This paper is a synoptic history of racial geography in the ‘fifth part of the world’ or Oceania— an extended region embracing what are now Australia, Island Southeast Asia, the Pacific Islands, Aotearoa/New Zealand, and Papua New Guinea. The period in question stretches from classical antiquity to the Enlightenment, to focus on the consolidation of European racial thinking with the marriage of geography and raciology in the early nineteenth century. The paper investigates the naming of places by Europeans and its ultimate entanglement with their racial classifications of people. The formulation of geographical and anthropological knowledge is located at the interface of metropolitan discourses and local experience. This necessitates unpacking the relationships between, on the one hand, the deductive reasoning of metropolitan savants; and, on the other hand, the empirical logic of voyagers and settlers who had visited or lived in particular places, encountered their inhabitants, and been exposed, often unwittingly, to indigenous agency and knowledge.

THIS PAPER IS A GLOBAL HISTORY OF THE CONCEPTUALISATION AND NAMING OF A SPACE – THE ‘fifth part of the world’; and of the naming and classification of places and ultimately people within it. It is primarily a story about European imagination, speculation, travel, and colonisation. Only latterly have indigenous protagonists energetically contested, appropriated, and supplanted introduced nomenclatures in a global arena. For well over 2,000 years, European philosophers, geographers, cartographers, and voyagers successively imagined the space as the Antipodes or Antichthon, terra incognita (‘unknown land’), Oceano Oriental (‘Eastern Ocean’), Mar del Sur (‘South Sea’), Mare Pacificum (‘Pacific Sea’), Terra Australis (‘South land’), Zuytlandt (‘Southland’), and Océanie (‘Oceania’). The
last of these terms was invented by French geographers in the early nineteenth century to name the great insular zone encompassing modern Island Southeast Asia, Australia, Papua New Guinea, Aotearoa/New Zealand, and the Pacific Islands. I use Oceania in this expansive sense. Indeed, a strong case could be made for extending Oceania at least to Taiwan, the homeland of the Austronesian language family whose speakers colonised significant parts of the region from about 6,000 years ago.

Recuperation of the original, broad scope of Oceania is justified on several grounds. Strategically, it redresses the heavy Polynesian emphasis in much recent literature on European voyages and encounters with Pacific Islanders;¹ and it flouts modern geopolitical or strategic postcolonial indigenous usages which restrict Oceania to the Pacific Islands and perhaps Australasia.² Historically, the (re)expansion of Oceania admits ancient, far-flung affinities of origin, language, customs, and material culture, as well as critical human trajectories in the region over 40-60 millennia (including those of Europeans after 1511), until the freezing of colonial borders in the late nineteenth century. Politically, an inclusive notion of Oceania problematises the hyper-realism of the modern states which inherited those colonial borders, leaving a shrunken Oceania severed from Island Southeast Asia; the island of New Guinea truncated; Bougainville separated from Solomon Islands; and Australia poised uneasily on the margins of both Asia and the Island Pacific. Academically, it challenges the conventional division of labour in the disciplines of history, politics, international relations, economics, geography, and anthropology, which mutually quarantine Asian, Australian, and Pacific Studies – though archaeology and prehistoric linguistics are honourable exceptions to this rule.

This vast space has been occupied for a more or less immense period by modern human beings who named themselves and the places they dwelt in and knew of.³ However, I limit my concern in this paper to a history of the thinking, naming, and segmenting of that space, its places, and its inhabitants as an integrated region of the globe. From such a global perspective, Terra Australis, the Pacific Ocean, and Oceania were European inventions. Yet, from the end of the thirteenth century, when the Venetian Marco Polo and his relatives traversed the far western margins of the region, the empirical legacies of direct personal encounters and local knowledge began to infiltrate and complicate European theory and
myth. Henceforth, the formulation of geographical and anthropological knowledge about the fifth part of the world would be located at the interface of unstable metropolitan discourses and often fraught regional experience. A particular concern here is to unpack relationships between, on the one hand, the profoundly ethnocentric but universalised deductions of savants in the metropoles; and, on the other hand, the uneasily cosmopolitan empirical logic of travellers and residents who had visited or lived in particular places, engaged with the inhabitants, and been exposed, often unwittingly, to local agency, lore, rumour, and nomenclatures.

**Imagining the Antichthon**

The world outside the *oikoumene*, the more or less known and inhabited continental land mass of Europe, northern Africa, and Asia, was the object of European fantasy or speculation for far longer than it has been actuality. In the sixth century BC, the Pythagoreans deduced that the earth must be a sphere because this was the perfect, harmonious solid form. Two centuries later, Aristotle proposed a theoretical proof for a spherical earth with the corollary that vast antipodean land masses were needed in the south and the west to counterbalance the *oikoumene*: the southern antipodes was known as the Antichthon. Though long debated and contested, this concept was endorsed by the Roman philosopher Marcus Tullius Cicero in the first century BC and mapped by the Alexandrian geographer Claudius Ptolemaeus in the second century AD (Figure 1).

Arguments for the sphericity of the earth and for the existence of inhabited antipodean lands were vehemently rejected on Scriptural grounds by most early Christian churchmen in favour of the ancient idea that the world was a disk surrounded by water. Early in the fifth century, Saint Augustine of Hippo notably ridiculed ‘the fable that there are Antipodes’ or ‘men on the opposite side of the earth’. He maintained that, even if it could be ‘scientifically demonstrated that the world is ... spherical ..., yet it does not follow that the other side of the earth is bare of water; nor ... that it is peopled’; and that ‘it is too absurd to say’, in defiance of Scripture, that ‘that distant region’ could possibly be inhabited by descendants of the ‘one first man’. The ecclesiastical dogma that all human beings were the posterity of Adam and that all must be able to receive the Gospel underpinned much medieval cosmography. However, the theory of the Antichthon was kept alive during the Middle Ages, notably in a
long cycle of mappa mundi illustrating an evangelistic commentary on the Apocalypse by the
eight-century Spanish monk Beatus. The earliest known such map depicts a southern
continent annotated as: ‘Deserta terra vicina solida ardone incognita nobis’ (‘a deserted
neighbouring land, hardened by heat, unknown to us’).7 The phrase was inspired by the
Etymologiarum of the seventh-century savant Saint Isidore of Seville who, in contrast to
Augustine, took seriously the concept of a spherical earth ‘divided into three [known] parts’
and further hypothesised the existence of a ‘quarta pars’, a ‘fourth part across the Ocean’, ‘in
the south’, which was ‘unknown to us because of the burning sun’ but was reputedly
inhabited by the ‘fabulous Antipodes’.8

The idea of an antipodean terra incognita took on new life during the fifteenth-
century Renaissance with the publication of old maps in novel printed formats. So, on the
mappa mundi produced for the 1482 edition of Ptolemy’s Cosmographia, a landlocked
‘Indian Sea’ is enclosed to the south by ‘terra incognita’ (Figure 1). In 1483, a circular zonal
world map by Augustine’s contemporary, the fifth-century Neoplatonist Ambrosius Aurelius
Theodosius Macrobius, appeared in a printed edition of his very popular commentary on
Cicero’s Somnium Scipionis. Macrobius’s map featured a great southern land mass labelled
‘Antipodvm, nobis, incognita’ (‘the Antipodes unknown to us’) (Figure 2).9 In 1507, in
Cosmographiae introductio, the German geographer Martin Waldseemüller revolutionised
contemporary understandings of the globe by maintaining that recent explorations –
specifically those of the Florentine Amerigo Vespucci in 1501-2 – had disclosed the
existence of a ‘quarta orbis pars’ (‘fourth part of the world’).10 He further proposed that,
since Vespucci had ‘inuenta’ (‘discovered’ or ‘conceived’) the quarta pars, it should be
called ‘America’.11 Waldseemüller duly included the neologism on two woodcut world maps
published in conjunction with his text, a small one in gores meant to be used as a globe and a
huge flat projection in twelve separate sheets.12 The maps were so popular that
Waldseemüller’s later attempts to withdraw the name America, apparently on the grounds
that Vespucci had not been the true discoverer of the quarta pars, failed completely.13
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With the designation of America as the *quarta pars*, the Antichthon could logically become the *fifth* continent or fifth part of the world to those who believed in it. A striking example of the new fivefold division of the continents appears on the title page of the first modern world atlas, the Dutchman Abraham Ortelius’s *Theatrum orbis terrarum* (Figure 3). The continents are represented by five female figures, symbolically attired and equipped and arrayed about a massive plinth: at the top, Christian Europe is enthroned; on the flanks stand Asia and Africa; at the base reclines ferocious, naked America, bearing weapons and a severed human head, beside the small bust of a demure Magellanica with a flame beneath her breast symbolising Tierra del Fuego, the ‘land of fire’ seen and named by Ferdinand Magellan in 1520 on the left of the strait that bears his name.14
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‘Recently discovered but not yet fully known’: *Terra Australis in theory and praxis*
Emergent from a critical node of geographical thinking and publishing at the Gymnasion Vosagense in Saint-Dié in Lorraine, Waldseemüller’s great map bore marked imprints of local knowledge acquired by practical mariners, including Vespucci along the south American coast and Portuguese travellers in Africa and India. On the basis of the up-to-date navigational information recorded in coastal portolan charts, Waldseemüller opened Ptolemy’s landlocked Indian Ocean to the east and west and thereby made redundant his *terra incognita* in the south.15 But this geographical parsimony was not emulated by many other contemporary cartographers who enthusiastically rehearsed the classical theory of a necessary southern counterweight to the great northern land masses.16 Ironically, their spur was pragmatic: the widespread conviction that Tierra del Fuego formed the northern tip of a southern continent. Yet survivors of Magellan’s voyage told Maximilian Transylvanus, secretary to the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, that they thought they had heard the roar of the sea ‘on a still farther coast’ beyond Tierra del Fuego. Transylvanus’s letter reporting his interview with the circumnavigators was published in 1523, along with a now lost globe, but failed to discourage cartographic fantasising about a southern continent.17

Well before this, in 1511, the Portuguese moving southeast from India had captured Malacca, on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, made contact with the Moluccas or Spice Islands, on the western edge of Oceania, and seen the as yet unnamed island of New Guinea.
In 1513, half a world away, local guides led the Spaniard Vasco Núñez de Balboa across the isthmus at Darien (in modern Panama) to show him a great sea to the south that he named *el Mar del Sur*. In November 1520, Magellan emerged into what he called the *Mare Pacificum* but saw only one inhabited island (Guam in modern Micronesia) during an agonising transoceanic passage to the archipelago later called the Philippines, where he was killed. It would take three centuries for Magellan’s Pacific Ocean definitively to supplant Balboa’s South Sea.\(^\text{18}\)

In the wake of Magellan’s voyage, in 1523-24, the Nuremberg mathematician and astronomer Johann Schöner produced a globe in gores depicting a huge antarctic continent separated from south America by a narrow strait. Part of the continent is named ‘*Terra Avstralis*’ and optimistically labelled ‘*recenter inventa at nondvm plene cognita*’ (‘recently discovered but not yet fully known’). The French mathematician Oronce Fine rehearsed the legend in his cordiform hemispheric world map of 1531 which named the entire southern continent ‘*Terra Avstralis*’.\(^\text{19}\) In his great mappa mundi of 1569, the Flemish cartographer Gerard Mercator famously promoted the idea of a vast ‘*Pars continentis avstralis*’ (‘southern continental region’). This map shows a large square island hovering above the *Pars continentis australis* and inscribed: ‘New Guinea which the Florentine Andrea Corsali appears to name *Terra de Piccinacoli*’ (‘Land of the little people’); and ‘we are as yet ignorant whether it is an island or part of the southern continent’.\(^\text{20}\) A year later, in the mappa mundi in his atlas, Ortelius also positioned a massive southern continent across the bottom of the world. He labelled it ‘*Terra Avstralis nondvm cognita*’ (‘not yet known’) and remarked that some named it the ‘Magellanic region after its discoverer’. A legend next to New Guinea mentions only the doubt about its insular status.\(^\text{21}\) However, two other maps in this atlas – ‘America or the new world’ and ‘East Indies and surrounding islands’ – specifically comment, as had Mercator’s mappa mundi, on Andrea Corsali’s apparent identification of New Guinea as ‘*Terre Piccinnacoli*’ (Figure 4).\(^\text{22}\)

Stories about dwarfs or little people (*L. Pygmaeus*) abound in European literature from classical times. While passing through the Moluccas under the direction of local pilots in 1521, Magellan’s Italian chronicler Antonio Pigafetta heard that on the island of Gafi there
were ‘uomini piccoli, come li nani, li quali sono li Pygmei’ (‘small men, like dwarfs, who are
the Pygmies’). The rajahs of Ternate and Tidore reportedly kept dwarfs at their courts while
Mercator’s mappa mundi of 1569 locates ‘Pygmei’ in the north polar region. Far from being
purely an expression of European prejudice or myth, the enigmatic phrase ‘Terra de
Piccinacoli’, like Pigafetta’s ‘Pigmei’, is itself a very early marker of the infiltration of a
metropolitan discourse by local knowledge from the fifth part of the world. I use the phrase
local knowledge in a dual sense, to refer directly to the grounded experience informing
travellers’ accounts and indirectly to the indigenous lore reported or more or less unwittingly
embedded in such accounts. The word ‘Piccinacoli’ – evidently an Italian dialectal term
meaning ‘little people’ or ‘pygmies’ – occurs in a letter written in 1515 from Cochin in
India by the Florentine Andrea Corsali who had accompanied a Portuguese voyage to India.
He was apparently an agent for the Medicis who had helped bankroll Portuguese expansion in
the East and his letter was addressed to Giuliano de’ Medici. Describing places and people he
knew in person or by repute from Portuguese and ultimately Moluccan sources, Corsali
explained that it was said that by ‘navigating towards the east’ from the Moluccas, one would
reach the ‘terra di Piccinacoli’ which ‘many’ thought was joined to the southern continent.

On Corsali’s authority, a series of maps produced from 1569 by Mercator, Ortelius,
and the Dutchman Petrus Plancius persistently associate Piccinacoli with New Guinea –
sometimes depicted as an island, sometimes as a massive peninsula jutting north from Terra
Australis (Figures 4 and 5). The great island had been visited by several Portuguese and
Spanish expeditions from the mid-1520s but was only named in 1545 by the Spaniard Iñigo
Ortiz de Retes. According to Antonio Galvão – captain of the Portuguese station in the
Moluccas in the late 1530s and author of an early history of voyages – Retes chose the name
New Guinea ‘because’ the people he saw along the north coast were ‘preta & de cabelo
revolto’ (‘black with twisted hair’). In Plancius’s 1617 map of the Moluccas (Figure 5),
New Guinea is annotated as Corsali’s Terra de Piccinacoli. However, this text seems also to
suggest, ‘on the authority of seamen’ (‘a nautis sic dicta’), that the name New Guinea
derived not from the appearance of the inhabitants but from that of the coastline, deemed
‘very similar’ to the ‘territories of African Guinea’. Whatever Retes’s explicit motivation,
his nomenclature eternalised by analogy the recurrent identification of the island’s inhabitants
with west Africans who, in Iberian and later general European thinking, epitomised barbarism and rightful potential for enslavement. An important innovation in the 1587 French edition of Ortelius’s map ‘America’, absent from earlier versions and from Mercator’s contemporary works, is the inclusion of ‘Insulæ Salomonis’ to the east of New Guinea, thus inscribing the highly unstable ‘discovery’ of the Solomon Islands by the Spaniard Alvaro de Mendaña during his return voyage across the Mar del Sur from Peru in 1567-69.29
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As Chris Ballard has shown with respect to New Guinea (which was encountered early by Europeans but long remained their ‘last unknown’), belief in the existence of innately short-statured populations, or pygmies, would be the most tenacious of the classical, medieval, and Renaissance fables that populated unknown regions of the earth with marvels and monsters.30 I by no means seek to trace an unbroken or unproblematic genealogy from stories told to sixteenth-century Portuguese navigators by inhabitants of the East Indies to the ‘pygmies’ with which some travellers, archaeologists, and anthropologists from the early nineteenth century onwards have peopled parts of the Malay Archipelago and the interior of New Guinea.31 But the identification of New Guinea as Terra de Piccinacoli by Renaissance map-makers, or as the abode of ‘a dwarf African negro’ by a nineteenth-century English philologist and anthropologist who had never been there, attest equally to the enduring power of both European prejudice and local rumour, even in a purportedly scientific discourse such as that of race.32

Not only are these early cartographic inscriptions of a barely known New Guinea infused with local knowledge, in both my senses, but they are studded with traces of voyagers’ engagements with the inhabitants – what I have elsewhere called indigenous ‘countersigns’ or residues of local agency in visitors’ perceptions, reactions, and representations.33 The names attributed in several maps to a series of islands ranged in echelon along the north coast of New Guinea recall descriptions of indigenous appearance and behaviour during particular encounters with Spanish mariners (Figures 4 and 5). Running west to east in Ortelius’s 1570 map of ‘East Indies’, the names are ‘yº. de crespos’, ‘yº. de mala gente’, and ‘yº. de hôbres blãcos’ (‘island’, respectively, of ‘frizzy-haired [people]’, ‘wicked/ugly people’, and ‘white men’).34 The accounts in question document an attempted
return voyage from the Moluccas to New Spain (modern Mexico) made by Alvaro de Saavedra Céron in 1528.

In a short, then unpublished ‘Relacion’ of this voyage, the seaman Vicente de Nápoles reported several encounters with the inhabitants of islands north of the New Guinea mainland and still further north in what were later named the Caroline Islands. The first such engagement must have occurred in Biak or a neighbouring island in what is now Indonesia’s Papua Province, where the Spanish met ‘a black, naked people with frizzy hair, bearing arms of iron and swords’. They traded food with the visitors during a stay of about a month and became the cartographers’ ‘crespos’. The Spanish then coasted to the southeast and were eventually blown north to another island, perhaps Manus (in Papua New Guinea), where ‘natives’ in canoes came out to the ship firing arrows. Nápoles called them ‘a black, naked and ugly people’. The syntax of this passage is significant: the derogatory epithet feo (‘ugly’) follows hard on mention of a doubtless alarming attack and is a countersign of baffling indigenous agency. The map-makers distilled feo into the more sweeping ‘mala gente’ – malo (from L. mālus, ‘bad, wicked, ugly, deformed’) at that time signified both ‘ugly’ appearance and ‘wicked’ behaviour. Driven further northwards by contrary winds, the Spanish reached more islands ‘populated by white, bearded people’ who also came out to the ship in canoes and threatened the visitors with slingstones. Misplaced to an island near the New Guinea mainland, they were the cartographers’ ‘hôbres blãcos’. The contemporary Spanish historian Antonio de Herrera y Tordesillas, who had certainly read Nápoles’s account, marvelled that the voyagers had seen ‘men so different in colour’ within ‘so short a distance’.

Herrera’s casual remark and the cartographers’ vivid appropriation of the Spanish voyagers’ broad descriptive terminology were rehearsed repeatedly over the next four centuries. Most such reinscriptions are anachronistic: they address contemporary preoccupations using contemporary lexicons. The early nineteenth-century voyage historian James Burney was sensitised to nuances of human skin colour during two voyages in Oceania under James Cook. He specified that the Spanish and Portuguese often used white to describe the ‘light copper-coloured complexion’. Alert to an emergent dual classification of Oceanian humanity, Burney attributed the map-makers’ recourse to the terms crespos and hombres blancos to the need to distinguish ‘Indians’ of this complexion from the ‘black and woolly-
headed Indians’. The nineteenth-century Spanish historian Martín Fernandez Navarrete took the reality of racial difference for granted in transposing Herrera’s expression of personal surprise to the voyagers themselves: ‘the Castilians were astonished to see people of such different colour in so short a distance’. The twentieth-century American historian Ione Stuessy Wright did likewise though neither Nápoles’s ‘Relacion’ nor any other text cited supports this assumption. In an excess of anachronism, Wright reconstituted the Spanish descriptive comparison into modern discrete racial categories: they were, she pronounced, ‘amazed’ by the ‘contrast between the light-skinned, bearded Micronesians and the black, frizzy-haired Papuans who lived so near’. The fatuity of this racial discrimination is patent in a later book in which Wright mistakenly reformulated the contrast as ‘between the light-skinned, bearded Melanesian natives and the Papuans whom they had left so recently’. In racial theory, ‘Melanesian’ and ‘Papuan’ are more or less synonymous terms!

Over more than 200 years, Terra Australis loomed more or less large in European cartography, geographical imaginings, and explorational goals. The first heyday of Terra Australis encompassed the voyages across the Mar del Sur of Mendaña in 1567-69, Mendaña and Pedro Fernández de Quirós in 1595-97, Quirós in 1605-6, Jacob Le Maire and Willem Cornelisz Schouten in 1615-16, and Abel Janszoon Tasman in 1642-43 and 1644. Mendaña and Quirós shared and were motivated by the conviction of the Spanish in Peru, fuelled by Inca legend, that the ocean to the southwest harboured certain islands and a great southern tierra firme (‘mainland’, ‘continent’) which promised vast riches, new colonies, and an untold number of heathens ripe for conversion and exploitation. Indeed, from 1596 until his death in 1615, Quirós dedicated his life to the chimera of ‘la parte Austral incognita’ (‘the unknown southern region’) which he claimed to have discovered and taken possession of for God, the Catholic Church, and the King of Spain in 1606 in the island of Espiritu Santo (now in north Vanuatu). He bombarded the King and other authorities with countless petitions seeking support for a further colonising voyage. One of them, the so-called ‘eighth memorial’ of 1609-10, was, within a decade, translated into most major European languages.

Thus widely disseminated, Quirós’s eighth memorial continued to excite voyagers, geographers, and savants for more than 150 years. One of the first and most significant savants to take seriously Quirós’s claim to reliable local knowledge was the renowned Dutch
cartographer and publisher Hessel Gerritsz who included a Dutch translation of the eighth memorial in a collection of primarily Arctic voyages. Gerritsz’s work contains a mappa mundi in two hemispheres in which a hypothetical continental coastline meanders northwest from the Strait of Magellan across the ‘Mar del Zur’ but solidifies south of the Solomon Islands in what Gerritsz’s annotation materialises as ‘the land recently discovered’ by Quirós, ‘formerly known’ as Terra Australis incognita (and now presumably cognita).44 In mid-Atlantic en route to south America in October 1515, the Dutchman Le Maire informed his crew that the goal of their voyage was ‘to go to’ the Southland. He read Quirós’s memorial aloud ‘to encourage them’ and noted that the seamen, especially, rejoiced because they hoped ‘that such a noble voyage could only bring them great fame and profit’.45

Yet the Englishman Francis Drake, who circumnavigated the world in 1577-80, had already cast serious doubt on the status of Tierra del Fuego as an appendage of a ‘continent or maine land’. Driven southwards by storms to about 56°, Drake ‘fell in with the vttmost part of land towards the South Pole …, without which there is no maine nor Iland to be seene to the Southwards, but that the Atlantick Ocean and the South Sea, meete in a most large and free scope’. In his world map of 1599, on the authority of Drake’s ‘discoverie’, the English mathematician and cartographer Edward Wright dismissed the supposed continent as ‘nothing els but broken land and Ilands’ and showed only empty sea to their south.46 In 1622, in the wake of Le Maire’s and Schouten’s voyage, Gerritsz also reneged on the reality of a great southern continent. Le Maire had proved Tierra del Fuego to be an island by passing through the strait that bears his name and around Cape Horn, which he named. He then crossed the Zuyd Zee (‘South Sea’) in more southerly latitudes than his Spanish predecessors but had no more success than they in finding the continent in which he and they more or less fervently believed. Accordingly, Gerritsz’s map of Mar del Sur, Mar Pacifico replaced Terra Australis by a stormy seascape.47

By the 1660s, following the voyages of the Dutchman Tasman, another Dutch cartographer, Pieter Goos, expressed a scepticism shared by several of his colleagues in rejecting the ‘call[l] for a fifth part of the world Terra Australis or Magellanica’. His world map reduced Tierra del Fuego to ‘a haep of Ilands’; restricted ‘Terra Australis’ to ‘those Countreys in the South of Nova Guinea’ recently visited by Tasman (New Holland and New
Zealand); and left blank the far southern portion of the globe. Yet, despite its ever-shrinking reality, the mirage of Terra Australis captivated savants up to and including the mid-eighteenth-century compilers of collections of voyage texts, John Campbell, Charles de Brosses, and Alexander Dalrymple. Moreover, Terra Australis remained a well-nigh universal goal for maritime exploring expeditions until the return in 1775 of Cook’s iconoclastic second voyage which definitively reduced it to roughly the modern contours of Australia and Antarctica.

**Terra Australis to Océanie**

Despite the practical efforts of navigators and the intellectual interest of savants, much of the fifth part of the world remained almost unknown and undifferentiated in Europe until the mid-eighteenth century. The subsequent naming and division of the region was largely a French project. Brosses proposed the earliest regional classification of the ‘Terres australes’ (‘southern lands’) in 1756 and his speculative program for discovery, commerce, and settlement there helped inspire the great French and British global circumnavigations of the 1860s. Though a disciple of the classical ‘counterweight’ theory of a necessary ‘immense’ southern continent, he insisted on the need to ‘fix’ our wavering vision by drawing firm boundaries. Accordingly, he divided this ‘unknown southern world’ into three great regions. He adapted the old term Magellanica to name as ‘Magellanique’ a purely conjectural land mass to the south of South America. ‘Australasie’ (‘Australasia’) and ‘Polynésie’ (‘Polynesia’) were neologisms. The first, also largely speculative, was fragmentarily materialised in actual places seen by voyagers in New Guinea, New Britain, New Holland (mainland Australia), Van Diemen’s Land (Tasmania), New Zealand, and Espiritu Santo. Polynésie encompassed ‘everything within the vast Pacific Ocean’ – what are now Polynesia, Micronesia, and much of Island Melanesia.

In 1804, when the region’s broad contours were known to Europeans, the geographers Edme Mentelle and Conrad Malte-Brun suggested the name ‘Océanie’ (‘Oceanica’) as a more precise denomination for the Terres australes, equivalent to Afrique (‘Africa’) and Amérique (‘America’). They jettisoned all Brosses’s regional labels bar Polynésie but contracted it to what would become Polynesia and Micronesia. In 1815, another French geographer, Adrien-Hubert Brué, amended Océanie to Océanie (‘Oceania’) but restored
Brosses’s regional geographic names (Figure 6). In 1832, the navigator-naturalist Jules-Sébastien-César Dumont d’Urville endorsed this academic nomenclature and instituted the spatial partition of Océanie into four ‘principal divisions’: Polynésie, Micronésie (‘Micronesia’), Malaisie (‘Malaysia’), and Mélanesie (‘Melanesia’) which included Australie (‘Australia’). In the process, he initiated the now conventional tripartite racial distribution of the Pacific Islands and their inhabitants (Figure 7).

Insert Figure 6
Insert Figure 7

**Naming and classifying people**

Over the first 250 years of European encounters in the fifth part of the world, the vocabularies applied to the inhabitants gradually became more specific, more discriminative, and more categorical. They also successively referenced prior experience and precedents in Africa, Asia, the Americas, and ultimately Oceania itself. ‘Race’ – then a concrete genealogical term connoting a nation or people of common ancestry – was hardly used before the mid-eighteenth century while its abstract modern biological sense – denoting permanent, innate, collective physical and mental difference – was unknown before the early nineteenth century. The subjects of every expanding European realm took for granted their own ancestral, religious, and civil superiority. However, somatic differences ranked fairly low in judgments about national characters because prevailing cosmologies conceived such differences as the transient, adventitious products of climate, humors, life style, and station on a single migrating human species. In principle, at least, all human beings were thought to share the potential for progress towards civility. Values of religion, ‘purity’, estate, and civility authorised sixteenth-century Iberian bigotry, persecution, and control but none is aptly reduced to race. Yet they converged ominously in the shifting import of the descriptor negro, ‘black’: originally a relatively dispassionate adjective, by the mid-sixteenth century it was commonly used as a noun throughout western Europe, negatively charged by the developing identification of ‘heathen’, ‘barbarous’, African ‘Negroes’ with chattel slavery.

Sixteenth-century Iberian texts are strikingly poor in collective nouns for human beings aside from the all-inclusive ‘people’ or ‘men’; the slightly more specific and often synonymous ‘Indians’ or ‘natives’; a sweeping religious differentiation of the inhabitants of
the East Indies into ‘Moors’ (Muslims) and ‘Gentiles’ (‘heathens’); and toponyms such as ‘Moluccans’ or ‘Filipinos’. Of particular interest here, as an example of the filtering of local terminology into colonial nomenclature, is the Iberian adoption of the vernacular toponym ‘Papua’ to designate islands to the east of the Moluccas, their inhabitants, and ultimately New Guinea itself and its people.\textsuperscript{56} Galvão explained in his \textit{Tratado} of 1563 that ‘the Moluccans’ called the ‘men’ of the north coast of New Guinea ‘Papuas’ because they were ‘black with frizzled hair’, like the \textit{Papuas} they knew closer to home, and that the Portuguese \textit{did likewise}. Galvão evidently absorbed adverse Moluccan behavioural, as well as physical stereotypes along with the name: not only were \textit{Papuas} ‘black people, with dishevelled/twisted hair’, but they purportedly ate human flesh and were ‘great witches’, ‘given to the devils’. Galvão implicitly contrasted them with other people seen by Spaniards who were ‘brown with flowing hair like the Moluccans’.\textsuperscript{57}

Such nearly juxtaposed representations might well be interpreted as prefiguring the nineteenth-century racialist dichotomy of black, frizzy-haired Papuans and brown, straight-haired Malays.\textsuperscript{58} I suggest, however, that at this point the contrasting Portuguese adjectives \textit{revolto} (‘dishevelled, twisted’) and \textit{corredio} (‘flowing’) are more plausibly read as indexing impressions of relative ‘barbarism’ and ‘civility’ shared with apprehensive Moluccans, than as racialist epithets. Moreover, the erratic continuum between barbarism and civility did not map neatly on to chromatic variation. Galvão reported an encounter with tattooed ‘white men’ by Saavedra who concluded from their ‘appearance’ and ‘whiteness’ that they must have originated in China but over a long period of time become ‘\textit{tam Barbaros}’ (‘so barbaric, wild’) that they now lacked law, sect, and the ‘capacity to raise living things’.\textsuperscript{59}

During the next 200 years, estimations of comparative civility or savagery displaced religion as the key criterion for evaluations of non-Europeans by both the pragmatic Dutch and British and the rationalist French. By the late sixteenth century, the collective noun ‘Indian’ not only meant ‘native’ in general but was also used in the more restricted sense of ‘\textit{Indians, both East and West}’, sometimes in implied contrast to ‘Negro’.\textsuperscript{60} A century later, the published narratives of the widely-travelled Englishman William Dampier compared the ‘Indians’ he met in the Americas, present-day Micronesia, and the East Indies with the ‘Negroes’ he encountered along the New Guinea coasts: Indians were ‘of a swarthy Copper
colour, with black lank Hair’; Negroes were ‘very black’ and ‘shock Curl-pated’. Such characterisations expressed a deeply ethnocentric contrast rather than a racial opposition: in Dampier’s judgment, both Indians and Negroes might be ‘savage’; Negroes more so; but Negroes who traded were less savage than ‘Wild’ Indians; and both had the capability to become ‘civilized’ through commerce.61

These fairly evenhanded assessments differ markedly from Dampier’s very negative published words (‘miserablest’, ‘unpleasing’) about the inhabitants of the west coast of New Holland whose appearance reminded him of ‘the Negroes of Guinea’ and whose indifference to material inducement – their agency – led him to question their capacity for ‘Traffick and useful Intercourse’.62 This was an early statement of a commonplace nexus drawn by Europeans between lifestyle, material desires, and alleged lack of perfectibility, very often to the detriment of Aboriginal Australians. Their refusal to ‘abide our comeing’ or to take ‘notice of any thing that wee had’ frustrated and insulted Dampier and left countersigns in an early manuscript draft of his first book, as well as in the narratives. Yet the draft entirely lacks the derogatory epithets for New Hollanders or the stereotypes of the Indian and the Negro that feature in the printed works.63 The differences between Dampier’s draft and his editorially embellished narrative signal, on the one hand, the ongoing imprecision of the available lexicon for human description; and, on the other hand, an emergent quest for a more exact terminology to express collective differences. Yet, despite the intermittent rhetorical comparison of Indian and Negro, usually to the latter’s disadvantage, the most common usage of ‘Indian’ well into the nineteenth century was as a general synonym for ‘native’, including ‘Negroes’, as in the previously cited passage by Burney.64

In outlining his pioneer division of the Terres australes, Brosses made no attempt to classify the region’s ‘many different peoples’ since taxonomy was not yet common in European thinking about man. Brosses did, however, identify a supposed ‘difference in the human species’ within a single geographical zone – an anomaly in terms of prevailing climatic explanations for human differences. He explained it in quasi-racial terms, imagining that ‘the native inhabitants’ of Australasie were an ‘ancient race’ of ‘frizzy-haired blacks’, identical to ‘the African negroes’, who had been displaced or destroyed in Asia by ‘foreign colonies’ of Malays and only survived in ‘unknown’, ‘Virgin’ lands like New Holland.65 The
first formal classification of ‘the Human Species in the South-Sea Isles’ was proposed in 1778 by the German naturalist Johann Reinhold Forster who had sailed on Cook’s second voyage of 1772-75. Forster empirically identified ‘two great varieties of people’, one ‘more fair’, the other ‘blacker’. Burney’s differentiation of ‘copper-coloured’ and ‘black’ Indians alluded to this distinction. Forster explained their ‘evident difference’ in terms similar to Brosses’s, as a product of the displacement of an ‘aboriginal black race’ by ‘successive’ migrations of ‘more civilized’, ‘ancient Malays’. This teleological presumption of the inevitable dispersal or extinction of black autochthons would haunt the subsequent projects of racial taxonomy and colonial settlement in Oceania. But Forster’s classification was not racial in the modern sense of the term: his unstable lexicon and conviction that human differences were ‘only accidental’ allowed no systematic ranking of varieties, tribes, nations, or races (all synonyms) but located them provisionally along a highly ethnocentric, unilinear trajectory of assumed common human potential for development from savagery to civilisation.66

In contrast to these inchoate, circumstantial discriminations, the term Océanique/Océanie was inherently racialised from the time of its invention in 1804, with skin colour and physical organisation the key differentiae in the elaboration of region-wide racial taxonomies. Indeed, the concept Océanie is a synecdoche for the fertile marriage of geography and raciology that characterised the science of race from its emergence at the dawn of the nineteenth century until the second half of the twentieth and beyond.67 Globally, the drive to classify human beings had gained momentum from the 1730s when Carl Linnaeus positioned man along with animals within the same ‘natural system’.68 Racial taxonomy, in the embryonic biological sense of race, dated from the late 1770s but Oceania was scarcely differentiated in emergent universal classifications before Mentelle and Malte-Brun’s racial geography of 1803-4. They located the ‘very beautiful’, ‘copper-coloured’, ‘Polynesian race’ in what are now Polynesia and Micronesia and assigned it ‘common origin’ with ‘the Malays of Asia’. They sharply differentiated ‘the Polynesians’ from the ‘black race, that we can call Oceanic Negroes’, which inhabited New Guinea, Van Diemen’s Land, and what is now Island Melanesia, and from a probable ‘distinct third race’ in New Holland which they ranked ‘only a single degree above the brute’ and likened to ‘the apes’.69
For the French naval naturalists and artists who dominated the anthropology of Oceania from 1800 to 1830 (when the first missionary ethnographies began to appear), the global terms of the scientific discourse of race were set by the leading French comparative anatomist Georges Cuvier who believed that human races were separated by real, collective physical differences; that races were innate products of biology rather than environment or climate; and that human intellect and morality were racially determined by anatomy, especially the size of the brain, and were thus immutable.\textsuperscript{70} In the mid-1820s, several naval naturalists with extensive experience in Oceania, including Dumont d’Urville, devised classifications of the populations of the region in response to an offer by the Société de Géographie de Paris of a prize for a memoir on the ‘various peoples’ of Oceania.\textsuperscript{71} All used race in its modernist biological sense and rehearsed Cuvier’s partition of humanity into three ‘eminently distinct’ races: ‘white’, ‘yellow’, and ‘negro’.\textsuperscript{72}

The most streamlined, the most durable, but the most systematically racialised of these classifications is that published by Dumont d’Urville in 1832: he proposed the geographical neologism \textit{Mélanésie}, from Greek \textit{melas} (‘black’), ‘since it is the homeland of the black Oceanian race’.\textsuperscript{73} He divided the inhabitants of \textit{Océanie} overall into ‘two distinct races’, correlating skin colour and physical appearance with language, political institutions, religion, and reception of Europeans. Melanesian was his general name for the ‘black race’ which he condemned as ‘hideous’; ‘disagreeable’; ‘natural enemies of the whites’; and ‘generally very inferior’ in physical, political, moral, and intellectual terms to the ‘copper-coloured race’ of Polynesians and Micronesians and to the Malays. He located the Australians and the Tasmanians at the base of his racial hierarchy as ‘the primitive and natural state of the Melanesian race’. Like Quirós, Brosses, and Forster, Dumont d’Urville contrived a conjectural history in which the ‘first occupants of Oceania’ were a ‘primitive race of Melanesians’ who were subsequently displaced or obliterated by the ‘yellow or copper-coloured race’ invading from the west. Unlike these predecessors, however, Dumont d’Urville transformed speculative history into modern colonial necessity: it was, he maintained, a ‘law of nature’, resulting from ‘organic differences’ in the ‘intellectual faculties’ of the different races, that the blacks ‘must obey’ the others ‘or disappear’ and that the white ‘must dominate’.\textsuperscript{74}
Dumont d’Urville framed his racial ‘system’ as the objective scientific ‘fruit of ten years of study, research and observations’. However, careful scrutiny of the narrative of his Oceanic voyage of 1826-29 shows clearly that his stereotyped Melanesian was largely distilled from a single episode of encounters with the people of Vanikoro in what is now eastern Solomon Islands. During their stay in Vanikoro, Dumont d’Urville and his companions were racked by malaria. They were traumatised by lurid imaginings about the fate of their compatriots, Jean-François de Galaup de La Pérouse and his crew, who had vanished in these waters 40 years before. And they were intimidated by the obstinate self-possession of the local men, their omnipresent arms, and their determination to dominate exchanges. Dumont d’Urville complained bitterly about their ‘excessive’ charges for products other than coconuts and bananas and their absolute refusal to exchange pigs. In these settings, his racial characterisation of the inhabitants of Vanikoro is generalised, dichotomising, thoroughly nasty, and quite at odds with the vivid personal portraits of named individuals drawn by the voyage artist Louis-Auguste de Sainson (Figures 8 and 9). ‘En masse, like all the black Oceanian race’, fulminated Dumont d’Urville, ‘this people is disgusting, lazy, stupid, fierce, greedy and has no known qualities or virtues’; moreover, they ‘are timid, mistrustful, and naturally hostile to Europeans’, unlike ‘peoples of the Polynesian race’. I have elsewhere argued that these hard words are countersigns of local strategies adopted to control or profit from the visitors and to conserve the Island’s resources. Such representations at once result from and testify to the consternation or fury induced in European voyagers by disapproved indigenous demeanour.

Within two years of the publication of Dumont d’Urville’s Oceanic cartography, its racial implications were taken for granted by the geographer Charles Monin. Monin’s map of Océanie (Figure 10) overlaid the division ‘adopted by the geographers’ (originally Brosses’s) into Polynésie, Australasie, and the Indian Archipelago, or Malaisie, with Dumont d’Urville’s geographical nomenclature and division ‘by race of men’ (Figure 10a). Geography and raciology, field and metropole were thus symbiotically entangled in an emergent science of race.
The modest metropolitan scientific reputations acquired by Dumont d’Urville and a handful of his naval naturalist colleagues rested heavily on their claim to field expertise – on what I earlier called their uneasily cosmopolitan empirical logic. In a number of works written over the last decade, I have probed the asymmetric interplay of two overlapping modes of knowing, one global but highly ethnocentric and deductive; the other regional and empirical. From different perspectives, both savants and field naturalists engaged in projects of human taxonomy that objectified and dehumanised actual people as racial types. Yet, whereas the imprint of encounters was often all but effaced in universal racial systems, the regional classificatory efforts of travellers and residents were always threatened by the mismatch of theory and praxis – the challenge of trying to cram personal experience of a highly varied mix of human physical features, lifestyles, and behaviours into neat racial slots.

A single brief example must suffice to illustrate the recurrent tension between systems and facts. A candid passage in Dumont d’Urville’s 1832 text simultaneously reveals the aesthetic and discursive power of racial stereotypes, particularly the disagreeable spectre of the Negro and its Oceanic metonym, and their vulnerability to actual human multiplexity. In Celebes (modern Sulawesi), Dumont d’Urville saw certain individuals who were said by local interlocutors to be inhabitants of the interior, or ‘Alfourous’. Various versions of the word Alfourou or Alfuro recur from the sixteenth century onwards in rumours about the inhabitants of inland zones in the larger islands of western Oceania, often with implications of autochthony and primitivity. In this case, the term ‘instantly’ brought to Dumont d’Urville’s mind the blackness, ‘frizzy hair’, and ‘flat nose’ of the ‘true Melanesians’. Yet, to his ‘astonishment’, the people in the flesh resembled figures he had seen in Tahiti, Tonga, and New Zealand (all in Polynesia) and spoke ‘an idiom quite different from the Malays’. Should their language prove to be more closely related to ‘Polynesian’ than to ‘Malay’, he pronounced confidently, he ‘would not hesitate’ to install Celebes as a likely ‘cradle’ of the Polynesian race or ‘at least’ as a major stop in its west-east itinerary. But he was later forced to admit that the alluring prospect of finding ‘a branch of the Polynesian family’ in Celebes had been dispelled by philological evidence. A word list collected on the spot convinced him that the ‘idiom’ of these alleged Alfourous belied any ‘external, physical’ resemblances.
because it evinced ‘fewer relationships with Polynesian than with Malay’. He concluded that all three ‘tribes’ must share a common origin, but in an ‘already very distant epoque’.81

By 1830, few Euro-Americans would have disputed Dumont d’Urville’s presumption of the material reality of discrete, physically defined, differentially endowed human races, though the origins, import, and future implications of racial distinctions were bitterly contested. His racial nomenclature for Oceania was commonly adopted in France but was viewed ambivalently by many anglophone writers. Indeed, for much of the nineteenth century, English terminologies for Oceanian people were more varied and ambiguous than French, due in part to differing emphases in the respective fields of inquiry. In Britain before 1850, the science of man was strongly philanthropic and drew much empirical sustenance from missionary ethnography.82 In France after 1800, the science of race was a highly deductive outgrowth of biology and physical anthropology, fed by the work of travelling naturalists.83 Yet, notwithstanding principled humanitarian antipathy to the dehumanising tendencies of the science of race, English anatomists adopted racial terminology at least as early and enthusiastically as their French counterparts.84 Moreover, English writings on man in general were steadily infiltrated by racial logic, language, and geography. For example, the authors of works on Oceania, including missionaries, routinely differentiated the ‘black’ ‘Polynesian negro’ from the ‘brown’ or ‘copper-coloured’ ‘proper Polynesian’, or the ‘Papuan’ race from the ‘Malayo-Polynesian’ race, before adopting varieties of Dumont d’Urville’s binary system early in the twentieth century.85 Dumont d’Urville’s racial geography was ultimately normalised in global geopolitics and modern indigenous identities but the genealogies of such usages are by no means direct or unproblematic and remain to be elucidated.

Conclusion
This paper has investigated the invention of a space by Europeans, its naming, the naming of places and people within it, and – with the marriage of geography and raciology from the early nineteenth century – the unstable racial classification of Oceanian people as Malay, Papuan, Oceanic Negro, Aborigine, Melanesian, Polynesian, or Micronesian. I position these processes of knowledge formation at the junction of shifting metropolitan discourses and ambiguous regional praxis, a strategy that leaves scope to take account of the more or less
obscure imprints of local knowledge and countersigns of indigenous agency. I can only allude to the historical paradoxes in these processes, not least the ironic appropriations of racialist colonial terms such as Melanesian, Papuan, and Kanak in the construction of anticolonial or postcolonial identities. The idea of race itself has a hydra-headed capacity to recur in defiance of the most determined liberal scholarly efforts to invalidate or extirpate it: as in the ongoing tendency to conflate a phenotype with a race whereas a race is in fact a stereotype; or in the complacent realism accorded races in popular discourses worldwide, including indigenous ones. Congealed by colonialism, racial categories and hierarchies continue to haunt the novel, often anomalous political borders that were negotiated by colonial states, inherited by postcolonial ones, and are further reinscribed in the partitioning of academic research.

From a synchronic present political perspective, my insistence on a broad conception of Oceania may seem anomalous or quixotic since, even in French, Océanie has contracted in conformity with the modern geopolitical norm that puts the Malay Archipelago in Asia and divides Asia from Oceania along the arbitrary colonial border which cuts the island of New Guinea in two. But as an historian, I prefer to invoke the long term; to disentangle the semantic history of words and their vernacular uses; and to expose the unthinking anachronism which reifies historically contingent arrangements or concepts as inevitable and eternal.
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