a museum was floating around for a while, now with the Institute, it became more concrete. The provincial was asked to enable the founding of a museum of ethnography and mission studies (“völkerkundliches und missionswissenschaftliches Museum”). One incentive to act took the form of a donation of 100,000 marks from the Volkswagen foundation for buying new ethnological objects.\textsuperscript{1176} The foundation is connected with P. August Knorr SVD, a missionary in New Guinea, who had sent artworks and photos from his mission field. His “collecting” and transferring was mainly driven by his aim to secure these objects in Europe because he saw the traditions vanishing in New Guinea. The second important actor in the founding of the museum was P. Wilhelm Saake SVD, then director of the Anthropos Institute.\textsuperscript{1177}

The mission museum was finally opened in 1973 under the name Museum Haus Völker und Kulturen. A year later, a series of open lectures from the Akademie Völker und Kulturen was added.\textsuperscript{1178} The museum’s name expressed the fact that the mission museum was independently organised from the Anthropos Institute.\textsuperscript{1179}

\textsuperscript{1175} Steyler Missionare, “Missionspriesterseminar St. Augustin – Geschichte”.
\textsuperscript{1176} Piepke, “40 Jahre Museum ‘Haus,” 148–49.
\textsuperscript{1177} Skrabania, “Haus Völker und Kulturen,” in Missionsgeschichtliche Sammlungen heute, 41.
\textsuperscript{1178} Steyler Missionare, “Missionspriesterseminar St. Augustin – Geschichte”.
The museum was located in a separate new building on the area of the mission house of St. Augustin, specially built for the museum (see Figure 7). It covers 1,400 square metres and its 1970s architectural style sets it apart from the rest of the older mission house. The Museum Haus Völker und Kulturen is one of the few cases of mission museums that were housed in specially built complexes.

Only from 1977 onwards, a scientific head was employed for the museum. The first was Dr. Josef Franz Thiel SVD who focused on Christian art with special exhibitions and publications on this topic. Thiel left the museum in 1984 to become director of the Ethnographical Museum in Frankfurt/Main. After Thiel, the position of a director was set up and P. Bernhard Mensen became the director in 1986, and P. Dr. Alfonso Fausone followed in 1992. From 2001 till 2013, Fr. Gebhard Rahe was the head of the museum.

In 2005, the museum was closed for the daily opening hours because of fire safety reasons or because staffing costs were too high. Since then the museum is only open upon request, that was also the case when I visited the museum in 2013. That means that currently, the museum is in a pending situation neither really open nor fully closed. Since 2013, Dr. Jerzy Skrabania SVD is the director of the museum.

The objects in this mission museum come from the following parts of the world: various countries in Western Africa (additionally Ethiopia), India, New Guinea, Philippines, Japan, China, and Indonesia. Smaller collections also come from several Latin American countries.

The collection consists of objects that were brought from their location in Switzerland (that means property of the SVD), new purchases from New Guinea, Western Africa and Congo bought with the money from the Volkswagen Foundation. The focus is clearly on the African and New Guinean collection. The museum owns about 10,000 objects. As Grauer

---

1181 Kramer et al., “Zum Geleit,” in *Missio, Message und Museum*, 8. Thiel, who left the SVD eventually, is an interesting example of a missionary’s career: born in 1932 in Yugoslavia, he joined the SVD in St. Gabriel, went through the “school” of the Anthropos Patres and ended as director of one of the biggest state-run ethnographical museums in Germany. German Anthropology, “Interview Josef Franz Thiel”.
1185 Skrabania, 50.
1188 Portal Wissenschaftliche Sammlungen, “Haus Völker und Kulturen”
shows, the equipping of the museum happened in a strategic way. The networks of the SVD were used to organise the exhibits. P. Saake even went on a “shopping trip” to New Guinea in 1964.\textsuperscript{1189}

The collections have together an estimated value of six million euros\textsuperscript{1190}, which shows the massive amount of accumulated worth to be gained by “collecting” ethnographic objects and art over the years.

Because of the move of the Anthropos Institute to St. Augustin, some objects had already a stop-over before this mission museum. A guidebook tells that specific objects from New Guinea were “collected” by the missionary Georg Höltker SVD in the 1930s.\textsuperscript{1191} The scholarly approach, stressing the role of SVD anthropologists, is obvious in the sources. Research on Höltker and his “collecting” has brought more insights into the establishment of collections for the mission museum St. Augustin.\textsuperscript{1192}

With the former director of the mission museum Josef Franz Thiel becoming the director of the state ethnographical museum in a big city like Frankfurt, it is clear that the mission museum could claim scientific orientation since its director could make such a career step. This is the highest career positions a (former) missionary has made in the world of German museums. It shows the involvement of the mission museum in the academic network of this field. Thiel’s main publication on Christian art in Africa cites a long list of institutions and scholars in this field with whom he was in cooperation and exchange.\textsuperscript{1193} Similar institutions are named in the guides for special exhibitions in 1980, one regarding Christian art in Africa again\textsuperscript{1194} and one about Chinese Christianity\textsuperscript{1195}. This shows how well the members of the SVD were connected to other (academic) institutions, not just in Europe but globally.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1190} Piepke, “40 Jahre Museum ‘Haus,’” 152.
\item \textsuperscript{1191} Thiel, “Führer 1977,” 57.
\item \textsuperscript{1192} Grauer, “Georg Höltker (1895–1976) und”.
\item \textsuperscript{1193} I mention those of interest for this study: Ethnological museums in Tevuren, in the Vatican, in Berg-en-Dal, in Hamburg, in Berlin, and in Freiburg/Breisgau. Further: Diözesanmuseum Bamberg, Schnütgen-Museum Cologne, Überseemuseum in Bremen; Catholic religious institutes were Society of Africa missionaries, Bethlehem Mission Society, Benedictines Münsterschwarzach, missio Aachen (including Sepp Schüller from the mission museum in Aachen PWG), Kindheit-Jesu-Verein Aachen, Spiritans (and their museum in Paris), Mariannhill Sisters, and Jesuits. It becomes clear that with Thiel, St. Augustin SVD was in a network with other institutes that had mission museums. Thiel and Helf, \textit{Christliche Kunst in Afrika}, 10. Further external scholars – this time from the Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum – were involved with the mission museum and show the network around St. Augustin: Dr. Josefine Huppertz, Dr. Waldemar Stöhr und Dr. Klaus Volpercht. See Piepke, “40 Jahre Museum ‘Haus,’” 150.
\item \textsuperscript{1194} Haus Völker und Kulturen, “Christliches Afrika”.
\item \textsuperscript{1195} Thiel, “Die Begegnung Chinas mit”. Here, the network included several SVD mission houses like St. Michael, St. Willibrod and the mission house Franz Xaver in the Netherlands, St. Albert in Poseix, St. Xaver in Bad Driburg (St. Xaver SVD), the Franciscan mission museum in Werl (Werl OFM), the St. Petrus Kolleg in Rome, and the religion study collection in Marburg.
\end{itemize}
The network of St. Augustin included not only state museums, but also other mission congregations (for example missio Aachen) and several missionaries from other Catholic congregations, as well as reformed mission entities (for example The United Society for the Propagation of the Gospel London). Thiel joined the SVD in St. Gabriel and it was St. Gabriel and the University of Vienna where he got into contact with anthropology. He was active as a missionary in the Congo, worked for the Anthropos Journal and in other academic positions (professorship) in Germany and finally left the SVD congregation. It is not the place here to go into details\textsuperscript{1196}, but Thiel’s biography is exemplary for understanding the high status of the anthropological work of SVD members in Germany. Thiel was not the only SVD member, others also left the congregation and worked as researcher at universities or in other museums.\textsuperscript{1197}

With the use of money from the Volkswagen foundation, we can see already the involvement of actors from wider German society, at least for financing parts of the collection. Their involvement gives precise insight into the German colonial past:

> With this help, the foundation wanted to help ensure that the valuable collection would not be scattered all over the world, but that it would be preserved for those who for more than sixty years in the former German colony have been working for the weal and woe of the natives.\textsuperscript{1198}

Stated reasons for the financial support were not the long tradition of SVD ethnographic research concerning New Guinea, but that New Guinea was part of the German colonial empire. Although we have only the words of P. Wilhelm Saake SVD and no statement from the foundation, the reasoning linking the SVD’s mission field and Germany’s colonial past is crucial regarding the context of the origins of the collections. It also shows the network that supported the early phase of establishing this mission museum.

Several aims were mentioned in the material: In the first initial plan to open a museum, it is presented as a “point of attraction for mission enthusiasts in general and schools in particular.”\textsuperscript{1199}

At first, it seems puzzling that the general public and schools should be the first target groups. With the Anthropos Institute in St. Augustin, a museum for the researchers at the Institute would be the obvious goal. And of course, this

\textsuperscript{1196} For more see especially his festschrift Kramer et al., Missio, Message und Museum and the insightful interview with Thiel, German Anthropology, “Interview Josef Franz Thiel”.


\textsuperscript{1198} (my translation) Letter from director of the Anthropos Institute P. Dr. Wilhelm Saake to the rector P. Josef Stobb and P. Provincial Altmeyer, quoted by Piepke, “40 Jahre Museum ‘Haus,’” 149.

\textsuperscript{1199} (my translation) Letter from director of the Anthropos Institute P. Dr. Wilhelm Saake to the rector P. Josef Stobb and P. Provincial Altmeyer, quoted by Piepke, 148.
was decidedly a main reason behind the wish to open a museum in St. Augustin, now after moving the Institute and with that the focus of the SVD’s scientific work to the location in Germany. And it is also crucial that there were mission museums in much smaller mission houses of the SVD.

The Anthropos Institute considers the establishment of such a museum to be appropriate since the ethnological department could provide an illustration of the scientific tasks and goals of the Institute and, as a study collection, enliven and deepen the ethnological teaching of the fraters.1200

In a request to the Volkswagen foundation for support not only for the “collecting” but also to finance half of the costs for a museum building, the functions are described thus: 1) to house illustrative material and documentation for the students of the Hochschule, 2) to offer inducement for missionaries on vacation for “collecting” and studying during their stays in the mission fields, 3) general education1201, 4) to offer material for (external) scholars.1202 These descriptions as well as the fact that the museum rooms are basically built around a huge lecture hall in the middle show how the scholarly intention is central for this museum. As Joachim Piepke notes, also the lack of the word museum in the title, instead referring to it as a Haus, shows the wholesale approach towards the functions of this mission museum.1203 Also, their online presentation stresses the scientific function1204 as well as it stresses its work towards understanding and dialogue: The Museum Haus Völker und Kulturen is a place for meeting and communicating cultures and a commitment to intercultural dialogue in a multicultural society. The aim is to promote understanding of the interculturality of peoples and missionary awareness.1205

The mission museum in St. Augustin has often attributed to itself characteristics like educating the general society and working towards dialogue, but the scientific character with the strong focus on anthropology and Christian art in the direct vicinity of the Anthropos Institute is not to be denied. The scientific character is, for example, visible in the fact that external experts, curators from state-run ethnographical museums, were entrusted with creating the exhibition

1200 (my translation) Letter from director of the Anthropos Institute P. Dr. Wilhelm Saake to the rector P. Josef Stobb and P. Provincial Altmeyer, quoted by Piepke, 149.
1201 The wording here most likely means education of the general public: visitors to the museum in contrast to the students of St. Augustin, as in the first named function.
1202 Attachment in request to the Volkswagen foundation, paraphrased in Piepke, 149–50.
1203 Piepke, 150.
1204 “Das Museum bietet heute: Anschauungs- und Dokumentationsmaterial für die Studierenden der Hochschule; Anregungen zu vergleichenden Studien; Funktion der allgemeinen Bildung für die Öffentlichkeit; Forschungsmaterial für Wissenschaftler.” Haus Völker und Kulturen, “Entstehung des Museums – HVK”
1205 (my translation) Haus Völker und Kulturen.
environment and design. The whole “package” of the Haus Völker und Kulturen (reasons for establishing, presentation in the museum building, and many scientific lectures) make it one of the most scientific mission museums in this list of portraits. Contradicting all these strivings towards a professional manner is the fact that obviously some objects from the collections were sold to other museums or private art dealers, as well as given as presents to friendly donors for the mission. Today, the curators must accept that some objects, also those “collected” by Anthropos Patres, simply have disappeared.

Missionary Sisters of St. Peter Claver (SSPC)

The Missionary Sisters of St. Peter Claver had several mission museums and exhibitions in various European countries. Three mission museums that were located in Switzerland and Austria constitute the first case study in this thesis. Therefore, these three are presented here just in brief. All sources for these portraits can be found in the case study. The congregation itself is presented in Section 5.2.

Salzburg SSPC: Afrikamuseum

Address: Dreifaltigkeitsgasse (Pagerie) and Claverianum, Salzburg, Austria
Website: -

In the birthplace of the SSPC, Salzburg, the first Africa exhibition took place in 1895 and by the end of the next year around 400 objects were gathered. The objects came entirely from the African continent including Togo, Cameroon, French and Portuguese Congo, Natal, Mozambique, Nubia, and Egypt. The objects were ethnographical objects as well as natural history objects.

The foundation of a mission museum according to the working definition took place in 1901. When the SSPC moved their central office to a bigger house in Salzburg (the Claverianum) in 1917, a new Africa museum was installed as well and opened in 1918. This Africa museum was closed in the course of the Second World War. Right after the so-called Anschluss in 1938, the Sisters packed and hid away some boxes with objects in a church in Salzburg. The founder of the local Natural History Museum Haus der Natur was a National Socialist and he and his museum confiscated objects from the collection. They were especially interested in the mineral collection.

After the war ended, some rescued objects that had survived were returned though some confiscated objects were only returned in 2013. In Salzburg, no

---

museum was reopened after the closing during the turmoil of the Nazi regime and the war.

**Maria Sorg SSPC: Afrikamuseum/Missionsmuseum**

Address: Maria-Sorg-Straße 6, 5101 Bergheim bei Salzburg, Austria  
Website: www.mariasorg.at

This museum is located in Maria Sorg, a branch of the SSPC in the countryside, outside of Salzburg. It was opened in 1900 and has also started as an Africa exhibition first. This museum was commonly visited together with the chapel and the printing workshop that was situated in Maria Sorg. The small Africa museum was closed during the Second World War because the Sisters had to leave this mission house. But the SSPC returned to Maria Sorg, which became their head office for Austria after the war. In this period after 1945 objects from the former museums in downtown Salzburg and in Maria Sorg were mostly stored in boxes but some single exhibits were on display in the reception area of Maria Sorg. Sr. Maria Paola Wojak took the initiative to re-establish the museum in Maria Sorg. The first steps toward the realisation of the plans for a new museum were taken in the 1990s, and in 1994 the new mission museum was opened. The SSPC changed their orientation during the second half of the 20th century and became interested in the wider world, not just in Africa. Therefore, the museum became a mission museum with objects from countries like Brazil, Uruguay, India, and the Philippines. The name changed as well, from Africa to mission museum. The museum was renewed and modernised in 2018.

The exhibition from before 2018 that I could visit presented many mission history objects as well as the “standard objects” in mission museums: ethnographical artefacts and natural history exhibits. For the SSPC, their printing apostolate was of greatest importance. This importance was expressed through the display of machines, technical instruments and tools connected to this apostolate.

**Zug SSPC: Afrikamuseum**

Address: St. Oswalds-Gasse 17, 6300 Zug, Switzerland  
Website: www.afrikamuseumzug.ch

In 1905, the SSPC opened its central office for Switzerland in Zug, a centrally located city in the German-speaking part of Switzerland. One year later, in 1906, they were already able to open an Afrikamuseum in this branch. A large hall on the third floor was used for exhibiting their objects. Maria Theresia Ledóchowska, the foundress of the SSPC, was reportedly herself involved in
the assembling of the museum and she was present when important visitors, like higher clergymen, visited the museum.

Only objects from Africa were on display during the first half of the 20th century: mainly natural history objects, like stuffed animals, including bigger ones (such as a lioness or a leopard), but also ethnographic objects.

In 1951, the museum moved into the ground floor where it is still located. The name, Afrikamuseum, is still used and in the current exhibition (Status: 2013) only objects from the African continent are shown. The exhibition has only a few descriptive texts, although there is a world map which shows the SSPC’s branches worldwide. This map also indicates where exactly in Africa some objects in the museum came from. Nowadays, most of the ethnographical objects are displayed in showcases.

Different from the two other mission museums, the Afrikamuseum in Zug remained undisturbed by political turbulence for more than a hundred years maintaining their orientation toward the African continent, expressed in their exhibition and in their name.

Salesian Family (SDB and OSFS)

There are several branches of this family tree of religious institutes that were founded by either Giovanni Bosco (1815–1888), commonly known as Don Bosco,1208 or by a successor of his.1209

The congregation that is most commonly referred to as “the Salesians” (or “the Salesians of Don Bosco”) is the Societas Sancti Francisci Salesii (SDB) founded in Turin by Don Bosco in 1859 (with papal approval in 1868). The congregation grew rapidly and the first missionaries left in 1875 to Argentina. Salesians’ engagement is addressed to the youth, be it in a Christian environment or in foreign mission.1210

Next to the female branches and secular institutes in the Salesian family, there are also the Oblates of St. Francis de Sales (Oblati Sancti Franciscis Salesii, OSFS). The Oblates were founded in 1872 by Louis Brisson and Maria Salesia Chappuis (with papal approval in 1875). Now, there are around eighty Oblates in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland and around 500 globally.1211

Today, the Salesian family is one of the biggest entities in the Catholic Church, working in over a hundred countries around the world. They serve in high ranks within the Catholic Church (archbishops and cardinals) and run universities including their Pontifical University in Rome.1212

---

1208 In Italy, Catholic priests were addressed with Don.
1209 For a good overview over this entity see this online chart: “Die salesianische Familie”.
1210 Kelley and Moloney, “Salesians”.
1211 Oblaten des Heiligen Franz von Sales, “Wer wir sind – OSFS”.
There are two mission museums, one run by the SDB and one by the OSFS. The first is not documented in detail, but the archive in Benediktbeuern, as well as their province archive in Munich, offer limited information about this closed museum. They send me copies of the few primary sources they found in the chronicles such as a newspaper article. Because of these sources, I can cover a longer stretch of time and therefore this portrait will discuss persons and the transfer of objects in a chronological way rather than in the order of the ideal grid I mentioned above. Information from the Salesian archivists and Schlegel’s study are sometimes contradictory and because of the paucity of Schlegel’s references, I follow the former.

There are few sources for the OSFS mission museum and, except for Schlegel’s mention of the museum in his theses, nothing can be found about a mission museum in this private high school. So the sparse information about this mission museum is based only on an email correspondence with P. Johann Schurm OSFS.1213

Benediktbeuern SDB: Missionsmuseum
Address: Don-Bosco-Straße 1, 83671 Benediktbeuern, Germany
Website: www.kloster-benediktbeuern.de

As early as the 19th century, Salesians were sent out to perform missionary work, and since the 1950s illustrative material (Anschauungsmaterial1214) was sent back from Latin America to Bavaria. This material was exhibited; it was publicly accessible in a room near the monastery gateway. Objects on display included jewellery, hunting gear such as bow and arrows, spears, shields. Also, stuffed animals like reptiles were exhibited.1215

The chronicle of Benediktbeuern mentions a mission exhibition and later the mission museum. First, for the Weltmissionssonntag in 1960, an exhibition in the youth centre of the monastery took place1216: Gerhard Bimmermann, a missionary for seven years in Brazil, had brought objects from the Bororo people and Xavante people to Benediktbeuern. The newspaper article mentions the following objects that could be seen in the exhibition: Jewellery (Federschmuck), weapons, work tools, and a five-meter-long snakeskin. Because of the rush of visitors, the exhibition had to be prolonged. The chronicle also mentions that in combination with the exhibition and a cinema show

1213 I want to thank all informants in Benediktbeuern, München and Dachsberg.
1214 That is P. Franz Schmid’s wording in his email.
1215 Email correspondence with P. Dr. Franz Schmid, archivist in Benediktbeuern, August 2016. He hesitated to call the room a mission museum because of its small size.
1216 The chronicle and a newspaper article (titled: “Kundschaft aus dem Mato Grosso”, without date or author) that is included in the chronicle and was sent to me as well are used as information about this exhibition.
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about the mission in Africa, a sizeable amount of donations were given.\textsuperscript{1217} The intention, to inform the German public of the people in the mission field, is evident, and raising donations for the mission was another goal of the mission museum.

The newspaper article furthermore names the title of the presentation on Sunday: “World mission or world revolution”.

In the first part, a colour slide lecture was shown of the missionary work among the Chavantes Indians; tape recordings of songs and dances of these Indians formed the accompaniment. The second part of the evening turned to Africa and gave insight into the huge field of work that the Church faces there. At the same time, however, the whole problem was revealed, which the missionary had to face: On the one hand the unrestrained exploitation of the blacks by the whites, on the other hand, the subversive work of communism.\textsuperscript{1218}

We can see that the temporary mission exhibition is a) connected to the Weltmissionssonntag, a special event in the liturgical year; b) it also includes tape recordings and early slide shows in colour, that means new media are used as well; c) it is accompanied by oral presentations with a specific aim – to make the oppression of the locals known in Germany, but equally they warn against political left engagement (“subversive work of communism”). This shows that accompanying mission exhibitions/museums was an address to and debate of pressing questions in the global Catholic Church.

Regarding the transfer of the objects, it becomes evident that they were brought by one of the German missionaries, who worked in the mission field in question. The transfer is therefore within the same society, the objects shown in the German monastery are in direct relation to the Salesians’ work in Brazil.

Furthermore, the article says in a side note, there was great public interest because the missionary and “collector” himself – Bimmermann, who is said to have been in the area of origin (of the objects) – was present and explained the individual exhibits. This is presented in the article to give added interest for the visitors, hence the mention of this fact. Clearly, his presence during the exhibition is a strong link between the German monastery and the far away Mato Grosso. Angela Jannelli states that the experience of the curators with the object is crucial in her wild museum concept. In Benediktbeuern, the missionary Bimmermann had this experience; he himself could explain the objects, its use and significance. This issue becomes even clearer if one considers the photograph in the article. It depicts a Salesian in a black habit, most likely Bimmermann himself, who holds arrows and a club in his hands. In the background, one can see other exhibits on the wall. Not only does this photo

\textsuperscript{1217} “[D]as freiwillige Missionsopfer wurde gern und reichlich gespendet.” Klosterarchiv Benediktbeuern (KIAB) C 106-1–1960 (chronicler: Friedrich Dingermann); Email correspondence with P. Dr. Franz Schmid, August-October 2016.

\textsuperscript{1218} (my translation) N.N., “Kundschaft aus dem Mato”.
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show the hands-on attitude of an independent museum (touching exhibits without gloves, nothing is kept behind glass), the description of the photo also tells the reader that it was such a club that was a murder weapon used by locals to kill two missionaries in the Mato Grosso area. Derogative stereotypes about indigenous people were alive and well in this coverage of the exhibition.

This temporary exhibition – and there is no reason to assume a different treatment of objects for the following mission museum in Benediktbeuern – shows that as in Jannelli’s wild museums the transformation from an ordinary object into a museum exhibit with its special care and precautions did not happen. Why should the very same person that “collected” the objects in its original environment and brought them to Europe, now use gloves to touch them? These objects were not brought to Europe to be analysed by scholars, were not to be used for teaching to ethnography students. These objects were transferred to be used for informing the inhabitants of a Bavarian village about the Xavante and Bororo people and their daily lives, their economy, their religion etc. Thanks to this newspaper article with the enclosed photo, the intention and practice of this exhibition can be clearly assessed as having the features of an independent museum.

In 1968 the chronicle mentioned then the mission museum. On Easter, a blessing of the room for the mission museum was held. It was the student Rudolf Lunkenbein who was mainly responsible for the initiative. This chronicle entry mentions vitrines, so the difference between the temporary exhibition and a permanent museum in this room dedicated to the collection is worth noticing.\textsuperscript{1219}

When the small mission museum and the message of the exhibition came up for review in 1988, it was decided to remove the mission museum and instead install a small shop.\textsuperscript{1220} Benediktbeuern shows a possible development, from temporarily organised mission exhibitions to a stable mission museum that lasted until the late 1980s.

**Dachsberg OSFS: Missionsmuseum**

Address: Dachsberg 1, 4731 Prambachkirchen, Austria
Website: www.dachsberg.at

The Oblates of St. Francis de Sales were founded in 1872 by the priest Louis Brisson and Sr. Maria Salesia Chappuis in Troyes, France. Through their involvement in German colonies in Africa, they planned to install also a German mission house. However, because of the problematic political negotiations in

\textsuperscript{1219} KIAB C 106-1-1968. Email correspondence with P. Dr. Franz Schmid, August-October 2016.

\textsuperscript{1220} Email correspondence with P. Franz Schmid, August-October 2016.
Germany considering the “French” congregations, instead, a location in Austria (to attract German-speaking new members) was chosen. The Oblates settled in Dachsberg, a remote place in rural Upper Austria. Dachsberg has nowadays only forty-one inhabitants. In a castle, the Oblates started a high school in 1920 which is until today headed by an Oblate.

The mission museum in this OSFS branch was founded in 1929. In 1999 it was closed, but a small number of the objects were put on display in glass cases while most of the others are stored in the attic. Any documentation of these actions or anything written at all does not exist.

As nothing more detailed can be said about the museum, in any case, Dachsberg OSFS is a good example of how remote these mission museums could be situated. The mission museum was located in a tiny village and 40 minutes by car to the nearest bigger city of Linz, which is considered remote surrounding for Central Europe.

Mariannhill Missionaries (CMM)

This congregation has its birthplace in Mariannhill near Durban. The Austrian Trappist (Ordo Cisterciensis Strictioris Observantiae, OCSO) Franz Pfanner founded in 1882 a monastery in Mariannhill and tried to harmonise missionary and monastic ideals. In 1909, this foundation in South Africa was separated from the Trappist order, and it became its own missionary congregation, the Mariannhill Missionaries (Congregatio Missionarium de Mariannhill, CMM). In 1885 Franz Pfanner founded the Mariannhill Sisters (CPS), who also have a mission museum in Germany, Neuenbeken CPS.

Both their mission museums are poorly documented and under-researched. For this portrait of Würzburg, I use a newspaper article about the museum and email correspondence with the responsible pater for the museum today, P. Siegfried Milz CMM. For the portrait about Riedegg, I refer to the notes from my visit on the 23rd of February 2013, which also included a conversation with P. Tony Gathen. Additionally, I have had to resort to websites and even Wikipedia.

1221 Gründer, Christliche Mission und deutscher, 75–76. In 1910 the congregation was eventually allowed to open a house in Germany, in Marienberg (therefore also called “Marienberger Oblaten”).
1222 According to Wikipedia, there are forty-one inhabitants and Dachsberg consists only of some farms and a few houses. “Dachsberg (Gemeinde Prambachkirchen)”.
1223 Schlegel also states 1929 as the founding year. Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland,” 95.
1224 Email correspondence with P. Johann Schurm OSFS, 2014.
1225 La Fontaine, “‘Felix Culpa’ From Monks”.
1226 See portrait Neuenbeken CPS: Missionsmuseum on page 380.
Würzburg CMM: *Missionsmuseum*

Address: Mariannhillstraße 1, 97074 Würzburg, Germany  
Website: www.mariannhill.de

Würzburg is an important location of the CMM in Europe housing the mission procura and a seminary of the congregation. In a building at Röntgenring 3, where the mission procura was situated since 1918, a mission museum was located from the 1930s onwards.\(^{1228}\) The current museum dates from the 1950s and is to be found in the building complex at Mariannhillstraße 1 in Würzburg.\(^{1229}\)

Located on three levels in a tower, this mission museum offers anthropological items from everyday life (for example from the Zulu), Christian art, and many stuffed animals. Also an original size “typical African” round hut is to be viewed. The issue of mission engagement is exhibited as well: Items like an old travel chest and a “travel set” of liturgical items are on display. Those items should represent the long time it took the missionaries decades ago to reach South Africa, for example. An old school desk represents the congregation’s emphasis on pedagogy and education. Also, institutions that are in cooperation with the CMM are given space in the exhibition. Additionally, one feature of the congregation, their mission press, is represented through photographic plates, old cameras and used printing presses. Some of these items are said to be as old as 100 years.\(^{1230}\) These objects that stand for an important area of activity for mission congregations of the 20th century within the scene of the mission museum are indeed not unique, as shown by the case study of Maria Sorg SSPC. Although it is not clearly stated, the geographic origin of the exhibits is dominantly Africa where the beginning of the congregation is located and it remains the main area for their branches until today.

The intention of the museum is not clearly articulated except with regard to the stuffed animals. There, the intention was to educate the future missionaries in the foreign African fauna which was partly seen as threatening.\(^{1231}\)

About the museum’s motivation (here it is more about the foreign mission *per se* than about the inhabitants of the mission field) and also the transfer of the objects, P. Siegfried Milz states the following: “the museum was created as a

---

\(^{1228}\) A more precise description of the beginning is not possible to get. As well this information is based on the memory of elderly Mariannhill members. Schlegel states that the museum was opened in 1882 which would make this the oldest Catholic mission museum in Germany by far. 1882 is the founding date of the first monastery in Mariannhill near Durban by Pfanner, so opening a mission museum at the same time in Germany is very unlikely. It seems that Schlegel confused the dates in this case. Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland,” 88.

\(^{1229}\) Email correspondence with P. Siegfried Milz CMM, June-October 2016.

\(^{1230}\) Kupke, “Zebra und Leopard friedlich”.

\(^{1231}\) Kupke.
side show to give the people a little insight into the environment of the missionaries.”

The apparently unplanned, indeed almost random way of putting together this small mission museum in Germany also contributed to the paucity of source material. Both are, to a certain extent, interrelated. The mission museum in Würzburg is an example of an unplanned, amateurish approach by missionary congregations toward using the medium of museums for their cause: an independent museum.

Riedegg CMM: Afrikamuseum
Address: Schloss Riedegg, Riedegg 1, 4210 Gallneukirchen, Austria
Website: www.schloss-riedegg.at

The Missionsmuseum of the Mariannhill Missionaries in Würzburg occupies three floors. By contrast, their Afrikamuseum in the castle of Riedegg fills only one small room. Despite the small size and its remote location, this mission museum can be seen as highly exemplary.

The founding date of 1972, which is given by Schlegel, could not be verified, but since it is the only available date, I must rely on it. The Wikipedia entry about the castle names the 1970s as the founding period for the museum as well. However, around 2007 or 2008 the Afrikamuseum was moved to its current room after general renovations in the castle. Before that move, it occupied more than just one room. Although the missionaries sold the castle in 2015, they still live in the castle, and the museum remains in its place.

The museum is in good shape and there is a slight overabundance of objects, especially Christian art is everywhere. There is a handout offered to visitors that numbers the vitrines from one to nine. The objects in the vitrines and on the walls are accompanied by descriptive texts, also small object descriptions are offered on the vitrines. This numeric system gives the room a direction, key to its use. It starts with Nr. 1, “Treasures from the depths of the Indian Ocean” (seashells), continues with “Flora and Fauna” (snakeskin, animal teeth, turtle shell), jewellery (bracelets and loincloths), everyday items (calabash, cooking tools), wooden art and carvings, Christian art (weavings, batik) up to the vitrine with “Something out of nothing”. This last vitrine is of significance. The handout tells that the objects (miniature animals, bicycles, cars)

1232 (my translation) Email correspondence with P. Siegfried Milz CMM, June-October 2016.
1233 P. Milz was involved with rearranging and reorganising. Also these processes were executed without well-planned strategies: “[…] oft eben ganz nach dem Belieben des jeweiligen ‘Einrichters’ oder ‘Umstrukturierers’ eingerichtet worden. Mindestens dreimal war ich selber als Helfer dabei und es gab keinen Leitfaden oder Ähnliches und schon gar keine Akten oder Unterlagen […]” Email correspondence with P. Siegfried Milz CMM, June-October 2016.
1234 Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland,” 98.
1235 The congregation owns the castle of Riedegg since 1936. “Schloss Riedegg”.
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are made out of rubbish: coke cans, mud, plastic leftovers, and wire (see Figure 19). There is also a football made out of wrapped plastic bags. This vitrine also has musical instruments, a rattle (made from a pig bladder), older drums and a plastic Vuvuzela, the horn-like instrument that became famous worldwide with the soccer World Cup 2010 (see Figure 2).

The small upcycle art pieces reminded me of products that are sold in Faire Trade shops, which are often connected to Christian solidarity and social engagement for the Global South. Therefore, I had the impression that the present time is also exhibited in this Afrikamuseum. It is not an imagined mysterious place, not a nostalgic view on this continent; their engagement is not only a matter of the past. The website of a local museum cluster organisation offers more background information to these items:

Art from garbage – The idea for this name comes from Middelburg in South Africa, where Sarah Mahlangu, a remarkable woman, started a project called “Something out of nothing” in 1998. The main concern was and still is: To create work for the unemployed. The recycling and community aspect is also important.1236

To exhibit objects from a quite current social project is unique for a mission museum, as far as I have experienced it during my visits.

The big advertisement reading “Mother in Law Hot Curry Mix” shows that the missionaries want to present also a humorous Africa.

Additionally, many pieces of Christian textile art represent a special feature in this museum. As I was informed while visiting, these pieces of art (weavings made by women and batik made by men) are present in the museum because they are in connection with the work of the female branch, the already mentioned Mariannhill Sisters. They are active in girls’ education and, as I understood, some of the art objects were made in their schools and academies. So this is a direct link between the museum and their mission engagement in Africa, and again, this link is a current one, in contrast to the highlighting of the old age of objects in Würzburg CMM. It is, of course, also a way to show “mission success”, which I interpret as one of the intentions of this mission museum. In this regard, Riedegg CMM also presents trophies.

Furthermore, the textile art proves that transfer of objects is not within one branch of Pfanner’s foundations in Durban, but within both. In this respect, the gendered division – male missionaries and missionary sisters – became less important.

Regarding the definition of independent museum in the sense of amateurish, Figure 19 gives a good impression:

---

1236 (my translation) Verbund Oberösterreichischer Museen, “Afrikamuseum”.
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The object description *Tischtuch Plastikreste* (“Table cloth, plastic scraps”) is printed on the back of a song sheet or similar, as the photograph shows a glimpse of staves and notes. Not only is this a perfect reference to the upcycling theme of the whole vitrine, but it also shows that the museum curator had a quite practical approach to presenting the objects. Usability, namely the conveying of information about the shown object is crucial, not a professional design of the object description. Thus, in this case, a used song sheet was re-purposed in the mission museum.

An independent museum approach is to be seen in the quote that the bespoken museum cluster website cites on the page about the *Afrikamuseum*: “The value of the exhibits in the museum lies in the stories behind them.”\(^{1237}\) This is exactly what Jannelli describes. The museum curators/missionaries, also Pater Tony who showed me around in 2013, have been working in South Africa for decades. Therefore, they can narrate the stories behind the objects\(^ {1238}\), especially if the objects represent a contemporary Africa with vuvuzelas from 2010 and footballs made from rubbish.

\(^{1237}\) (my translation) Verbund Oberösterreichischer Museen.

\(^{1238}\) An article tells of such personal experience: “P. Bernhard steht im Missionsmuseum von Riedegg und lacht. In der Hand hält er einen Stock, in den Landgebieten Südafrikas bis heute ein ständiger Begleiter eines Mannes als Statussymbol und zur Abwehr, etwa von Hunden. Der heute 77-jährige lebte und arbeitete vier Jahrzehnte als Missionar in Südafrika.” Kirchen-Zeitung, “Von Riedegg nach Südafrika”. Note that the *Afrikamuseum* is here also named a *Missionsmuseum*. So, these terms are used parallel.
Sacred Heart Missionaries (MSC)

The German-speaking branch of the Sacred Heart Missionaries had one mission museum both in Austria and in Germany. The one in Germany, Hiltrup MSC, constitutes the third case study. Therefore I give only a short portrait of this museum at this point. All sources for the Hiltrup MSC portrait can be found in the case study. The portrait of Liefering MSC, on the other hand, follows the normal grid. As mentioned, the MSC had a small-scale mission museum in their mission house in Oeventrop as well, which is not part of this study. For a description of the MSC congregation see Section 7.2 in the case study.

Hiltrup MSC: Missionsmuseum

Address: Am Klosterwald 40, 48165 Münster, Germany
Website: www.hiltruper-missionare.de

Although the mission house in Hiltrup is younger than the mission house in Liefering, the mission museum in Hiltrup is older and therefore presented here as the first one.

When the MSC could finally open the mission house outside of Münster in 1897, they immediately started with a mission museum. The Provincial Superior P. Hubert Linckens is named as the founder of the mission museum, but the much younger MSC members Otto Meyer, Richard Schumm, and Gerhard Peekel were equally or even more responsible for the beginning of this mission museum. The museum was planned and realised from the beginning of the mission house onwards, starting with a small collection that grew over the years. Floor plans show that it was close to the entrance area.

There were an ethnographical and a natural science collection side by side. Birds were of special interest for many MSC missionaries from the very beginning. Some of the missionaries from Hiltrup were in tight exchange and cooperation with natural scientists in Germany. Clearly, most of the objects – both ethnographical and natural history objects – came from New Guinea, primarily from the New Britain Archipelago, where the German colonial empire was situated until the end of the First World War. Only a few objects came from the mission field in China, and some rare exhibits from Japan, Bali, Australia and some Latin American countries. Regarding the zoological collection, it is important to note that there were also specimens from the German flora and fauna and this was in connection to the teaching activities in the mission house because Hiltrup also housed a high school.

1239 Schlegel lists a mission museum of the Hiltruper MSC missionaries near Arnsberg, which must be the mission museum Oeventrop. She states that it was founded at around 1900 and closed 1967. Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland,” 106.
Patres and fratres from Hiltrup shaped the museum, be it as guides or builders of the showcases or as the “collectors” in the mission fields.

In 1941, the Nazi regime requisitioned the mission house, which meant the end of the mission museum. More than 1,500 ethnographical objects were taken to the Ethnographical Museum Berlin. The natural history collection was brought to the local museum for natural history in Münster. Although there were signs that the former head of the museum, P. Johann Braam, tried to re-establish a museum though it is unlikely that the museum was opened again. The remaining ethnographical objects were sold to the Ethnographical Museum in Basel in 1962, and other collections were sold later on the private market.

Liefering MSC: Missionsmuseum
Address: Missionshaus Liefering, Schönleitenstraße 1, 5020 Salzburg, Austria
Website: www.bondeko.org

The reasons that led to the founding of the mission house in Salzburg are to be found in the Kulturkampf in Germany and in the fact that the French founded congregation also wanted to move into the German-speaking part of Europe. The first mission house in the German-speaking part of Europe was built in Austria, close to the border to Germany, to circumvent the restrictions in Germany. The founding of the mission house including a novitiate in Liefering took place in 1888. From Liefering more branches were initiated, and missionaries left for Oceania (since the 1890s), China (since 1926), Congo (former Zaire, since 1955), and Brazil (since 1966). Liefering is the motherhouse for the Southern Germany-Austrian province since 1925.

In the time of my research, there were still seven brothers in Congo, Brazil, Ecuador and Namibia, but as the missionaries themselves write on their website, after decades of mission engagement outside of Europe, the Sacred Heart Missionaries are coming back to the provinces in Europe. The young Churches are independent and, in the meantime, Europe became a “mission field […] and the pope’s call to new evangelisation in our secularised society shows us the enormous tasks in our homeland.” Their focus is now on renewal and consolidation of the Christian faith in Europe.

1240 The main geographical orientation of the Sacred Heart Missionaries was whole Oceania, starting in Melanesia and Micronesia as their first mission field in 1881. However, it is only New Guinea that is mentioned on the website. Wessel, “Ein Leben für die,” in Österreich in der Südsee, 318. The dates for each mission field are to be found in the leaflet at the mission museum. Leaflet “Missionsmuseum der Herz-Jesu-Missionare im Kloster Salzburg-Liefering”.
The compound in Liefering includes a private high school with distinct Christian profile and *Bondeko – Ort der Begegnung für Eine Welt*, an institution founded by the missionaries for public awareness of mission (mainly towards children and teenagers) and for interreligious dialogue.

The mission museum in Liefering has to some extent been documented thanks to the work of the anthropologist Alexandra Wessel. Her dissertation about the mission museum describes the process of her work with the objects and the (re-)establishing of the exhibition. Therefore, the current state of the exhibition is mainly due to her effort and research. As an anthropologist, she focuses on the objects themselves (objects as source), their presentation and preservation, not on the history of the museum.

The portrait is based on her publications and a small guidebook (co-authored by Wessel), on brochures and leaflets offered in the museum and on my personal visit to the museum on the 4th of April 2013.

The founding date of this mission museum is unidentified. On the one hand, Schlegel mentions the mission museum in Salzburg with only one line, stating it was founded in 1904 and the collection contains objects from Oceania. Primary sources are also unclear about a founding date or period. As it is the only discovered founding date so far, I follow Schlegel with 1904. Wessel’s dissertation lacks a historical summary of the museum or collection, as she starts with the situation she found in Liefering when she started to work on her thesis after 2000: Around 600 objects were stored in vitrines in the mission house and in the cellars, categorised according to origin: Africa, South America, Oceania. Some display cases also had objects from China. The vitrines were situated in the entrance rooms of the mission house and in corridors toward the school premises. There were traces of a former categorisation (numbers on the objects), but no inventory was to be found. Some descriptions and attributions to geographical regions were incorrect. Wessel’s thesis gives only scarce hints about the years before the renovation and reorganisation. The small museum guidebook narrates more enthusiastically that in 2002, by coincidence, objects from New Guinea and Congo were discovered in the archive:

> Everyday objects, weapons and masks, once sent home to Salzburg by Sacred Heart Missionaries, waited in suitcases and boxes for their rediscovery. The find, as well as the very high quality of the objects, produced a small sensation the result of which is the furnishing of today’s museum.

---

1245 Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland,” 88.
1246 Although Wessel published about the mission museum, there is no hint about a founding date.
As the guidebook also mentions already existing exhibits before that discovery, it can be assumed that the number of new-found objects was the reason for rearranging and reorganising the museum, not that it was the actual discovery of stored objects.

I want to sum up the developments of the mission museum as far as I can reconstruct it: Missionaries of the Sacred Heart congregation “collected” and transferred to Liefering objects from around the 1880s onwards.\textsuperscript{1249} Up to the early 2000s, the objects were partly presented in the mission house to visitors, partly stored away. Alexandra Wessel and P. Anton Ringseisen MSC cooperated with the goal to reopen a new exhibition. The objects were examined, sorted, photographed, and an inventory was made according to current standards.

Pupils of the high school attached to the mission house were involved in this whole process, that means that already the process of rearranging this missionary collection had a pedagogical impetus and an integral outreach.\textsuperscript{1250} In October 2007, on the occasion of the centenary of Jules Chevalier’s death, the founder of the congregation, the mission museum was re-opened. They claim to have updated it to the current anthropological and missionary standards.\textsuperscript{1251} With “missionary standard” I assume they refer to a current theology of mission.

I could not detect a founding figure or an outstanding missionary who would be involved in the “collecting” and transferring of the objects. But the question of responsibility for the museum is of interest. This question leads to the institution of \textit{Bondeko} because it seems as if the museum would be a shared responsibility between the Sacred Heart Missionaries and the institution \textit{Bondeko}. The mission museum is not mentioned on the official websites of the mission house Liefering (www.herz-jesu-missionare.at), nor on the website of the Sacred Heart Missionaries of the Austrian-Southern German province (www.msc-salzburg.at). Its only online presence is on the website of \textit{Bondeko}. A leaflet that presents several workshops by \textit{Bondeko} (topics ranging from Fair Trade to street children in Africa and Latin America) shows that the mission museum is used in one workshop as a starting point to discuss the mission engagement of today.\textsuperscript{1252}


\textsuperscript{1250} Wessel, \textit{Die Macht des Objekts}, 102–3.


When visiting the museum, I had a similar impression that the museum is today more a matter of Bondeko than of the congregation. That means that the care for the objects transformed to be a matter of laypeople too since Bondeko is an institution led by laypersons, as well as a Sacred Heart missionary and an Ursuline Sister. Thus, the strong responsibility of lay theologians is an important characteristic of this mission museum.

The objects from New Guinea and Melanesia, in general, are dominantly presented in the primary sources, for example, masks and objects for ritual dances. Other objects come from the Congo, especially Bakuba textiles. Their collection of copper objects, jewellery and everyday items, is remarkable. The collection from Brazil is not described in the guidebook; it is only mentioned that the amount of these objects is small compared to the importance of the mission field for the congregation.1253

In the guidebook, the existence of objects from the mission fields in Liefering is addressed in several connections. It is stated that at first the missionaries received the objects as thanks for their work from the indigenous peoples – at least in New Guinea where Wessel describes the attitude toward the missionaries as positive. Wessel goes on to explain that often the usage or the process of making an object was of greater importance than the object itself: “After a celebration, the objects were often thrown away, so it was no problem for missionaries, anthropologists and others to take them with them.”1254 As we can see, the visitor of this mission museum is not left alone to confront the objects from the mission fields, rather the narration in this museum – through the guidebook – gives explanations. This happens at least for the objects from New Guinea. Of course, this brochure also stresses the good relationship between the missionaries and the locals.1255

The transferring objects from the mission field to Europe is explained due to objects becoming waste after usage; whether or not this is a satisfying explanation for the visitors is, of course, another question.

As a second step after the changing ownership of objects, missionaries brought the objects with them when they were on vacation at home, and they

---

1254 (my translation) Herz-Jesu-Missionare Salzburg-Liefering, 16.
sent objects to Salzburg.\textsuperscript{1256} Network boundaries overlapping with other congregations or outside of the Catholic sphere are not mentioned.

Motivation and goals for the museums are revealed regularly and some of the aims are in line with other mission museums.\textsuperscript{1257} The special focus on youth is expressed several times:

```
Today young people learn in the mission museum in connection with the Bondeko interculturality and solidarity as well as dialogue and encounter with the Other. Both institutions are places of encounter where the missionary understanding of the Sacred Heart Missionaries is discussed.\textsuperscript{1258}
```

Clearly, the expectations of what to achieve with the museum are high; self-reflexion is one of the aims:

```
The mission museum is understood as part of the school and youth work of the Sacred Heart Missionaries and should offer an opportunity to reflect on one’s own life and to deepen one’s faith by looking at the Other. The exhibition documents 155 years of missionary work of the Sacred Heart Missionaries in different parts of the world and informs about the changes in the respective countries.\textsuperscript{1259}
```

Here, the clear approach towards young visitors is verbalised. This has to do with the affiliated high school although the mission museum in Liefering is not the only mission museum close to a high school, think for example of St. Ottilien OSB. Even the process of renovation included integrating pupils, as Wessel describes. It becomes evident that the switch of responsibility to a (lay) institution like Bondeko and the focus on youth as visitors, as well as the clear aim to mediate the current missionary vision, are the characteristics of the mission museum in Liefering.

**Spiritans (CSSp)**

The *Congregatio Sancti Spiritus sub tutela Immaculati Cordis Beatissimae Virginis Mariae*, or in their more common name, the Spiritans or Holy Ghost Fathers are a congregation of twofold origin. 1703, Claude Poullart des Places founded a community in Paris (Congregation of the Holy Ghost) which started their mission engagement in French colonies from 1805 onwards. In 1848 it joined the Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, founded by Francis

\textsuperscript{1256} Herz-Jesu-Missionare Salzburg-Liefering, 3-4; 16.
\textsuperscript{1257} "Ziel des Museums ist es, Besucher über das Wirken der Herz-Jesu-Missionare in Papua Neuguinea, China, Afrika und Brasilien vom Beginn der Missionsarbeit bis in die Gegenwart zu informieren." Herz-Jesu-Missionare Salzburg-Liefering, 4.
\textsuperscript{1258} (my translation) Herz-Jesu-Missionare Salzburg-Liefering, 4.
\textsuperscript{1259} (my translation) Herz-Jesu-Missionare Salzburg-Liefering, 5.
Libermann. Today the Spiritans are responsible for fifty-six mission districts globally.\textsuperscript{1260}

In Germany in times of the \textit{Kulturkampf}, they had troubles establishing a mission house there. The fact that they were a French foundation and that they were seen as related to the Jesuits did not exactly help. On the other hand, the engagement of French Spiritans in Bagamoyo, the main city in German East Africa, impressed many in Germany.\textsuperscript{1261}

No portrait of the Spiritans’ museum activities would be complete without mentioning their ethnological museum in the Netherlands, which they founded in 1955 in their community in Berg-en-Dal, near Nijmegen.\textsuperscript{1262} This museum is today the Afrika Museum, a Dutch state museum that merged in 2014 with the \textit{Tropenmuseum} in Amsterdam and the National Museum of Ethnology in Leiden.\textsuperscript{1263}

The portrait of the mission museum in Knechtsteden is based on email correspondence with P. Johannes Henschel and Belinda Peters as well as small parts of Peters’ diploma thesis on Knechtsteden at the University of Cologne, which she was kind enough to provide me with.\textsuperscript{1264} There is archival material in Knechtsteden about the museum but, as Peters’ thesis already covered many aspects, I assumed that it is enough for this short portrait to be based on that. Her unpublished thesis is a detailed study of the museum, including an overview of the congregation in general, its activities in the mission fields and the German province. She follows the development of the museum up to the year of 1984 and had the great opportunity to also integrate interviews with the responsible patres into her thesis.

As Henry J. Koren CSSp in his history of the congregation and Schlegel also offer further information about the mission museum in Knechtsteden, these bits of information are interwoven into the portrait.

**Knechtsteden CSSp: Missionsmuseum**

Address: Knechtsteden 4, 41540 Dormagen, Germany
Website: www.spiritaner.de

\textsuperscript{1260} Klosterführer, 20–21.
\textsuperscript{1261} Gründer, \textit{Christliche Mission und deutscher}, 70–71.
\textsuperscript{1262} Koren, \textit{The Spiritans}, 330.
\textsuperscript{1263} Afrika Museum, “Wie zijn wij?”. The website tells of the origin as a museum of the congregation: “What is now a wealthy, well-documented collection of objects from Africa, began as a modest but valuable private collection of the missionaries of the Congregation of the Holy Spirit. Members of this missionary congregation worked and work in Africa. The objective of the fathers: a broader perspective on the experiences of the people in those areas where they [the missionaries, RLN] have long been employed. In 1954, P. P. Bukkems, a former missionary in Tanzania, took the initiative of establishing an Africa Museum. […] The first exhibition consists of objects which have been brought by the patres themselves over the years from Africa or have come from various traveling mission exhibitions.” (my translation) Afrika Museum, “Over het Afrika Museum”.
\textsuperscript{1264} The university library of Cologne lost her thesis therefore it is no longer publicly accessible.
The mission museum in Knechtsteden is the oldest mission museum on my list being established in 1896. Schlegel mentions that the museum moved several times within the complex. In 1941, as the Nazi regime requisitioned the whole complex the museum was also shut down. The exhibits were confiscated and a high number of objects vanished in this circumstance. In the post-war years, the now empty museum building was transformed into an asylum for homeless people.

In 1953, the mission museum was opened again and in 1965 and 1967 renovations of the exhibition design took place.

According to P. Henschel, the mission museum was closed in the 1970s. The reason for shutting it down was as he stated because the exhibition did not meet the requirements of contemporary mission theology. Today, there are special exhibitions in parts of the cloister, also on topics like African cult objects. Henschel also mentions that they plan to have an exhibition about research by Spiritans in anthropology, African studies, linguistics and so on, and an exhibition about the Spiritan P. Alexander Le Roy who was active in Bagamoyo. Judging from his emails, it becomes clear that the Spiritans in Knechtsteden reflect very much on their own history and their own engagement and see the need to share this topic with the community in Germany, with the medium of an exhibition.

The objects came from the mission fields of the Spiritans, with a focus on religious, and often rare objects. Peters also mentions ethnographic objects; “collectors” were normally Spiritans themselves. An inventory was only made partially. According to Schlegel, most objects come from the mission fields by the Spiritans in East-Africa. Other parts of the collection were donated by locals (ethnographic objects from Togo and Pacific) or bought.

As mentioned above, the German Spiritans are connected to the Catholic Museum in their mission station in Bagamoyo, today’s Tanzania, which I

---

1266 Also Koren mentions this: “Previously, a Nazi official had seen to it that the ethnological collections of the Knechtsteden museum and the best works of its library were shipped to safety in Berlin.” Koren, The Spiritans, 321.
1267 Koren, 323.
1268 Schlegel, “Missionsmuseum in Deutschland,” 107.
1269 P. Henschel could not give a more precise date in his email. However, Schlegel states that the museum was closed in 1996 because of lack of space. Schlegel, 107.
1270 Email correspondence with P. Johannes Henschel CSSp, April 2015.
1271 Email correspondence with P. Johannes Henschel CSSp, April 2015.
1274 Schlegel, “Missionsmuseum in Deutschland,” 107.
1275 Clausewitz, “Der Schrecken ist gegenwärtig”. After I had visited the museum in Bagamoyo myself in 2015, I had an email correspondence with the former museum director and main curator of the exhibition, P. Johannes Henschel (April 2015). He strongly rejected the idea of seeing the museum as a mission museum. Despite the fact that the museum is within the old sisters’ house of a mission station, the main issue is not the Spiritans mission activities, it is the history of slavery. As von Clausewitz’ article expresses, the museum in Bagamoyo is meant to
categorised as a Missionary Heritage Museum (see Section 1.4.1). I asked about a connection between this museum in Tanzania and their mission museum in Knechtsteden. The person responsible P. Henschel assured me that there was no connection or network of any kind between the museums in Tanzania and in Germany.1276

As for the intention of Knechtsteden, Peters is clear: It was propaganda for the mission (Propagandazwecke) that led to the opening. Contrary to a scientifically oriented museum in its time, this museum was opened to influence the – primarily religiously oriented – public in regard to Christian mission. The idea is that visitors should become interested in mission and they should be convinced about the necessity of foreign mission. According to her, the scholarly interest in the objects was very limited.1277

Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate (OMI)
The Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate (Congregatio Missionarium Oblatorum Sanctissimae et Immaculatae Virginis Mariae, OMI) were founded in 1816 by the Bishop of Marseille and it is one of the typical French founded mission congregations of the 19th century that became active in the German-occupied African areas and consequently longed for mission houses in Germany too.1278 Today they are about 3,800 members strong and consist of patres and fratres.1279 They work in Europe, Africa, Asia, and both Americas. In Germany, they are also known as Hünfeld missionaries after their main house in Hünfeld, a town in the State of Hesse, central Germany.

Reliable hints about the mission museum in their Bonifatius monastery in Hünfeld are rare. Next to the short mention in Schlegel1280, I found a photo of a postcard on eBay that says “St. Bonifatius-Kloster, Hünfeld Museum”1281. My following inquiry about sources, mainly letters, was met with a positive response that there are indeed letters in the archive with remarks about the sending of objects to Germany. But I was informed that the high number of letters and data protection would make further research impossible alas, I would not get access to them. Therefore, this is a very short portrait and I rely on the email exchange with the Oblates.

document the history of slavery in Tanzania and to help the local population to come on terms with their historical trauma. More locals and Africans visit the museum than foreign tourists.

Clausewitz, III.

1276 Email correspondence with P. Johannes Henschel, April 2015.
1278 Gründer, Christliche Mission und deutscher, 68.
1279 The Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate, “Who are we?”.
1280 Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland,” 112.
1281 “St. Bonifatiuskloster Hünfeld Museum”.
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Hünfeld OMI: Missionsmuseum

Address: Bonifatiuskloster Klosterstraße 5, 36088 Hünfeld, Germany
Website: www.bonifatiuskloster.de

For the founding phase, I must resort to Schlegel who states 1912 as the founding date of the museum. Ethnographic objects like musical instruments, wood carvings and masks were on display.\textsuperscript{1282} In 1970 during general renovation and new organisation of the whole monastery, the museum was reduced to merely a few vitrines.

The objects come from the following fields of origin: Sri Lanka, South Africa, Namibia and Canada. These origins were verified by the archivist.\textsuperscript{1283}

Although this little information is quite unsatisfying, this mission museum can serve as an example for how little is known and researched not just about the mission museums but about some mission houses in Germany in general. Especially noteworthy is the fact that in the case of Hünfeld OMI, the source material is available in principle, but it is not accessible for researchers.

Bethlehem Mission Society (SMB)/Bethlehem Mission Immensee (BMI)

The Bethlehem Mission Society, \textit{Societas Missionum Exterarum de Bethlehem in Helvetia} (SMB), was founded by the Sacred Heart Priest Pierre-Marie Barral in 1896 as the Institute Bethlehem, with the goal of educating Swiss boys from poor families to become priests for the foreign mission. In 1921, the Institute was transformed into the Bethlehem Mission Society (SMB). First missionaries left Switzerland for China in 1924 and in 1938 their mission engagement in South Rhodesia started with Japan and Taiwan following. In 1953 Colombia joined the ranks of mission fields. From 1950 to 1992 also the diocese of Denver (USA) was “equipped” with Swiss missionaries.\textsuperscript{1284} The society developed in line with the general developments in the Catholic Church. Under the title Bethlehem Mission Immensee (BMI), a new construction regarding active engagement by laypersons as well as in the leadership was erected. From the male Institute and society, it became today a plural entity with a \textit{Verein}, an association, established in 2000.\textsuperscript{1285} Today they state: “We are men and women, single and married, laypeople, brothers and priests.”\textsuperscript{1286}

\textsuperscript{1282} Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland,” 112. The display with these objects can be verified even with the rather bad view on the postcard.
\textsuperscript{1283} Email correspondence with P. Schellmann and P. Wolf, August 2016.
\textsuperscript{1284} Meili, “Von der Missionsgesellschaft Bethlehem,” in \textit{Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft}, 118-122.
\textsuperscript{1285} Meili, 125-133.
\textsuperscript{1286} (my translation) Meili, 128.
Source material for this mission museum is almost non-existent. At my visit to the archive in March 2013, I could use the inventory of the museum objects from 2010. That means, the objects were documented, but not regarding my main research questions. The history of the museum is not documented; for this area I could not find primary sources. Therefore, this portrait is based on the inventory of objects which allows some interesting results nonetheless.

Immensee SMB: Missionsmuseum

Address: Bethlehemweg 10, 6405 Immensee, Switzerland
Website: www.smb-immensee.ch

The mission museum was established in 19211287 and was closed in 2010. During the closing process, every object was photographed, and an inventory made, categorised by continents.

These inventories show the broad range of objects: From skull bones and ostrich eggs to hair saloon advertising and musical instruments, to tree seeds in small bottles. Again, the objects are diverse. Areas of origin are classical mission fields: Zimbabwe, Zambia, Tanzania, Taiwan, Japan, Philippines, and various countries in South America. In all these areas, the SMB is still active today.1288

The inventory from 2010 was made in the course of shutting down the mission museum. It includes description, material, technique, dimensions, and origin of the objects. Sadly, there are no details about the “collectors” or the transfer of the object, which is disappointing because the inventory with the photographs is otherwise carefully made.

Analysing the inventories of Africa, Asia and Latin America, some features of the collection can be traced: The dates of acquisition range from the 1930s up to the 1980s. Only one time a remark indicates that an object was brought by an SMB missionary while being on a home visit. His name was E. Imhof, he was working in China since 1924 and visited Switzerland in 1933.1289 Often so-called Schülerarbeiten, artwork made by students in mission schools, are mentioned. Here also names and dates are given. One remark also indicates that a bamboo nativity scene came from a source that is connected to SVD missionaries.1290 Therefore cooperation and networking, at least for the origin of some objects in this mission museum, seems to be confirmed. The SMB was since its start in mission work related to the SVD mission, as their general history shows. In 1924 the first three missionaries from Immensee travelled to

---

1287 This was also the year of establishing the seminary in Immensee.
1288 Japan, China, Taiwan, Kenya, Tanzania, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, and Colombia according to their website. Bethlehem Mission, “Missionsgesellschaft Bethlehem SMB”.
1289 “Inventory “Asien”, 1661, ABMI.
1290 “Werkstatt F. Grimm SVD (gem. O. Ballof)”, Inventory “Asien”, 1100.2, ABMI.
China, Yanzhou, where they were introduced into Chinese language and culture by SVD missionaries *in situ*.\(^{1291}\) I am also of the opinion that since the SMB was a numerically smaller mission congregation, such cooperation with a bigger congregation like the SVD was a necessary consequence.

**Pallottines/Society of the Catholic Apostolate (SAC)**

The brothers and priests of the *Societas Apostolatus Catholici* are better known as Pallottines, after Saint Vincenzo Pallotti (1795–1850, canonised 1963), who founded the community in 1835. During the 19\(^{th}\) century, mission activities became so dominant in the society, that the name changed to “the Pious Society of the Missions”, but in 1947 the old name was restored.\(^{1292}\)

Pallottines were allowed to open a mission house in Germany, in Limburg. Since 1892 they educated new members for mission engagement in the German colonies, at first for Cameroon.\(^{1293}\) They were active in three mission fields: Cameroon (1890–1916 and from 1964 to the present), South Africa (from 1922) and Australia (from 1901).\(^{1294}\) Today, the Pallottines name Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, Cameroon, Nigeria, Rwanda, Zambia, South Africa, and India as their mission field.\(^{1295}\) In 2010 the first non-European member became rector general, the highest rank in the society.\(^{1296}\)

For this portrait, I rely on email correspondence with German Pallottines, and a text written by P. Alexander Holzbach\(^{1297}\), an article and the website www.museumsdesign.de which offers photos of the exhibition. By email, I was informed that there should be some primary sources for the museum but nothing that is ready to be investigated at this point.

**Limburg SAC: Missionsmuseum**

Address: Wiesbadener Straße 1, 65549 Limburg an der Lahn, Germany
Website: www.pallottiner-limburg.de

Since 1890 Pallottines from Limburg an der Lahn were active in Cameroon, and they brought objects from their new home to their old home. With these objects, the Pallottines opened a small exhibition in the guest house in their mission house in the Frankfurter Straße in Limburg. When the bigger St.

\(^{1291}\) Bethlehem Mission, “Geschichte”.
\(^{1292}\) Societas Apostolatus Catholici, “History of the Society”. On a side note: Pallotti’s personal room in Rome became a museum (it can be visited virtually via Societas Apostolatus Catholici, “Visita virtuale museo”).
\(^{1293}\) Gründer, *Christliche Mission und deutscher*, 64–65.
\(^{1294}\) Holzbach, “Das Missionsmuseum der Pallottiner”.
\(^{1295}\) Pallottiner, “Missionsbericht 2015”.
\(^{1296}\) Orden-online.de, “Pallottiner wählen ersten Nicht-Europäer”.
\(^{1297}\) Holzbach, “Das Missionsmuseum der Pallottiner”. 
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Mary’s Church was built in 1927, the former private chapel was converted into a mission museum. Therefore 1927 is chosen as a founding date for the statistics in this study. In 1967 the objects were transferred to the cloister and a modernised exhibition was put in place there. The Pallottines celebrated “100 years of Pallottine Mission in Cameroon” (1990) and “100 years of Pallottines in Limburg” (1992), in which the museum was updated, and the design renewed, although the majority of the exhibits were kept in place. The museum was closed in 2012 and the exhibition was removed, the objects being professionally photographed before they were stored.

Regarding the objects, Holzbach and Schützeichel mention the following: everyday goods, tools, weapons, masks, and stuffed animals. A lion from Cameroon that is said to have been in Limburg since 1906 and an ostrich since the 1920s from South Africa, as well as a butterfly collection were the stars of the exhibition. We can conclude that Limburg SAC is also an example of ethnographical and natural history objects side by side. Apart from these two categories of objects, the exhibition also included an overview of the founder Vincenzo Pallotti and the global distribution of the society. Objects, photographs and text informed about the history of the Pallottines mission engagement and the situation of the Catholic communities in Cameroon, South Africa and Australia. This text shows that mission history was an important part of this mission museum.

As one of the main intentions during a later phase of the mission museum (that means after the reorganisation in 1992), imparting of the Pallottines’ current understanding of mission is mentioned:

Evangelisation involves a constant and sympathetic effort to introduce the gospel to different cultures, called “inculturation”. This is what the mission museum tells us.

In the 1990s, the museum wanted to impart the concept of inculturation through the exhibition. Also quotes from the encyclical *Redemptoris Missio* are given to explain this concept. Clearly, the museum addresses negative aspects which the notion of inculturation seeks to counter. Even destruction through evangelisation is named:

---

1298 However, the earlier mentioned website names 1967 as the founding year, but it seems obvious, that the exhibition in the private chapel from 1927 should be seen as the more accurate date. Deciding the founding date for this museum is problematic because there are many contradictory claims: apart from 1927 or else 1967, Schlegel mentions 1898 (which would even predate the first active missionaries in Cameroon, so it is very unlikely), and Schützeichel states 1900, which is as well unlikely because it is also too early. Schlegel, “Missionsmuseen in Deutschland,” 88; Schützeichel, “Missionsmuseum in Limburg”.

1299 Holzbach, “Das Missionsmuseum der Pallottiner”.

1300 Email correspondence with Fr. Georg Adams, August 2016.

1301 Holzbach; Schützeichel, “Missionsmuseum in Limburg”.

1302 (my translation) Schützeichel.
At the same time, the presented also takes a critical look at the destruction of culture through colonisation and missionisation by Europeans in the Third World. Adults are encouraged to reflect. [...] Of course what we see in the museum shows the past. 1303

These negative impacts are seen as only happening in the past, not present. When asked about the intention and with that also the transfer of objects to Limburg, P. Holzbach emphasises a different aim:

Souvenirs of the missionaries were exhibited to give visitors an impression of the exotic countries. [...] I would say the museum was not systemically formed. It happened more likely “by chance”. 1304

The museum is referred to as something that runs alongside, and as we have seen, the transferred objects are described as souvenirs of the missionaries (Mitbringsel). The intention is to give a first impression of the mission field to the German population. The mission fields are here even referred to as “exotic”. For that intention, a strategy for “collecting” is not needed. Furthermore, together with the question of the museum being independent or scientific and professional, we learn from the manuscript by Holzbach, that the mission museum in Limburg offered something rare in the diverse range of the mission museums: the linguistic research of the Pallottines is made public. The Lord’s Prayer is printed in twenty different languages inside the museum. So they refer to their society’s scientific work, but at the same time the text makes it clear: This is not a scientific museum:

Since the comparatively small mission museum of the Pallottines does not see itself as a historical-ethnological exhibition, the tour ends with a plaque quoting a word of Jesus from the Gospel of John, which asks the visitors about their own standpoint: “I am the resurrection and the life... Do you believe this?” (John 11:25–27). 1305

With this mission museum, it becomes clear that the division between independent and scientific is complex. The society has no emphasis on the anthropological field or on natural sciences; therefore they do not have the personnel to work out a “collecting” strategy, arranging a “more professional” exhibition with the ethnographic objects and animals brought to Limburg. But they could bring in their professional resources regarding linguistics. Additionally, it is important to note that the author of this manuscript also contrasts the scientific

1303 (my translation) Schützeichel.
1305 (my translation) Holzbach, “Das Missionsmuseum der Pallottiner.”
or professional attitude with the Bible quote. Seen as a more independent museum, this mission museum took up the society’s convictions and turned directly toward the visitor with the question from the gospel. The local visitors encountered, after seeing the gaze turned on the non-Christians in Africa or Australia, now themselves in the gaze, as they are asked if they believe.

**Pontifical Mission Societies (PWG)/missio**

The case of the mission museum in the German city Aachen is a special case in several ways. Most obvious, it is a mission museum founded by a lay mission organisation. The history of the museum as well as of the institutions it is connected to is complicated. Several strands end in what is today *missio*\(^{1306}\) with its headquarters in Aachen.

One strand was founded by the French Pauline Maria Jaricot (1799–1892), the Society of the Propagation of the Faith. The first German copy of this was the *Ludwig-Missionsverein* in Munich, the Southern German branch.\(^ {1307}\) Inspired by Jaricot, the German physician Heinrich Hahn (1800–1882) founded its Northern Germany branch, called the *Franziskus Xaverius Missionsverein*.\(^ {1308}\) In 1922, it got the pontifical recognition by Pius XI and is called in German *Päpstliches Werk der Glaubensverbreitung* (in short PWG). In English, it is the Pontifical Mission Societies. In 1972, the PWG together with the *Ludwig-Missionsverein* in Munich got merged into *missio*, today divided in *missio Aachen* (*Franziskus Xaverius Missionsverein*) and *missio München* (*Ludwig-Missionsverein*).\(^ {1309}\)

Quality of source material for the *Aachner Missionsmuseum* depends on the time in question. There is plenty for the first years of existence, but later on, information gets scarce. The *missio* archive in Aachen with the name *Mikado* was helpful in supplying me with some primary sources. According to the archivists there are around 150 loose papers of lists and inventory lists, tour guides and a floor plan dating from 1932. The photo archive has visual material that gives an impression of the museum. For this portrait I rely on some written museum guides and published articles.

\(^{1306}\) There are *missio* organisations in several countries, including *missio Switzerland* and *missio Austria*.

\(^{1307}\) Gründer, *Christliche Mission und deutscher*, 48.

\(^{1308}\) Schüller, *Ein Führer durch das*, 5. Both these figures are also presented and depicted in the mission museum in Aachen.

\(^{1309}\) Furthermore, *missio* includes next to PWG, the Missionary Childhood Association (Werk der Hl. Kindheit, also a French 19th century movement), the Society of St. Peter the Apostle and the Missionary Union of Priests and Religious.
In 1917 the *Franziskus Xaverius Missionsverein* already considered the idea of opening a mission museum and first ethnographic objects were organised. The main difference between this society and the other portrayed congregations was of course, that their members were not directly “on mission”. As a consequence of this lay status, I argue, they had more struggles to establish a network for equipping a future mission museum. And they mention that themselves: In the 1920s “General secretary van der Velden added some pieces to the first collection and established overall valuable ties with collecting missionaries.”[1310] The author of the museum guide even used the network terminology for establishing contacts: *Verbindungen knüpfen* (literally: to tie connections), when describing the preparation phase for the museum.

What distinguishes this society from a mission congregation is that they could not easily rely on internal connections to missionaries in the mission fields, because they were just a supportive society not a community of missionaries such as the aforementioned congregations.

From 1929 onwards, Karl Breuer mentions himself as the one who started a more systematic collection:

> [...] every missionary, every missionary sister, but especially the mission superiors were given a written, or oral request for the delivery of museum objects when the requested [financial] support was handed over.[1311]

The “collecting” of objects happened therefore as a response for remitting donations for the mission. It was kind of a payback: giving financial support and as a response sending objects. This also shows that the request for objects was in oral and written form. It shows that it was male and female missionaries who they tried to enlist for sending objects. There was no gender division in their outreach.

In 1932, rooms in the PWG house in Hirschgraben 39 were available and consequently, the time for presenting the collection to the public was ripe. Before the opening, the museum organisers travelled through Germany to the mission procura of the German orders and congregations to get more material.[1312] The museum curators in Aachen obviously used the network inside Germany, not just their connections to the outer-European mission fields to equip their museum. It becomes clear that objects had several stops on their way from the mission fields to a specific mission museum in Germany.

---

At this founding stage of the mission museum, Karl Breuer (treasurer of the forerunner of missio), the stage designer Sepp Schüller, the sculptor Albert Lauscher, and allrounder Maria Louis worked together to establish the presentation of the collection.\textsuperscript{1313}

Finally, in April 1933 the Diocesan bishop solemnly opened the mission museum.\textsuperscript{1314} It was titled \textit{Aachener Missionsmuseum}, as the founder Sepp Schüller calls it in his article \textit{Ein Jahr Aachener Missionsmuseum}.\textsuperscript{1315}

In 1936, the PWG headquarters and with it also the mission museum moved to the Hermannstraße 14 in Aachen. At the same time, some objects from the PWG collection were exhibited at the headquarters of another branch of the Pontifical Mission Society, the Missionary Childhood Association, in Aachen.\textsuperscript{1316} From 1972 onwards called \textit{missio}, this institution moved to the current address in Aachen, Goethestraße 43. Parts of the collection of the mission museum are until today exhibited in the entry area of \textit{missio}. The other part of the collection is stored in depots but details regarding the whereabouts of the whole collection and possible losses during the Second World War are missing.\textsuperscript{1317}

Schüller’s article from 1934\textsuperscript{1318} and the museum guide from 1933, the year of its founding, give an excellent insight into the exhibition rooms in this early phase of this mission museum – and with that show also the range of objects in the mission museum: In the first room, the \textit{Missionshilfswesen in der Heimat} (the engagement for mission in Germany) is presented. It offers an overview of the history of Catholic mission, the distribution of religions globally, history of the PWG and of “big names” in the mission, photographic records of the journeys of missionaries, maps of India and Japan showing the travels of missionaries, etc. The tour guide from 1937 also mentions a model of the ship Santa Maria which Christopher Columbus used in his voyage to the Americas in 1492. The range of exhibits that seemed suitable for a mission museum was obviously very wide.\textsuperscript{1319}

Then the rooms dedicated to different regions begin: First Africa or as the article just puts it casually: “the dark continent”\textsuperscript{1320}. African countries that are distinctly named are Cameroon, Congo, Angola, Togo and South Africa. Then rooms are assigned to South America (Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Mexico), India,  

\textsuperscript{1313} Breuer, 26.  
\textsuperscript{1314} Schückler, \textit{Brücken zur Welt}, 24.  
\textsuperscript{1315} Schüller, “Ein Jahr Aachener Missionsmuseum”.  
\textsuperscript{1316} The Missionary Childhood Association (\textit{Kindermissionswerk}) is until today an important institution when it comes to global mission and involving children and youth for Catholic engagement. In Austria, Switzerland, and Germany, they are until present most famous for their \textit{Aktion Dreikönigssingen} around the 6th of January, where children dressed as the three magi collect money for children in the Global South. For more see www.kindermissionswerk.de.  
\textsuperscript{1317} Email correspondence with archivist Michael Drummen, July 2016. Aachen was heavily destroyed in 1944 (Battle of Aachen).  
\textsuperscript{1318} Schüller.  
\textsuperscript{1319} Schüller, \textit{Ein Führer durch das}, 4.  
\textsuperscript{1320} Schüller, “Ein Jahr Aachener Missionsmuseum,” 218.
Sri Lanka, two rooms for South Pacific islands, further Philippines, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, and China. Regarding the objects: masks, weapons and shields, clan chief’s stool, idols, figures, ivory carvings, furniture, and jewellery are named. Exhibits that no one of the other presented mission museums included – as far as I could conclude from the sources of course – are (as a selection): Korean ginseng¹³²¹, a palm-leave manuscript with Christian content, a plaster cast of bound so-called “lotus feet”, a model of a Samoan hat, a weaving loom from the Philippines, a Javanese Wayang theatre with gamelan orchestra, a golden Buddhist shrine, a Shinto home altar and a fly net said to be from the Chinese Emperor’s bed.¹³²²,¹³²³ As later texts show, more unique objects were added to the museum. For example, from Australia boomerangs and bullroarers.¹³²⁴ As we have seen in some other mission museums, the guides from 1933 and 1937 also mention a piece of art made by the indigenous (female) students of German missionary sisters.¹³²⁵

The special characteristic about this mission institution is its connection to multiple mission orders and congregations. Most of the time, the texts about the mission museum just refer to Catholic, or specific German, missionaries.¹³²⁶ Congregations that are mentioned include Capuchins, Jesuits, Mariannhill Sisters, Missionary Sisters of Our Lady of Africa (aka White Sisters), Mariannhill Missionaries, Franciscans and Franciscan missionary sisters, Marist brothers (FMS), and the Sacred Heart Missionaries (MSC) from Hiltrup.

Only a few times an explicit reference is made that these orders and congregations were indeed responsible for the organising and transferring the objects to Aachen. Having page long museum guides from the 1930s allows detailed insight into the broad range of objects. But the topic of the transfer from the mission fields to Aachen is only mentioned a few times in the published material. Other examples show that the network which the mission museum in Aachen used to equip its exhibition often included missionaries coming from Aachen and its surrounds. A silk embroidery was sent by the Mongolian bishop Chang to the museum via the missionary Waldetrudis Schanz who was born in Aachen. A Jesuit missionary, who was tortured and executed in 1737 in Tonking, was also remembered in the museum because he was born in the

¹³²¹ Ginseng was unknown to Germans at that time. Breuer, Kurzer Führer durch das, 15.
¹³²² As this text was written in the year after the seizure of power of the Nazis in Germany, the author explains that the net includes a swastika, which he explains as an old symbol for luck in the Far East.
¹³²⁴ Australian exhibits are mentioned in the guide from 1937. Schüller, Ein Führer durch das, 11.
¹³²⁶ For example: “Über sechstausend Pioniere des Glaubens, deutsche Missionare, Männer und Frauen, künden in den fremden Ländern der Erde die Frohbotschaft Christi.” Weber, “Gott oder Götzen?” 25. Here it becomes clear, that the German term Missionare in its grammatical male form refers to male and female missionaries.
diocese Aachen. Clearly, missionaries from the region are of importance. This is something that I did not notice occurring to this extent in other mission museums. More often, the affiliation with a congregation or order is more important than the regional connection. This makes sense regarding that Aachen PWG is not a mission museum run by a congregation, but by an association bound to a region. Therefore, regional links are more important than membership in one specific congregation.

Another example of the transfer of objects, also from Asia, around the year 1933:

At this moment when this guide has to be given to the print, a box from Madura in the south of India is reported to us, but we cannot wait for its arrival. According to a message from the donor, a Jesuit missionary, it contains several Indian works of art, tea tablets, which are carried by elephants, ibex horns and idols.

This proves that objects were indeed given to the museum as presents by missionaries. It was clearly not the museum curators who ordered specific items as they did not really know what the shipping definitely contained. Passages like these show that there was no strategic and elaborated “collecting”. Instead it looked rather like this: Whatever the Jesuit sent from India, the museum organisers would put into the vitrines. It was the missionary overseas who had the most influence on what the German visitors at home could see. It was the ones in the field who initially controlled the direction of the gaze on the mission field and its population. Another example is the model of a mission station in New Guinea, which was built and given to the museum by the MSC missionaries from Hiltrup. This network edge is of interest since the MSC missionaries had their own mission museums (see portrait MSC Liefering and the third case study).

The transfer of the emperor’s mosquito net, mentioned above, is another example. The author of the guide from 1933 tells the story of how this net came from Beijing to Aachen. A European soldier stole it while storming the palace in the Boxer Rebellion (1899–1901) and then left it with a Catholic family in China. When this family’s son became a priest, he took the net with him into the parish.

Priestly poverty forced him to exchange the precious piece with our museum by the mediation of a Franciscan missionary born in Aachen for mission alms, with which he built a chapel in a nearby village of his parish.

---

1327 Breuer, Kurzer Führer durch das, 24.
1328 (my translation) Breuer, 11.
1329 Breuer, 14.
1330 (my translation) Breuer, 22.
Clearly, the missionary networks – here the Franciscans – connected a Chinese priest, via a missionary from Aachen, with the mission museum in Aachen and enabled the mosquito net to be transferred to Germany. The self-proclaimed fact that it was owned by the Emperor of China, even made by the Empress of China and her court ladies, made the net an exotic and fascinating object. The net showed swastikas, which were in Germany – the guide was printed in 1933 – only associated with National Socialism. The further fact, that it was war booty and came under dubious circumstances into the possession of the priest, is in contrast not problematised. The outcome – the building of a chapel for Chinese Christians and having the net as an outstanding object for the museum – seems to justify the means. One can also say that the “biography” of the net adds to its significance.

The aim of the mission museum is often vaguely stated: the goal is to awaken and raise the enthusiasm for mission\textsuperscript{1331}, to give insights into the “hard and rocky work” of Catholic missionaries and the lives of those who should be converted.\textsuperscript{1332} Relating to the question of this museum’s being independent vs scientific, it becomes clear that the museum in Aachen was not designed to be a scientific museum, but neither was it a fully independent one. The ultimate goal is not to educate scientifically, nevertheless the presentation aspired to be based on scientifically correct knowledge of the time. It was their plan “to create a mission museum, which gives insights into the hard and rocky work of Catholic missionaries, based on an ethnological base”.\textsuperscript{1333} Ethnographic knowledge was only the base of the museum, but not the raison d’être for it. Consequently, in the articles and guides, missionaries are never presented as scholars or academic experts\textsuperscript{1334}, instead they appear at times as actors in the network who are responsible for transferring objects, as intermediaries of European art standards, and as educators and teachers, for example when it comes to pieces of art by their students. The \textit{Aachener Missionsmuseum} should have been an ethnographical museum “for the people”, a museum that the “simple man” and “even the youth” can understand easily.\textsuperscript{1335} In a way, it wants to present itself as the antithesis of a scientific museum, but at the same time wants to share in its authority.

\textsuperscript{1331} “Ihm, dem göttlichen König aller Völker, sei dieses Museum geweiht, das beitragen will zur Weckung und Vertiefung katholischer Missionsliebe, um dadurch mitzuhelfen an der weiteren Ausbreitung des Gottesreiches auf Erden.” Breuer, 3.
\textsuperscript{1332} Breuer, 25.
\textsuperscript{1333} (my translation) Breuer, 25.
\textsuperscript{1334} Schüller even stresses the contrast between a scholar and a missionary. The first is not trusted by the locals in the mission field, whereas the missionary, who stays for longer time at their place is trusted. The scholar is called a stranger, the missionary is accepted. Schüller, “Ein Jahr Aachener Missionsmuseum,” 218.
\textsuperscript{1335} Schüller, 217.
Congregation of the Franciscan Missionary Brothers (CMSF)

The Congregatio Missionaria Sancti Francisci (CMSF) was founded in 1901 in India by Paulus Moritz. Like the Sisters of the Holy Cross, it belongs to the Franciscan family, here the Third Order. Especially the Capuchin Gottfried Pelekmans OFMCap promoted the congregation. Brother Hermann-Paulus Moritz (1869–1942) was the head of this institute for more than forty years.\(^{1336}\) The area of their religious engagement is India and Sri Lanka, as well as Paraguay and Bolivia. The generalate is in Mumbai.\(^{1337}\) Their work circulates around orphanages, schools, dispensaries, rehabilitation centres and model agricultural farms.\(^{1338}\) Today, there are around 350 Indian and four German brothers. The house in Bamberg is the only branch in Germany.

The literature on the congregation and the museum is so limited that I even had to rely on Wikipedia articles. For this portrait, I use their website presentation of the museum\(^{1339}\) and an email exchange with Fr. Georg M. Koldert. He informed me that the archival sources are scarce due to lack of staff. Only for problematic objects like ivory objects documents were kept for toll reasons. No information is available on the exhibition; communication with the visitors is via guided tours.\(^{1340}\)

Bamberg CMSF: Missionsmuseum

Address: Schloßstraße 30, 96049 Bamberg, Germany
Website: www.cmsf.de

The mission museum in Bamberg was opened in 1965. The founder was Fr. Columban Keller from Freiburg/Breisgau, who was also a long-time missionary in India.\(^{1341}\) A temporary exhibition is to be seen every year from the first Advent Sunday to the 6\(^{th}\) of January. It is a presentation of nativity scenes from Asia, Africa and Latin America.\(^{1342}\)

The objects originate from India and South America. The website names stuffed wild animals and fossils, precious works of art from India (some dating back to the 16\(^{th}\) century), furniture and everyday goods.

\(^{1336}\) Frank, “Franziskanerbrüder”.
\(^{1337}\) “Missionsbrüder des Hl. Franziskus”, “Fratelli missionari di San”.
\(^{1338}\) Missionsbrüder des heiligen Franziskus – Missionshaus Bug, “Information in english”.
\(^{1339}\) Missionsbrüder des heiligen Franziskus – Missionshaus Bug, “Das Missionsmuseum in Bug”.
\(^{1340}\) I want to thank Fr. Georg for patiently answering my questions regarding the museum and the general literature about the congregation.
\(^{1341}\) Email correspondence with Fr. Georg M. Koldert, August-September 2016.
\(^{1342}\) Missionsbrüder des heiligen Franziskus – Missionshaus Bug.
One object is named on the brothers’ website1343 as well as on an external website: a shrunken head. “The shrunken head should impress the most, […]”1344 the tourism website of Bamberg notes in its only two sentence long description of the museum. The brothers as well as the city tourism website fail to address properly the problem of how best to treat human remains in the museum.

Of interest is the museums’ self-representation on its website:

A museum whose diversity cannot be ignored, which informs its visitors. A museum that, despite its diversity, is small enough to remain manageable. You will also get a good overview of the extensive mission and development work in India, Sri Lanka, Paraguay and Bolivia today. A contribution to international understanding among nations and dialogue with cultures.1345

The attributes and aims of the museum are: diversity or richness but without becoming too vast and incomprehensible, transfer of information, their current mission and development cooperation, cultural dialogue and even – like the museum St. Wendel SVD – understanding among nations. Clearly, the brothers are interested in the conveying of information with the specific goal of understanding and dialogue. The museum and its objects are means to this end. Mission is also an ongoing process, and about this they want to inform their visitors. Nowhere is there a hint of any scholarly approach within the congregation and within the museum.

As this congregation was a foundation in the mission field in India, not in Europe, the need for educating young European members was naturally not a big concern. The otherwise often-named motivation for mission museums (internal education of the young members) is absent from this mission museum. This is a consequence of the foundation in India, not Germany.

Secular Institute Schönstatt Sisters of Mary (S MS)

The secular institute1346 was founded in 1926 in Schönstatt, Germany, as one of several female branches of the Catholic Schönstatt movement.1347 First, they

---

1344 (my translation) BAMBERG Tourismus & Kongress Service, “Missionsmuseum Bug”.
1346 Members of secular institutes follow the evangelical counsels of chastity, poverty and obedience, but used to live in the world, not in closed communities. With this form, it is possible to combine a common profession (living in the world) with professing the evangelical counsels. Braun, “Einleitung,” in Die Kongregationen in der Schweiz, 36–38.
1347 The Apostolic Movement of Schönstatt is a Marian movement, founded in 1914 by Joseph Kentenich, a Pallottine Pater. It sees itself as a spiritual movement, with the goal to renew being
expanded to many European countries. From 1933, the Schönstatt Sisters were sent out to mission abroad, initially to South Africa, then to Latin America. Today, the sisters have spread worldwide, including the USA, Australia, India, the Philippines and also many countries in Latin America.\textsuperscript{1348}

This portrait is based on some information from their website (www.s-ms.org) and the email conversation with Sr. Mariana.

**Schönstatt S MS: Schönstatt in weiter Welt**

Address: Missionszentrale Berg Schönstatt 2, 56179 Vallendar, Germany
Website: www.s-ms.org

In their mission general office (Missionszentrale) in Schönstatt the sisters founded a mission museum with the name *Schönstatt in weiter Welt* between 1965 and 1970. It is still open but the location may change in future. Schönstatt

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
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\caption{The Africa section in the mission museum of the Schönstatt Sisters (Schönstatt S MS). Photo credit Secular Institute Schönstatt Sisters of Mary.}
\end{figure}

a follower of Christ, with a greater focus on Mary. In 1964 the movement was separated from the Pallottines, and it built a structure of organisations and certain grades of fellowships. Five secular institutes are the centre of the movement. Around 100,000 persons are integrated in the movement, but through events, like pilgrimages it reaches up to two million people worldwide. Wolf, “Schönstatt-Bewegung”.\textsuperscript{1348} Schönstätter Marienschwestern, “Unsere Geschichte in Daten”.  

\textsuperscript{1348} Schönstätter Marienschwestern, “Unsere Geschichte in Daten”. 
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is a famous pilgrimage site, especially for worldwide followers and so this museum has frequent visitors.

At the moment, there are four rooms: one is dedicated to the international expansion of the institute and of the Schönstatt movement itself. The other rooms represent the continents with objects on display and information texts on the walls (see Figure 20).

My informant named Sr. M. Bonifatia Warth as a foundress of the museum. Asked about the transport of the objects from the mission fields, I got the answer that the majority were brought to Germany by the sisters themselves, but there is no further information available than that.\textsuperscript{1349}

As their goal for the museum, the website states “exhibits from all continents give you an impression of the richness and originality of different cultures”.\textsuperscript{1350} Interestingly, the first associations that should be mediated are especially positive: richness or opulence and originality.

Furthermore, the exhibition is introduced as follows:

\begin{quote}
Photos, summaries and texts will give you an overview of the new beginnings of the Christian life that emanate from the Schönstatt Shrines all over the world; [the exhibition] introduces the Pilgrim Shrine project as a modern form of new evangelisation; [the exhibition] presents concrete tasks and social projects of our community.\textsuperscript{1351}
\end{quote}

They name the media with which they want to convey their message: photographs, didactic material and texts. And their message is about evangelisation through members of their movement, the movement as such as well as their concrete projects. Although there are not enough sources, this first glimpse suggests that their aim focuses definitely on the movement’s own mission engagement. That is the main goal as expressed by naming the shrines which are unique for the Schönstatt movement and not representative for the Roman Catholic mission in general.

\section*{Menzinger Sisters/Sisters of the Holy Cross}

The Sisters of the Holy Cross are better known as Menzinger Sisters after their motherhouse in the picturesque village of Menzingen in the canton Zug, Switzerland. They are a Franciscan community (Third Order, officially called Institut der Lehrlaschwestern vom III. Orden des hl. Franziskus von Assis) and were founded in 1844 by mother Bernarda Heimgartner and the Capuchin

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{1349} Email correspondence with Sr. Mariana, September 2016. I want to thank Sr. Mariana for not just answering my questions but also for sending photos and allowing me to publish them.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{1350} (my translation) Schönstatt Marienschwestern, “Missionszentrale”.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{1351} (my translation) Säkularinstitut der Schönstätter Marienschwestern.}
Theodosius Florentini. Their aim was to fight secularisation. The female members’ role was to act for the women in Switzerland; therefore the sisters were active in girl’s education, especially in the poor and rural areas of Switzerland. In 1883 the first sisters went to South Africa, and they were the first Swiss female missionaries to do so. They started girls’ schools for local Catholics inhabitants and white settlers. Chile, India and Sri Lanka followed as mission fields. Over the course of the 20th century, the majority of the sisters were located outside of Switzerland, and the new members were almost exclusively coming from their mission fields.

For this portrait, a text written in 2004 by Sr. Hannah Kessler was thankfully handed over to me by Sr. Anna Gasser (archive) and Sr. Vreni Haslimeier (responsible for the museum). It is the only material written on the mission museum in the archive. It also serves as a handout for visitors of the museum and is, therefore, part of the self-presentation of the museum. The portrait also cites one newspaper article (from 23rd September 1985), information by the sisters themselves on the phone and during a personal visit of the mission museum (1st of February 2014). The mission museum is also mentioned on the website, but contains no information other than basics like opening hours or guided tours.

Menzingen: Missionsmuseum
Address: Hauptstrasse 11, 6313 Menzingen, Switzerland
Website: www.kloster-menzingen.ch

Although the first sisters were sent out to mission fields already in 1883, their mission museum in Menzingen is one of the younger ones. It was founded in 1984–85, more than 100 years after the first sisters went abroad. The museum’s founder was Sr. Pientia Selhorst who was not a Holy Cross sister but a Mariannhill Sister. Selhorst was head of the art academy in Mariannhill, Natal, South Africa. It is unique that the mission museum at a motherhouse such as in Menzingen was established by an outsider and not by a member of the congregation itself. But it shows the close cooperation that happened when it came to the organisation of bigger projects like a mission museum. Apart

---

1354 Holy Cross Sisters, “Missionsmuseum”.
1355 Here, the sister is referred to as a Marinnhill Sister. Their official name is Missionary Sister of the Precious Blood (CPS). This congregation also has a mission museum, see their portrait Mariannhill Sisters (CPS) on page 380. The cooperation between different congregations with mission museums is noteworthy.
from Selhorst as an initiator, Sr. Clara F. Grünenfelder from the procura Menzingen is mentioned, as well as Sr. Ruth Rechsteiner.1357

The mission museum is still open today and located in the level directly above the church. It covers mainly the mission fields of the sisters: South Africa, Lesotho, Namibia, Zimbabwe, Zambia, India, Sri Lanka, Chile, and Argentina. Also areas, where the sisters have never been stationed, are present in the mission museum, like Colombia for example.

The presentation of the African section is ascribed to Sr. Pientia Selhorst, the Indian/Sri Lanka section to Sr. Clara Grünenfelder and the Latin American to Sr. Ruth Rechsteiner.1358 It is seldom that the curators of specific departments within the exhibition are named in written sources. As Selhorst and Rechsteiner both were on mission in their assigned geographical areas, knowledge about the objects they worked with, seems to have been a priority. This agrees with Jannelli’s wild museum curators, who also had personal experience with their exhibits. The exhibition also displays little pieces of information about shown objects and also about the respective cultures and countries. For example, a small label asks, “Why are the Mapuche so poor?” with a short explanation about colonialism and land confiscation in the 19th century.

As for the displayed objects, an exceptionally broad range is to be found; from leopard skins, masks, musical instruments, saris and small female and male figures showing different Indian ethnic groups, to impressive gold or silver jewellery and a calabash gourd for mate (see for example Figure 4). A decent number of the objects are related to religious practices like a “totem” for prophecy.1359 Also, a large number of artworks are portrayed as indigenous Christian art, like a crucifix carved in ebony.1360 Intermingled with the exhibits, a significant number of photographs show the engagement of the sisters in their mission fields: women dressed in white habits run orphanages and schools, visit the poor, hand out communion, feed cows and work in a dairy.

Two unique features are to be noted with this mission museum: First, an own room is dedicated to the Holy Land, Judaism and Islam. A Torah, kippahs, and a Koran are on display. Second, the exhibition has a motto, which states that God loves the people. This slogan in its forms (“God loves Hindus”, “God loves Buddhists”, etc.) is seen in various places throughout the exhibition, every time different religions are explained and their objects on display.

Although the three main responsible sisters for the exhibition are known, it is not stated how the manifold objects came to the rural Swiss village. The information I heard from the sisters while visiting was that the objects were in Menzingen since long before the museum opened and that they were souvenirs

---

1357 “Kultur und Kunstgegenstände”.
1359 Kessler, 5.
1360 Kessler, 2.

---
and small presents from the mission field. It seemed obvious for my inform-
ants that the donors were the missionaries themselves. The same is stated by
the newspaper article: “Over one hundred years of involvement (since 1883)
in overseas mission fields have resulted in an impressive collection of cult and
art objects, [...].”

I received a source that shows a more complex emergence of the mu-
seum. In a letter from 1925, Franz W. Demont, a member of the congrega-
tion of the Priest of the Sacred Heart of Jesus (SCI or SCJ) wrote to the
founder of his congregation, Leon Dehon. The context is their presentation at
the Vatican mission exhibition:

I receive the news from P. Gasparri that our objects have not arrived in Rome
and yet we have already sent them in September. Poor Gariep! Fortunatley, I
had sent a note to our Sisters of the Holy Cross in Switzerland to send their
objects from here (they have a museum in Menzingen) to Rome and so P. Gas-
parri wrote to me we still have a small corner at the exhibition.

The Sacred Heart priest Demont was included in a network of which the Sis-
ters of Menzingen were also part. Moreover, he clearly mentions a museum in
Menzingen. What cannot be decided from this is if Demont knew Menzingen
personally or if he just knew from hearsay.

After this discovery, I contacted the sisters again to ask about a museum or
exhibition before 1985. A sister, born 1928, who had worked with the mission
procurator Sr. Grünenfelder, remembered that Grünenfelder brought objects
to Menzingen on her visitation tours to the mission fields. But a permanent
museum or exhibition was still contested. On further enquiry, three sisters,
including a 100-year-old Menzinger Sister, cannot remember a mission mu-
seum before 1985, but they report that in the former chapter house in Men-
zingen objects from the mission fields were on display in vitrines, between
1897 and 1983. This room and therefore the objects were not open to the pub-
lic.

1361 “Aus dem über hundert Jahre langen Engagement (seit 1883) in den überseeischen Ein-
satzgebieten hat sich ein eindrücklicher Fundus an Kult- und Kunstgegenständen angesammelt,
[...]” (my translation) “Kultur und Kunstgegenstände”.
1362 I thank Dr. David Neuhold (Fribourg) for sharing the information about this letter with me.
1363 This congregation must not be confused with the Congregation of the Sacred Heart of Jesus
(founded by Joseph-Marie Timon-David) or with the MSC missionary congregation, Mission-
aries of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. In German, their names are even more confusing as the here
affected congregation are called Herz-Jesu-Priester whereas the latter are Herz-Jesu-Missionare.
1364 “Je reçois la nouvelle du P. Gasparri que nos objets ne sont pas arrivés à Rome et pourtant
nous les avons envoyés déjà en septembre. Pauvre Gariep! Heureusement j’avais envoyé mot
en Suisse à nos Soeurs de la Ste Croix d’envoyer leurs objets d’ici (elles ont un musée à Men-
zingen) à Rome et ainsi P. Gasparri m’écrit nous avons quand même un petit coin à l’exposi-
tion.” (my translation). Demont, Letter Demont to Dehon (4.03.1925), Archivio Dehoniano
Roma.
1365 Email correspondence with Sr. Maria Emil Amrain, September 2016.
The Menzinger case is, for this reason, a good example for possible development of a mission museum: From a collection of objects with internal access only, it developed into a bigger and carefully planned museum with public access. The audience changed from internal to external.

Missionaries of the Holy Family (MSF)
The congregation, in Latin *Missionarii a Sacra Familia*, was founded 1895 in the Netherlands and is dedicated to enabling poor men with a late vocation to become priests. A special focus is – as their name says – pastoral care for families. Since 1911 they are working in mission fields, such as in Brazil, USA, Borneo and Java. Today there are about 950 members (patres and brothers) with the generalate located in Rome. Outside of Europe, they currently work in Argentina, Canada, Chile, Mexico, Madagascar, and Papua New Guinea.1366

The information for this portrait is solely based on their website and email correspondence with P. Roman Zwick, a missionary in Madagascar for 31 years.1367

Werthenstein MSF: *Madagaskarmuseum*
Address: Kloster Werthenstein, 6106 Werthenstein, Switzerland
Website: miray-madagaskar.ch

The congregation opened its mission museums in 1995, and it is one of the youngest in this study. It was located in Werthenstein, an idyllic village of 2,000 souls near Lucerne, wherein 1909 the MSF opened a school in the former Franciscan monastery from the 16th century. In 1950, the first three missionaries from Werthenstein were sent to Madagascar. P. Roman Zwick said of the founding of the museum:

> Our missionaries have been in Madagascar since 1950. Over time, a lot of material has accumulated. In 1995 the procura building was extended, and a room for a museum was built.1368

The collection – as the museum’s title already indicates – only originates from Madagascar, their mission field.

---

1366 “Missionare von der Heiligen”; Missionswerk MSF Österreich, “MSF WELTWEIT”.
1367 I want to thank P. Roman Zwick for promptly answering my questions and giving insights into the current situation.
Decisive changes in the congregation led to the move from Werthenstein to Nuolen, canton Schwyz, in 2016. This also meant the closure of the Madagaskarmuseum: The shell collection was given as a loan (ewige Leihgabe) to the Natural History Museum in Bern; the more precious religious objects (around seventy in number) were given to the Ethnological Museum Neuchâtel, Switzerland. A large number of objects of lesser value like textiles, leather goods, tools, instruments etc. were sold at a bazaar. This way of handling the objects, to offer them at a bazaar, is a good indicator that this was an independent museum. Some woodwork, such as Madonna figures, were stored away in the attic of the monastery in Werthenstein. What remained in Werthenstein was the supportive society, the miray Förderverein MSF, which continues to engage in an exchange between the Swiss and Madagascan cultures.

Asked for important personages for the museum, Zwick named P. Anton Blum, the mission procurator and P. Emil Rusch who was responsible for the seashells collection.

The transfer of the objects to Switzerland seems according to Zwick’s estimation more like a random accumulation of objects, as his quote above also indicates. It is clearly not a strategically planned organisation. Additionally, the time period of the accumulation is around forty years (between 1950 when the first missionaries went to Madagascar and the opening in 1995), so the transfer of objects by this rather small missionary congregation was definitely of lower priority.

This case shows that even in the immediate past, documentation and archiving was not a priority. Four characteristics are important here: a) the lack of written sources or clear and detailed information; b) the very remote location; c) the small size of the missionary congregation, which does not hinder them from organising the collection/museum in Europe. And finally, d): through the closing, parts of the collection were forwarded to two state-owned and professional museums in Switzerland.

1369 Email correspondence with P. Roman Zwick, September 2016, as well as miray Förderverein MSF, “11. MÄRZ 2016: GV”.
1371 Email correspondence with P. Roman Zwick, May 2014.
Mariannhill Sisters (CPS)

The Missionary Sisters of the Precious Blood (*Congregatio Pretiosio Sanguine*, CPS) were founded by Abbot Franz Pfanner even before the male congregation of the Mariannhill missionaries were soundly established. Their founding took place in South Africa with the closest date for the foundation being 1885. The papal approval for the sisters came in 1906. They are better known as Mariannhill Sisters, as I refer to them in this thesis.

For this portrait of their mission museum, I use the sisters’ website and email correspondence. Further archival material is unavailable.

Neuenbeken CPS: *Missionsmuseum*

Address: Alte Amtsstraße 64, 331000 Paderborn, Germany
Website: www.missionshausneuenbeken.de

Artwork from schools by the Mariannhill Sisters – as mentioned above – is on display in the mission museums by the (male) Mariannhill Missionaries. But that the sisters had an own small mission museum in their mission house Neuenbeken, Germany, was not mentioned to me in the correspondence with the Mariannhill missionaries or while visiting Riedegg CMM. This may be due to its very recent foundation date: After having a collection of objects scattered in the mission house in Neuenbeken near Paderborn, in October 2016 a mission museum was opened, where all the objects were brought together and presented. This makes it the most recent mission museum in this study.

Their mission museum now consists of a museum corridor starting at the monastery gateway and here the history of the congregation is explained, from its beginning in South Africa, to the mission house in Neuenbeken. After the corridor, the actual museum with the exhibits is to be found. It is located in the former workshop for paraments. Not only the sisters and some craftsmen worked on preparing the rooms but also local citizens helped.

The mission house is located beside a hiking trail. Therefore a lot of visitors casually visit the mission house/cloister with its café, the church, and now the mission museum. Opening days of the museum are Saturday and Sunday. Therefore, it is seen as a way to present the congregation as such to a broader audience, not just people interested in religious sites.

Regarding the history of the sisters, it is important to note that their founding in Natal was connected to girls’ education: “[I]ts nucleus was a group of five lay apostles whom Pfanner invited in 1885 to instruct young girls at Mariannhill monastery in Natal.” This education of girls made it possible to

---

1373 Kremer, 734.
send textile artworks to European mission museums such as those mentioned above.

The exhibits came from the African continent where the congregation has its origin. Also, New Guinea and Korea are mentioned as both being areas “where the sisters are active”. Works of art, everyday items and cult objects are mentioned. The objects are presented as brought by the missionaries to Germany. The website explains the possession of the objects as follows: “These [exhibits] are presents that the sisters received in the course of the past decades from the locals.” The quality of a gift is stressed, which prevents a deeper discussion about the objects’ new existence in the European context, since being thought of as gifts forecloses any enquiry into questionable changes in ownership.

In the conversation with Sr. Maria Georg Loos, the intention of the museum was stated clearly: Because the sisters become older,

we thought using the sculptures and pictures to get into contact with the people in the neighbourhood and to tell something about our experiences in the mission fields with these objects in order to evangelise a little bit longer. Many of our sisters here in the house are returnees from the mission fields, […].

Sr. Loos went on to explain that the sisters who are present during the opening hours are meant to encounter the visitors: “So it’s more about conversation and encounter than about museum science.” The sister expresses here directly the key characteristic of an independent museum.

Furthermore, the goal of the museum is expressed as follows: “[T]o promote sensitivity for mission, to revive the interest, but above all to show that we old and young continents need each other and can learn from each other.” Clearly, communication and encounter with visitors are at the focus in Neuenbeken and not just communication, but direct communication between an experienced sister and the European, local visitor. As well, this refers not just to a member of a missionary order but decidedly to a member who had been living in the mission field – returnees as Sr. Maria Loos calls them, including herself. The terminology she uses for describing the aim of the museum is clear: contact, experience, conversation, encounter, and sensitivity for

---

1374 Auffenberg, “Missionsmuseum neu eröffnet” (my translation).
1375 “[…] dachten wir, diese Skulpturen und Bilder zu nutzen, um mit Menschen aus der Umgebung in Kontakt zu treten, und an Hand dieser Dinge etwas über unsere Erfahrungen in den Missionsländern zu sagen, und so noch etwas missionarisch zu wirken. Viele unserer Schwester hier im Haus, sind ja Rückkehrer aus den Missionsländern, […]” (my translation) Email correspondence with Sr. Maria Georg Loos CPS, November 2016.
1376 “Es geht also mehr um Gespräch und Begegnung, als um Museums-wissenschaft.” (my translation) Email correspondence with Sr. Maria Georg Loos CPS, November 2016.
mission. According to her report about this mission museum, it is very similar to Jannelli’s concept of the *wild museum*, closest to the bee museum because in this museum also the direct and personal experience of the museum organisers is stressed. As all museum organisers there have to be beekeepers, the present sisters can also speak from their first-hand encounters about South Africa, for example. The exhibits are not *per se* of interest; they just serve as a medium to inform and share the experience of the sisters. Consequently, the topic of evangelisation is at the heart of the museum. It is, in the words of Sr. Maria, a humble way to do mission in Germany.

Finally, Sr. Maria Loos stated, although they call their museum a mission museum, it is more an appendix to their other offers towards the public (such as the cafeteria) and is, in reality, a *Begegnungsstätte*, a centre for encounters or a meeting place. This term sums up a lot of facets of this mission museum.

---

1378 In conversations with other museum curators, often specific exhibits were mentioned to me, like especially precious or rare objects. But this was not the case with the Mariannhill Sisters.
1379 Email correspondence with Sr. Maria Georg Loos CPS, November 2016.
Bibliography

Unpublished sources

Archivum Centrale of the SSPC, Rome (ACSSPC)

Correspondence


Other source material
“Avis aux RR. PP. Missionaries – Manière de prendre et de conserver les scarabées”. French, one page.
Handout for missionaries. manuscript, six pages, Italian, German, French.
“Jahres-Bericht der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität für die afrikanischen Missionen 1897.” Salzburg, 1898.
“Jahres-Bericht der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität für die afrikanischen Missionen 1899.” Salzburg, 1900.
“Jahres-Bericht der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität für die afrikanischen Missionen 1900.” Salzburg, 1901.
“Jahres-Bericht der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität für die afrikanischen Missionen 1902.” Salzburg, 1903.
“Jahres-Bericht der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität für die afrikanischen Missionen 1905.”
Salzburg, 1906.
“Jahres-Bericht der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität für die afrikanischen Missionen 1906.”
Salzburg, 1907.
“Jahres-Bericht der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität für die afrikanischen Missionen 1909.”
Salzburg, 1910.
“Jahres-Bericht der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität für die afrikanischen Missionen 1911.”
Salzburg, 1912.
“Jahres-Bericht der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität für die afrikanischen Missionen 1912.”
Salzburg, 1913.
“Jahres-Bericht der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität für die afrikanischen Missionen 1913.”
Salzburg, 1914.
“Jahres-Bericht der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität für die afrikanischen Missionen 1916.”
Salzburg, 1917.
“Jahres-Bericht der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität für die afrikanischen Missionen 1917.”
Salzburg, 1918.
“Jahres-Bericht der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität für die afrikanischen Missionen 1918.”
Salzburg, 1919.
“Jahres-Bericht der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität für die afrikanischen Missionen 1921.”
Salzburg, 1922.
“Jahres-Bericht der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität für die afrikanischen Missionen 1922.”
Salzburg, 1923.
“Jahres-Bericht der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität für die afrikanischen Missionen 1923.”
Salzburg, 1924.
“Jahres-Bericht der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität für die afrikanischen Missionen 1925.”
Salzburg, 1926.
“Jahres-Bericht der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität für die afrikanischen Missionen 1926.”
Salzburg, 1925.
“Jahres-Bericht der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität für die afrikanischen Missionen 1933.”
Salzburg, 1934.
Ledóchowska, Maria Theresia. Letter Ledóchowska to missionaries (11.09.1911).
typescript, one page, printed signature by Ledóchowska.
Box “Museo Vino”.
“Mitteilungen der St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität für ihre externen Mitglieder und För-
derer April 1918.” Missionsschwestern vom hl. Petrus Claver, 1918.
“Musée ethnographique africain Fribourg.”. Brochure. Fribourg, n.d. Box “Museo
Vino”.
N.N. “Per il Vademecum del Songressista”, “Un Museo Africano”. note, typescript,
one page.
Photo album in the generalate.
“Rundschreiben an die Hochw. Missionare und Missions-Schwestern Afrikas” 1899.
St. Petrus Claver-Sodalität. Box “Circolari ai Missionari”.
“Tagesberichte vom Claverianum (1938–1939).” transcript by Sr. Maria Paola Wojak
SSPC mailed to author July 1, 2016.

388
Archive Missions-Ethnographisches Museum St. Gabriel, Mödling (AMEM)

Announcement by the Rector, St. Gabriel (3.6.1936). typescript, two pages.
Correspondence between P. Bsteh and Antonia Süß-Linaert/Linner (1987). typescript, two letters, photo of corpus, diapositive of photo.
Correspondence between P. Bsteh and Maria Matreux (5.3. and 12.3.1980). with signature.
“Einkaufspreise der Sammlungsgegenstände”. typescript, five pages.
file card 01-0339 a-d.
file card 05-0751. file card with handwritten note attached, signature Fr. Schausberger.
Hauschronik 1900. chronicle.
Hauschronik 1901. chronicle.
Kanjamala, Augustine. Letter Kanjamala to rector St. Gabriel. typescript, signature.
Kutscher, Francis. Letter Kutscher to Piskaty (2.5.1965). typescript, one page, with signature.
Letter Bergland publishing house to Piskaty (10.4.1970). typescript, one page, with signature.
List “Feuerland Vitrine 4”. handwritten list, photographs of Gusinde vitrine.
Mehler, German. Letter Mehler to Altnöder (29.2.1976).
N.N. Festschrift St. Gabriel 1910–1912. commemorative publication.
Note “14 Schädel”. handwritten note, one page.
Photograph P. Hermann Hochegger. photograph, one note, index number: 06-0239.
“Verzeichnis der Überbringer von Exponaten für MEM”. typescript, two pages, attached to handwritten lists, forty-one pages.

**Archive World Museum Vienna, Vienna (AVKM)**

Direktionsakten (DA) for the years 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1945
Folder “Bergungsslisten”
Folder “Dr. Gusinde Martin” Post XI/1927.
Folder “Eigentumsfragen 1940–1942”
Folder “Malakka Sammlung Schebesta”.
Folder “Malakka Slg Schebesta”.
Folder “Martin Gusinde”.
Folder “Schebesta Belg. Kongo”.
Folder “Schebesta Post 17/1928”.
Folder “St. Gabriel 1940–1942 1929 1931”
Heger, Franz. “Ethnografische Gegenstände aus dem Togogebiet”. handwriting, one page, with signature. Folder “St. Gabriel 1901/03/05”.
Heger, Franz. Post XIII. “1905 Fetschötpe aus Deutsch-Togo”. handwriting, one page, with signature. Folder “St. Gabriel 1905”.
Hein, Wilhelm. “Aufnahmebefund der Sammlung P. W. Schmidt Post V-1901”. handwriting, two pages, with signature. Folder “Schmidt P-1901/03/06”.
(11.6.1900/28.6.1900)”. handwriting, three pages, with signature Dr. Wilhelm Hein and Heger. Folder “St. Gabriel 1900/06/11”.
Lechner, Josef. Letter Lechner to Schebesta (16.3.1932). handwriting, two pages, with signature. Folder “Malakka Sammlung Schebesta”.
Letter Z:124 (8.5.1941). typescript; no signature. Folder “St.Gabriel 1940-42.1941/05/08”.
Röck, Fritz. Letter Röck (15.3.1934). typescript, one page. Folder “Malakka Sammlung Schebesta”.
Schmidt, Wilhelm. Letter Schmidt to Director VKM (11.11.1927). typescript, one page, with signature. Folder “Schmidt”.
Schmidt, Wilhelm. Letter Schmidt to Director VKM (16.11.1927). handwriting, one page, with signature. Folder “Schmidt”.

Archive MSC North German Province, Münster (ANPMSC)
Braam, Johann. Letter Braam to Petto (8.4.1942). Sig: A 1267d.

Archivio Dehoniano Roma, Rome
Printed sources and literature


Bell, Joshua A. “Bird Specimen, Papua New Guinea.” In Jacobs; Knowles; Wingfield, Trophies, relics and curios?, 57–60.

Bender, Josef. “Missionshilfe in der Heimat.” In Hüskes, Pioniere der Südsee, 197–203.


Boyer, Christoph. “Netzwerke und Geschichte: Netzwerktheorien und Geschichtswissenschaften.” In Unfried; Mittag; van der Linden, Transnationale Netzwerke im 20. Jahrhundert, 47–58.


Constitutiones Societatis Verbi Divini. Steyl, 1922.


Elliott Weinberg, Catherine. “Moffat’s model house, South Africa.” In Jacobs; Knowles; Wingfield, Trophies, relics and curios?, 147–50.


Mischek, Udo. “Antisemitismus und Antijudaismus in den Werken und Arbeiten Pa


Rossi, Milène. “Georg Höltker et les massues.” In Ruegg, Ethnographie und Mission, 63–79.


Scherer, Gerhard. “Chronik der Sektion Coleoptera der Zoologischen Staats- 
Schindlbeck, Markus. “Rotes Tuch und Ahnenmasken: Der Handel mit Ethnographica aus Ozeanien.” In Hensel; Rommé, Aus Westfalen in die Südsee, 224–36.


Stornig, Katharina. “Globalisierte Körper? Repräsentationen der Welt und ihrer Bevölkerung in der vatikanischen Missionsausstellung 1925.” In Weichlein; Ratschiller, Der schwarze Körper als Missionsgebiet, 123–52.


Strohmeyr, Armin. “Maria Theresia Gräfin Ledóchowska: Kämpferin gegen die Sklaverei.” In Strohmeyr, Glaubenszeuge der Moderne, 53.


Wilms-Reinking, Gudrun. “Gesellschaft der reisenden Brüder für Christus.” In Bernhardt; Scheffler, Reisen, entdecken, sammeln.
Wingfield, Chris. “Giraffe, South Africa.” In Jacobs; Knowles; Wingfield, Trophies, relics and curios?, 25–27.
Winowska, Maria. Go out to the whole world…. The call of Mary Theresa Ledóchowska. Nettuno, 1992.


Index

Aachen 75, 305, 368, 369, 371, 372
Aachen PWG (mission museum) 69, 79, 82, 91, 95, 99, 100, 267, 301, 302, 340, 369–73
Agenegbode 163
Albania 101, 307
Altnöder, Ferdinand 16, 221, 224, 225, 226, 229, 297
Amrhein, Josef 318
Angola 101, 370
Anheuser, Clemens 310, 311, 312
Antwerp 249
Appenzeller, Salvius 229
Argentina 101, 139, 178, 248, 345, 365, 379, 381
Arles 192
Atunto, ? 281
Aulendorf–Blöried 300
Australia 48, 49, 50, 53, 188, 193, 265, 267, 354, 365, 366, 368, 371, 376
Ayoreode 53, 313
Bad Bentheim 69, 310
Bad Driburg 336
Bagamoyo 36, 37, 360, 361
Baining 266, 277
Bali 199, 265, 354
Bamberg 340, 374
Bamberg CMSF (mission museum) 70, 73, 82, 84, 86, 91, 98, 302, 374–75
Bambuti 195
Bandundu 215
Bannwarth, Clement 161
Bardel OFM (mission museum) 69, 81, 86, 87, 91, 95, 96, 100, 302, 310–312
Barmen 38
Barmherzige Brüder von Maria-Hilf 72
Barral, Pierre-Marie 363
Basel 35, 75, 126, 127, 197, 260, 295, 355
Batu Islands 52, 54
Baumeister, ? (MSC) 273
Bauzin, Adrien 162
Bavaria 73, 318, 346
Becker-Donner, Etta 240
Bedel, Jean-Marie 163
Beecher Stowe, Harriet 114
Beijing 372
Belgian Congo 237
Belgium 109, 196, 249
Benares 36
Beneficentines 29, 30, 31, 54, 69, 70, 79, 90, 92, 95, 147, 154, 189, 276, 302, 303, 318, 324, 326–29, 332, 333, 340
Benediktbeuern 78, 346
Benediktbeuern SDB (mission museum) 73, 86, 87, 95, 346–48
Benin 61, 161, 162
Berchmans, ? (SVD) 220, 221
Berg-en-Dal 38, 340, 360
Bergheim 68, 344
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berlinhafen</td>
<td>213, 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlioux, ? (SMA)</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bern</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhil</td>
<td>174, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bielak, Maria Valeria</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bierenz, Aloisia Maria</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biermans, John</td>
<td>156, 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bimmermann, Gerhard</td>
<td>346, 347, 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bley, Bernhard</td>
<td>251, 265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blum, Anton</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boers</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>28, 101, 312–14, 370, 374, 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonn</td>
<td>72, 319, 338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borchardt, Karl</td>
<td>279, 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borgmeier, Thomas</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borneo</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bororo</td>
<td>346, 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosco, Giovanni</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braam MSC, Johann</td>
<td>246–48, 250, 251–53, 255–82, 284, 355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bratislava</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>101, 139, 248, 265, 291, 305–08, 310–12, 344, 346, 347, 355, 358, 365, 370, 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bregenz</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremen</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breslau</td>
<td>113, 129, 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breuer, Karl</td>
<td>369, 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge, Thomas</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisson, Louis</td>
<td>345, 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Malaya</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bröring, Theodor</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Georg</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukkems, ? (P.)</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>56, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>25, 87, 101, 126, 131, 343, 365, 366, 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>101, 363, 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canisius, Petrus</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capistran, Mary</td>
<td>108, 156, 157, 159, 162, 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capuchins</td>
<td>30, 69, 72, 76, 77, 79, 85, 302, 304, 305, 314–17, 371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmelites</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebes</td>
<td>262, 270–72, 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemenati, ? (SMA)</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalmers, James</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chappuis</td>
<td>345, 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevalier, Jules</td>
<td>248, 357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chigi, Flavio</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>101, 109, 191, 192, 212, 237, 370, 378, 379, 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian, Viktor</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claver, Peter</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleophae (Sr.)</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cologne</td>
<td>20, 21, 305, 308, 340, 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>101, 109, 363, 364, 379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo-Brazzaville</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregatio Jesu</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregation of the Little Sisters of Saint Francis</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook, James</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelio, Leo</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubao</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunald, ? (Fr.)</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dachau</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dachsberg OSFS (mission museum)</td>
<td>69, 82, 154, 302, 348–349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughters of Charity of Saint Vincent de Paul</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Daughters of Our Lady of the Sacred Heart (FDNSC) 248
de Pazzi, ? (Sr.) 166
Dehon, Leon 380
Demont, Franz W. 380
Dener 363
Diels, ? 278
Dietel, Edgar 328
Dollfuß, Engelbert 180, 214, 317
Dominican Republic 248
Dominican Sisters 72
Dormagen 68, 360
Dorsten 276, 286, 305, 308, 309
Drabbe, ? 271
Duke of York Islands 275
Durban 349, 350, 352
Dutch East Indies 207
Earthy, Dora 171
Easter Island 101, 192, 199, 211
Eberlein, ? 281
Eckardt, Andreas 322, 323
Ecuador 355
Egypt 99, 101, 131, 308, 343
Eichelberg, Johannes 257
Enshoff, Dominikus 321
Ertl, Johann Nepomuk 324
Essen 277, 285
Ethiopia 101, 339
Evers, ? 267, 268
Fabian, ? (SVD) 232
Falkenhayn, Maria Julia 118
Fausone, Alfonso 339
Favian, Alejandro 19
Feldkirch 315
Fester, Lambert 62
Fiecht OSB (mission museum) 59, 70, 77, 82, 85, 90, 91, 102, 302, 327–30
Finland 35
Fischer, Adolf 309
Fischer, Heinrich 277
Florentini, Theodosius 378
France 30, 144, 162, 192, 244, 248, 296, 349
Franciscan Missionaries of Mary (FMM) 111
Franciscan Missionary Sisters for Africa 156
Franciscan Sisters 72, 156, 371
Franciscans 28, 30, 68, 69, 70, 79, 154, 276, 286, 302–14, 373
Frankfurt 48, 339, 340
Franz Josef (Emperor) 141
Freiburg/Breisgau 340, 374
Freinademetz, Josef 37, 178
French Guinea 127
Freyburger, ? (SMA) 162
Fribourg 19, 122, 130, 149, 188, 190, 191, 196, 197, 202, 241, 380
Friedl, ? (Dr.) 136
Frobenius, Leo 332
Froideville 190
Fuchs, Peter 232
Gallneukirchen 70, 351
Gasparri, ? (P.) 380
Gazelle Peninsula 281, 283
Geistingen 157
Gemeinder, Georg 226
Genadendal 36
Gendersen, Lucia 273
Gerkmann, Heinrich 258
German East Africa 25, 318, 360
German New Guinea 25, 213
German South-West Africa 25
Ghana 224
Glader, Kosmas 291
Goa 219
Goch 37
Goette, Remigius 53, 307
Gold Coast 126, 131
Gouzaga, ? (SVD) 217
Great Britain 202
Great Lakes 131
Grewe, Januarius 306
Gross, Alois 257, 258
Grünenfelder, Clara 379, 380
Guatemala 248
Gusinde SVD, Martin 174, 184, 189, 192–98, 202, 211, 212, 216, 228, 232, 237, 240, 242, 243, 313
Haekel, Josef 232
Häfliger, Johannes 324
Hahn, Heinrich 368
Halakwulup 192
Halka, Alexander see Ledóchowska, Maria Theresia
Hall in Tirol OFM (mission museum) 53, 70, 76, 82, 83, 84, 86, 87, 205, 261, 295, 302, 312–14
Hamburg 43, 167, 236, 340
Hammerschmidt, Joseph 258
Hanfland, Canutus 307
Harms, ? 278
Hartzer, Marie-Louise 248
Hasberg, Nikolaus 305
Hauger, Ernest 162, 163
Häussler, Heinrich 308
Heger, Franz 233, 234, 235
Heiligenkreuz/Nysa 187, 192, 195, 227
Heimgartner, Bernarda 377
Hein, Wilhelm 214, 233, 235
Heinrich, Hans 258
Hellbusch, Sigrid 259
Helsinki 38, 228
Herzog, Theodor 313
Hesse 362
Hestermann, ? 278
Hiltrup 300, 302, 354, 355, 390
Himmler, Heinrich 136
Hochegger, Hermann 215, 216, 232
Höltker, Georg 184, 190, 196, 197, 228, 232, 236, 238, 240, 340
Holy Ghost Fathers see Spiritans
Holy Spirit Sisters 178, 207, 225
Honiara 57
Hüffer, Meinolphus 308
Hünfeld OMI (mission museum) 68, 77, 81, 83, 154, 302, 363
Huppertz, Josefine 340
Hutterer, ? (SVD) 232
Ibadan 114
Immensee 364
Immensee SMB (mission museum) 59, 69, 81, 84, 99, 302, 364–65
Imst 315
Indonesia 101, 178, 208, 221, 224, 248, 265, 273, 316, 335, 337, 339, 371
Innsbruck 75–77, 113, 128, 137, 314–316
Innsbruck OFMCap (mission museum) 59, 72, 81, 83, 85–87, 91, 95, 100, 205, 267, 291, 292, 314–17
Italy 28, 30, 73, 113, 129, 130, 304, 316, 345
Ivory Coast 147
Jansen, Arnold (MSC) 268, 273, 281
Janssen, Arnold (SVD) 31, 37, 73, 177–79, 183, 188, 225, 268, 319
Japan 101, 194, 207, 208, 216, 222, 224, 226, 326, 244, 248, 265, 304, 315, 335, 337, 339, 354, 363, 364, 370, 371
Jaricot, Pauline Maria 368
Jarre, Cyrillus 306, 309
Java 381
London 36, 38, 49, 52, 83, 156, 198, 289, 295, 341
London Missionary Society 36, 38, 49, 52, 56, 83, 289, 295
Loosdorf 109
Louis, Maria 370
Lucerne 381
Lunkenbein, Rudolf 348
Lusaka 114
Luther, Martin 148
Luttenbacher, C. 149
Luzietis (Sr.) 226
Lyon 144, 160, 162, 163, 165
Macron, Emmanuel 22
Madagascar 93, 96, 101, 111, 118, 146, 151, 316, 381, 382
Madang 16, 297
Madura 372
Mahlangu, Sarah 352
Majonica, Ernst 308
Makonde 147, 320, 326, 327
Malacca 36, 216
Malawi 36
Malawí 36
Malay Peninsula 195, 237
Manas Jr., 225
Manila 78, 225
Manndorff, Hans 240
Mapuche 379
Marburg 341
Maria Christina of Austria 153
Maria Enzersdorf 68, 76, 334
Maria Sorg SSPC (mission museum) 59, 68, 81, 83, 89, 98, 99, 102, 113, 116, 118–21, 129, 137–143, 289, 302, 344, 350
Mariannhill Missionaries 349, 351, 371, 383
Maringer, Johannes 337
Marist brothers 371
Massai 333
Mayr, Franz 108, 116, 137, 165–69
Meier, Josef 251, 281, 282, 283
Mendel, Gregor 253
Mense, Hugo 311
Mensen, Bernhard 339
Menzingen (mission museum) 70, 77, 78, 80, 87, 89, 90, 93, 98, 100, 101, 146, 291, 302, 304, 378–81
Mertens, Bernhard 265
Metz 161
Mexico 19, 101, 370, 381
Meyer, Otto 250–52, 256, 259, 265, 278, 279, 283, 354
Miklas, Wilhelm 180
Mindanao 223
Missionaries of Charity 31
Missionaries of the Precious Blood (CPPS) 136
Missionaries of the Sacred Heart of Jesus 29, 380
Missionarinnen Christi 72
Missionary Benedictine Sisters of Tutzing 88, 95, 318, 322, 329
Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate 68, 71, 154, 302, 362
Missionary Sisters of St. Peter Claver 29, 68, 73, 102, 104–173, 302, 303, 334–45
Missionary Sisters of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus see MSC Sisters
Mödling 76, 134, 174, 179, 181, 200, 201, 206, 235, 239, 334
Moffat, Robert 295
Mombasa 158
Mongolia 304
Monrovia 151
Moorrege 44, 126
Moritz, Paulus 374
Mother Teresa 31
Moury, Jules 160
Mozambique 131, 171, 195, 304, 343, 364
MSC missionaries see Sacred Heart Missionaries
MSC Sisters 245, 249, 260, 266, 276, 300
Mumbai 374
Munich 76–88, 113, 125, 129, 130, 323, 324, 346, 368
Münster 16, 68, 72, 96, 103, 205, 244, 245, 249, 259, 265, 276, 278, 283, 285, 354, 355
Münsterschwarzach OSB (mission museum) 69, 73, 81, 91, 267, 302, 325–27
Münzlinger, ? (MSC) 275
Mussolini, Benito 190
Nagy, Imre 16, 225, 229, 297
Namibia 36, 101, 355, 363, 379
Natal 131, 165, 166, 169, 343, 378, 383
Natschläger, Franz 229
Nepal 101, 315, 317
Netherlands 38, 73, 177, 249, 308, 334, 341, 360, 381
Neuchâtel 382
Neuenbeken CPS (mission museum) 70, 71, 79, 82, 86, 87, 90, 93, 290, 296, 303, 349, 383–385
Neulauenburg see Duke of York Islands
Nevermann, Hans 258, 259, 262, 276, 277, 281, 285
New Britain see Niu Briten
New Pomerian see Niu Briten
Niger 161
Nigeria 114, 163, 365
Nijmegen 360
Niu Ailan 265, 271, 273
Niu Briten 244, 249, 250, 257, 265
Nordenskjöld, Erland 313
North Rhine-Westphalia 37, 264
Norway 35
Nubia 131, 343
Nukapu 57
Nuolen 382
Oblates of St. Francis de Sales 69, 154, 302, 345, 349
Oeventrop 275, 300, 354
Ogé, Jean 151
Ohm, Thomas 276
Oies 37
Ouagadougou 22
Oxford 198
Paderborn 32, 70, 75, 336, 383
Palestine 101, 304, 305, 307, 308, 313
Pallotti, Vincenzo 291, 365, 366
Pallottines 69, 87, 154, 267, 288, 291, 365–67, 376
Papua New Guinea see New Guinea
Paraguay 220, 223, 374, 375
Paris 20, 50, 61, 113, 129, 130, 167, 228, 318, 340, 359
Parkinson, Richard 50, 281
Patroklus, ? (Fr.) 337
Patteson, John 57
Peekel, Gerhard 250–52, 255, 256, 270, 271, 278, 279, 283, 354
Pelckmans, Gottfried 374
Peru 248, 265, 329, 330, 339
Pfanner, Franz 165, 349, 350, 352, 383
Philippines 101, 139, 142, 189, 195, 196, 199, 206, 208, 222–25, 248, 322, 326, 335, 337, 339, 344, 364, 371, 376
Pietermaritzburg 169
Piotin, Pierre 163, 164, 173
Piskaty, Kurt 223, 225
Pius IX 248

421
Schurig, Margarete 171
Schuschnigg, Kurt 180, 181
Schuster, Bonaventura 321
Schwarzkach am Main 325
Schweiklberg OSB (mission museum) 17, 59, 70, 82, 86, 93, 96, 100, 303, 330–34
Schwyz 382
Seipel, Ignaz 180, 186
Selhorst, Pientia 144, 146, 378, 379
Selk’nam 192
Semang 195, 216
Senegal 248
Seoul 323
Shandong 308, 309
Shanxi 308
Silesia 195
Siriono 313
Sister Servants of the Holy Spirit of Perpetual Adoration 31
Skrabania, Jerzy 339
Slovenia 73, 140
SMA patres 160, 161
Society of African Missions see SMA patres
Sœurs missionnaires de Notre-Dame des Apôtres 144
Solomon Islands 57
South Rhodesia 165, 363
South Tyrol 37, 73, 130, 304, 314
Spain 153
Spannagel, Candidus 308
Spelz, Johannes 258, 270, 272–75
Spiritans 20, 36, 38, 54, 68, 152, 154, 302, 340, 359, 360, 361
Spiss, Cassian 329
St. Augustin SVD (mission museum) 59, 70, 72, 82, 83, 85, 86, 88, 89, 95, 99, 197, 222, 242, 293, 294, 303, 319, 338–43, 340
St. Gallen 151, 164
St. Pölten 110, 172
St. Wendel SVD (mission museum) 69, 81, 227, 303, 335–36, 375
St. Xaver SVD (mission museum) 69, 81, 303, 336–37, 341
Stadtmann, ? (MSC) 257
Stagl, Justin 232
Stavanger 38
Steinmetz, Francois 160–63, 173
Steins, Hermann Josef 308
Stenmanns, Josepha 178
Steyl 38, 73, 177, 178, 187, 220, 227, 334, 336
Stiglmayr, Engelbert 232
Stöhr, Waldemar 340
Stollwerk, Maria 178
Strehlow, Carl 48, 50, 51
Stresemann, Erwin 278
Stuttgart 277
Sulawesi see Celebes
Swaziland 165
Sweden 35
Taiwan 101, 363, 364
Tanganjika 92
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>36, 37, 101, 147, 319, 320, 322, 323, 326, 329, 332, 333, 360, 361, 362, 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarawa</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Annie Royle</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempalang</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>195, 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamba Raj, A. J.</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thauren, Johannes</td>
<td>181, 205, 208, 212, 214, 215, 236, 239, 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodor, ? (Fr.)</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thiel, Josef Franz</td>
<td>39, 40, 97, 198, 230, 231, 232, 339–41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thijssen, Anton Hubert</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thometzki, Helmut</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibet</td>
<td>171, 219, 308, 339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tierra del Fuego</td>
<td>192, 194, 195, 211, 216, 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Kiga</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Kitta</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Maria</td>
<td>266, 267, 268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>25, 101, 123, 126, 131, 200, 216, 234, 235, 239, 333, 337, 343, 361, 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonking</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toriu</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toth, ? (SVD)</td>
<td>217, 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tratz, Eduard Paul</td>
<td>136, 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trieste</td>
<td>73, 113, 125, 129, 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troyes</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrol</td>
<td>73, 76, 313, 314, 328, 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>56, 108, 114, 121, 157, 158, 333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uhrich, Romuald</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>101, 139, 344, 365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>113, 363, 376, 381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallendar</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van der Velden, ?</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Klaarwater, Bernhard</td>
<td>280, 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuapope</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatican</td>
<td>19, 28, 109, 189, 195, 202, 226, 227, 236, 254, 275, 279, 335, 340, 380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verhoeven, ? (MSC)</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versailles</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versteijnen, Frits</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilshofen an der Donau</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlodrop</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Völling, Arsenius</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volpercht, Klaus</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vomp</td>
<td>70, 327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>von Ernst, Melanie</td>
<td>110, 113, 117, 126, 127, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>von Hatzfeld, Boni</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>von Hebentanz, ?</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>von Leonhardi, Moritz</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>von Raesfeld, Karl</td>
<td>264, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorbichler, Karl</td>
<td>208, 209, 210, 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vuatom</td>
<td>250, 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vunapope</td>
<td>78, 273, 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vurun</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walloschek, Arnold</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warth, M. Bonifatia</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber, Paul</td>
<td>257, 268, 323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber, Norbert</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werl</td>
<td>83, 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werth, Godehard</td>
<td>257, 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werthenstein MSF</td>
<td>70, 76, 82, 93, 100, 303, 381–81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sumatra</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wewak</td>
<td>217, 229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
White Fathers 54, 71, 111, 152
White Sisters 111, 371
Wilhelmsburg 43
Winkelmann, Josef 265
Winthuis, Josef 282, 283
Wolf, Notker 321
Wolff, ? 281, 284
Wolkenstein-Trostburg, Wilhelm 110
Wuppertal 75
Würzburg
Würzburg CMM (mission museum) 17, 69, 73, 75, 82, 97, 98, 99, 123, 303, 350–51
Xavante 346, 348
Yamana 192, 228
Yugoslavia 339
Zambia 101, 114, 333, 364, 365, 379
Zeist 52
Zilas, Felix 308
Zimbabwe 101, 195, 364, 379
Zimmermann, Fridolin 236
Zirngibl, Manfred 331
Zug 104, 106, 130, 143–47, 151, 344, 377
Zug SSPC (mission museum) 59, 68, 81, 84, 89, 100, 102, 125, 131, 143–48, 303, 344–45
Zulu 123, 350
Zululand 123
Zurich 77, 78
Studia Missionalia Upsaliensia & Svecana

This publication is part of the Studia Missionalia Svecana series, published by the Swedish Institute of Mission Research, Uppsala, Sweden. Books can be ordered from Uppsala University online shop at http://www.ub.uu.se/actashop/ or through e-mail acta@ub.uu.se

Studia Missionalia Upsaliensia ISSN 0585-5373


1 (I) Peter Beyerhaus (1956). Die Selbständigkeit der jungen Kirchen als missionarisches Problem.
10 (X) Sigfrid Estborn (1968). Johannes Sandegren och hans insats i Indiens kristenhet.
186
12 (XII) Sigvard von Sicard (1970). The Lutheran Church on the Coast of Tanzania 1887-1914 with Special Reference to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Tanzania, Synod of Uzaramo-Uluguru.
14 (XIV) Sigbert Axelson (1970). *Culture Confrontation in the Lower Congo: From the Old Congo Kingdom to the Congo Independent State with Special Reference to the Swedish Missionaries in the 1880’s and 1890’s.*


17 (XVII) Stiv Jakobsson (1972). *Am I not a Man and a Brother?: British Missions and the Abolition of the Slave Trade and Slavery in West Africa and the West Indies 1786-1838.*


22 (XXII) Axel-Ivar Berglund (1976). *Zulu Thought-Patterns and Symbolism.*


29 (XXIX) Bengt Sundkler (1976). *Zulu Zion and Some Swazi Zionists.*


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Studia Missionalia Svecana ISSN 1404-9503</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editors: 81-103 (LXXXI-CIII) Alf Tergel and Aasulv Lande; 104-107 (CIV-CVII), Kajsa Ahlstrand and David Kerr; 108- (CVIV-) Kajsa Ahlstrand and Mika Vähäkangas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 (XC)</td>
<td>Yvonne Maria Werner (red.) (2004)</td>
<td>Nuns and Sisters in the Nordic Countries after the Reformation: A Female Counter-Culture in Modern Society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
106 (CVI) Jieren Li (2008). In Search of the Via Media between Christ and Marx: A Study of Bishop Ding Guangxun's Contextual Theology.