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Abstract

This study seeks to investigate an alternative view of land and of its cartographic representations. Such view sees land not as a priori given, but as available to be interpreted in relation to the subjective gaze of those who look at it and determine it as a social space. In particular, this study looks at the South-Pacific. The ‘discovery’ of the landmasses in that area is to be read in a typically European context, for it completes the vision of the world of those that had earlier ignored its existence. From this point of view, I have analyzed representations of Australia that show the evolution of how the rest of the world learnt to think about it. In particular, I have taken into account cartographic representations that show how the unknown lands of the South were turned into the fetished British possession of Australia. Looking at them is a useful way to develop considerations about the processes of appropriation of land by the British Empire.
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Introduction: a gaze that leaves a sign

It seems unthinkable nowadays to consider that there might be big continents that we do not know of. The evolution of satellite technologies has guaranteed a deep knowledge of the land masses that can be found on the surface of the earth – at least when the analysis is limited to their existence – the possibility of finding new ones is just out of question. Maps give us such certainty and make this kind of knowledge easily accessible to everyone. In spite of this, such confident feeling is not very ancient. It was only the 19th century when a new continent permanently appeared in the world picture: the British are considered to have completed the discoveries of the lands in the South-Pacific and charted them for the first time. In spite of earlier contacts with these landmasses, their existence before that time represented a big question mark and those lands were referred to as *terrae incognitae* – the unknown lands. However, their territories were included in cartographic representations of the world before their official ‘discovery’. Their presence on the maps gave scientific legitimation not only to their doubtful existence, but also to that of a whole set of preconceived ideas about what monstrosities such an enormous distance was meant to be keeping away.

This enquiry into the cartographic representation of the South-Pacific has a number of origins and a number of sources. It is informed, to begin with, by J.B. Harley's innovative ideas about the nature of maps [2001]. Harley reads in the geographic precision that they propose, the power relations, cultural practices, preferences and priorities of those that have produced them. In the light of his assumptions maps have been analyzed as representations of the way in which these territories must have appeared in the eyes of the explorers.

The cartographic representations I have focused on show the evolution of a very peculiar transformation of Australia: maps show its ‘evolution’ from being a *terra incognita*, a part of the world populated by savage monsters, to being the contemporary Australia of New South Wales and Queensland. The analysis of these maps displays change of vision of those lands; they illustrate the construction of a sense of British ownership, while at the same time displaying misbalance between the core of the Empire and its peripheries.

Furthermore, the existence of representations of the South-Pacific that precedes the first European contacts is a proof of rather mature traditions that reflected upon the existence of land beyond the known world and its borders. The unknown lands would eventually turn into the known lands of the South-Pacific, but their contemporary charts have not left behind the impressions of those who reached the costs of the South Pacific, crossing the delimitations of the world that was known to them. While looking on land for signs that could make it – and its inhabitants-intelligible and fall into known categories to facilitate the process of familiarization with these new scenarios, the explorers' gaze was one that left its signs. It is by identifying some of those signs that appeared on maps produced after the official discovery that this study seeks to develop considerations about the processes of visualization and of production of these lands as part of the British Empire.

This study draws on ideas in art history, literature and the study of visual and material culture; its sections are built on
the necessity for a discursive, subjective research method that establishes that theoretical and socio-historical co-
ordinates in which the final analysis of maps has been conducted. Such method has been chosen with the validation of R.
Murray Thomas' outline of what such a method entails, that is, 'gathering and interpreting information from the viewpoint of kinds of objects, ideas, or events' [Murray 2005: 225]. A socio-semiotic approach for the interpretation of visual and textual references will be used as a template for the understanding of the thematic.

**Historical premises**

Long before the official discovery of Australia geographers had stated that a vast continent of the size of Europe and Asia lay in the southern half of the world. The existence of such a vast land seemed essential to balance the weight of the land masses of the northern hemisphere. It was also thought to cover the whole southern surface of the Earth and to be in the midst of all the known oceans, the Atlantic, the Pacific and the Indian [Clarke 2002]. The first European that provided a written account of the existence of Australia was the Spanish geographer Pomponius Mela who wrote about A.D. 50. Mela held that the continuity of the oceans in the unknown southern hemisphere was interrupted by a continent of which Ceylon possibly formed the northern tip; in this continent were the springs of the Nile, which flowed subterraneously to emerge in Africa. (Beaglehole 1947: 5)

In the I century A.D, Ptolemy was the first to draw the borders of a vast *Terra Australis Incognita*, and from then on ‘many is the ancient chart that shows it, sketched with a free and uncontrolled hand, around the South Pole’ [Wharton 1893: 14].

In spite of this, ‘for such centuries Pomponius Mela and Ptolemy pondered in vain’ says John Cawte Beaglehole [1947: 6], New Zealand historian and editor of James Cook's three journals of exploration, in his *Exploration of the Pacific*, a landmark publication in the field of Southern Pacific historiography; those lands stood outside the representations that were offered by ecumenical geographical descriptions and mapping and it was also believed that getting there was forbidden. It was a matter of faith that anyone sailing to the underside of the globe would end up dying because of the tropical sun as he crossed the Equator: scientific observations showed, after all, that the more south one headed – and the closer to the Equator- the warmer it grew. Also, a sort of suspicion towards those that inhabited the antipodes did not encourage in trying to overcome the borders. However, from the 16th century on, intermittent yet periodic reports from pioneers in the Pacific seemed to imply that the great southern continent was more than a legend and a belief in its existence became a commonplace among most educated Europeans. By the times of James Cook, the occasions for systematic explorations of the great Pacific Ocean became more and more frequent; in those same days imperial competition became nail biting.

European countries were eager to search for and claim *Terra Australis Incognita*: both Britain and France sent their captains to the South Pacific, in a sort of race. By 1766 Samuel Wallis and Philip Carteret left for an expedition on behalf of Britain. The next year, the Chevalier de
Bouganville followed for France. And finally, in 1769 the celestial transit of Venus between the Sun and the Earth provided another reason for undertaking a new voyage. British admiral of the Navy William J. L. Wharton carefully reports this episode in his 1893 *Preface* to a transcription of Captain Cook's journal during his first voyage round the world. To put it in his words:

> A transit of Venus over the sun's disc was to occur in 1769, and astronomers were anxious to take advantage of it, the object of the observation being to ascertain the distance of the earth from the sun, the fundamental base line in all astronomical measurements, and which was very imperfectly known. The Central Pacific afforded a favorable position, and the Royal Society memorialized the king to send a ship for the purpose. (Wharton 1893: 18)

The Royal Society were eager to observe the phenomenon from several points, including one spot in the Pacific and the Admiralty agreed to send a ship for this purpose, seizing the chance. The Admiralty choice of leader for this expedition was Cook, who sailed on the *Endeavour*. Two plans can be distinguished in Cook's instructions. The first was the official reason for the voyage and was for public consumption. It dealt with the supervision of the observations of the transit of Venus in Tahiti.

The primary object of the expedition is to take a correct observation of the transit of Venus on the 3rd of June. No time therefore should be lost in getting to the station fixed upon for that purpose, there being many preparatory operations absolutely requisite, which may take up six weeks, or two months previous to the day of the transit.¹

The second plan was the secret one and an additional instruction as the letter specifies. Once the scientific purpose of the expedition for which the *Endeavour* voyage was originally commissioned by the Royal Society of London was fulfilled, Cook was ordered to head south for 1500 miles, where Douglas (1768) thought that 'there is reason to imagine that a continent of land of great extent, may be found'. As described in the letter to Sir Joseph Banks, naturalist and botanist who also took part to the first voyage on the *Endevour*:

> When that business is finished, other matters may be attended to. Particularly the discovery of a Continent in the lower, temperate latitudes; [...] There are different indications described by navigators, for judging whether land described be an island or part of a large continent. Very high mountains within land, at a great distance from the shore, give strong symptoms of a large continent.²

Cook's Secret Instructions are evidence of British first official expressions of

¹ This reference, as well as some of the following, refers to the digitalized version of the manuscript correspondence between Sir Joseph Banks and James Cook. The letter explains what the aims of the expeditions should be, introducing James to the secret instruction. Digital Collections – Manuscripts – Cook, James, 1728 -1779... Cook's voyage 1768-71 [manuscript]: copies of correspondence, etc. [ONLINE] Available at: http://nla.gov.au/nla.ms-ms2-s56-e-cd. [Accessed 11 April 2014].

interest in Australia. They picture the quest for scientific discovery, combined with the desire to find exploitable natural resources and to expand British control of strategic trading posts around the globe. According to the instructions Cook was there, to establish friendship and alliance with the inhabitants, to get to know about their progresses in the arts and in science, in mechanics and astronomy, and with their consent, possess the Country in the name of the King. If he found no continent, he was to turn west and investigate the land known as New Zealand and to then get back to Britain via the Cape of Good Hope.

The official year of the discovery of Australia is 1770: Cook charted the coasts of New Zealand, much of Australia and many remote islands in the South Pacific. He imposed the Union Jack on the discovery of the east coast of Australia, naming it New South Wales. However, in spite of the official British discovery, there's strong evidence that the discovery of Australia had taken place earlier. A series of weapons dating back from the sixteenth century and of undoubted Portuguese origins were found on an Australian beach, in the 50s of last century. A few years later, a Spanish helmet was found, too. The existence of these findings shows that two centuries earlier than Cook's voyage, the Iberian States already knew of the lands of the Pacific. In the seventeenth century, it was Holland's turn. Dirk Hartog hit Australia's coasts in 1616. In 1642 the Dutch explorer Abel Tasman reached today's Blackmans Bay, discovered Tasmania and provided a name for the land that had been referred to thus far as of the 'Unknown South Land' (Fantolino 2008: 15-16). 

Nieuw Holland, New Holland was the first name to be given to Australia, after the Dutch province of Holland.

Wharton (1893) reports in his Preface to Captain Cook's journal that it was held that many zones of the South Pacific had already been touched before Cook's expedition, but that 'no one had been to see'. The preface provides an account of what was known and of what was unknown when Cook arrived in Australia. The unknown part, he specifies, comprises the whole of the east coast of Australia, or New Holland, and whether it was joined to Tasmania of the south, and New Guinea to the north; the dimensions of New Zealand; New Caledonia and the New Hebrides, with the exception of the fact that the northern island of the latter existed; the Fiji Islands, Sandwich Islands; the Phoenix, Union, Ellice, Gilbert, and Marshall Groups, with innumerable small islands scattered here and there; the Cook Islands, and all the Society Islands except Tahiti. The majority of the Paumotu Group. The coast of North America north of 45 degrees north was unknown, and there was the great, undefined, and imaginary southern Continent to disprove. (Wharton 1893: 18)

And yet, in spite of the existence of proofs of previous contacts between European explorers and Australia, almost 150 years had to pass before Western eyes officially recognized Australia's existence. One of the reasons that have been provided for explaining such a delay have to do with America's previous discovery: its incomparable economic resources and the lower distance were way more attractive than what could be found on the Australian soil. America seemed a more secure route to Europeans, and this is a reason why Australia's exploration was destined to
an unspecified future. As Fantolino (2008 26) concludes in proposing these ideas, what is ignored cannot be regretted. Many reasons account for the fact that Australia seemed less attractive than the Americas. Above all it was widely assumed from Dutch observations on New Holland that nothing advantageous could be gained from those territories.

Stamping Degree Zero

In spite of evidence that seems to say something else, the official discovery of Australia is attributed to the British. The 1770 discovery of Australia thus acquires meaning to Western conscience as the product of those practices which define it not simply as a place that exists in the Pacific Ocean, but rather as space, a piece of land that is given meaning because it expands the needs and possibilities of the ones who recognize its existence.

What can be considered Barthes' greatest contribution (1964) to the development of semiotics, that is his denial of the presumption of innocence, becomes helpful when explaining the attitude of the explorer towards the discovery of an unknown continent and its appearance on the official representations of the known world that were produced for divulgation. By focusing on Bourgeois writing, Barthes criticizes the idea of an objective transparency that is the portrait of an innocent reflection of reality. He sees this process as a feature of all bourgeois appropriation, by which middle class bourgeois values disguise themselves with inevitability. However, Barthes points out that bourgeois writing is not innocent. Rather it shapes reality in its own image, acting as a carrier or transmitter of the bourgeois way of life and its values. It is such 'naturalness' that provides a possible approach to read the corpus of diaries and exploration records that were produced with every expedition, and consequently of maps, too. John Catwe Beaglehole says about the attitude of the discoverer:

In every great discoverer there is a dual passion – the passion to see, the passion to report; and in the greatest this duality is fused into one – a passion to see and to report truly. (1947: 1)

Regardless of the genre these reports work in, be it a personal diary or a journal, Barthes's idea of a cloaked transparency helps producing interesting considerations about the degree of accuracy of such representations and about the truths that are at stake therein. In those texts narration usually takes the form of a personal record (narrated in first person) that places the author at the very centre of what he is exploring. Bonwick says about this kind of narration:

Objection was taken to the literary mode adopted. The author chose to make the narrative in the form of a personal record of events. The Captain was represented as speaking of himself, saying 'I saw' or 'I did' &c. It was asserted by critics that to accomplish this personal mode of narration, there would necessarily arise some difficulties in the rearrangement of his source of history. (1901: 3)

His descriptions provide a representation of those new lands and of its inhabitants; but whilst claiming to be as faithful as possible, they do not take into account what models they are faithful to and fail to include other voices – be these

3 'Ció che si ignora non si puo rimpiangere'.
Aboriginal or other explorers’. The explorer-author thus constructs the land for others from scratch by means of his own description and by making use of conventions, which assure the reader of the reliability of what is being reported. The South-Pacific thus results as something ‘natural’ and indeed authentically original in the very way in which it is looked at by British eyes – a construction that takes place both inside and outside the text.

There is also another level of disguise that takes place with the narration of the author. The explorer, usually British and male (and head of a numerous fleet), builds a narration that needs to be authoritative and knowledgeable. Such narration needs, above all, not to fail in taking into account institutional expectations and desires.

The earliest of the institutions that regulated the explorations was the Royal Society of London for Improving Natural Knowledge. This institution relied on the financial development of its members and for this reason it was one of their main interests to preserve the wealthy ones, even when these lacked a scientific education. The Royal Society of London was connected to the higher levels of government, and the gathering of knowledge was always connected with the achievement of power. This is also demonstrated by the admission criteria to the Society. Its members were simply requested to have an interest in ‘natural knowledge’ and did not need to have studied or to be working with sciences and with its methods of investigation.

Another institution that was relevant to scientific explorations was the Royal Geographical Society, founded in 1830 for the advancement of geographical science. It was promoted by the Royal Society of London with the idea of exploration in its agenda. Ryan (1996: 37) explains it as such:

Under a façade of gentlemanly science, the RGS was an organisation with a fundamentally instrumentalist agenda. And the agenda was expansion of empire.

The Royal Geographical Society reproduced the alliance between the scientific institution and aristocracy on the one hand. On the other hand, it represented the possibility for the explorers to progress socially. Exploration was a way by which one could be elevated within the Royal Geographical Society as well as reach high positions in the social ladder. Thus, the explorers' personal interests were constantly intertwined to those of the Empire: these are influencing factors that an analysis of the reports' degree of authenticity needs to be concerned with. The Royal Geographical Society used to reward explorers and this generated a strong sense of competition; the awarding of titles, prizes and medals reinforced the construction of exploration as an individual enterprise, too. Sometimes the attempt to present the most interesting log meant for the explorer ‘to prepare as interesting as narrative as he could’, and to try ‘to please home parties as flatteringly as circumstances permitted’ (Bonwick 1901, 24). In the case of explorers' diaries and reports, Barthes' notion of writing has to be taken literally. In spite of this, along with the poststructuralist ideas that everything can be a sign, his study can be applied to the reading of maps – supported by an analysis of travel reports and illustrations – that sees these forms of representation as non-transparent portraits. Barthes' ideas inspire an analysis of the codes these are based on as operating to modify and generate
meaning in a far from natural fashion. In the case of Imperial expansion though, ‘writing’ can also take an extremely pragmatic connotation and it becomes ‘carving’ on land of the signs that modify it and that allow the explorer-user to make sense of it; that allow the clod to become Australia. These incisions are the very footsteps of the British explorers and eventually become actual writing in the moment in which maps are drawn up.

Mitchell, cited by Alan (1836: 38-39) says about his exploration:

I have written the name of Britain deeply into the rocks and mountains of Australia by the roads and passages already made. In Mitchell’s declaration, Australia is depicted as the tabula rasa upon which men could write by engraving both their personal achievements and the institutional identity in an intertwined way. Writing as a personal narration is the preferred method for exploration records as well as for the actions that precede their telling: writing the territory becomes a pragmatic deed that leaves tangible marks on the Australian Soil.

Epistemic shifts in map making

Speaking about maps Ryan (1996: 37) states that: ‘there can be few representational objects that are so often confused with the things they are meant to represent’. Such consideration is especially important when analyzing maps from the past. As a matter of fact, the representation of the geographical qualities of land has been a prerogative that mapmakers from different times have inflected with information that was not always strictly physical or political. The evolution of maps’ representational purposes through history has been characterized by general epistemic shifts that it seems important to highlight before moving into the specificity of the cartographic representations of the South Pacific.

Provided that each cartographic representation is a system of signs, from a semiotic perspective looking at maps means analyzing the way in which human vision and visual recognition have been intertwined in the space of a cartographic representation. Maps, as an extraordinary fusion between text and image, hold an iconic value that makes them the storage medium for information about space, and a picture of the world to help people understand the spatial patterns, relationships, and complexity of an environment. Such is the functional continuum of maps and it manifests itself into a kind of symbolism that associates a graphic trait, colour, etc., to a conceptual content. However, with the evolution of social and material perspectives on land through history, the sign system of cartography evolved, too, leaving behind itself an epistemic discrepancy: different eras have produced maps to provide messages that can be scientific and geographical, but also philosophical and theological, at a degree that varies through times. Maps produced during the Middle Ages will not be the same as those produced during the Enlightenment: certain elements that used to be considered as central to the production of a map have disappeared through centuries and have been replaced by others. The disappearance of signs from maps becomes a sign in itself as it signifies a different way of looking at and understanding space.

During Medieval times maps represented
both natural characteristics and spiritual allegories. Medieval cartographic representations were visually laden with illustrations about the history of mankind and theological knowledge. Very often such maps were accompanied by texts that would amplify the maps' content. In the Renaissance maps became more political and more cultural and they acquired a military and a strategic role. The Renaissance saw the production of a variety of maps: non-pictorial and mathematical maps, such as navigation and military maps, intended for everyday use, occupied one side of the spectrum, with those that evolved from the belief in the encyclopedic function of maps on the other. Even in this category, however, illustrations and texts served to depict not only historical and biblical events, but also botanical and anthropological information, such as information of the newly discovered lands (Barber; Harper 2010).

Thus, the message delivered by maps worked at different levels, from purely philosophic to scientific. Later on, the Enlightenment – which is considered to have influenced greatly contemporary map making – largely simplified the artistic qualities of maps from earlier generations; it rather developed them from a scientific point of view in a way that reified those times’ pursuit of encyclopedic knowledge (Livingstone; Withers 1999: 165-167). From this perspective, in order to analyze maps from the past we need to take an approach rooted in art history in which the focus moves from the object to the emotional and psychological dimensions of visual culture.

These considerations will have to be taken into account when looking at how cartographic representations have kept track of the transformation of the unknown lands into the contemporary territories in the South Pacific. In particular, in the next section information retried on maps will open up to the historically imbued discourses that have produced these territories as Terra Australis Incognita in the first place, as a Tabula Rasa, in the second, and finally as Australia and New Zealand.

Charting the South-Pacific: how Terra Australis Incognita became Australia

The Theatre of the World

The ‘theatre of the world’ was a very common metaphor in the XVI century and it was used to indicate all those scientific publications that highly relied on the role of illustrations and drawings. The best illustrated books of the time contained reference to the ‘word theatre’ in their names, for such books anticipated the contemporary importance of visual representations that was to be lost by the 17th century baroque sensibilities (Mangani 2008: 46-54).

One of the most remarkable examples of such tradition is Theatrum Orbis Terrarum (literally Theatre of the World), a high-end atlas of charts, whose name referred to such metaphor in the first place. In the second place it hinted at the traditions of the great cabinets of curiosities and of personal collections. What this book had in common with these collections was the great value images were given as tools for the creation of knowledge. Ortelius’ Atlas (1564), whose reputation is to be a cartographic masterpiece and possibly the first modern atlas in which maps were uniform in format and design,
shows the increased knowledge of both Old and New Worlds available to mapmakers by those times. The map of the world therein contained also showed the existence of parts of the world that were unknown.

The peculiarity of Ortelius' world map is that, Tierra del Fuego in South America is shown as part of those unknown southern lands, Terra Australis Nondum Cognita, while New Guinea is shown as an island. Such map was the result of the theories according to which a vast land had to exist in the southern hemisphere in order to balance the landmasses in the north. In spite of the mystery around these lands and notwithstanding their being located outside geographical experience, Ortelius' theatre shows that the terrae incognitae of the South were integral to the world picture. The existence of such representations is a proof of rather mature traditions that reflected not only upon what could possibly lie beyond the known world's borders, but also on the reasons why it was kept outside. The next section will be looking at the reasons why terra incognita was not a place to be sough.

'Unknown but not unthought'

It is very exciting to realize that both visual and written culture included representations of the areas that are of interest to this study before their discovery. Such representations were built upon religious beliefs about what was to be found on the outside of the known world passed its borders. These are represented as a mystical/mysterious border: crossed the fire line that delimited the world, those spaces offered antipodal regions that even before the discovery of the lands of the South Pacific were described as perverse and inverted. Alfred Hiatt, author of Terra Incognita: Mapping the Antipodes before 1660, suggests that these representations functioned 'precisely as a warning against fantasy, against both intellectual and political overreach' and that it was for this reason 'that the antipodes frequently made their appearance in classical and medieval literature' (Hiatt, 2008).

Ryan (1996) provides an epistemological interpretation about the mechanisms that led towards the creations of such purely theoretical representations. His idea originates from taking into account the very geographic position that is occupied by the continent in relation to what was known when the representations were produced: outside the world or upside-down. These lands' coordinates became further more than just geographical indications and provided a key to read the semiotic relations by which the southern continent had been defined in the processes of projection of Europe's views. These, however, were in most cases the result of lack of information: what was projected on them was the very notion of 'blankness', which produced a 'semiotic tabula rasa' upon which it was possible to easily insert European fantasies and fears. Such process, Ryan explains, is typical of colonialist practices and has characterized the creation of representations of Asia, Africa and America, as well. While those 'empty' territories have soon been filled, Australia is formed as a blank and is filled occasionally by fantasy, but one of these projections is blankness itself. Thus Australia is semiotically 'filled in' by projections of blankness –
both cartographically and in explorers’ aesthetic descriptions (Ryan 1996: 105).

As previously explained, the existence of lands outside geographical reasoning was considered as a possibility by the medieval world picture. Charts and maps tried to offer a representation of it that mirrored the theories about was to be expected from it and that were indeed very ancient. While mapping the lands that were known relied on principles of realism, marking *terra incognita* meant using a very different order of representation. As Hiatt says:

*terra incognita* constituted an a-cartographic mode of representation within the map, uncharted land that nevertheless appeared on the chart. Such land was stripped to its raw essentials, to its fundamental idea: *terra incognita* was land unknown but not unthought (2008: 11).

The world charts that were produced before the 17th century did include the unknown parts of the world: they involved the fusion between continents that were officially recognized and those that only existed as an idea, since no sources other than fantasy could provide an account for their representation.

Although only imagined, these lands were produced socially in the eyes of those to whom the land was incognita. The role of maps in this process was enormous: both known are unknown lands were reduced to the space of two dimensional representation. Thus, maps gave scientific legitimation to the unknown parts of the world by juxtaposing them to the very heterogeneous spaces of the known continents. By including *terra incognita* on world maps, this is represented as a possible world that can be looked at passively and from a distance, a blankness that cannot be lived directly but that is rather experienced from ‘the other side’ of the fire border. Even though this only happens abstractly, it is done in relation [and often in opposition] to very concrete European images and symbols.

As a result, a whole set of spatial practices have been enacted towards these mysterious lands. Even when these are to be understood as mental processes, these practices established a relation that developed around the notions of ‘upside-down’, ‘antipode’ and ‘unknown’. Naming it, fearing it, describing it, forbidding contacts with it are all practices that shape the South Pacific territories, connoting them in a way that makes them intelligible to European eyes. Its position on the charts was the signifier of an inverted Europe: *Terra Australis Incognita* was a space in which everything was perverse and against European norms and conventions. The Wolfenbüttel map (about 1150) presents the southern hemisphere with a label that says: ‘here live our antipodes but they endure night and day opposite from ours’. At times this definition took a shape which is less metaphorical than expected: these lands were thought to be populated by anomalous Aborigines that walked with her head down and their feet up, on a ground that lay above the sky. Macrobius (1150 ca.), cited in Hiatt, says in his commentary to the map:

For if for us o assert it is a kind of joke below’ is where the earth is, and ‘above’ where there sky is, for them also ‘above’ will be what they look at from below, nor will they ever fall into the upper regions. I affirm also that amongst them those less educated believe the
same about us: they do not believe that we can inhabit this place, and they opine that if anyone tried to stand beneath their feet, he would fall. (2008: 46)

The fourth part of the world

In this section I am going to be looking at the origin of the notion of antipode in relation to the unknown lands of the south and how it was produced visually in early maps of the world. Medieval mapmakers inherited classical descriptions of the Earth and portrayed the world in relation to the Bible's descriptions. Such representations were rather schematic and were construed by placing a ‘T’ in a circle. The T represented the Mediterranean, the Nile, and the Don dividing the three continents, Asia, Europe and Africa, and the O is the ocean all around it.

This kind of map is considered to be representing only the top-half of the Earth. It was presumably considered a convenient representation of the inhabited parts and since the southern temperate clime was considered unattainable and inaccessible, there was no need to depict them on a world map: as mentioned above, it was after all believed that no one could cross the torrid equatorial clime and reach the unknown lands on the other half of the globe. These imagined lands were called antipodes.

On the other hand, the antipodes did make their appearance in later maps of the world that depicted the southern hemisphere, as well. They were represented as part of a tradition of zonal maps that showed them just aside to the known parts of the world. The earth was divided into five climatic zones but it also included a contrast between a terra cognita and a terra incognita, between what was known and filled with names and what was completely unknown, only theorized and blank, ‘present on the map but devoid of any topography’ [Hiatt 2008: 6].

An example of this kind of maps is Beatus of Liébanas’ world map. In 776, Beatus, a monk of Santo Martino in the Liebanese valley in north Spain, finished composing his Commentary on the Apocalypse. The commentary contains a map that offers a representation of the world as divided in four portions. The Antipodes make their appearance among Europe, Africa and Asia at the very right of the map; they appear as separated from the other continents and as a completely blank space without information of any kind. Ryan reports a passage of the Commentary on the Apocalypse of Saint John that explains what lived on these extremely far lands:

outside the three parts of the world there is a fourth part, the farthest from the world, beyond the ocean, which is unknown to us on account of the heat of the sun. We are told that the Antipodeans, around whom revolve many fables, live within its confines.

These maps provide account of the marginalization processes towards the monstrosities and aberrations that were expected to be found on Australian soil. As Ryan says:

The southernmost areas of the world, then, become a stage on which Europeans fantasies of difference, aberration and monstrousness can be played out. [1996 108]

Discovery did not change the
representations of the antipodes before their discovery; on the contrary these representations seemed to anticipate everything that was to be seen for the first time. Thus, when something unexpected was found on Australian soil it was immediately contained within the realm of the 'unexpected expected' (Ryan 1996: 10).

Tabula Rasa: acknowledging Terra Australis Incognita

With the passing of the centuries, such practice evolved into representing the southern continent as a blank space: the existence of Terra Australis Incognita had been acknowledged by Cook's travels, in spite of its territory being completely unknown. Such lack of information was represented on the maps that were produced after the discoveries and it created a recurrent representation of Australia and New Zealand as empty lands. These were produced visually as bordered shapes containing a very limited amount of information; they often were of the same color of the surrounding ocean, just as borders within the sea, a blank text waiting to be written on by the impending colonial process. Nova Hollandia thus made its appearance on maps and among the known continents, achieving a degree of scientific justification that legitimated its existence as a tabula rasa.

Such is the case, for example, of N.A. Chrysologue's Hemisphere inferieur de la mappemonde projettee sur l'horizon de Paris (1774). Such map of the southern hemisphere shows part of the southern American and South Asian islands; in stark contrast with their colours and abundant textual references, Australia and New Zealand make their appearance in the South Pacific with nothing more than black lines, their borders traced within the ocean, but empty of indications on the features of its soil. Only a few names appear on the coasts of the land known as Nouvelle Holland. Another example of the effects that the discovery had on European cartography is A. Zatta's Nuove Scoperte fatte nel 1765, 67 e 69 nel Mare Del Sud (1776), in which besides Australia's cartographic emptiness, emphasis seems to be given to Cook's route and even the illustrations on the corner of the map shows a vessel which is likely to be the Endeavour, emphasizing the perspective that was adopted when presenting the new territories to the maps' beholders.

Representations of the lands of the South-Pacific as visual silences need to be seen as statements, rather than as passive gaps in the text that the cartographic image is. The land's existence as a tabula rasa is the cartographic signifier of the absence of an Aboriginal ownership. It acknowledges its territory as it makes its appearance on the homogeneous space of Euclid, while denying the existence of its past and excluding it from the space of two dimensional representations. The absence of colors and of textual indications eliminates everything, even those whose humanity was considered to be 'nothing belonging to our race' in the previous centuries and that populated the lands of the South-Pacific when these were still unknown: those same spaces are now known for being blank. Bonwick refers to this pursuit when speaking about the process naming for Botany Bay:

We cannot avoid expressing
surprise at finding that the gentleman whose duty it was to fill up the vacant spaces, purposely left open for the insertion of names of places, was not always correct in orthography. He may have intended always to write Botany, but varied it in Bottany, Bottony, Bottonest, Botony, Botanis. (1901: 24)

The blank spaces of Australia are seen as empty texts whose possibilities are open-ended. ‘Vacant’ and ‘fill up’ belong to the same semantic field and collocate the land’s past within the context of erasure. While neglecting the land’s past, the construction of any desired future by the Empire is thus legitimated. Australia’s territory becomes an empty signifier and it will be only up to the explorers to give meaning to it. The Aborigines and the signs of their existence are not accepted in the construction of the land as Australia, which thus also becomes a terra nullius, a land owned by nobody.

Sturt himself offers a reference to the relation between Australia blank space and its representation through maps. He writes in his log:

Let any man lay the map of Australia before him, and regard the blank upon its surface, and the let me ask him if it would not be an honorable achievement to be the first to place foot in its centre. [1848: 186]

Sturt’s strong statement projects void over aboriginal culture, absence on Australian soil. It stimulates European imagination, introducing the perspective of a land owned by nobody, which is delivered through cartographic emptiness and deprivation, a form of violence that an interpretation of land needs to be concerned with. The relation between space and violence emerges in the processes of filling the tabula rasa that followed its discovery: it comes from seeing a spatial production as differentiation and as implying hierarchy and division, splitting, and also detachment from. These become unavoidable conditions in the process of production of space as they enact a physical and social differentiation. Filling the tabula rasa is the product of complex relations that do not leave out of consideration the representations of the South-Pacific that were developed before the explorers’ arrival. On the contrary, these are in most cases underlined and emphasized. As the land is explored, interpreted, and described through very European categories, it appears on the charts – and to European eyes – in the way in which its signs have been decoded by the explores. The voyeuristic gaze of the explorers translates into spatial practices that are soon re-translated into visual tracks when the charts of what has been seen are created. Such views partly take inspiration from reality, partly influences it, ending up creating at long term. Operating in such a way, writing on the land took place through spatial practices that gradually changed the representation of the South-Pacific as a tabula rasa, filling it and turning it into something else.

From this perspective, attention also needs to be paid to the terminology that is used in order to designate the process of appropriation of space that ‘filled’ the tabula rasa. The next sections will be focusing on the concepts of ‘discovery’ and ‘exploration’, and on the pragmatic act of baptizing the land.

Discovery

To begin with, the notion of ‘discovery’
immediately collocates the phenomenon in a typically European context: it is the cognitive horizon of English explorers that is being amplified in order to comprehend these ‘new’ spaces; it rises then to an universal condition in the moment when ‘discovery’ completes a vision of the world that is illustrated by means of a map. It is not enough for the continent to merely exist: in order for its existence to be recognized, it needs to lean on Western awareness; such a situation seems to be completely ignoring a possible opposite movement, thus relegating the indigenous conscience – as well as the conscience of preceding explorers – to the condition of being ignored. In investigating the presupposes of language, ‘discovery’ rather becomes ‘invention’, in an etymologic sense: discovering what was hidden and that is still unknown; but avoiding to underline to whom that space was unknown. It is also interesting to focus on the concept of ‘hidden’: the discovery of Australia is almost contemporary to the discovery of the Americas, but it took centuries in order for it to be recuperated and made official. Australia is thus hidden – and discovered – twice: as clod and as existing in geography, first; as a space, by the hands of British explorers, then. This clearly unveils the actualization of a principle of power. It not only comes to exist in function of Western conscience, but also when it is decided by the West; to the eyes of Western officials, the spaces of Australia have indeed been suspended for decades, in the condition of an empty and potential signifier, ready to embrace the projections of a over-abundant England.

Also, for the discovery to be such, all knowledge of the land must be denied; Ryan reports an ‘anthology’ of meaningful statements made by those that ‘dis-covered’ Australia:

George Grey speaks of an ‘utterly unknown country’, Stokes desires to ‘penetrate into this known and mysterious country’ and Ernest Giles enjoys the ‘pleasure and delight of visiting new and unknown places’.

Not only the land but also its inhabitants and their knowledge lose their ‘a priori’ existence to the understated purpose of discovery: expansion and enlargement of the colony.

**Exploration**

The space of the Empire is universal and built as being present in an objective way, a status quo to which it should be difficult to imagine other possibilities. The attitude of the explorer enforces not the discovery of a space, but rather the construction of a space that is measurable and divisible. Maps assume an incredible power from this point of view. As Ryan (1996) posits, the representations of space through maps ‘become an imperial technology used to facilitate and celebrate the further advances of explorers, and display worldwide imperial possessions’. Ryan suggests that the incredible role of maps derives from the scientific authority that is imposed on the representation of land. On the one hand, these have served the scientific community itself, in showing what ‘the starting point’ of the exploration was – what had been already discovered (by themselves or other explorers). On the other hand, they served the bigger purpose of diffusing awareness about the belongings of the Empire. An analysis of those maps reveals the very point of view from which
the new scenarios had been read and translated; a key to understanding the processes of transformation of a piece of land into the fetishized British possession of Australia.

**Giving the name**

One of the most outstanding evidences of the negotiation process that takes place between the bearer of the look and what is being looked at, is the practice of baptizing, the linguistic act of choosing the name for the land, the choice of a new name for a territory that also becomes a trace of the aforementioned relation between violence and space. Maps play an important role in the processes of divulgation of the new names and therefore in filling the *tabula rasa* and in process of becoming Australia. Names of cities and places often tell us about past Empires and powers: in the moment when the new name is given and inscribed onto a cartographic representation, it establishes an indelible connection between the territory and the interpretations that are given to it.

Patrizia Calefato (2006) highlights the relation between conquest and the spatial practice that is being analyzed here. Such relation is considered to be the result of the improper approach to those that are considered to be strange, strangers or Antipodean. It is an irreverent violation, the imminent creation of confusion that manifests itself through language and through the imposition of the name. Imposing the name thus characterizes itself as a spatial practice that facilitates reading the land signs for those that provide it. On a different level, re-baptizing the territory also imposes a kind of reading for others; its new name becomes a keyword that signifies earlier presence and that imprints a sense of ownership, which others will have to respect. Sometimes, this is done in the attempt to keep the Aboriginal names while simplifying their pronunciation for British speakers and thus naturalizing and emphasizing a way of seeing these lands as inherited; of familiarizing with the new properties by making it easier to utter their names. Wharton says about Cook's choices in naming different places in the South Pacific:

Cook's knack of finding names for localities was peculiarly happy. Those who have had to do this, know the difficulty. Wherever he was able to ascertain the native name, he adopts it; but in the many cases where this was impossible, he manages to find a descriptive and distinctive appellation for each point, bay, or island. He seems to have kept these names very much to himself, as it is seldom the officers' logs know anything of them; and original plans, still in existence, in many cases bear different names to whose finally pitched upon.

In the cases in which this proved to be an impossible ‘pursuit’, the name would be attributed by underling the similarities that were found between the *antipodes* and the motherland. In yet other cases the name that was imposed would help describing the new use to which the lands were destined. This is the case of Botany Bay, that I will be dealing with in the following section. In all cases, when the Aboriginal name is abandoned, the connotations and the knowledge about that place die in relation to original world in which they had developed. The *tabula rasa* gradually becomes a community of
colonizers; in a post-colonial typical reading, its new names become the signifiers of the possibility for the colonizers to stay and destroy native memory. Calefato (2006: 147-150) suggests that the reasons of this transformation are to be found in the very definition of cultural translation meant as openness and passage: the names are lost forever, just as the very authenticity of their bearers.

In spite of this, it is a translation that cannot in any way be understood as a third space of peaceful coexistence of two different cultures. It does not accept the survival of the source and it does not allow forms of hybridism to get formed. At the same time, the new name symbolizes the recognition of the antipodes into the known world; in doing so the antipodes will have to respect the moral and religious rules, the formalities and tastes of the world that has discovered them. The following section will provide instances of toponomastic choices that filled the black spaces on the charts of the South-Pacific.

New South Wales, Possession, Botany Bay

To look at the contemporary names of different parts of Australia can provide an example of the effectiveness of the practice of naming places, as well as of the discourses that are signified by the chosen words. Perth, Gloucester, Windsor, New Castle, Manchester Square are only some of the names of British towns that it is also possible to find on Australian soil. Choosing these names might have become the result of a habit. In the earliest cases though, re-using the name of places that exist in Britain meant recognizing in the South-Pacific elements that reminded the explorers of home.

This is the case, for example, of the region of Australia that was named New Wales before being re-baptized as New South Wales. As a matter of fact, the official story of taking New South Wales, as given by Dr. Hawkesworth in Bonwick, is as follows:

As we were now about to quit the eastern coast of New Holland, which I had coated from attitude 38°, to this place, and which I am confident no European Had ever seen before, I once more hoisted English colours, and although I had already taken possession of several particular parts, I now took possession of the whole eastern coast from latitude 38 to this place, lat 10°55’ in right of His majesty Kin George the Third, by the name of New South Wales, with all the bays, harbours, rivers and the Islands situated upon it; we then fired three vollies of small arms, which were answered by the same number from the ship. Having performed this ceremony upon the Island, which we called POSSESSION ISLAND, we re-embarked in our boat, but a rapid ebb tide setting N E made our return to the vessel very difficult and tedious. [1901: 24]

This passage provides valuable examples of the way in which language is used in taking possession of the new territory. In particular, three elements of this description catch my attention.

In the first place, the explanation of the reason why New South Wales seemed the most appropriate name for the eastern coast of Australia, that is the resemblance between the Welsh countryside and the newly discovered
land. In the second place, it seems important to underline the affirmation that Cook was the first European who had visited any part of the eastern coast. Through the spatial practices of imposing the name, he imposes his presence, thus effectively disposing of the claim of Dutch, Spanish and Portuguese navigators. In the third place, the word possession is chosen to denominate the area in which the ceremony of possession took place. ‘Possession’ thus meets a twofold signified. On the hand it indicates the new British territory, while, on the other it signifies the very process of appropriation and the reason why its ownership cannot be put into question any longer. From that moment, other logs and maps make use of the same name to refer to Possession. The Log of Richard Pickersgrill provides this version:

At 6 Possession was taken of this country in his Majesty Name and this was announced from the shore by Vollies and answer from on bd. Colours flying and concluding with 3 cheers. [Bonwick 1901: 22]

The land was seen as a *terra nullius* not belonging to anybody, despite the obvious presence of people along the shores and rivers. For this reason, possession is taken for the British Empire in King George III name in the least metaphorical way in which this could happen; taking possession became a dialectic relation that enacts all consequential processes of transformation of the antipodes into British territory in the Pacific.

On 28 April 1770, while on his voyage of discovery on the Endeavour, Captain James Cook was located off the east coast of Australia, just south of where present day Wollongong is located. Around 2 p.m. he and some of his crew attempted to land on the mainland, but they were unable to land due to strong surf. Captain Cook then ordered the ship to be sailed northward. Four hours later at 6 pm. he discovered a Bay, which he was to name *Stingray Bay*. Attempting to land, the explores noticed a party of natives cooking over a fire and ignoring the British explorers. When the natives noticed their arrival they threatened them with curved throwing sticks, which returned to the thrower after striking the target. Cook eventually effected a landing some distance from the hostile natives and hoisted the Union Flag to claim the territory for Great Britain.

Bonwick (1901: 6) shows how the name of *Stingray bay* appears in various logs, also in two variations: *Sting Rea* and *Ray Harbour*. In all variations, though, Cook chose such name because to the large number of Stingrays fishes in the Bay. Such name has indeed been used to refer to the bay. Its apparition on many travel reports and logs provides an evidence of its use. The bay is also referred to by that name on the log of Lieutenant Zacakry Hickes, ‘first mate or chief officer of a vessel’, who according to James Bonwick (1901: 4) provides ‘the most reliable opinion as to matters connected with a voyage’. Bonwick quotes passages of Hikesog:

> ‘Remarks on boards his Majesty Barque Endevour New Holland, 1770’. Therein we read for successive days ‘Moor’d in Sting Rea Bay’

Also, Cook describes in his own log:

> Gentle breezes and settled weather. At 3 p.m. anchored in seven and a half fathoms of water in a place I called ‘Sting Ray Harbour’. We saw several of the natives on both sides of the north shore, opposite the
place we anchored, and where I soon after landed with a party of men accompanied by Mr. Banks, Dr. Solander and Tupia.

The name was chosen to describe what Cook had found on the island. In spite of this, Botany Bay soon became its official name, for reasons that nowadays seem very mysterious. Only suppositions can be made for the purpose of interpreting this change. Contemplating the profusion of plants and trees from The Endeavour, Captain James Cook and his expedition promptly named the place 'Botany Bay'.

Corner's report on May 6th 1770, cited in Beaglehole (1974) says: 'The great quantity of plants Mr. Banks and Dr. Solander found in this place occasioned my giving it the name of Botany Bay'.

On May 30th we read of 'The same sort of Water Fowl as we say in Botany Bay'. The bay's name suddenly became Botany Bay, by which the harbor of in New South Wales is still called nowadays. It is interesting to notice the shift in the point of view in the process of naming the bay. The choice of Stingray Bay reflected what had been first observed in the bay: the abundance of fish, stingrays in particular, that dwelled in the uncontaminated waters in which the Endeavour was moored. The name Botany Bay reflects a choice that is oriented on the later uses of the land by British explores, the very purpose to which the bay would be destined, that is the study of the new species of plants and vegetation that the discovery of Australia brought about. Once again, their choices in names betray the explorers' intentions; the harbor name was inspired by a process of generation of knowledge that is oriented towards filling the gaps in the hesitant and fragmentary British scientific awareness and that does not wish to inherit any previous indigenous information.

Finally, in his study on the process of naming Botany Bay, Bonwick (1901) provides his own interpretation on the reasons why naming was a practice that was subject to constant change. He blames Dr. Hawkesworth, named by the Admiralty to edit Captain Cook’s paper relation to his first journey. Bonwick says:

*Endeavour* had the misfortune to be prepared in his absence, by a less capable historian. As the worthy Captain always candidly acknowledged his inability from defective education, and from absorption in seamanlike pursuits from his early boyhood, to tell how own tale, we naturally wonder how Dr. Hawkesworth compiled the adventurous voyage of the Endeavour. [...] Dr. Hawkesworth meant to prepare as interesting as narrative as he could, and tried to please home parties as flatteringly as circumstances permitted. Thus, men of science would be gratified by the selection of the place as Botany Bay, an Admiralty officer would be glad of the adoption of his name in Port Jackson, while the Dutch appellation of New Holland gave place to the more British one of New South Wales. Even Torres Strait, that honoured the navigators of Spain and Portugal, surrendered to the English name of Endeavour Strait (1901: 24)

**Conclusion**

The discovery of the Western Pacific Ocean in the early 1500s marked the beginning of a period of exploration that was only completed in the last century, with the exploration of the interior of
Papua New Guinea. Geographical maps were crucial to English transoceanic venture. Those ventures depended upon an active discussion about the nature of the world and the place of Britain in it and mapping the colonies was very important to create awareness about and the very identity of the very heterogeneous British Empire.

In order to grasp the mechanisms that lie behind the construction of the cartographic representations of the lands in the South-Pacific, this article has tried to analyse them through Harley's alternative reading of maps, which criticizes their usual perception as graphic representation of the real world that admits no inaccuracy. Harley's studies have attempted to re-describe maps by reading in the geographic precision which they propose, the power relations, cultural practices, preferences and priorities of the ones that have produced them (2001). Harley suggests that besides the information about the measurable world, provided through techniques that are more and more reliable, cartographic representations can also be subject to a kind of reading that aims to analyse them as the visual production of social discourses and practices.

The rhetorical and non-rhetorical aspects of Australia's cartographic representation by British explorers have been my main concern through this article and their interpretation was derived from the visual and textual references that I could retrieve on maps.

References


Bonwick J. (1901), Captain Cook in the New South Wales or The mystery of naming Botany Bay, London and Bungay: Richard Clav and Sons, Limited.


London International Exhibition 1862. *Descriptive catalogue of the collection of products and manufactures contributed by the colony of Western Australia to the international exhibition of 1862. With remarks on some of the principal objects exhibited*, London: London International Exhibition.


Murray R. (2005), *Writing for academic journals* [Electronic source], Maidenhead: Open University Press.


**Online sources**


**Online newspapers archives**


**Cartographic Material**
Beatus of Liebana, World Map. *Commentary on the Book of Revelation*, Cathedral of Burgo d’Osma, MS 1, fs. 25v-36.


Zatta, A. (1776), *Nuove scoperte fatte nel 1765, 67, e 69 nel Mare del Sud*. catalogue.nla.gov.au. 14/03/2013
This article was first published in *JOMEC Journal*

*JOMEC Journal* is an online, open-access and peer reviewed journal dedicated to publishing the highest quality innovative academic work in Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies. It is run by an editorial collective based in the School of Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies at Cardiff University, committed both to open-access publication and to maintaining the highest standards of rigour and academic integrity. *JOMEC Journal* is peer reviewed with an international, multi-disciplinary Editorial Board and Advisory Panel. It welcomes work that is located in any one of these disciplines, as well as interdisciplinary work that approaches Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies as overlapping and interlocking fields. It is particularly interested in work that addresses the political and ethical dimensions, stakes, problematics and possibilities of Journalism, Media and Cultural Studies.

To submit a paper or to discuss publication, please contact:

Dr Paul Bowman: BowmanP@cf.ac.uk

www.cf.ac.uk/jomecjournal

Twitter: @JOMECjournal

ISSN: ISSN 2049-2340

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License. Based on a work at www.cf.ac.uk/jomecjournal.