

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HISTORY OF BOTANY AND
EXPLORATION IN MALAYSIA. 8—9*)

by

M. J. VAN STEENIS—KRUSEMAN

(Oegstgeest)

8. Heinrich Bürger (? 1806—1858), explorer in Japan and Sumatra

When Dr. F. G. Meyer, in a letter to Dr. Ding Hou, inquired after biographical particulars of "Heinrich Bürger", the name of this naturalist meant nothing to me. This is not astonishing, as nearly all of his activities took place in Japan, a country outside our range of study.

It took Dr. van Steenis some efforts to warm me up and in the meantime he gathered some information, mostly provided by Prof. Dr. H. Boschma at Leyden and by Prof. Dr. F. Verdoorn at Utrecht. When Verdoorn *inter alia* referred to Flora Malesiana vol. 1 (Cyclopaedia of Collectors) I was baffled and got intrigued, though at the time it seemed dubious whether "Burger", who was cited there to have sent plants to Blume (1), was identical with Heinrich Bürger.

Though some people seem to think that I know the Cyclopaedia by heart, it had yet another surprise for me in store. In its index I found another reference to a Dr. Burger, a Burger who was one of the Directors of a mining company and the host of James Motley (a civil engineer, employee of that company, and a well-known collector of Bornean plants), when the latter stayed at Batavia in 1854 (2). For conscience' sake I looked up a letter written by Motley during that stay (3) and found to my amazement that doubtless the same person was involved, for Motley was delighted to be the guest of a congenial spirit, a man who in former years had made extensive collections in Japan, and whom he described as being both a botanist and a zoologist!

A paper written by H. Burger, Phil. Dr., on a visit to the Padang Uplands (4) directed attention to his being for some time a member of the "Natuurkundige Commissie" in the Netherlands Indies, a fact also mentioned by Veth (5), who recorded his outstanding work in Japan.

Bürger (or Burger as he is often quoted and as he later signed his name), when a young man, assisted Freiherr Ph. Fr. von Siebold in Japan, and after some years became his successor. One would think it comparatively easy to find more particulars about somebody who collected so extensively both botanically and zoologically, that a Fauna and Flora of Japan were mainly based on Von Siebold's and his collections. Not so, however.

Neither C. J. Temminck (the then Director of the Zoological Museum at

*) Parts 1—6 were published in Bull. Bot. Gard. Buitenzorg III, 18, 1950, 463—472; part 7 in Reinwardtia 1, 1951, 67—73.

Leyden), nor Dr. C. L. Blume (the then Director of the Rijksherbarium), whose institutions and publications benefitted so much by Bürger's collections, mention any particulars about him. The former even wrote in an official letter that he knew nothing about "Burger" except that he was a collector (6).

Whereas everybody who respects himself thinks fit to write eulogies and more eulogies on famous men like Darwin, Linnaeus, etc., and while obituaries of well-known contemporaries are mostly written in at least five periodicals, other people of great merit have simply fallen into oblivion. One of the latter category is Heinrich Bürger, although it is admitted that phytophographers and zoographers have commemorated him in generic names and many specific epithets. It is particularly pleasant to give such persons the credit they deserve, though a bit late, and give a glimpse of their life, their ambitions, and work.

Fortunately archives do not select their material and thanks to their contents (7) it was possible to reconstruct a rough outline of Bürger's life, although the background of many things can only be guessed at, and will partly remain a mystery forever.

Heinrich Bürger was, if we rely on documents present in the Rijksarchief at The Hague, born at Hameln on the Weser (Hanover) in Germany, in early 1804. The latter year was found by deduction. Inquiries in Germany, however, did not confirm this year of birth. The town-archivist at Hameln, Dr. R. Feige, failed to locate him in the church registers. At a later date I found that he was of Jewish descent and then the archivist of Hanover spotted a Heinrich Bürger, born Jan. 20, 1806, at Hameln, as the seventh of ten children of Samuel Bürger and Eva Meyer, in a Jewish family register. After having informed Dr. Feige, the latter wrote me that the Jews in that time had to pay "Schutz- bzw. Beiwohnungsgeld" to the municipality. He looked up the accounts for the year 1806, which made mention of 9 names, amongst which two with the first name Samuel, viz Samuel Salomon, and Samuel Hirsch. He suggested that one of them will have been Heinrich's father, as the name Bürger was probably later adopted by change of name or christening (8). If these data apply to *our* Bürger, the question rises whether the latter intentionally tampered with his year of birth. One of the reasons may have been that it was easier for him to get an appointment in Holland at the age of 19 than at 17. He might have got into difficulties in crossing the border to Holland when under 18, and apparently without consent of his mother.

He lost his father early, and his mother was not in a position to look after his education; his knowledge was said to have been the result of untired zeal (14). Whether and where he visited a university is not known to me, nor whether he rightfully used the Doctor's title. Dr. Feige (Hameln) detected that a "Heinrich Bürger" from Hannover, son of a merchant's widow at Hameln, matriculated as a student in mathematics at Göttingen on 25. 10. 1821, and switched over to astronomy in Oct. 1822 (9). There seems a possibility that he might be identical, although this preliminary training does not sound very useful for a prospective pharmacist. On the other hand these years correspond with the year 1823 when he secretly left his parental home to go to Holland.

In September of the latter year he sailed, in one of the ships of Voûte & Co at Amsterdam, bound for Java. He was officially appointed "élève voor de pharmacie" (apprentice pharmacist) (10) in the hospital at Weltevreden (= Batavia, Djakarta) and was promoted to 3rd class pharmacist in 1825 (11). In the same year he was, at his own request, put at the disposal of the surgeon-major Ph. F. von Siebold in Deshima (also written Decima, a small islet in the Bay of Nagasaki, place of the Dutch settlement in Japan).

Von Siebold had the instruction to make a scientific investigation of Japan; besides he did excellent medical work for which he was held in high esteem by the Japanese. He trained numerous Japanese pupils for the medical profession, and established a botanic garden which in 1829 harboured already a thousand rare plants; when he later (1859—62) returned to Japan it had fallen into decay. When he asked for an assistant and a draughtsman, Heinrich Bürger and Karel Hubert de Villeneuve were sent to Japan.

What induced Bürger to change his position is not known to me. One of the reasons may have been the underpayment of the pharmacists. In this respect it is instructive to quote from a letter written by Dr. P. Bleeker (dated Jan. 7, 1857) to Temminck (12): "De positie der pharmaceuten, élèves van de heer Mulder, laat hier veel te wenschen over. Hunne vooruitzichten zijn treurig, hunne tractementen zeer beperkt en hun tijd geheel benoodigd voor drukke mechanische diensten, welke niet aan hunne gemaakte studiën beantwoorden." (transl.: The position of the pharmacists, pupils of Mr Mulder, leaves here much to be desired. Their prospects are miserable, their salaries are very restricted, and their time is entirely occupied by routine work not fitting their education). If this was the case in 1857, it will certainly have hold true in 1825. Here it must be mentioned that an important reason for Bürger's entering the Dutch East Indian service was to be in a position to help his mother and sisters financially (14).

In 1828 he was commissioned to take over the function of Von Siebold (13), but owing to difficulties with the Japanese over the so-called imperial charts (geographical maps of Japan, which Von Siebold intended to take with him to Holland for reproduction in his scientific standard work; this was strictly taboo with the Japanese), the latter was not allowed to leave before December 1829 and was interned the preceding thirteen months in the smallest house in Deshima, not by the Japanese, but by the Dutch officials who feared that their commercial relations with Japan might be jeopardized (version of Von Siebold) (31).

A comic feature of this unpleasant period in Von Siebold's life is the fact that he nevertheless succeeded in adding to his collection, not only by the specimens Bürger presented him with (cf. p. 502), but also by selecting his specimens from the hay brought in daily for his goat. For obvious reasons he ordered the hay to be gathered from ever more remote places.

As to Bürger's work as an official in Japan not much is known to me. At the outset, under Von Siebold, he was charged with the teaching of physics, chemistry, and mineralogy, subjects for which he was said to have a predilection. In 1826 Von Siebold made a journey to Jedo and, under the guise of being his secretary, Bürger was allowed to accompany him. End 1828 he officially took over the natural science investigations. It may be stressed here, that apart from Von Siebold's medical and teaching work, the latter's

pioneer studies in Japan covered enormous fields. When one skims his "Nippon. Archiv zur Beschreibung von Japan" (1832 →) one feels awe-inspired for this source of information on the country, language, customs, flora, physiognomy, calendar, and numerous other subjects, brought together in a span of less than seven years, though with help of admirers and pupils. It is not to be doubted that Bürger did not have Von Siebold's gift for synthesis and was overshadowed by his chief and predecessor, a talented but overbearing person.

It is evident that Von Siebold was assisted in making natural history collections by hunters whom he engaged, while fishes were bought on the market near the harbour of Nagasaki; sometimes existing collections were presented or bought. The same line was probably followed by Bürger.

When asked for a testimony of Bürger in 1834, Von Siebold made mention of some unpleasant incidents with some officials, but ascribed these mainly to hurt pride and misunderstanding, and added that they could by no means obscure Bürger's merits (14).

Between the years 1830 and 1835 Bürger sent large Japanese zoological and botanical collections to Leyden, which were shipped from Batavia, together with those of the "Natuurkundige Commissie" (Commission for Natural Sciences, operating in the Dutch East Indies since 1820).

Bürger's Japanese period was interrupted by a stay in the Dutch East Indies. In 1832 he arrived in Java with a large quantity of seeds and plants of the tea shrub, intended for cultivation in "Het Etablissement van Landbouw" (an experimental agricultural garden) at Krawang. This material did, however, not form the nucleus of the later tea culture, of which the stock came from Canton.

In the next year, 1833, he was instructed to join an expedition of the "Natuurkundige Commissie" to the Padang Uplands on the west coast of Sumatra (15) and to inspect the culture of tea plants at Krawang (16). In Sumatra he travelled in the company of the botanist P. W. Korthals, the draughtsman P. van Oort, and the taxidermist S. Müller. As Korthals during his travels wrote an extensive diary (MS in the Rijksherbarium), it seemed worth-while to scan it for eventual remarks on Bürger, and factually it contains a few. He states that Dr. H. Bürger (written this way) was charged to investigate the mineralogy. Early June the party started from Batavia. It seems that Bürger was conversable and helpful during the boat trip; later on he is hardly mentioned, except to state that "he ran on ahead again". But for a party of members with different interests it is quite usual not to stick together.

His Sumatra trip which probably lasted till the end of the year 1833 (17) resulted in a paper published in the "Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap" (4), of which society he was a member. In the same volume he gives an account of the Japanese copper mines, and the manufacturing of copper (33).

In recognition of his valuable service in Japan and as a member of the "Natuurkundige Commissie" (during the Sumatra trip) he was decorated in 1834 and became a "Ridder in de Orde van de Nederlandsche Leeuw" (19). Before this was decided, the opinion of the Hanoverian government, of the

Shipping Company Voûte & Co, and of Dr. von Siebold was requested, respectively on his conduct before entering the Dutch East Indian service, his behaviour during the voyage to Java, and as an assistant to Von Siebold. It may seem strange to find a shipping firm in this company, but it must be remembered that at that time the voyage covered a long period, certainly suitable to get acquainted with somebody's character. The information from Hanover was favourable, stressing his zeal and his conduct with regard to his mother and sisters to whom he forwarded money several times. Von Siebold underlined his merits (cf. p. 498), and the shipping company judged his behaviour on board to have been correct, although later they had no reason to praise his attitude towards them (without giving further details) (14).

In 1834 he must have returned to Japan, as in that year he again shipped zoological and botanical material (18). In June 1835 his investigations in Japan came to an end and he was placed on half-pay (20), evidently settling in Java again. About 1837 he was asked to continue his researches in Japan, but he refused. The reason for this refusal is not known to me, but it might be that he had married by that time (cf. p. 500).

In 1839 it was under consideration to install him once more as a member of the "Natuurkundige Commissie" (21). When the Minister consulted the Director of the "Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie", C. J. Temminck (at that time a member of a commission to further the interests of nature investigation in the Dutch East Indies), and Dr. von Siebold, Temminck answered that he only knew Bürger as a collector (6), and Von Siebold's testimony must have been unfavourable, as it is subsequently stated by the Minister that Bürger had *insufficient scientific background* for a renewal of an appointment with the Commission. One cannot help thinking it a bit strange, to say the least, that Bürger, who in 1834 was awarded the decoration of the "Nederlandsche Leeuw" for his work in Japan and Sumatra (with a recommendation of the same Von Siebold), is five years later not considered worthy of the same kind of work! If ever, Bürger's pride must have had a big blow this time. As a result of Temminck's and Von Siebold's advice, it is decided to grant Bürger a pension. Pending this, the latter asked to be granted a leave to Holland.

In 1840 he sailed in the "Cornelis Houtman" and, after arrival in Holland, settled at Amsterdam. The resolution regarding his pension came off in 1843 (22).

I tried in vain to ascertain when Bürger returned to Java. In Amsterdam the "Bevolkingsregister" goes back to 1850, at which time Bürger evidently was not a resident anymore. For the possibility that he might have moved to Leyden after 1843, a supposition prompted by a list in *Linnaea* (23) in which a Dr. Bürger (Leyden) is inserted, is not sustained by the registers of Leyden, extant for 1845 and 1849, which do not include his name. This is no proof, however, as he might have been a resident in a period between those years. The archives at Amsterdam and Leyden did not yield a marriage certificate either.

From 1843 onwards many were his activities in the Dutch East Indies, all as a private citizen, and all things seem to point to a return to Java

about that year. This being sustained also by him being mentioned as a proprietor in Java in 1844 under the corresponding members of the Dutch Society for Encouragement of Horticulture under the direction of Von Siebold and Blume (34). His interests ranged from rice-hulling works to the supply of rice and oil to the "Buitenbezittingen" (Outer Possessions, i. e. the islands outside Java), from the insurance business to mining companies, sugar factories, etc. It is clear that he had to make a living next to his pension for his family which at the time of his death (1858) existed of a wife (Anna Cornelia van Daalen, † 1874, 55 years of age, at Batavia) (24) and six children of which at least one girl was married in 1860 (7).

There is no evidence that Bürger sent collections to Holland later than 1835, although he brought home a collection of Japanese plants in 1840 or early 1841 (cf. p. 502). It is not to be accepted that his interest declined as the opposite appears from Motley's letter to Hooker (cf. p. 495). A plausible inference seems to me that he was frustrated after the little appreciation of his scientific and exploration work. In this respect it seems appropriate to stress the importance of encouraging letters to collectors, which can mean an enormous stimulus. A sign of appreciation, in contrast to one's collections falling into a void so to speak, can make all the difference. Especially in Temminck and Blume's period it was quite customary to take the trouble people took in making collections for granted, as is evident from many instances. Another thing was of course that the situation in Java could hardly be compared with that in Japan, where he was for several years the only European who made natural history collections.

In 1855 he was naturalized (25); March 25, 1858 he died at Indramaju, probably when being on a tour of inspection as in July 1857 he was still a resident of Batavia, and his wife lived there till her death in 1874. Possibly he is the ancestor of many descendents bearing the name Bürger in Java.

If we summarize what Bürger contributed to science: Siebold & Zuccarini's *Flora japonica*, Temminck & Schlegel's *Fauna japonica* could not have been made without the collections of Von Siebold and certainly not in the last place those of Bürger. The latter is occasionally mentioned in the *Flora* as a "naturaliste zélé", and a man who has so much merit for the botany of Japan, but only one plant, *Hydrangea buergeri* (26) is named in his honour in that work.

As for the fishes in the *Fauna japonica*, Bürger's part is still larger and besides the material he sent a large manuscript written in Dutch (about 1835), containing descriptions and a few particulars of 200 species he distinguished, accompanied by a valuable collection of beautifully coloured drawings made by a Japanese artist. According to Boeseman the manuscript, though rather nice for that time, sometimes lacks accuracy, but that did not prevent Temminck & Schlegel to use parts of Bürger's descriptions, sometimes even verbally (27). It seems a bit unjust to say the least, in this case to qualify Bürger, as Temminck did, as a collector of whom he did not know anything else (cf. p. 499). Some fishes have a specific epithet commemorating Bürger's name.

The importance of Bürger's collection of birds has been stressed by Stresemann (28). Many were his collections in other groups of the animal kingdom.

F. A. W. Miquel in his *Prolusio Florae japonicae* originally gave no information on Bürger either. On the other hand in that relatively small paper over 20 species have an epithet derived from the name Bürger, certainly no minor tribute. In the separate issue of the same work, which appeared later, recognition of Bürger's work and some biographical information was given (29).

When searching the old archives of the Rijksherbarium for eventual correspondence regarding Bürger, a parchment-bound booklet was found (n. 66) containing a systematic enumeration of 1790 Japanese plants, mostly with latin names, all provided with vernacular ones (both in Japanese handwriting and phonetically written down). After comparison with a collection list signed by Bürger, it was evident that the handwriting was without doubt identical.

Besides in the Rijksherbarium, Japanese plants collected by Bürger are represented in the herbaria at Brussels, Florence, Groningen, Munich, St. Louis, and Utrecht (30).

There is a possibility that he also sent plants from Sumatra (1833) to C. L. Blume (then Director of the Rijksherbarium at Leyden), at least Dr. P. W. Leenhouts remembers Sumatra specimens of the Blume herbarium with a B at the left upper corner of the label which by exclusion he inferred to be Bürger specimens.

Remains the question why Von Siebold, who gave a favourable testimony of Bürger in 1834 (cf. p. 498), in 1839 judged that Bürger's background is insufficiently scientific for a nomination as a member of the "Natuurkundige Commissie" in the Dutch East Indies. I had nearly acquiesced in this remaining a mystery forever, when by sheer luck, while talking to Dr. Ding Hou, he told me of the existence of a Siebold portfolio in the archives of the Herbarium. Who sketches my amazement when it contained amongst others an "Open brief aan den Minister van Binnenlandse Zaken" (31), which, I am well-nigh sure, gives the clue to his conduct. This letter was written as an *oratio pro domo* from the imputations by the late Dr. C. L. Blume († 1862) by whom he was accused of holding back scientific material said to be government property. It would take us too far afield to disclose here the ins and outs of the controversy Blume versus Von Siebold, but it is a different thing where Bürger is involved. The following statements seem important:

- 1.*) Of necessity I here must dwell on the botanical collections made by Dr. Burger in Japan in the years 1829—1832 The botanical collections of Dr. Burger are limited to the plants of the botanical garden in Dezima, the pleasure- and temple-gardens, and the environs of Nagasaki. The Latin names were communicated by me as far as possible with the available literature; genera and species unknown to me I provided, as I did in my own earlier and later collections, with the Japanese names The plants sent by Mr Burger to the Rijksherbarium during three years accordingly have no other names than those given in my collections and plant lists, either Latin or Japanese. It cannot be doubted that a number

*) The original Dutch text is reproduced in the annex at the end of the paper, including the spelling errors.

of the later (1831—32) forwarded *plants of this capable and diligent collector will not be in my collections or will be new* (italics by the present author).

2. *However, by pressing a scientific stamp on Bürger's collection, I handed Mr Blume a sharp weapon against myself* (italics by the present author).
3. Mr Blume couldn't appropriate my botanical discoveries in Japan as he did those of the travellers in the Dutch East Indies; he did his best, however, to give the honour of the first discovery of Japanese plants by me, to Mr Burger, Mr Textor or others . . . as he later was prevented in this practice by Article 14 of the Instruction for the Director of the Rijksherbarium "The Director refrains from making use of the collections and discoveries of living members of the dissolved Natuurkundige Commissie in the Dutch East Indies in the botanical works he might publish", he tried to evade this regulation by ascribing the origin of the Japanese plants to Mr Burger and others.
4. Japanese dried plants presented to me by Mr Burger at his return in Europe.
5. Whenever it was possible and if specimens of the plants were represented in Burger's or Textor's collections also, Mr Blume attempted to ascribe the first discovery to them, in order to obscure my merit, and because Mr Burger and Mr Textor never engaged in writing botanical publications.

My comments are:

On 1. The arrangement was, that in the period of Von Siebold's internment (13 months, up to Dec. 1829) Bürger was to collect plants while Von Siebold offered to give him the taxonomic or Japanese names (on paper, as he avoided personal contact with him), provided that Bürger put one specimen of each at his disposal. This collection was part of the disputed collection which Von Siebold later claimed as his private property. This transaction covered, however, little over a year, while Von Siebold speaks of a 3-years collection provided by him with names. Furthermore, Bürger collected later also, viz in the years 1834—35. Von Siebold admitted that a number of plants collected in 1831—32 were not in his collections and might be new.

On 2. Now this seems to me to be the crucial point. Von Siebold judged that Blume exaggerated the scientific value of Bürger's collections (in Von Siebold's opinion due to the names which he, Von Siebold, provided), in order to minimize the importance of Von Siebold's. Could not this be the reason of the dictum "not enough scientific background" in 1839?

On 3. This reasoning does not hold as Bürger did not die before 1858, and Textor even later than 1859!

On 4. According to Blume (32) Bürger's plant collections were, after the latter's return to Holland (this must have been in 1840 or 1841), deposited with Von Siebold to be returned later to the Rijksherbarium accompanied by Von Siebold's notes. Bürger's Japanese collections were always sent to Batavia, where they were forwarded to Holland together with material collected by the members of the "Natuurkundige Commissie". A list of a plant collection, made in 1834, and sent via Batavia, is present in the Rijksherbarium. Possibly Blume meant a (? duplicate) collection which was retained by Bürger and taken home in 1840 (cf. p. 500).

Presumably there was still another, accurately annotated, set of his which was bought by J. Pierot when the latter visited Java on his way to Japan, ? early 1841 (for joint account of him and G. Bisschop, The Hague). It was sold to the Rijksherbarium in January 1844 (34). This collection was labelled by Miquel as being collected by Pierot. This error was rectified by Miquel himself in his "Prolusio Florae japonicae" (1867) (29). Miquel's supposition (l. c. p. vi) that the collection was bought after Bürger's death cannot be correct, as Bürger went on leave to Holland in 1840. I found no information by whom the collection was offered to Pierot in Java, though it seems certain that a Bürger collection was involved as Venema established by comparison (35).

On 5. It is of course true that neither Bürger nor Textor ever wrote a botanical paper, but I found no evidence that Blume ascribed new species rather to them than to Von Siebold.

If we keep in mind that Von Siebold had great difficulties in getting access to his own collections in the Leyden Herbarium, it seems doubtful whether he ever got an idea of what Bürger's later collections amounted to.

The fact that Bürger, after his return to Holland (1840 or early 1841) handed plants to Von Siebold, seems to point to a friendly relation. Quite possible, as Bürger certainly will have learned a lot from his predecessor, and will have held him in high esteem. The fact that Von Siebold gave an unsatisfactory testimony with regard to an eventual reappointment in the "Natuurkundige Commissie" will probably never have come to Bürger's knowledge.

Looking at the facts, it seems justified to conclude that neither Temminck nor Von Siebold were inclined to underline Bürger's merit in 1839. At that time Temminck deliberately borrowed from the latter's manuscript on the Japanese fishes (a current method in those years), while Von Siebold felt that Blume tried to minimize the importance of him and his botanical collections, as compared with Bürger's. There is no denying, however, that their attitude put a stop to Bürger's investigations and his most important collecting activities. It is certainly owing to their attitude that Bürger's capacities in that direction were sterilized and that after 1840 he disappeared from sight.

REFERENCES

1. cf. Fl. Mal. 1, 1950, 91.
2. cf. *ibid.* 373.
3. cf. HOOK. J. Bot. & Kew Gard. Misc. 7, 1855, 78.
4. H. BÜRGER: „Aanteekeningen op eene reize door een gedeelte der Noord-Westkust van Sumatra, op last van het Gouvernement gedaan in het jaar 1833. Aanmerkingen gehouden op eene reize door eenige districten der Padangsche Bovenlanden". Verh. Bat. Gen. K. & W. 16, 1836, (159)—(226).
5. cf. H. J. VETH, Overzicht van hetgeen . . . gedaan is voor de kennis der fauna van Nederlandsch Indië. Thesis, Leiden 1879, p. 74.
6. cf. A. GIJZEN, 's Rijks Museum van Natuurlijke Historie 1820—1915. Thesis, Leiden 1938, p. 101—102. Erroneously mentioned as D. W. Burger; his signature may easily be misread!
7. Liberal information was given by the staff of the "Rijksarchief" at The Hague (Mr A. E. M. Ribberink) and its "Hulpdepot" at Schaarsbergen (Mr H. G. Wondaal), while thanks are due too to the municipal archives of Amsterdam and Leyden for their help.

8. Information received from the "Niedersächsisches Staatsarchiv" in Hanover (Dr. Carl Haase) and the "Stadt-Archiv" at Hameln (Dr. R. Feige).
9. cf. GÖTZ VON SELLE, Die Matrikel der Georg-August Universität zu Göttingen 1734—1837 (1937) Nr. 28978 and 29536, p. 660, 676.
10. General State Archives, The Hague, Koloniën 2479, resolution Governor General Nov. 6, 1824, no. 3.
11. G. S. A. Koloniën 2480, resolution Jan. 14, 1825, no. 1.
12. cf. VETH l. c. sub 5, p. 129.
13. G. S. A. Koloniën 2815, resolution July 1, 1828, no. 1.
14. In letters to the Minister of the Colonies, in dossier with regard to the Royal decree (see sub 19), of which some particulars are published here with consent of the "Algemene Rijksarchivaris", The Hague.
15. G. S. A. Koloniën 2550, resolution June 9, 1833, no. 8.
16. L. c., resolution June 27, 1833, no. 2.
17. cf. VETH l. c. sub 5, p. 75.
18. G. S. A. Koloniën 2557, resolution Jan. 17, 1835, no. 1, and see in Gijzen, l. c. sub 6, p. 305.
19. G. S. A., Staatssecretarie 3954, royal decree Sept. 16, 1834, no. 61.
20. G. S. A. Koloniën 2855, resolution June 14, 1835, no. 4.
21. cf. Letter from the Minister of the Colonies to the Governor General dated Nov. 30, 1839, no. 4/7676 (inv. no. 1268).
22. G. S. A. Koloniën 2646, resolution June 30, 1843, no. 9.
23. cf. *Linnaea* 19, 1847, 153.
24. cf. P. C. BLOYS VAN TRESLONG PRINS, *Genealogische en heraldische gedenkwaardigheden* . . . Batavia vol. 3, 1938, 149.
25. Law of Dec. 18, 1855, *Staatsblad* 153 (Justitie inv. no. 4862).
26. cf. *Flora japonica* 1, 1835, tab. 57, p. 111.
27. M. BOESEMAN: "Revision of the Fishes collected by Burger and von Siebold in Japan". Thesis, Leiden 1947, p. 1—3, 10—15, pl. 1—4.
28. cf. E. STRESEMANN, *Die Entwicklung der Ornithologie*. 1951, p. 387, 396.
29. In MIQUEL, *Ann. Mus. Bot. Lugd. Bat.* 2 and 3, 1865—67, and in a separate issue (1867) to which my attention was drawn by a paper of Dr. H. J. VENEMA in *Meded. Bot. Tuinen Belm. Arb.* 3, 1959, 58—59, which was kindly brought to my notice by Dr. H. C. D. de Wit.
30. cf. *Index Herbariorum* pt. II Collectors, 1954, p. 107.
31. An open letter to the Minister of the Interior, dated Aug. 15, 1864.
32. cf. Letter from Blume to Von Siebold, dated Oct. 21, 1847, in the *Rijksherbarium* archives.
33. H. BURGER: "Eene beschrijving der Japansche kopermijnen, en de bereiding van het koper". *Verh. Bat. Gen. K. & W.* 16, 1836, (1)—(28).
34. cf. *Ann. Soc. Encourag. Horticult. Pays-Bas* 1, 1844, p. ix.
35. cf. H. J. VENEMA in l. c. sub 29.

ANNEX.

Original text of selected passages from the "open brief":

1. "Ik moet hier noodzakelijk eene uitwijding maken ten opzichte van de kruidkundige verzamelingen van Dr. Burger in de jaren 1829 tot 1832 op Japan bijeengebragt, . . . De kruidkundige verzamelingen van Dr. Burger beperken zich tot gewassen van den plantentuin op Dezima, de lusttuinen en tempelhoven en de omstreken van Nagasaki. De systematische namen heb ik hem medegedeeld, voor zoo verre ik dezelve met de hulp van de toenmaals mij ten dienste staande letterkundige hulpmiddelen bestemmen kon; aan de mij onbekende geslacht- of soortnamen heb ik dan ook, zoo als in mijne vroegere en latere verzamelingen, in de zijne met de Japansche namen aangeteekend, . . . De gedurende drie jaren door de heer Burger aan 's Rijks Herbarium

gezonden gewassen dragen dan ook geene andere namen als die in mijne plantenverzamelingen en plantenlijsten opgegeven zijn, het zij systematische of Japansche. Dat een getal van dien *bekwamen en ijverigen verzamelaar later (in 1831—32) overgezonden planten zich niet in mijne verzamelingen bevinden of nieuw zijn, is niet te betwijfelen*" (italics by the present author).

2. "*Den Heere Blume heb ik edoch door een wetenschappelijk stempel op de Burger'sche verzameling gedrukt te hebben, een scherp wapen in handen gegeven tegen mij zelven*" (italics by the present author).
3. "Mijn kruidkundige ontdekkingen op Japan heeft de Hr. Bl., zoo als hij ten opzichte van de reisigers in Indië gedaan heeft, zich niet kunnen toe-eigenen, hij deet echter zijn best, de eer van de eerste ontdekking van Japansche gewassen door mij, aan den heer Burger, den heer Textor of anderen toetekennen. . . . daar hij later door Art. 14 van de Instructie voor den Directeur van 's Rijks Herbarium "De Directeur onthoud zich in de botanische werken die hij mogt in het licht te geven, gebruik te maken van de in het Herbarium aanwezige verzamelingen en ontdekkingen van nog levende leden der opgeheven Naturk. Commissie in Nederl. Indië" daarin belet werd, zoo zocht hij, door de afkomst der Japansche planten aan den heer Burger en anderen toe te eigenen, deze bepaling te ontduiken."
4. "japanische gedroogde planten, mij door den heer Burger bij zijne terugkomst in Europa ten geschenke gegeven."
5. "waar het maar doenlijk geweest is, en wanneer exemplaren van de planten ook in Burgers of Textors verzamelingen aanwezig waren, zocht de Hr. Bl. de eerste ontdekking aan deze toe te eigenen ter verduistering mijner verdienste, en omdat zich de heeren Burger en Textor nooit letterkundig met botanie bemoeid hadden."

9. The transfer of the Rijksherbarium from Brussels to Holland in 1830

When hunting for particulars on Heinrich Bürger, it seemed worthwhile to consult the archives of the Rijksherbarium, not only under Bürger, but also under Von Siebold. One of the interesting finds was an 'Open Letter' from the latter directed to the Ministry of the Interior, dated Aug. 15, 1864, to which was already referred in my preceding Contribution no. 8. That letter, in which occasionally mention is made of Bürger, is of more historical interest, as it gives a view on the personality of Von Siebold, his relation with Blume, and interesting details on the history of the Rijksherbarium.

The plants collected by Von Siebold in Japan during the years 1823—1828 were forwarded via Batavia to Leyden. At that time the Rijksherbarium was still in the making. Dr. C. L. Blume was the man who was put in charge of the foundation which was to be housed in Brussels and of which the nucleus would be formed by the collections of Blume himself and of the members of the "Natuurkundige Commissie", Kuhl, Van Hasselt, Zippelius, and others, up to 1829 all preserved at Leyden. It was actualized by a Royal Decree of March 31, 1829.

After his return in the Netherlands (Antwerp) in June 1830, Von Siebold



The aspect of the building in which the Rijksherbarium was housed from 1829—1830, 8—12, Rue de Namur (formerly Rue de Coudenberg), Brussels, as it still is to-day. It dates from 1778 and first harboured the Coudenberg convent. From 1786 onward it served as an abode for various institutions amongst which the Royal Athenaeum (1818—1838), until it was occupied by the Military School (1838—1874).

We owe these particulars to the kind co-operation of Dr W. van Eeghem, of Brussels. The picture is taken from "Le Vieux Bruxelles, etc." (Bruxelles 1907), pl. XXV, and the photocopy was kindly provided by the Royal Library, Brussels, at his request.

sent two other cases containing dried plants, seeds, wood samples, etc., the harvest of his last year's stay, to Brussels. A few days later he visited Blume at Brussels, went for some time to Ghent (where they kept his living plants brought from Japan), and subsequently to Antwerp, where his ethnographical collection was stored, awaiting the issue of the revolt which resulted in the same year into the separation from the Northern Netherlands.

Some days after Von Siebold's visit to Brussels, Blume went abroad with his young wife, just before the outbreak of the revolt. Anxious what might happen to his botanical collections, Von Siebold proposed to Mr Van Ewyck, the Administrator for Education, Arts and Sciences, The Hague, to go to Brussels and try to remove them to Leyden. With an authorization to that effect he returned to Ghent and subsequently to Brussels, where he, in the absence of Blume, conferred with Dr. J. B. Fischer, Blume's assistant and collaborator. They then decided *) to remove the whole of the Rijksherbarium to Leyden. For this aim all the material was packed in 50 cases and forwarded in vans to Ghent, where Von Siebold was to see after its further dispatch. At Ghent a boat was chartered to bring the cases to Rotterdam. In the meantime the cases were unloaded on a quay at Ghent, and it did not take long before the lot, drawing the attention of the people, was seized by the mutineers and came under control of a guard. After a discussion during which Von Siebold explained the scientific value of the contents of the cases and the calamity it would be if the mob got hold of them, he succeeded to have them safely shipped to Holland. Von Siebold retained the two cases sent in June from Antwerp and forwarded them together with his ethnographical collections to Holland. According to his own words he reported the issue of his mission to Mr Van Ewyck who gave all the credit to his resolution. Since October 1830 the collections are officially housed at Leyden.

Though under the circumstances it was probably the best thing to do, one wonders what the reaction of Blume will have been, taking into account that his relation with Von Siebold was none too friendly. Imagine the Director going on holidays abroad and in the meantime the whole of the collections being transferred!

As even Dr. W. A. Goddijn, the historiographer of the Rijksherbarium (Meded. Rijks Herb. Leiden n. 62, 1931, 1—53) was evidently ignorant of the details of this transfer, which he rightly supposed to have been due to the riots in the Southern Netherlands (the later Belgium), it seemed worthwhile to publish the facts as given by Von Siebold.

The passage of the original text of Von Siebold's 'Open Letter' in the Rijksherbarium archives relating to the transfer reads as follows:

"Ik bleef eenigen tijd te Gent, waar mijne uit Japan overgebragte levende gewassen in den Hortus Academicus bewaard werden en begaaf mij vervolgens naar Antwerpen, waar zich mijne ethnographische verzameling bevond, in afwachting van den afloop van den opstand. De heer Blume was eenige dagen na mijne visite met zijne jonge vrouw op reis naar buitenland gegaan, voor dat de revolutie uitbraak. Uwe Excellentie, die met den toemaligen

*) See also Holthuis & Lam, *Blumea* 5: 188, footnote. 1942.

hopeloozen staat van zaken te Brussel bekend is, zal zich met de voorzigtigheidsmaatregelen vereenigen die ik onder zoo bedenkelijke omstandigheden ten opzichte van mijne te Brussel bevindelijke kruidkundige verzamelingen, de vruchten van een veeljarig wetenschappelijk onderzoek, te nemen besloten heb. Ik heb namelijk aan den toenmaligen Administrateur van het onderwijs, kunsten en wetenschappen, den heer Van Ewyck, persoonlijk het voorstel gedaan, naar Brussel te gaan om de door mij in Japan bijeengebrachte kruidkundige voorwerpen naar Leyden trachten overtebrengen. Met de noodige volmagt voorzien (Bijlage Lett. A), begaaf ik mij naar Gent en vervolgens naar Brussel, mij met den Dr. Fischer, Assistent en Collaborateur van de heer Blume, die afwezig was, in relatie te stellen over de aan mij opgedragen missie. Met dezen geleerden en schranderen man kwaam ik tot het besluit, het geheel Rijks Herbarium naar Holland overtebrengen hetwelk onverwijld in het werk gesteld werd. Dr. Fischer deed het Rijks Herbarium en mijne Japansche planten inpakken en met vrachtwagens naar Gent brengen, waar ik het verder vervoer trachtte te bewerkstelligen. Door de hulp van een handelshuis te Gent was mij een vaartuig ter beschikking gesteld om daarmede de kruidkundige verzamelingen naar Rotterdam aan de Consignatie van den heer Antony van Hoboken overtebrengen. Deze in meer dan vijftig kisten verpakte vreemdsoortige goederen, welke aan eene kaai te Gent afgeladen werden, trokken de nieuwsgierigheid van het volk tot zich, en spoedig werden dezelve door muiters die onder het bevel van den befaamden Pontecoulant te Gent ingetrokken waren, in beslag genomen en door eene militaire wacht in verzekering gehouden. Ik verklaarde aan het muiterhoofd dat de in beslag genomen goederen uit niets anders als kruidkundige verzamelingen bestonden gedurende mijn lang verblijf in Japan bijeengebragt, en betrachtte hem te bewegen deze wetenschappelijke schatten niet ten prooi van het gepeupel bloot te stellen; waarin ik ook gelukkig geslegd ben. Op deze wijze heb ik mijne kruidkundige verzamelingen en die van het rijk uit een nieuw gevaar gered. Na weinige dagen zijn dezelve naar Oud Holland overgebragt geworden. Als ik den heer van Ewyck van het uitslag mijner zending berigt bragt, juichte hij toe "aan mijne fermetéit" dit zijn zijne eigen woorden."