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PREFACE

EUROPEAN EXPLORATIONS IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC:

The Underexplored Narratives of the Malaspina Expedition

José Colmeiro

Prince of Asturias Chair
The University of Auckland
“Sad is the ambition which, under the pleasant guise of science and philosophy and by imposing both unjust and costly measures on a deluded nation, obliges other nations to follow her closely in her imaginary conquests, perchance acquired not with rivers of blood and money, but with a few astronomical instruments, some trinkets exchanged for item of much greater use, and some description or another buried in marked places”

Alejandro Malaspina

“This able navigator is still more celebrated for his misfortunes than his discoveries”

Alexander von Humboldt

The five-year scientific and political expedition (1789-1794) around the Pacific under the command of Alejandro Malaspina and José de Bustamante y Guerra has until recently received relatively scarce attention among history and anthropology scholars focusing on the encounters between Europeans and Pacific Islander peoples. Due to various adverse political circumstances, historical rivalries and critical neglect, the Malaspina expedition, as it is now commonly known, was not allowed to leave a big mark in the collective memory of European explorations in the Pacific. In fact, for a long time it appeared to have been condemned to the dustbin of history. According to British hydrographer and editor of Malaspina’s journals Andrew David, “He was one of the greatest and one of the least known explorers of the 18th century.”

In recent years, however, Malaspina’s voyage has been the object of increased attention by scholars, cultural institutions and the media, particularly in Spain but also in English-speaking countries around the Pacific, in remembrance of the bicentenary of the original expedition and Malaspina’s death in 1810, which has included a myriad of important publications, including the complete version of the expedition journals, as well as a Spanish TV documentary mini-series on Malaspina’s Pacific voyage. This new public awareness and interest has culminated in the commemorative Malaspina

---

Expedition 2010, a marine biology research voyage around the world organized in 2010-2011, which called on the port of Auckland, and visited the University of Auckland in April 2011.²

Indeed, the historical “recovery” of the original Malaspina expedition has acquired a high-level profile, almost becoming a “matter of state” for the Spanish government, determined to build up its contemporary political and scientific presence in the global scene. The Malaspina Expedition 2010 was a colossal eight-month project orchestrated by the Spanish National Research Council in conjunction with the Spanish Navy and more than twenty international scientific institutions. The project also involved the assistance of the Instituto Cervantes, Spanish consular offices and embassies, counted on the support of both private and public funding agencies and the collaboration of universities and research centers around the globe, including the University of Auckland, Auckland’s Maritime Museum and Antarctica NZ.

The Malaspina Expedition 2010 was conceived as an interdisciplinary research project aiming to evaluate the impact of global change on the ocean and explore its biodiversity. At the same time, this circumnavigation project also aimed to showcase and commemorate the original Malaspina voyage of research and exploration of the Americas from Cape Horn to Alaska and its tour of the Pacific, including the South Pacific islands of New Zealand and Vava’u. Like Malaspina’s original expedition, it was both a scientific and a political project. The visit to Auckland on April 13-16th of the Hespérides research vessel as part of the Malaspina Expedition 2010 offered a historic opportunity for a critical reassessment of the historical accomplishments, scientific as well as political, of the original Malaspina expedition in the South Pacific, while exploring the cultural contexts of the contacts established between the members of the European expedition and the native peoples of the South Pacific.

The self-titled “scientific and political voyage” led by Alejandro Malaspina to visit and document the Spanish colonies in the Americas and Asia is nowadays hailed as the most important

² See www.expedicionmalaspina.es
Spanish contribution to the Enlightenment. Indeed, there is general recognition of the vast wealth of knowledge accumulated by the Expedition, in the form of maps, drawings, nautical charts, collection of botanical and mineral specimens, medicinal plants, and anthropological documentation.

Figure 1. Plan de un viaje científico y político a el rededor del mundo. (Plan of a Scientific and Political Voyage around the World). Autograph by Alejandro Malaspina, 1788. Museo Naval, Madrid.

---

3 Alejandro Malaspina, Plan de un viaje científico y político a el rededor del mundo. 1788. MS. Museo Naval, Madrid. The first partial edition in Spanish of the expedition journals was published in 1885: Pedro Novo y Colson, Viaje Político-Científico Alrededor del Mundo por las Corbetas “Descubierta” y “Atrevida” al Mando de los Capitanes de Navio Don Alejandro Malaspina y Don José Bustamante y Guerra desde 1789 á 1794, Madrid: Imprenta de la Viuda é Hijos de Abienzo, 1885.

4 Donald Cutter was one of the first historians to assess Malaspina’s expedition as Spain’s “greatest exploratory contribution to the Age of Enlightenment.” Donald Cutter, Malaspina in California, San Francisco: John Howell Books, 1960, p. v. This estimation has been echoed in recent years by many different institutional publications, such as the promotional materials produced by the Expedición Malaspina 2010, which have regarded the expedition as “Spain’s most significant contribution to the Enlightenment’s great voyages of discovery” (see official website at http://www.expedicionmalaspina.es/MI/CUADRIPTICO%20MALASPINA_VEN TANA_baj2010071212121940.pdf).
The present view, however, does not reflect the way things have been in the not-too-distant past. The trajectory of Alejandro Malaspina is in itself a fascinating history lesson, running in parallel to the development of Spanish and world history over the last two centuries. Upon his return to Spain from his five-year long expedition, Malaspina was received with great honours and promoted to Rear Admiral. Plans for publication of his journals were officially sanctioned. However, political turmoil and Malaspina’s enlightened ideals and reformist views condemned him and the results of his expedition to historical oblivion for a long time.\(^5\)

Interestingly, in one of those uncanny historical coincidences, the death of Malaspina died in exile in 1810, the same year of the declaration of independence of Mexico, and the beginning of the end of the Spanish Empire. In retrospect, it could be argued that Malaspina saw it coming, but nobody cared to listen.

The five-year expedition around the Pacific (1789-1794), from Tierra del Fuego to Alaska, and from Manila to New Zealand, Australia and Tonga, was designed from the beginning as a “scientific and political voyage” with a dual purpose. One of the objectives was to survey, document and study the vast Pacific region, “the Spanish Lake”, as it had been ostentatiously called for over two hundred years.\(^6\) With Spanish hegemony now questioned by competing European explorations and the establishment of new colonies, the expedition also aimed to assert a political presence and strengthen its territorial claims in the region in face of the expansion

---

\(^5\) According to Cutter, “The expedition records, including 300 journals, 450 notebooks and 183 charts, were impounded or scattered, unpublished and unstudied, as forgotten as the expedition's commander.” Wilford, “A Great Spanish Explorer.”

\(^6\) Malaspina voyage was the first grand plan to assure control of the vast Pacific region. Until the mid-18\(^{th}\) century, Spain enjoyed more than two centuries of unopposed theoretical domination of the Pacific. However, only the American Pacific coast was under Spanish control, as well as Philippines and some colonial outposts in the islands (such as Guam and the Marianas). As Cutter has noted, “The true nature of the Spanish claim was mostly on paper”. Donald C. Cutter, “Malaspina and the Shrinking Spanish Lake”, In: Margarette Lincoln (ed.), *Science and Exploration in the Pacific European Voyages to the Southern Oceans in the eighteenth century*. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 1998, pp. 73-80, quotation on p. 73.
of rival empires (British, French Russian), following the expeditions of Cook, La Pérouse and others. Malaspina himself was an admirer of Cook’s achievements in the South Pacific, and the names given to his expedition’s vessels, *Atrevida* and *Descubierta*, were in honour of Cook’s *Resolution* and *Discovery* from his earlier voyages.

But the political situation in Europe had changed considerably by the time of the expedition’s return to the Spanish Court in 1794. During their absence the French revolution had put an end to the Bourbon dynasty in neighbouring France, and the climate in the Spanish court was in turmoil. The enlightened King Carlos III, who was the enthusiastic sponsor of the expedition, had died and the throne had been inherited by his less forward-thinking son Carlos IV, who had delegated government to the Queen’s favourite, Manuel de Godoy. Malaspina’s enlightened reformist views were met with the ire of Godoy. Moreover, his criticism of faulty economic policies, the widespread corruption and the poor administration of the colonies, and his outlook advocating no further imperial expansion—in fact recommending territorial retraction and liberal commercial trade in a federation style—caused him to fall into political disgrace.

The official punishment received was rather fierce and unenlightened. Malaspina was accused of treason and given a ten-year prison sentence, and later sent into permanent exile in his native Italy. Publications of all the journals and reports of the expedition were halted, and public mention of his name or reference to his expedition was officially banned. While some parts of the immense wealth of knowledge brought by the expedition’s scientists were published in different countries and languages throughout the following decades, for the best part of the next two centuries the expedition’s achievements were neglected and the complete journals of the expedition were only published at the end of the 20th century, in a nine-volume collection.7

---

7 For quite a long time, only a very small part of the vast amount of documentation collected by the expedition saw the light of day. Naturalist Luis Née’s report was published in 1800 and Dionisio Alcalá Galiano’s journal of the exploration of the Vancouver area was published in 1802, without any reference to Alejandro Malaspina. In 1809 José Espinosa y Tello published two volumes with the results of his astronomical and geodesic studies conducted during the expedition. Malaspina’s
The relative obscurity of Malaspina’s name in world history has only begun to change recently. The new attention arising from the publication in Spanish of the complete Malaspina journals in the 1990s, followed by their translation into English in 2001-04 by the Hakluyt Society, has been hailed as “the beginning of a Malaspina industry” by Norman Fiering, director of the Carter Brown Library at Brown University.\(^8\) For other scholars, the publication in English of the Malaspina journals meant the restoration of “an overlooked chapter in the scientific exploration of the Enlightenment”, an event that could lead to “a proliferation of studies of Malaspina and Spain's role in what had been viewed as a largely British and French endeavor.”\(^9\)

One could argue that the trajectory of Alejandro Malaspina, with its fall from glory and fame into complete historical obscurity, and its extraordinary reinvention two hundred years later, is a remarkable parable of Spain’s loss of global hegemony in the Pacific in the eighteenth century and the remnants of its large empire throughout the 19\(^{\text{th}}\) century; but at the same time it underlines Spain’s modern reinvention and embracing of enlightened and democratic political ideals in the latter part of the 20\(^{\text{th}}\) century, and the re-emergence of new scientific, economic and cultural aspirations, with the advent of globalization at the turn of the new millennium.

The collection of essays that make up this special issue are revised versions of selected papers presented at the international Roundtable Colloquium held at the University of Auckland on April 14, 2011, under the title of “Revisiting the Malaspina Expedition: Cultural Contacts and Contexts.” The following essays aim to explore the cultural links of Malaspina’s voyage with the South Pacific, particularly the expedition’s visit to Doubtful Sound (New Zealand) and Vava’u (Tonga), the pictorial and written

---

\(^8\) Wilford, “A Great Spanish Explorer”.

\(^9\) Wilford, “A Great Spanish Explorer”.

own journals were first published, in Russian, in 1824-1827, and the first Spanish publication was an abridged version of his Diario de Viaje, published in 1885 by Pedro de Novo y Colson, almost a hundred years after the original expedition. Malaspina’s complete journals of the voyage were not published in its definitive form until 1987-1999, two hundred years after the end of the expedition.
representations of the cultural encounter between Europeans and the Pacific Islander peoples, and the important role of the scientific naturalists involved in the expedition.

Only one year after Malaspina’s death, Alexander von Humboldt, who had a deep appreciation for Alejandro Malaspina and actually consulted his manuscripts before his own travels of exploration, wrote about him, “this able navigator is still more celebrated for his misfortunes than his discoveries”. 10 As James Braund reminds us in the ensuing essay, and the rest of the articles corroborate, this is no longer necessarily the case for Malaspina or, indeed, for the rest of the participants in the expedition. By revisiting Malaspina’s voyage of exploration and reassessing the cultural contexts of the connections between Europeans and the natives of the South Pacific, these essays will make a major contribution to augment our awareness and understanding of an important and fascinating chapter in our modern history.

José Colmeiro
Auckland, November 2011

NOT A TRACE, HOWEVER REMOTE, OF INHABITANTS:

Malaspina’s Visit to Doubtful Sound, New Zealand, 25 February 1793

Anne Salmond

The University of Auckland
In his account of his expedition around the Pacific Rim, Alejandro Malaspina disavowed any idea that his had been a voyage of discovery:

In 1789, the habitable portion of the globe could be considered as known... The peoples living on the shores of the Pacific, their customs, numbers and origins, had been described and their products examined. The safest and shortest routes between the most distant corners of the earth had been pieced together. Any attempt at a further voyage of discovery would have invited scorn from scholars.\(^{11}\)

In particular, he was anxious to avoid any direct comparison with the voyages of Captain James Cook, who had explored the Pacific Ocean twenty years earlier. Here, the disclaimer was wistful:

The English were inspired... by the desire to find new possessions and new opportunities for trade in countryes not yet well known, and thereby to achieve fame, novelty, economic advantage and a happy triumph over a thousand obstacles.

Our sights, on the other hand, were fixed on acquiring thorough knowledge of a range of immense possessions... The inevitable consequences... included the need to compile a great weight of hydrographical and political information; to proceed slowly; to incur high costs; to undertake navigation at modest risk.\(^{12}\)

Malaspina’s original plan, however, had been extremely ambitious, including a detailed exploration of the west coast of America and the Hawai’ian islands and visits to Kamchatka in Siberia, Canton in China, S.E Asia, the west coast of Australia and the Tongan and Society Islands, before heading south to explore and chart the coastline of New Zealand.


\(^{12}\) David et al. (eds.), *The Malaspina Expedition*, vol 1, p. lxxx.
In the event, the voyage was scaled down, and the explorations of the Hawai’ian archipelago, the west coast of Australia, the Society Islands and the New Zealand coastline were abandoned. For New Zealand, Malaspina planned to head from New Caledonia to Dusky Sound, visited by Captain Cook in 1773. Here, the Spanish scientists would conduct experiments with a purpose-built pendulum, aimed at establishing an international standard for weights and measures and discovering the true shape of the globe. Later, since Doubtful Sound was closer to 45° South, the latitude on which these experiments were being conducted around the world, Malaspina thought that this might be a better location.

The weather in Fiordland in notoriously fickle and uncertain, and on 24 April 1793 when the Atrevida sighted land, the mountains were shrouded in mist before the lookouts on board the Descubierta could see the shore. The next morning, however, the day dawned fine and clear, and Malaspina’s officers were able to use the coastal profiles sketched by Captain Cook and his men to identify Five Fingers Point at the entrance to Dusky Bay, and the entrance to Doubtful Bay. As Malaspina wrote:

> It would be difficult to better the description of the ruggedness and height of this coast than given by Captain Cook during the surveys of his first voyage. We obtained no bottom with one hundred fathoms of line two miles offshore and off the entrance to Doubtful Bay.

> Although the island in between [the two bays] showed signs of fairly dense vegetation, the far end of this harbour, closed in on both sides by jagged, inaccessible mountains, bore out the opinion of Captain Coo who, on his departure, had considered this harbour as extremely dangerous.\(^{13}\)

Since the winds were easterly, Malaspina could sail close to the coast, and he decided to send the Descubierta’s armed pinnace under the command of Don Felipe Bauzá into Doubtful Sound, to examine and chart the fiord (which Cook and his men had not done),

\(^{13}\) David et al. (eds.), *The Malaspina Expedition*, vol 1, p. 57.
and look for a sheltered anchorage where they could conduct their experiments, and take on wood and water.

At 9 o’clock that evening when Bauzá returned to the ship, he reported that although his men had obtained soundings at the entrance to the fjord and on the seaward side of the island that now bears his name, the water in the two channels and along the landward side of Bauza Island was extremely deep.

They had, however, sighted a sandy inner bay –now called Pendulo Reach– that promised a safe, sheltered anchorage where the experiments could be conducted. One can trace the precise course of the pinnace from the line of soundings recorded on Bauzá’s chart of the lower reaches of Doubtful Sound. As Malaspina remarked:

[They saw] very few birds and no seals, while the shellfish were limited to a few small limpets. There was not a trace, however remote, of inhabitants. [There was] a complete lack of pine trees, the vegetation consisting of a kind of bush, of medium height.

In short, if it were not for… a real necessity which might lead the occasional navigator to this harbour, we would believe it to be destined to be perpetually deserted and that it would always be Dusky Bay which would attract the visitor with its safer, healthier and more comfortable shelter.¹⁴

On his chart, Bauzá also noted the flax plants that grew on Bauzá island, and “a plague of Mosquitoes whose bites drew a quantity of blood” –the notorious Fiordland sandfly.¹⁵

At nightfall, the pinnace was hoisted on board and the ships were becalmed. A light north-westerly breeze soon set in, however, and by midnight the two corvettes were about three leagues offshore.

Early the next morning the temperature plummeted, and as the wind grew stronger, the coast was once again shrouded in fog.

¹⁴ David et al. (eds.), *The Malaspina Expedition*, vol 1, p. 59.
¹⁵ Robert J. King, “Puerto del Pendulo, Doubtful Sound: The Malaspina Expedition’s Visit to New Zealand in Quest of the True Figure of the Earth”, *The Globe: Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Map Society* In, 65 (2010), p. 6.
During the day, as the gale howled ferociously, whipping up the sea and damaging rigging and sails, Malaspina tacked away from the coast, giving up the idea of entering Doubtful Sound. On 2 March, after consulting with the Atrevida’s officers, he decided that instead of sailing to Queen Charlotte Sound, Captain Cook’s favourite port in New Zealand, the ships would head for Botany Bay in Australia.

As Malaspina had remarked, the circumstances of his voyage were very different from those of Captain Cook. During Cook’s six week visit to Tamatea (or “Dusky Sound”) in Fiordland twenty years earlier, the Resolution had arrived from Antarctica, where Cook’s ships had spent four months in freezing, dangerous conditions, icebergs tipping around the ships, the rigging frozen solid and the sails shrouded in snow, before losing sight of each other in the middle of a thick fog.

When the Resolution had sailed into Tamatea on 26 March 1773, just a few miles to the south of Doubtful Sound, on a bright, sunny day, the British sailors were ecstatic. As the naturalist George Forster remarked:

The weather was delightfully fair, and genially warm, when compared to what we had lately experienced; and we glided along by insensible degrees, wafted by light airs, past numerous rocky islands, each of which was covered with wood and shrubberies, where numerous evergreens were sweetly contrasted and mingled with the various shades of autumnal yellow.

Flocks of aquatic bird enlivened the rocky shore, and the whole country resounded with the wild notes of the feathered tribe... The sloop was no sooner in safety, than every sailor put his hook and line overboard, and in a few moment numbers of fine fish were hauled up on all parts of the vessel, which heightened the raptures we had already felt at our entrance into this bay.16

---

The next day, the *Resolution* anchored in a sheltered deep water cove with a clear stream. As Lieutenant Pickersgill remarked, this location was

one of the most enchanting little Harbours I ever saw… surrounded with high Lands entirely cover’d with tall shady trees rising like an amphitheatre; and the sweet swelling Notes of a number of Birds made the finest Harmony.17

When the sailors tied the ship to the trees, using a fallen rata tree as a gangway, the rats, cats and dogs ran ashore. It was probably because of these animals, first introduced by Captain Cook, and the havoc they wreaked in the bush, that Bauzá and his companions heard so few birds in Doubtful Sound. Cook’s sailors and naturalists blazed away with their guns, killing seals, ducks and other birds; caught huge hauls of fish with their lines and nets, dived for crayfish, and felled trees around the cove for their camp and the observatory, where the astronomer William Wales took observations to fix the longitude of this part of New Zealand.

Although twenty years later, Bauzá and his companions saw no people during their brief visit to Doubtful Sound, it is likely that migratory groups of hunters and gatherers still frequented the fiord during the summer. During Cook’s visit to Tamatea, these people (who were probably Ngati Mamoe) had been elusive, paddling several small canoes around the *Resolution* the day after she anchored and staring with amazement, although they vanished without speaking to the Europeans.

It was not until 6 April 1773 that a bearded man standing on a rocky point on Mamaku (“Indian”) Island hailed Captain Cook and his companions, who had been off shooting ducks. Cook greeted him in Tahitian, landed on the point where he laid down white paper, handkerchiefs and beads on the rocks, and shook hands and pressed noses with this man, who was trembling with fear. Afterwards, he introduced Cook to two women who stood nearby

with long spears in their hands, telling them to put down their weapons.

When Cook and his companions, including the artist William Hodges, visited these people the next day, they found them living with a teenage girl and boy and three little boys in bark and flax shelters, their double canoe tied up to a tree. Cook gave the man hatchets, spike nails, beads and looking glasses in exchange for a cloak, a plaited belt, two taiaha (Maori wooden weapons) and bird bone beads, and Hodges sketched him and one of the women in red chalk, the sacred colour. Over the next two weeks, Cook and his companions met this family almost every day, and although the sailors tried to persuade the women to have sex with them, they resisted.

Finally on 18 April, the man agreed to visit the Resolution with the younger woman. Approaching the gangway, he put on a white birdskin ear ornament and broke off a green branch, which he used to strike the main shrouds, chanting to raise the tapu (presence of the ancestor gods) from this strange vessel.

This man presented Cook and Forster with fine cloaks and a greenstone adze, chiefly gifts, in return for hatchets, nails and tufts of feathers, while the sailors showered the girl with presents. They were fascinated by the European animals they saw on board, and the sawpit, and the man resolutely fired a musket, although the young woman threw herself on the deck in fear. At about midday, they left the ship, returning that evening to collect their gifts, and then vanished.

It seems that while these people were on board the ship, another group had arrived in Tamatea. The next morning while Cook and Johann Forster were hunting ducks south of Long Island, they were startled by an uproar that came from two or three places in the bush –probably a haka or chant of challenge.

Later that day a man, a woman and a child greeted Cook and his companions, waving a white birdskin, while two men appeared on the opposite bank. When two other men armed with spears hailed Cook, he advanced and greeted one of them, exchanging gifts, although this man and his companions vanished later that evening.
These people had rafts, instead of small canoes, and they were the last inhabitants that Cook and his companions saw in the Sound.

Before leaving Tamatea on 11 May 1773, three weeks later, Cook liberated five geese and planted a garden with peas, mustard, parsley and strawberries. He and his officers completed a meticulous chart of Dusky Bay, while Hodges painted the breathtaking scenery. Captain Cook and the 113 men who accompanied him to Fiordland had no sense that their presence might be disruptive or destructive, although they took large quantities of seals, fish, birds, wood and water from the Sound. For them, this was simply “one of the finest Harbours in the World.” As Charles Clerke remarked,

You Wood and Water here with the utmost facility; the Wood may be cut down close alongside your Ship, and the Water may be fill’d by a fine running Brook about a 100 yards from the Stern –in the next place it abounds most plentifully in Fish– all large, firm and exceedingly well tasted; there are likewise great abundance of very large and very good Crawfish. I believe take one day with another our supply of Fish had been about a Hundred Pr Diem and those I’m sure at an average 2 pounds apiece; so that for near these 7 weeks our constant consumption of Fish has been 200lb every 24 hours, and as many Craw Fish besides as we know what to do with.

The Water Fowl here too, I think, may justly claim some mention… I was one of a party of four that in a days shooting kill’d 41 Ducks and Curlews and did not deem it a very extraordinary days sport –there are many Seals about too which are easily come at, whose Haslets... make steaks very little inferior (some of our Gentry sware, far superior) to Beefsteak, and the Blubber renders very good Oil for lamps.18

Twenty years later, Malaspina might have enjoyed a similarly superb opportunity to rest his men and refit his ships in Fiordland. Although the dreadful weather prevented the Spanish from entering the Sound, it saved Doubtful from an even larger invasion of strangers than that experienced by the few inhabitants of Tamatea.

The lasting traces of Malaspina’s brief visit to Doubtful Sound are Bauza’s fine chart, and a cluster of Spanish placenames around the fiord. Had the Spaniards stayed longer, it is very likely that they, too, would have met small, wandering families of Ngati Mamoe or Ngai Tahu and had friendly, if fleeting exchanges with these people.

It would have been fascinating to compare the collections, images and descriptions made by the Spanish artists, scientists and officers in Doubtful Sound with those by Captain Cook and his men in Tamatea, just a few miles to the south, but that is not how it happened. Sometimes, history can be very frustrating.
CEREMONIAL ENCOUNTERS:
Malaspina and the Spanish Pacific

Mercedes Camino
Lancaster University
On arrival in today’s Santo in Vanuatu in 1606, Pedro Fernández de Quirós performed a series of rituals of possession that bewildered his crew and must have astonished the island’s inhabitants. On reaching Santo’s beach, Quirós, in a gesture reminiscent of Christopher Columbus, knelt and kissed the land that he thought to be the Southern Continent. Quirós represented Oceania as a Terrestrial Paradise, using feminine terms to describe the land and its people. The ceremonial practices performed during his voyage were part of the Spanish apprehension of the South Pacific and, as will be seen below, remained of paramount importance at the end of the eighteenth century. There is, however, a substantial rearrangement of roles between observer and the observed from the earlier to the later voyages, as seen in the rituals deployed by Alejandro Malaspina in the Vava’u archipelago of Tonga in 1793. This shift, as this essay will suggest, is informed by contemporary notions of gender and class, exemplifying some telling changes regarding the assimilation of other cultures which distinguish the earlier from the later voyages.

Quirós’s perception of the Pacific occupied a privileged position for over two hundred years, inflecting eighteenth-century discourses. This was largely due to the translation and widespread dissemination of one of his memorials, known as Memorial Eight.¹ His perspective of a bountiful land went on to become the hallmark of the apprehension of the Pacific, remaining popular when James Cook embarked on his momentous voyages (1768-71, 1772-75 and 1776-79), as well as during the Spanish five-year voyage led by Malaspina between 1789 and 1794.²

² According to Andrew David, “the aim of the expedition was to produce hydrographical charts for the most remote parts of the Americas and to investigate the political state of Spanish possessions with regard to Spain and foreign countries and to record their trade, natural resources and defence, rather than discovering new lands”. See “The Voyage of Alejandro Malaspina 1789-1794”. In: Annual General Meeting of The Hakluyt Society 7 July 1999, London: The Hakluyt Society, 2000, pp. 3-24; quotation on p. 3. This article, written while the Hakluyt edition of this voyage was taking place, offers a summary of Malaspina’s journey.
Malaspina’s journey provided a plethora of documents with
descriptions and depictions from the scientists and artists who
produced a large number of drawings of landscape, flora and fauna,
and indigenous people encountered. These are relevant to the
apprehension of the Pacific insofar as the journey visited Port
Jackson in South East Australia, the South Island of New Zealand
and the Vava’u archipelago.\(^3\) Furthermore, in terms of design and
objectives, Malaspina’s expedition followed the patterns established
by the earlier “scientific” expeditions, especially those led by Cook
and Louis Antoine de Bougainville.\(^4\)

The parameters embedded in narratives and drawings of
sixteenth and eighteenth-century Spanish voyages contributed to
creating or, to use my own terminology, producing the South Pacific
or South Seas.\(^5\) Differences notwithstanding, both the earlier and
later representations of this area of the globe relied on an
apprehension of landscape (including seascapes and beaches),
indigenous peoples and women that was determined by European

\(^3\) In fact, as Donald Cutter remarks, the “most enduring legacies of the expedition was
the copious artistic archive amassed during the voyage, as the artists drew both places
and people... The many drawings give a visual dimension to the anthropological
details, and help to identify the scenes described in the journals. Since further details
were often added in the finished versions, the drawings generally are most reliable in
their original state than when efforts were made to meet artistic expectations”. Donald
Cutter, Introduction. In: Andrew David et al. (eds.), The Malaspina Expedition, 1789-
1794: Journal of the Voyage by Alejandro Malaspina. 2 vols. London/Madrid:
Hakluyt Society and Museo Naval, 2001-2004. Vol 1, pp., xxix-lxxvii; quotation on
p. lx.

\(^4\) Bernard Smith explains the contradictions within which the journey operated: “One
of the most important voyages modelled on those of Cook was the Spanish one under
the command of Alejandro Malaspina which set out from Cadiz in 1789. Despite their
excellent work of collecting and describing, completed on the voyage itself, those on
the expedition came home to Spain to confront a social and political situation highly
unfavourable to the encouragement of the arts and sciences. The momentum of the
French Revolution, with all its attendant excesses, threatened the values upon which
the dynamics of Enlightenment science were based”. Imagining the Pacific: In the
47.

\(^5\) On this topic, see Mercedes Camino, Producing the Pacific: Maps and Narratives of
Spanish Exploration (1567-1606), Portada Hispánica, 18; Amsterdam and New York:
social relations. This way of perceiving the universe reveals the relationships of power inherent in observation, description and interpretation. It is a mode of observing that can be linked to Michel Foucault’s analysis of the *panopticon*, in which observers gaze upon and construct their subjects. This mode of observing is, moreover, integral to the development of ethnography within the colonial setting. It is, moreover, tainted with the connotations inherent in the European construction of the “tropics” that, as Felix Driver and Luciana Martins suggest, “have long been the site for European fantasies of self-realization, projects of cultural imperialism, or the politics of environmental salvage”.  

Through his account, Quirós contributed uniquely to the genealogy of the Pacific as a plentiful land in terms of flora and fauna. This myth was, in turn, extended to embrace the sexual availability of its women, especially Polynesian women. Indeed, the perception of “free love” that was especially popular in narratives and paintings from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, has recently been seriously questioned by Serge Tcherkézoff. Interestingly, this notion ran hand-in-hand with the eighteenth-
century view of upper-class women as weak and delicate creatures in need of protection and enclosure. This idealisation of women was heavily inflected by class differences, and it is a view that was translated to the Pacific into a feminisation of indigenous men, who were deemed to be objects of vision within the paradigm of observation characteristic of the Enlightenment project, as will be seen below.

The creation and appropriation of the Pacific in the European mind is explicitly conveyed by Quirós’s aforementioned words, which were part of the rituals of possession performed on arrival in his *Australía del Espíritu Santo*, a term coined to indicate the southern position of the land and in honour of the Hapsburg, or Austrian, king of Spain, Felipe III, under whose auspices the journey was undertaken. As I have described in great detail elsewhere, Quirós’s words were accompanied by several ceremonies that elaborated on those performed by Columbus on reaching the Americas and which were modeled on French traditions.¹⁰

The last ocean to be explored, the Pacific was gradually constructed in European maps and minds from a resilient mythology that was only laid to rest by Cook in the last third of the eighteenth century. Prior to Cook’s voyages, the South Pacific remained one of the least known parts of the world. The fabled Islands of Solomon, discovered in 1567 by Álvaro de Mendaña, found their way into maps but remained intangible to later explorers until well into the eighteenth century, when Louis de Bougainville completed their discovery (1766-68).¹¹ For two and a half centuries after Ferdinand Magellan’s circumnavigation (1519-1521) mapmakers laid down *Terra Australis Incognita* on their maps with no evidence for its existence.

¹¹ Álvaro de Mendaña, born in a village in the province of León in 1542, and went to Peru when he was 20, after his uncle, Lope García de Castro, was named President of Lima’s Audiencia (High Court). There, a distant relation of Mendaña, Pedro Sarmiento de Gamboa, influenced Mendaña’s decision to solicit support for an expedition to the fabled Southern Continent. This landmass, Mendaña thought, could be found west of Peru, where King Solomon’s ships took the gold with which his famous temple was built in Jerusalem.
Sixteenth-century explorers, including the first world circumnavigator, Ferdinand Magellan, were mesmerised by the idea of this Southern Continent, which was based on Classical scholars, as well as Marco Polo’s legacy. It was during this time that the Pacific entered the European imagination and became the target for future explorations. The name Pacific is attributed to Magellan, when he was deceived by the peaceful appearance of the ocean after the tumultuous waters of the Strait that today bears his name. From this time onwards, the Pacific Ocean started to appear in maps produced in various European countries. Indeed, these maps and the narratives about Magellan’s voyage can be said to have “produced” the Pacific for it was not until this journey was popularised that the name and limits he had given to the ocean became part of European knowledge.

After Quirós’s voyage in 1606, the Spanish Crown did not sponsor any more voyages until the eighteenth century. Nevertheless, many of the ideas about Terra Australis Incongnita, including the notion of the “noble savage”, can be traced to some of the mystified views that he expounded. Quirós himself, as his contemporaries noted, was imbued with ideas from the early conquest and settlement of the Americas more than one century after Columbus’s momentous arrival in 1492. Indeed, Quirós was rightly compared with Columbus and he continually stressed the innocence of indigenous peoples, very much along the lines of the “Apostle of the Indians”, Bartolomé de las Casas. This view contrasted with

---

12 The first map to use the name Pacific supposedly given to the sea by Magellan is Sebastian Münster’s (1546).
13 Glyn Williams shows that the growth and spread of publications about the Pacific and the desire to believe in an ideal place on earth infused eighteenth-century explorations, spreading the idea of the “noble savage” at the time “Although the idea of the ‘noble savage’ can be traced back at least to Montaigne’s writings, it was during the eighteenth century that it became a cult”. Glyn Williams, The Expansion of Europe in the Eighteenth Century: Overseas Rivalry, Discovery and Exploitation. London: Blandford, 1966, p. 102.
14 Las Casas, who was born in Seville in 1484, became a Dominican friar and an outspoken advocate of the rights of Amerindians throughout his life. He engaged in theological debates with Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda, which culminated in the great debate of 1550 in Valladolid, where Las Casas defended the humanity and rights of Amerindians with passion. The publication of his Brevisima relación de la destrucción de las Indias (A Brief Account of the Destruction of the Indies) in 1552
the presentation of indigenous peoples as subhuman, which was substantiated with real or apocryphal references to the practice of human sacrifice or cannibalism.\textsuperscript{15}

One obvious difference between the mindset of eighteenth-century explorers and their predecessors is that, throughout the settlement of the Americas and as a result of the subjugation of the great Aztec and Inca empires, early Spanish voyagers, by and large, believed in a providential view of the world and of humanity. Unlike their enlightened followers, the explorers of the sixteenth-century could justify colonisation by claiming that they were instruments of the divine will to extend Christianity’s kingdom. This was the case even when the difficulties of incorporating the discovered worlds into a universal Christian paradigm became immediately apparent to many, and the contradictions inherent in that outlook remained contested and unresolved.

The time where gold and God infused travel and exploration was all but fading away by the end of the eighteenth century, with commercial exchanges and other forms of economic domination gradually gaining ascendance. This was the case initially for the Netherlands, followed by England and, later on, for France and even Spain.\textsuperscript{16} Carlos III of Spain, who reigned between 1759 and 1788, worked closely with ministers clearly steeped in French revolutionary ideology and appreciated the differences between the past empire and his own project.\textsuperscript{17} It was during this epoch that Spain underwent a centralising impulse comparable to that taking

galvanised public opinion against the methods used by conquistadors and hacendados to subdue the Amerindian population.

\textsuperscript{15} “A Europe newly convinced of the innate sinfulness of man, and increasingly conscious of the need for a powerful state organization to restrain the forces of disorder had little inclination to idealize the virtues of primitive societies” by the seventeenth century. John H. Elliott, \textit{The Old World and the New 1492-1650}. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970, p. 103.

\textsuperscript{16} Pagden observes that the French, whose imperialism had initially been informed by Catholicism, eventually, “shifted their ultimate objectives from the cultivation of souls to the cultivation of land and the opportunities for trade ... By the second half of the eighteenth century all three empires, even that of Castile, came to be seen by their respective mother countries as predominantly commercial enterprises”. Anthony Pagden, \textit{Lords of All the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France c.1500-c.1800}. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995, pp. 37, 73.

\textsuperscript{17} Pagden, \textit{Lords of All the World}, p. 194.
place in the sixteenth century and, under its Bourbon monarchs, tightened the commercial rules to be followed in its colonies. This phenomenon, as Peter Bakewell observes, has led historians to consider the later part of the eighteenth century as the only period when “Spain’s American territories became true colonies in a modern sense of the terms: overseas possessions whose own interests were subservient to those of the metropolis.” These differences are apparent in the voyages that Carlos III sponsored, the leading men of which, like their European counterparts, embraced the paradigm of scientific observation, even if Christianisation remained in the minds and deeds of many.

Following upon the new era of Pacific exploration, which was heralded by the important eighteenth-century voyages of George Anson (1740-44), Samuel Wallis (1766-68), Louis Antoine de Bougainville (1766-69) and, especially, James Cook (1768-71, 1772-75 and 1776-79), the Spaniards took a renewed interest in this part of the globe, which they had until then considered their own “lake”. Commercial and scientific aspirations were undoubtedly reflected in the way the expeditions to the South Pacific from colonial Latin American were mounted and in the composition of the people on board the ships. The changes in the understanding of the world and the way travellers and explorers approached it are noticeable in the use of scientists in the voyages. In this regard, the voyages of Cook and Bougainville established a model that was readily followed thereafter. For the first time, key scientists, often from different nationalities, travelled on the ships. These included the famous Joseph Banks, Daniel Solander, Johann Reinhold Forster and George Forster on Cook’s expeditions or Tadeo Haenke and Luis Née in the Spanish-sponsored voyage led by the Italian-born Malaspina (1789-94). With these scientists travelled artists, whose work included

---

18 Peter Bakewell, “Spanish America: Empire and Its Outcome”. In: John H. Elliott (ed.), *The Hispanic World: Civilization and Empire: Europe and the Americas: Past and Present*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1991, pp. 65-84; quote at p. 70. In fact, Bakewell goes so far as to label the last years of Ferdinand VI’s reign (1746-59) and those of Charles III (1759-88), as “a second reconquest of Spanish America,” which he contrasts with the long period from 1600 to 1750, in which the empire underwent a continuous process of decentralisation (pp. 76-79).
19 Besides navigators like Juan Antonio Gutiérrez de la Concha, “The scientific staff chosen by Malaspina consisted of the Spanish army officer Antonio Pineda as chief of
maps, bird’s-eye views and artistic representations of what they saw, including flora and fauna, landscapes and the peoples encountered.  

Eighteenth-century Spanish voyages of Pacific exploration were scarcely documented prior to the last part of the twentieth century. During that time, four significant Spanish explorations took place besides the better-known scientific journey of Malaspina, on which this essay concentrates. These five voyages – four of which were sponsored by the Spanish crown and organised by the Viceroy of Peru, Manuel de Amat – departed from the Peruvian port of El Callao in Lima, with the first one directed to today’s Rapa Nui or Easter Island in 1770. This expedition was commanded by Felipe González de Haedo, with Juan Hervé, who drafted some remarkable

natural history, with French-born Luis Née, a naturalized Spaniard, as his assistant. The landscape artist José Guío completed the scientific team. At the King’s suggestion the services of the brilliant Bohemian-born natural scientist Tadeo Haenke was also obtained.” See Andrew David, “The Voyage of Alejandro Malaspina 1789-1794”. In: Annual General Meeting of The Hakluyt Society 7 July 1999, London: The Hakluyt Society, 2000, pp. 3-24; quotation on p. 5. Pineda died of heat exhaustion on the voyage, in the Philippines, where he was buried, in March 1792. The artists, Juan Ravenet and Fernando Brambila, joined the expedition in Mexico, in October 1792.

It is worth remembering in this context, Denis Cosgrove’s now-classic formulation about the landscape: “[T]he landscape idea represents a way of seeing – a way in which some Europeans have represented to themselves and to others the world about them and their relationships with it, and through which they have commented on social relations. Landscape is a way of seeing that has its own history, but a history that can be understood only as part of a wider history of economy and society; that has its own assumptions and consequences, but assumptions and consequences whose origins and implications extend well beyond the use and perception of land; that had its own techniques of expression, but techniques which it shares with other areas of cultural practice. The landscape idea emerged as a dimension of European elite consciousness at an identifiable period in the evolution of European societies: it was refined and elaborated over a long period during which it expressed and supported a range of political, social and moral assumptions and became accepted as a significant aspect of taste”. Denis Cosgrove, Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1998, p. 1.

María Dolores Higueras has grouped the abundant materials related to this journey, cataloguing them in three volumes. See her Catálogo crítico de los documentos de la expedición Malaspina (1789-1794), 3 vols. Madrid: Museo Naval, 1985-1994. Quotations from Malaspina’s journal in this section are taken from the translation and edition from the Hakluyt Society prepared by Andrew David et al. (see notes 2 and 3 above). On Malaspina, see especially Juan Pimentel’s La física de la Monarquía. Ciencia y política en el pensamiento colonial de Alejandro Malaspina (1754-1810). Aranjuez: Doce Calles [Colección de Historia Natural Theatrum Naturae], 1998; and Viajeros científicos: Jorge Juan, Mutis y Malaspina. Madrid: Nivola, 2001.
bird’s-eye views of the island, as pilot. The next two Spanish-sponsored voyages were directed to Tahiti, and took place in 1771-72 and 1774-75 respectively. The first voyage was led by Domingo de Boenechea, who also commanded the second one, in which he died on the island, being succeeded by Tomás de Gayangos for the return journey.22

The last two voyages of Spanish exploration to the Pacific reached the Vava’u group of islands in the Tongan archipelago. The earliest of these was led in 1780-81 by Francisco Mourelle de la Rúa, the first European ever to land in those islands.23 The same group of islands was visited in the most ‘enlightened’ eighteenth century Spanish voyage to the Pacific: the scientific journey of Malaspina in 1789-94. Malaspina’s fleet consisted of two ships, Descubierta and Atrevida, which were commanded by Malaspina and José de Bustamante respectively. As part of the five-year voyage, they travelled from the North Pacific to the Philippines, New Zealand, Vava’u and Australia, landing in Port Jackson and visiting Sydney, Parramatta and Botany Bay in 1793. Malaspina’s fleet arrived in the Pacific from Alaska and Mindanao in 1793 (Figure 1). Initially, they sailed to New Zealand’s Dusky Sound but because of the weather, they had to anchor off nearby Doubtful Sound. As the bad weather continued, they abandoned their task, though they left some names on the New Zealand landscape, which are still preserved.24

---


23 José María García Sánchez studies the “tropicalism” of Mourelle’s account in “Tropicalismo y romanticismo: El viaje de Francisco Mourelle de la Rúa por el Océano Pacífico (1780-1781)” Cuadernos dieciochistas (2009) 291-307. García Sánchez uses the ideas about “tropicalism” developed by Driver and Martins, who contrast it with orientalism in that “both have conventionally been used to define and legitimize essential differences between cultures and natures, both understood in strongly spatial terms”. Driver and Martins, “Views and Visions of the Tropical World”, pp. 4-5.

24 John Robson, “Somebody knows what!: The Cartographic Results of the Visits by Vancouver and Malaspina to New Zealand in the 1790s”, New Zealand Map Society Journal 15 (2002), 35-49. Cutter believes Malaspina’s aims to be twofold, and to have been involved in espionage: “Although when Malaspina’s ships reached Port Jackson the visiting Spaniards might easily have been viewed as agents of an alien power, on the surface they were received most civilly in acknowledgment of the
Even though there were periods in Malaspina’s voyage during which imperial goals remained important, the segment of the long voyage at Port Jackson and in Vava’u, was mostly devoted to inspection and those forms of scientific exploration associated with the Enlightenment.

Prominent here was the investigation of flora and fauna, as well as the lifestyle of the indigenous peoples, although they seem not to have had much direct contact with Australian Aborigines, who nonetheless found themselves as “ethnographic sitters”, as well as anonymous workers on ships. 25 Similarly, Australian convicts made a surreptitious appearance in one of the drawings, from which their expedition’s role in the advancement of science... the visit coincided with a brief period when Great Britain and Spain were allies... there is little doubt but that he was engaging in what at a later date might be called espionage”. Cutter, *The Malaspina Expedition*, p. lxxi.

25 “He described their physical appearance in some detail, but took much of his comment on their customs from Cook’s report of his contact with them in 1770, agreeing with him that they were “the most miserable and least advanced nation which exists on earth... without agriculture and industry, and without any product which would attest their rationality”. Cutter, *The Malaspina Expedition*, p. lxxii.
chains were eloquently removed in the version given to the Australian Governor, Philip Grose, to avoid offending him.26

While some draughtsmen accompanied the expeditions to Easter Island and Tahiti that were more or less contemporaneous with those of Cook, Malaspina’s journey mirrored quite closely Cook’s and Bougainville’s with the inclusion of botanists, as well as artists, such as Felipe Bauzá, Luis Planes and the Italians Fernando Brambila (Ferdinando Brambilla) and Juan Ravenet, who joined the expedition in 1792. Their drawings help scholars identify the scenes in the journals, giving also a visual dimension of the socio-cultural parameters embedded in their approach to cultures different from their own.

The artists of Malaspina’s expedition produced a large number of drawings and sketches of people and scenes of Vava’u, including coastal profiles and ceremonial gatherings. Interestingly, in some of these ethnographic depictions the explorers’ position of observers is clearly highlighted. These images thus not only provide interesting social data, but are also a salutary reminder that, as John Berger remarks, “We never look at just one thing; we are always looking at the relation between things and ourselves” and that “we situate ourselves in” relation to what we see.27 This can certainly be said of the scenes presented, where we share the position with the explorers who view them. Furthermore, here the men are strategically located in the foreground, providing, as it were, a point of entry into the view, representing themselves in a privileged position as mediators between the subjects who view the images and the objects of observation. This feature is clearly embedded through the location of Europeans in these ceremonies performed in their honour, where they stand between the painter and the viewer to

26 See Peter Barber, “Malaspina and George III, Brambila, and Watling: Three Discovered Drawings of Sydney and Parramatta by Fernando Brambila”, Australian Journal of Art 11 (1993), 31-55. Differences between original and revised versions also offer some curiosities: “Occasionally, different versions were prepared by the same artist, as when Brambila during the ships stay at the new British settlement in New South Wales drew two versions of a scene. One, which was sent to Spain, showed some of the convicts as a chain gang; the other, presented to the governor, Philip Grose, omitted the chains”. Cutter, The Malaspina Expedition, pp. lx-lxi.
whom these are addressed. Needless to say this viewer is not just there observing the scene but also somewhere in Europe, where they assess the scene thus mediated (Figure 2). Their position on the left is, moreover, interesting from the point of view of “reading” the scene, as the viewer’s gaze will be initially directed to the centre of the image, and then proceed to scanning it from left to right, thus occupying the position of the visitors in that particular occasion.

The drawing of this scene participates of the dominant belief taking hold of intellectuals throughout the latter part of the eighteenth century that the world ought to be observed carefully in its minutiae and that this observation would reveal the hidden rules underpinning it. Interestingly, the same tenets that applied to the observation of nature were extended to geography and non-European cultures, all visible from the gaze that Mary Louise Pratt has incisively labelled “imperial eye”.

![Figure 2. Luis Planes, Baile de los hombres en Vavao (Men’s Dance in Vava’u). Museo Naval, Madrid. ms. 1724 (12).](image)

This imperial eye cast its gaze upon a world which might be apprehended in a panorama-like view and could be subsequently possessed and controlled by human forces. The typical, masculine observer, whom Pratt has labelled “seeing-man,” would be a paradigmatic explorer-cum-scientist white male whose personal gaze presented the world from a point of view that was assumed to be universal.29

By comparison with Quirós’ ceremonials of possession, eighteenth-century rituals emphasise the attempt to understand the other, while still considering one self and European mores as superior. In this, the explorers were attempting to show respect for the local customs, which they observed as much as they took part in them. They could thus be said to have taken part in a Western “gazing act” of participant observation. As the name suggests, participant observation requires that one take part in the cultures described, while attempting to accept them on their own terms. Nonetheless, as Clifford remarks, observers cannot but be outsiders who must, of necessity, remain beyond the cultures under scrutiny.30

The ceremonies surrounding this journey were mostly staged to honour the visitors, who spent ten days on the island. They were almost always performed by the indigenous people, although the explorers also corresponded with the display of military drills. On the day after they arrived, on 21 May 1793, the visitors were met with a kava drinking ceremony, which was followed by the chanting of “some twenty men … to the beat of split or hollow canes.” These men were inside a circle “divided into three sections for men,

29 Instead, Pratt reminds us that he was nothing if not a “traveller which deploys an imperious and imperial way of perceiving and viewing from above, offering a visual topography from heights which suggest a masculine and imperial possession of landscape and peoples”. Pratt, Imperial Eyes, p. 7.
women, and youths”, which made their welcoming performance rather harmonious, as Malaspina was duly appreciated.\(^{31}\)

The kava ceremony that preceded this celebration was not as feted by the explorer, though Malaspina tried to show respect for the local customs. This event took place after the scientist Haenke and the draughtsman Bauzá returned from a short trip to explore the island, when many of the locals gathered to share kava, the preparation of which, as had happened with the previous voyager, Mourelle, disgusted Malaspina. In spite of their repugnance at the fact that a woman chewed the root to produce fermentation, the Spaniards took the drink “with the required ceremony” to show their appreciation of indigenous culture.\(^{32}\) The voyagers sat with Vava’u’s chief, Vuna, accompanied by some local women, spending the afternoon “in the greatest concord and cheerfulness” while the chief’s nephew, Feileua, and an older boy who seemed to tutor him, Latu, acted as go-betweens. Food and female company, as well as meetings, were part of the encounter, with Malaspina highlighting the kindness of the women of those “happy climes”.\(^{33}\)

The following day, 22 May, the Spaniards were honoured by further “amusements” that were announced to them by Feileua. On this occasion, Feileua indicated that the festivities would take place in the afternoon, when a ‘chorus of young women’ sat at the centre of a group. The Spaniards corresponded with gifts, which were followed by “a large meal of roots sweetened with sugar.” Then, the men took their turn, with thirty of them performing “to the beat of the canes.” After “pyramids of foodstuffs” were consumed, around a

\(^{31}\) David et al. (eds.), *The Malaspina Expedition*, p 107.

\(^{32}\) David et al. (eds.), *The Malaspina Expedition*, p. 107.

\(^{33}\) “It would be difficult, without being accused of the exaggeration so often found in travellers’ tales, to describe the attractiveness with which fortune has endowed the fair sex in these happy climes, whose charms we still had only a very imperfect notion”. David et al. (eds.), *The Malaspina Expedition*, p. 113. Curiously, however, there seems to have been a good degree of restraint on the part of the sailors, which was often enforced by those in command, using strict punishments for those who sought to have intercourse with local women. Again here, both in terms of respect and admiration for local women, the journeys of Mourelle and Malaspina, exemplify the eighteenth-century approach.
dozen women performed, although this time “nervously,” as they were obliged to do it by Vuna against their will.34

The members of the expedition eventually corresponded with some ceremonies of their own, which the indigenous people admired. On 25 May, five days after they had been on the island, people sat again in circles, the explorers made a display with their weapons, first marching and then firing some volleys in different directions. The islanders then reciprocated by playing instruments, while a choir of thirty-two men sung, following which some sixty men staged a battle. This was followed by more dances, firstly those “performed by at least forty men”, and then “fifty women” whose skills were admired as “even finer than those we had already seen,” as they showed “modesty and shyness” (Figure 3).35 Their movements inspired Malaspina to compare them with “a vivid representation of the Golden Age,” which was by then a widely-used analogy in many contemporary descriptions of Pacific life.36

Figure 3. Luis Planes, Baile de las mujeres en Vavao (Women’s Dance in Vava’u), Museo Naval, ms. 1724 (13).

34 David et al. (eds.), The Malaspina Expedition, pp. 113-18.
35 David et al. (eds.), The Malaspina Expedition, pp. 128, 129.
36 Malaspina likened their performance to those taking place in the temples of “Cnidus and Amathus”, which was Aphrodita’s sanctuary in Cyprus. David et al. (eds.), The Malaspina Expedition, p. 129.
These encounters provide early examples of participant observation when Malaspina and his officers watched the women and the men dancing, or when they took part in the kava ceremony. Like gift-giving, ceremonies were often a way to display degrees of authority and of cementing closer relationships between visitors and hosts.\footnote{I investigate gift-giving and other exchanges in Exploring the Explorers: Spaniards in Oceania 1519-1794. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009. The classical study of gifts in “archaic” or “primitive” societies is Marcel Mauss, The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies. London: Routledge, 1990 (originally published in 1922). Nicholas Thomas studies the subject in great detail, with particular reference to the Pacific in Entangled Objects: Exchange, Material Culture and Colonialism in the Pacific. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1991. See especially Thomas’ nuanced discussion of Mauss’ and Bronislaw Malinowski’s ideas of gifts as inalienable property in chapter 1: “Objects, Exchange, Anthropology”, pp. 7-34.}

It is interesting to note in this context that, as seen in the images of the festivities, the alternation between male and female is matched evenly, and both are equally located within the explorers’ field of vision. Effectively, this places the indigenous peoples in the position of women vis-à-vis the explorers or the scientists who view and describe them. This feature is corroborated by the way the Spaniards represented two named islanders, Feileua and Latu, in individual portraits (Figures 4 and 5).

The explorers had practical reasons for appreciating the friendship of Vuna and of his nephew, Feileua, a boy around eight to ten years old, because, whenever these two were on board any items stolen were quickly restored to them. Indeed, Feileua became good friends with the Spanish and, as a sign of his friendship, exchanged names with José Espinosa and acquired Spanish dress. Both Feileua and Latu, the older boy who accompanied him, appear in portraits by Juan Ravenet, which are significant in the depiction of their gentleness and quasi-feminine appearance. This can indeed be appreciated when compared with the representation of one of Vuna’s fatafegis (wives) (Figure 6).
In Ravenet’s portrait, Latu holds the loincloth opened for the viewer, so that the central and first point of access to the painting is his groin. His demeanour, however, sharply contradicts his supposed masculinity, as the gentleness of his ‘unveiling’ is matched by the expression in his face. Along those lines, Ravenet’s drawing of Feileua is likewise feminized; his countenance, his arms folded together and general demeanour, clearly feminise the boy.

The intricate connection between art, science and power that was at the centre of these voyages is apparent in the drawings thus produced. In fact, the extent to which hegemonic relations underline these eighteenth-century products can be clearly appreciated in the scenes presented. The drawings freeze reality at a specific moment,
removing it from the flux of time and change, and rendering it the property of the observer. They therefore locate the other in a temporal space distant from the speaker’s and sum up the different notions of reality that both cultures embraced, as well as the role played by class and gender in such cross-cultural understandings.

These notions are corroborated by one of the most unusual drawings produced in this journey. Wishing to be given some of the utensils, Vuna insisted on offering women in exchange “for our use,” a method which Malaspina classed as the weapon Vuna thought to

38 Cosgrove, *Social Formation*, p. 22.
be more effective with them.\textsuperscript{40} At this point, and to counter the offer of local women, the Spaniards asked Ravenet to produce a likeness of an ideal European woman, which he did, drawing “a woman graced with all the personal charms usually admired in our Europe… dressed in imitation of the ladies of Panamá and reclining negligently in a hammock” (Figure 7).\textsuperscript{41}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure7.png}
\caption{Juan Ravenet, Señorita de Panamá en una hamaca (Lady of Panama in a hammock). Museo de América, Madrid.}
\end{figure}

The Spaniards showed this portrait to Vuna, telling him that the wives of the officers were just as beautiful but would not go with them because of their delicate constitution.\textsuperscript{42} On seeing the portrait, Vuna, assuming the woman to be real, proclaimed his wish to meet and possess her. In exchange, Vuna offered as many Vava’u women as the visitors may wish to have. Malaspina interpreted the scene with a summary of the relationship between painting and original,
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stressing how Vuna would prefer the “imaginary subject of our tableau” to local women, which the Spaniards would desire “with good reason.”

The reference to this woman’s beauty places the artist and those contemplating the portrait in the role of observers, very much along the lines already established in Albrecht Dürer’s *Draughtsman Drawing a Recumbent Woman* (Figure 8). The position of both women further suggests not only that they are objects of display but that, as I have stressed in an earlier reading of Dürer’s drawing, they are a “kind of landscape.” This woman, clearly bounded by her class and not physically active, is presented as the epitome of beauty for contemporary Europeans. Dressed in apparel that appears to be soft taffeta or muslins, she is slightly orientalised.

![Figure 8. Albrecht Dürer, Draughtsman Drawing a Recumbent Woman (1525). Graphische Sammlung Albertina, Vienna.](image)

Although presented as European, desirable and belonging to the privileged classes, her portrayal and clothing make her resemble a woman in a harem, while her placement on a hammock locate her firmly as a colonial subject of the Americas. The significance of the hammock and its prominent position as regards colonialism has been scrutinised in relation to the Americas by Tom Conley, who

---

43 David et al. (eds.), *The Malaspina Expedition*, p. 123.
observes the recurrence of the artefact in the frontispiece of Abaham Ortelius’ *Teatrum Orbis Terrarum* (1570) (Figure 9), and also noted the paradigmatic representation of the arrival in the Americas in Jan van der Straet’s “Vespucci Discovering America” (Figure 10).


For Conley, “the weave of the hammock [is] one of the principal attributes of Amerindian culture… [and] can be seen among “effects” that are brought back to Europe from the New World.”\(^\text{46}\) The portrait is thus an example of a way of defining the

\(^\text{46}\) Conley concludes that: “The conquest of the New World is engineered by a process of gridding that is common to both reason and mapping …. [so that] Ortelius’
self by opposition to the other, in this case the Spaniards by opposition both to their own women and to indigenous people like Vuna.

Figure 10. Jan Van der Straet, Vespucci Discovering America. British Museum.

Differences notwithstanding, eighteenth-century explorers, like their predecessors, relied on a paradigm that associated the landscape with the indigenous peoples of the places encountered, feminising their embodiment. Throughout these examples, to represent is to assume the position of the observer in a duality in which indigenous peoples, women and the landscape are observed and denied agency. Any claim of realism that these drawings present is in fact ideological. It is, to borrow Berger’s classic formulation about Western art, a “way of seeing” or a “gazing act” performed by the explorers and the intended viewers of the scenes. The way this hammock [may be seen] as an abstracted figure that folds together or conflates into one form both the cause and effect of conquest”. Tom Conley, “Pierre Boaistuaau’s Cosmographic Stage: Theater, Text and Map”, Renaissance Drama (1992), 59-86; quotation on p. 76.

Cosgrove, Social Formation, p. 26
gazing act underlies both the earlier and later voyages is brought home by Michel de Certeau’s now-classic reading of Jan Van der Straet’s representation of Vespucci’s arrival in the Americas:

Amerigo Vespucci the voyager arrives from the sea. A crusader standing erect, his body in armor, he bears the European weapons of meaning. Behind him are the vessels that will bring back to the European West the spoils of a paradise. Before him is the Indian “America,” a nude woman reclining in her hammock, an unnamed presence of difference, a body which awakens within a space of exotic fauna and flora…This erotic and warlike scene has an almost mythic value. It represents the beginning of a new function of writing in the West … This is writing that conquers … For the moment of a rupture between a subject and an object of the operation, between a will to write and a written body (or a body to be written), this writing fabricates Western history.48

As Certeau mentions, from the early voyages, colonialism was premised on a division between those who could write and those who did not.49 Like Vespucci, his eighteenth-century counterparts carried with them the symbols of European power, including their scientific artefacts and their ships. Although the cruciform staff is nowhere to be seen, Vespucci’s navigational astrolabe became an Arnold chronometer, while the banner bearing the Southern Cross was replaced by an ensign with the insignia of the royal or private sponsors. Also, Vespucci’s large sword was removed from sight,

49 As Stephen Tyler posits: “To represent means to have a kind of magical power over appearances, to be able to bring into presence what is absent, and that is why writing, the most powerful means of representation, was called ‘grammaryl, ’ a magical act. The true historical significance of writing is that it has increased our capacity to create totalistic illusions with which to have power over things or over others as if they were things. The whole ideology of representational signification is an ideology of power”. Stephen Tyler, “Post-modern Ethnography: From Document of the Occult to Occult Document”. In: James Clifford and George E. Marcus (eds.), Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1986, pp. 122-40; quotation on p. 131.
although the manoeuvres and the displays of military skills would certainly give the locals a perception of the visitors’ might.

From the three early modern discourses of mastery, religious truth, scientific truth and military power, only the first remains in the background by the eighteenth century, while the second and the third are, if anything, intensified. Whereas religious truth had become increasingly questionable, the claim of reality of scientific truth, often backed by military power, remained a cornerstone of European thought. This, I have proposed in this essay, is exemplified by the Spanish perceptions of *Terra Australis* and its inhabitants, which presupposed a notion of the universe in which nature, indigenous peoples and women are subjected by the ‘universal male’ that ‘produced’ them. This universal, “disembodied” viewer, as Daniel Cosgrove reminds us, was “endowed with a will to power” and was “thus the sovereign subject of history.” This “subject of history” objectified, mystified or idealised women, as well as the new lands and the peoples encountered. He did so through the projection of a model of thought that established hegemonic relations that, by the eighteenth century, foregrounded knowledge and understanding, but did not delete altogether religion, weapons or fear.

50 “Humanist values were promoted as a universal and progressive achievement, to be adopted with time and “development” by all peoples, an element in the construction of a Modern global identity. Central to this progressive narrative of human achievement has been the figure of the individual European male, conceived as a universal subject, exercising rational self-consciousness within a largely disembodied mind, and endowed with a will to power: thus the sovereign subject of history. Cosgrove, *Social Formation*, p. xvii.
THE MALASPINA EXPEDITION IN VAVA’U, 1793

Phyllis Herda

The University of Auckland
On the 29th of July 1789 a Spanish expedition under the command of Alejandro Malaspina and José Bustamante y Guerra left Cádiz, Spain for what was to become a five year voyage of political and scientific exploration. As a voyage, this was Spain’s greatest contribution to what has been called the Age of Enlightenment. European explorers entered the Pacific in the late 18th and early 19th century on august scientific expeditions with clear designs to describe and categorize all that they saw. The Pacific, with its seemingly geographically discrete islands was thought to provoke a perfect and natural environment for this encounter. In May 1793 the expedition spent two weeks in the northern Tongan archipelago of Vava’u. While completely unfamiliar with Tongan language, custom and history, except what was gleaned from the accounts of James Cook, the Malaspina expedition created an interesting snapshot of the archipelago at a significant time in the history of Tonga.

The expedition’s visit to Vava’u, in itself, was not particularly remarkable. It lasted thirteen days and was one of the shortest stays of the expedition –having spent nine months in the Philippines and one month at Botany Bay in Australia. Yet the material from Vava’u has gained prominence in historical interpretations, surpassing that of many of their other ports of call. Obviously, as members of the expedition did not speak Tongan, their communication with the inhabitants was limited. However, these, far from perfect, descriptions of a very short stay have gained significance in an understanding of Tonga’s past.

The records of the Malaspina expedition in Vava’u are noteworthy in Tongan history for three reasons. Firstly, the expedition visited the northern Tongan group of Vava’u, not Tongatapu to the South as most of the other European explorers did, with a strikingly different description. The reason Vava’u was chosen was due to the 1781 visit to the group by Francisco Mourelle. From a Tongan perspective Vava’u has always been different. It is, unquestionably, part of Tonga and its history is enmeshed in the wider events and politics of the Kingdom.

1 J.F.G. de La Pérouse, The Voyage of La Pérouse Round The World, in the Years 1785, 1786, 1787, and 1788, with the Nautical Tables vol. 1, London: John Stockdale, 1798, pp. 194-241.
However, it has always been perceived as standing apart from the goings on in the more southern islands.

Secondly, the account of the Malaspina expedition is Spanish, not French and certainly not English, which dominated the early European accounts of Tonga. Consequently, there is a difference in their interests, descriptions and, indeed, judgments about the archipelago and its inhabitants.

Thirdly, and most significantly, the 1790s was a time of tremendous political change in Tonga. The members of the expedition met and spoke with individuals who were players in these changes. Some of the events they recorded shed light on aspects of Tongan history not highlighted by later hegemonic accounts. The significance of these factors is evident when we compare the accounts of the Malaspina expedition and that of the French expedition commanded by D’Entrecasteaux who was sent to search for La Pérouse. The French visited Tongatapu one month before the Malaspina expedition anchored in Vava’u, but they recorded a very different account of Tonga at that time.2

Fourthly, the material collected by the members of the Malaspina expedition was, due to political intrigue in Spain, locked away in Spanish archives for many years. As such, it was not known to those interested in Tonga’s past. The version of events recorded by the Malaspina expedition is, therefore, neither reported nor accounted for in the histories of Tonga.

**Background to the Malaspina Expedition**

The first document of what has become known as the Malaspina expedition appears in the record as a written proposal which was presented by Malaspina and Bustamante to Naval Minister Antonio Valdés on 10 September 1788 (Plan de un viaje científico y político, see figure 1 in this issue’s preface). The proposal put forward by Malaspina and Bustamante y Guerra

---

outlined a voyage which would circumnavigate the globe and the results of which should, by necessity, be divided into two spheres. The first sphere, which Malaspina and Bustamante referred to as the “public” aim was, true to the spirit of the Enlightenment, to foster a scientific and philosophical understanding of the world in terms of contributions to hydrography, geography, astronomy, botany and natural history, while also obtaining a collection of curiosities for the Real Gabinete (now in the Museo de América in Madrid) and specimens for the Real Jardín Botánico. This aspect of the voyage was portrayed as vital to the national integrity of Spain and the Crown was urged to approve the proposal on the grounds that:

For the past twenty years the two nations of England and France worthy of a noble emulation have undertaken voyages in which navigation, geography and knowledge of humanity have rapidly progressed. The history of human society has laid the foundation for a more general investigation: natural history has been enriched with an almost infinite number of discoveries; and finally the preservation of Man in different climates, in extensive journeys, and among some almost incredible tasks and risks, has been the most interesting acquisition which navigation has made.³

The belief that Spain was lagging behind other European nations and the commitment towards the growth of scientific knowledge is a recurrent theme in the literature of the expedition.

The second objective of the expedition was referred to as the “private” aim of the voyage. Its objective were twofold: First, to produce hydrographic charts, especially of the unknown parts of the Americas, which would prove useful to mercantile operations; and second, to investigate the economic and political state of the Spanish

³ Pedro Novo y Colson, Viaje Político-Científico Alrededor del Mundo por las Corbetas “Descubierta” y “Atrevida” al Mando de los Capitanes de Navío Don Alejandro Malaspina y Don José Bustamante y Guerra desde 1789 á 1794, Madrid: Imprenta de la Viuda é Hijos de Abienzo, 1885, p. 1. Throughout this article the translation from Spanish of the Novo y Colson material is mine.
colonies of the Americas, the Marianas Islands and the Philippines, as well as a special report into the nature of the activities of other European nations in the New World. The Russian presence in California and the British penal colony in New South Wales were of particular interest as were the Portuguese in Macao. The British presence in Nootka Sound on the Northwest coast of what is now North America was to become an important issue. More vital than the perceived encroachments upon Spanish territory was the latent threat that each settlement potentially posed to already established Spanish colonies.

The proposal met with the approval of the Spanish monarch, Carlos III, who was well known as a patron of the sciences, and Malaspina and Bustamante y Guerra began nine months of ship preparation and crew appointments. Both commanders insisted that specialists in botany be included among the officers and that all of the crew should be volunteers who were “not indifferent to natural history”. Expedition members were recruited beyond the Spanish borders. Notable among those who joined the expedition were the Austrian botanist and naturalist Thaddeus Haenke, French botanist Luis Neé, cartographer Felipe Bauzá y Cañas, artists Tomás de Suría, Fernando Bambila and Juan Ravenet, and the fraternal naturalist team of Arcadio and Antonio Pineda. This emphasis on botany, based on the inherent usefulness and potential profitability of certain plants, is in keeping with other eighteenth century Spanish expeditions, such as that headed by Félix de Azara to the Río de la Plata, Hipólito Ruiz and José Pavón to South America and Martin Sesse to South America, as well as the Royal Scientific expedition to New Spain (Mexico).  

---

4 MS 316, Museo Naval, Madrid.
The Voyage

On 28 July 1789 two corvettes which were renamed the Descubierta (Discovery) and the Atrevida (Daring) so as to communicate the spirit of their mission, set sail from Cádiz, Spain. After an uneventful Atlantic crossing the ships spent one and a half years surveying the east and west coasts of southern America as South America was referred to at the time. They also made extensive notes on the Spanish settlements at which they called. These included Montevideo, Puerto Deseado, las Islas Malvinas (the Falkland Islands), San Carlos de Chiloe, Valparaiso, Callao and Guayaquil, before they arrived in Acapulco in April of 1791.

A royal decree was waiting for them in Acapulco which directed them to amend their original itinerary of sailing to the Hawaiian Islands where they were to have investigated the Spanish claim to the archipelago by right of an alleged Spanish discovery. Instead, owing to Spanish concessions made to the British during the Nootka Sound controversy in 1790, they were to head north and carefully reconnoitre the Northwest coast of what is now known as North America between 59 and 60 degrees latitude in order to report on the activities of the British and, more importantly, in hopes of locating the Strait of Maldonado, thereby re-establishing Spanish supremacy in the area. The expedition spent the summer of 1791 on the Northwest coast and sailed as far north as Yakutat Bay. Having convinced themselves of what they already suspected, that there was no Northwest Passage, they sailed south visiting Nootka Sound on what is now called Vancouver Island and the Spanish mission at Monterey before returning to Acapulco.

After needed repairs and some quick provisioning the expedition set sail across the Pacific sighting the Ladrones Islands (now known as Marianas Islands) and stopping at the Spanish settlement at Humata (Guam) before heading towards the Philippines. Cape Espiritu Santo on Samar Island was sighted on 3 March 1792 and the corvettes anchored at Manila on the 26th of that month. The expedition remained in the archipelago for almost nine months observing the state of the colony and making exploratory excursion to northern Luzon and the surrounding area. During this
time Bustamante y Guerra also sailed the *Atrevida* to Macao to investigate the Portuguese settlement there.

The expedition was underway again in November 1792 visiting Mindanao before heading on the next leg of the voyage. In February 1793 they proceeded to the South Island of New Zealand where they visited Dusky and Doubtful Sounds. From here the expedition sailed to Port Jackson where they were met by Lieutenant Governor Grose in charge of the British penal colony. The corvettes remained at the penal colony until April 12th when they set sail for Vava’u, Tonga. Grose reported the expedition’s visit noting that they “sailed from hence on the 12th instant, but as they seemed to evade any questions that were put to them respecting their future intentions, I can form no probable conjecture where they are gone”.6

The cause of the Spanish evasiveness was that the expedition’s orders were to proceed to Vava’u and to claim possession of the group by right of their “discovery” by Spaniard Francisco Mourelle in 1781. The Spanish Crown’s decision to annex the islands appears to be an attempt to provide a Spanish counterbalance in the South Pacific in case the rumours of the British colony in New South Wales proved true. Malaspina and the expedition remained until June 1st at Vava’u, from where they sailed back to South America, arriving in Peru on 31 July 1793. From here they began the long voyage home with some of the expedition members making their way overland to continue their observations. They rendezvoused with the two corvettes at Montevideo and the expedition set sail for Spain on 21 June. They arrived in Cádiz on 21 September 1794 after a slow and cautious Atlantic crossing. Spain was at war with France and Malaspina was instructed to take no chances.

---

The Spanish Crown's Reaction to the Voyage

Upon their return to Spain the expedition was highly praised by the Spanish court. Malaspina was granted permission to visit his natal home in Italy and he was instructed to sketch out a plan for the publication of the material from the expedition while he was away. This gesture, in itself, indicates Royal approval, for the Spanish Crown traditionally did not allow the results of its voyages to be made public for fear of divulging national secrets. An allowance for publication had been considered from the outset of the voyage, however, as both Malaspina and Bustamante were of the opinion that scientific results must be made available to the scientific community and to the interested public.

It is difficult, in retrospect, to pin-point when things started going wrong for Malaspina. Upon his return to the Spanish Court after his visit home he was promoted to the Spanish equivalent of Rear Admiral, it was rumored that he would be made Minister of the Navy and Father Manuel Gil was appointed to assist him in preparing the expedition’s papers for publication. However, this was not to be; Malaspina was placed under house arrest on 29 April 1796. The events leading up to this action are not clear, but it seems certain that the then Prime Minister Manuel Godoy was behind the arrest.7

During the voyage Malaspina appeared to have developed a growing disenchantment with European colonial imperialism and he was especially moved by the poor treatment of the Spanish colonies. Upon his return to Spain he frequently vocalised his criticisms and, despite warnings from well-meaning friends and acquaintances, he planned a separate expedition publication outlining his recommendations for more liberal treatment of the Spanish colonies.8

Included in the proposal for this volume was a history of the conquests of America, an analysis of the expediency of the American mines, a study of agriculture, an investigation into the

---

legal and religious systems, and the issue of emigration in the colonies. The volume was to culminate with a report on the state of naval defenses of each of the colonies. Although such a report was suggested in the original voyage proposal approved by King Carlos III, the Spanish monarchy had subsequently changed and the new Court of Carlos IV did not share his father’s liberalism. Godoy found out about the report which allegedly showed him in a bad light and he pressed Carlos IV to have Malaspina arrested. Another version of the controversy relates that Godoy, whom Malaspina was fond of calling “the Sultan”, was jealous of the royal attention shown Malaspina. It was further rumored that Godoy was afraid that Malaspina would replace him as Queen Maria Luisa's lover, so he plotted Malaspina’s downfall. The available evidence favours Malaspina’s liberalism as the reason with Prime Minister Godoy as the instigator. In any event, Malaspina was found guilty of treason and sentenced in 1796 to ten years imprisonment. He received an early release in 1803 through the intervention of an Italian government official with the establishment of the Bonaparte government in Spain on the condition that he leave for Italy never to return to Spain. He was escorted back to Italy where he remained until his death in April 1810.

At the time of his arrest, Carlos IV issued an order that all papers dealing with the Malaspina expedition be seized and banned from publication. Manuel Godoy was reportedly so incensed by Malaspina that he made sure that the decree was followed to the letter, to the point that in an 1802 report of a side expedition sent to the Northwest coast of what is now North America, Malaspina could only be mentioned as “the commander of the expedition”.9 Godoy would not allow Malaspina’s name to appear anywhere in print. The majority of the appropriated material from the voyage was eventually deposited in the Hydrographic Archives and, upon the closure of that office, it was moved to the Museo Naval in Madrid.10

9 Anonymous, Relación del Viaje Hecho por las Goletas Sutil y Mexicana en el año 1792 para reconocer el Estrecho de Juan de Fuca, Madrid: Imprenta Real, 1802, p. 57.
It was here that the manuscripts remained until Lieutenant Pedro Novo y Colson located the documents and selected material from them for his 1885 publication.

Although other publications from the expedition exist, the Novo y Colson edition constitutes the official view of the expedition.11 Observations made are represented, for the most part, as being those of Malaspina or as a compilation by him of his officers’ experiences, sources which he freely acknowledges. The available records do not indicate that officers and crew were forbidden to keep journals during the expedition, but the paucity of them may indicate that Malaspina and Bustamante y Guerra had established an official publication prerogative, much as Cook did.12

Figure 2. Fernando Brambila. Sepulcro de Paulaho, soberano de las Yslas de Vavao (Tomb of Paulaho, Sovereign of the Isles of Vava’u). Museo de América, Madrid.

34.3 (1981), pp. 319-40 for an account of the Expedition manuscripts which accompanied Felipe Bauzá y Cañas when he fled Spain for exile in England.
12 Novo y Colson, pp. x-xi.
Malaspina in Vava’u

The expedition spent 13 days at Vava’u (20 May-1 June). They anchored off Longomapu on the north side of the bay at the southwest extremity of Vava’u. During that time they met with the local aristocracy and political elite, were feasted by them and entertained with chant and dance performances by the men and women of Vava’u. Their descriptions are detailed, but, of course, as they were not aware of the more subtle connotations of what they saw, the narrative contains mistakes or is misguided in its interpretations. Despite their short stay, Ciriaco Cevallos, who was said to have a gift for languages, produced a vocabulary of over 300 Tongan words.\(^\text{13}\)

Overall, the members of the expedition were greatly impressed with the physical beauty of the islands as well as its abundant gardens (see figure 1):

The regularity of plantations, the gracious harmony of the surroundings, and the profusion of trees always coloured by flowers, all this presented itself to us in the brightest colours as marvels of Nature... We admired the state of their agriculture, to which they applied themselves as the principal and most useful occupation of their society. An occupation to which they not only owed a strong physique, but also a quiet life in the bosom of plenty and pleasure.\(^\text{14}\)

And in fulfillment of their royal instructions, the members of the expedition buried a bottle with a document inside claiming the islands for Spain. Interestingly, especially in light of his liberal thoughts on colonialism which most likely led to his arrest, Malaspina himself appears not to have attended the ceremony –its sentiments not to his liking– and recorded:

Sad is the ambition which, under the pleasant guise of science and philosophy and by imposing both unjust and costly measures on a deluded nation, obliges other nations to follow her closely in her imaginary conquests, perchance

\(^{13}\) Pedro Novo y Colson, pp. 620-26.
\(^{14}\) Pedro Novo y Colson, pp. 277-78.
acquired not with rivers of blood and money, but with a few astronomical instruments, some trinkets exchanged for item of much greater use, and some description or another buried in marked places.\footnote{Novo y Colson, pp. 258-9.}

Of all the people met by members of the expedition, Vuna appears to be the central figure. He is described as a man of about 45 years of age and as “King of Vavao” [Vava’u]. The expedition recorded that he had more than four wives, at least two of whom were the daughters of late Tu’i Tonga Paulajo [Paulaho] and his wife Dubou [Tupoumoheofo]. Bustamante recorded the women’s names as Fatafegi (also Fatafegui) [Fatafehi] and Taufa [Taufa], although Malaspina referred to them as the “two Fatafegis” (see figures 3 and 4 in Mercedes Camino’s essay in this issue). The son of the one known to Bustamante as Taufa was a boy of about 8 to 10 years old named Feileua (also “Feyleúa”) who was described as “hereditary prince of the islands” (see figure 2).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure2.jpg}
\caption{Juan Ravenet, Vuna, Soberano de las Yslas de Vavao (Vuna, Sovereign of the Islands of Vava’u). Museo Naval, Madrid.}
\end{figure}
Members of the Malaspina expedition also met Vuna’s sister Dubou [Tupou] who was also identified as Dubou Filumanuma, her husband had been Tuyalafatai [Tu’ihalafatai] who had died some years before. Their son was Tufoa, a youth the some members of the expedition grew quite fond of. Vuna’s younger brother was Xavea or Javia [Havea]. His son was Latu, who was identified as the “manservant of Feileua”.

Considerable confusion occurs in identifying these individuals by the names recorded by members of the expedition. They were clearly people of exalted rank and significant political power. Before the nineteenth century, Tonga was ruled by a tripartite configuration of three titles: the Tu’i Tonga (sacred ruler of Tonga), the Tu’i Ha’atakalaaua and the Tu’i Kanokupolu. It is said that the three titleholders worked in a complementary manner in the rule of Tonga, especially during the latter half of the eighteenth century, which is described as an idyllic and peaceful golden age. The reality was a highly charged, competitive polity with the exercising of power formed by a complex and dynamic configuration of ever changing fortunes and factions.

The most well-known Vuna in Tongan hohoko (genealogy) was the second son of Tu’i Kanokupolu Mataelele’apiko and Papa, daughter of the Tu’i Ha’amea of Tongatapu. There is some discrepancy as to whether Vuna was actually appointed to the Tu’i Kanokupolu title or if he was just Tu’i Vava’u; however, most sources list Vuna as the fifth Tu’i Kanokupolu. Thomas believes that Vuna was succeeded as Tu’i Kanokupolu (by Ma’afu-‘o’tu’itonga) in about the year 1730. Vuna married Leha’uku, who was a daughter of Tu’i Ha’atakalaaua (12th) Tu’ionukulave. Their son was Vuna Ngata who married ‘Otu’angū of Ha’apai. Their son was known as Vuna Tu’ioetau who married ‘Ulukilupetea (a woman who

---


had many chiefly and powerful sons). Their son was Vuna Takitakimālohi who married Toe’umu. Vuna Takitakimālohi was known to William Mariner residing at Vava’u at the turn of the 19th century. 19 He reportedly fled to Samoa at the time of Fīnau ‘Ulukālala and Tupouniu’a’s take-over of Vava’u. Takitakimālohi had no sons.

Elizabeth Bott, an anthropologist who worked with the Tongan Traditions Committee and spoke extensively with Queen Sālote about Tongan genealogy and history, believes that the man known to Malaspina as Vuna was, in fact Tu’iha’ateiho Fā’otusia Fakahiko’uiha, whose personal or nickname may have been Vuna. 20 Gifford’s work also tends to support this claim. 21 Fā’otusia is recorded as the son of Tu’iha’ateiho Haveatunga and the Tu’i Tonga Fefine Nansipau’u. Fā’otusia’s full siblings were Veasi’i and Tamahā Fakahiko’uiha who later adopted the Christian name Amelia Jane. Both Fā’otusia and Veasi’i are sometimes spoken of as “male Tamahās”. 22 Fā’otusia met his death on the 10th of May 1799 during uprising against Tu’i Kanokupolu Tuku’aho by Fīnau ‘Ulukālala and Mulikiha’amea. A renegade London Missionary Society preacher recorded that:

Among them was a respectable chief of Ardeo [Ha’ateiho]. He had received three or four wounds in the head before he would retreat. Some, like this chief, were very courageous and fearless of death; others were timid and cautious. 23

It seems unlikely that Tamahā Amelia is the woman who is named Dubou Filumanuma and describe as Vuna’s sister. Tamahā Amelia was said to have married Tu’i Kanokupolu Tuku’aho and to have had no children – contrary to the expedition report which lists

Dubou Filumanuma’s husband as the late Tuyalafatai and her son as Tofua. Thomas notes that a Filoimanumaa was the second wife of Tu’ihalafatai and that their child was known as Atuatu Kautabu. I can find no other reference to confirm this and Thomas gives no other clues as to the identity of this woman.

Bott bases her supposition of Vuna’s identity as Fā’otusia on the hohoko (Tongan genealogies) which list the two daughters of Tu’i Tonga Paulaho and Tupoumoheoefo (Sinaitakala-‘i-Fekitetele and Fatafehi Lapaha) as being married to Tu’iha’ateiho Fā’otusia. Sinaitakala was also known as Fatafehi Ha’apai, which seems to support Malaspina’s designation of the sisters being known as the two Fatafehis. Fatafehi Ha’apai is remembered as marrying only Fā’otusia and having one daughter by him named Fana. Collocott, a Methodist missionary to Tonga who was also interested in Tongan history, recorded a poem about a man who wished to marry the Fatafehi Ha’apai, but was bitterly disappointed to find that she had gone to Vava’u to marry a man named Vuna.

The other daughter of Tu’i Tonga Paulaho and Tupoumoheoefo who is recorded as marrying Fā’otusia was Fatafehi Lapaha. Her son by Fā’otusia was Makamālohi, who was the Tama Tauhala (“extraordinary child”). Gifford was told that there was only one individual in history who held this title and that he is buried in the Langitauhala near Lapaha. Bott (relying on Queen Sālote) believes that Makamālohi was Tama Tauhala because his mother was a Tu’i Tonga Fefine, while his father, also the child of a Tu’iha’ateiho and Tu’i Tonga Fefine, was considered himself to be a male Tamahā. It is said that Makamālohi’s rank was so high that he was sent a moheofo (principal wife) –a practice usually reserved for only the Tu’i Tonga.

It is hard to overstate the value of this alternative account. Tongan history is distinctly hegemonic and this was a time of

24 Elizabeth Bott, 1982, p. 36.
25 John Thomas, “Mythology of the Tongans”, p. 54.
26 Elizabeth Bott, 1982, p. 34.
28 E.W. Gifford, p. 81.
29 Elizabeth Bott, 1982, p. 36.
immense political upheaval. Conventionally, constructions of Tonga’s past date the upheaval as beginning six years later with the assassination of Tu’i Kanokupolu Tuku’aho—an event recorded by the newly landed London Missionary Society missionaries and enshrined in Tongan oral traditions.30 However, members of the expedition were told that Tu’i Tonga Paulaho was an “usurper” and that Feileua was to inherit the rule of all the islands. Queen Sālote stated that at one time, the Tu’iha’ateiho, and most probably the Tama Tauhala, may have been regarded as a substitute for the Tu’i Tonga.31

The title of Tu’iha’ateiho derived from the Fale Fisi—or “House of Fiji”—the descendants of a Tu’i Tonga Fefine (Sinaitakala-‘i-Langileka) and Tapu’osi a man from Fiji. Before this time the Tu’i Tonga Fefine (Female Tu’i Tonga) did not marry. As the sister of the sacred male ruler of Tonga, she outranked him and outranked every man in Tonga. Marrying a Fijian from “outside” was seen to provide a “solution” for the spouse of a Tu’i Tonga Fefine because, although their children (and descendants) outranked the sacred male ruler, they were “foreign” and not a political threat. The titles of Tu’i Lakepa, Tu’iha’ateiho, Mā’atu and Tu’i’āfitu are the four titles of the Fale Fisi.

Members of the Malaspina expedition were told that Fuanunuiava (who was the son of Paulaho and Tupoumoheofo) had been twice opposed and defeated by Tu’i Kanokupolu Mumui and that he had either been assassinated or was living “confused with the lowest common people” in Tongatapu.32 We know for a fact that Fuanunuiava was not killed because he was made Tu’i Tonga in 1795 by Mumui, who was attempting to restore political order in Tonga.33 Clearly something was up regarding the succession of Fuanunuiava to his father’s title, for one month before the Malaspina

32 Novo y Colson, p. 139.
expedition arrived in Vava’u, the French (D’Entrecasteaux) had recorded a statement in Tongatapu made by Fīnau ‘Ulukālala about Fuanunuiava that “everybody passed themselves off for chiefs” – that is ‘eiki.³⁴ Individuals descended from a Tu’i Tonga or a Tu’i Tonga Fefine, both titles derived from a divine ancestor, were known as sino’i ‘eiki (‘of the body of aristocratic rank’). Here, ‘Ulukālala was denigrating the rank and ancestry of Fuanunuiava and, perhaps, casting doubt on his right to hold the Tu’i Tonga title.

José de Bustamante y Guerra, the second in command of the expedition, met Tupoumoheofo in Neiafu and described her as “taller than average, quite light skinned, of pleasant features and with an elegant appearance”. They thought her to be about 48 years old and “composed in a manner of a woman very concerned that appropriate decorum be paid to those who visit her”.³⁵ Members of the expedition were told that Tu’i Tonga Paulaho was “dethroned” and killed by Vuna in hand-to-hand combat in about 1784. This was the outcome of a conspiracy hatched between Vuna, Mumui and Tupoumoheofo. After Paulaho’s death, Vuna was reportedly named as Tu’i Vava’u, Tupouto’a as Tu’i Ha’apai, Mumui as Tu’i Kanokupolu and Tuku’aho as Tu’i ‘Eua.³⁶

It is interesting to speculate on the death of Paulaho. Several writers who were not acquainted with the visit of the expedition mention that his death occurred in Vava’u about 1784 but they do not record that he was killed.³⁷ Members of the expedition visited his grave during their excursion to Neiafu:

A terrace rose up more than three feet from the ground, forming a perfect square with an area of 4000 feet. The upper edge of this platform was faced with great slabs of black stone placed side by side tightly joined together. In the centre of this area, a house of

---
³⁴ Labillardière, p. 340.
³⁵ Novo y Colson, p. 278-9.
³⁶ Novo y Colson, p. 382.
the same style as that previously described could be seen, and inside the humble building lay the ashes of the Prince [Tu’i Tonga Paulaho].\textsuperscript{38}

Thomas recorded that Paulaho “was buried, not as a Tu’i Tonga, but as an ordinary chief”.\textsuperscript{39} We know that Paulaho had tried to secure the succession of his son Fuanuniava as Tu’i Tonga in the late 1770s. This appears to have been in response to pressure from the politically ambitious Kanokupolu titles who put pressure on his rule. It may be that Paulaho sought to increase the Tu’i Tonga’s sphere of influence which, through succeeding generations, had become that of a sacred ruler with secular rule going to first the Tu’i Ha’atakalaua and, later, to the Tu’i Kanokupolu. It has been said (by descendants of Tu’i Tonga supporters) that in addition to being Tu’i Tonga, Paulaho was also ‘hau’ – a designation of secular rule and power thought to be outside of the Tu’i Tonga’s domain in the late 18\textsuperscript{th} century. However, as the fighting escalated, Paulaho sought refuge in Vava’u among his supporters there. The expedition commentary that “there was a clash which ended with the death of [Paulaho] at the hands of Vuna after these two leaders fought hand to hand” suggests that the opposition to Paulaho’s rule was much wider spread than previously thought and that the denigration of the sacred title began long before the rise of Tu’i Kanokupolu Tāufa’āhau, who would become the first King of Tonga.\textsuperscript{40}

\textbf{The Malaspina Expedition and History-Making in Tonga}

The accepted structures of the \textit{longue durèe} in Tonga’s past, based on Tongan oral traditions, have, by and large, been portrayed as absolute and unchanging. The ideological and historical hegemony of such a situation is not surprising considering the markedly hierarchical and encompassing nature of Tongan notions of chieftainship. Tongans recognize the hegemonic nature of their

\textsuperscript{38} Novo y Colson, p. 276.  
\textsuperscript{39} Thomas, “History of Tonga”, p. 45.  
\textsuperscript{40} Novo y Colson, p. 382.
history and express it beautifully in the saying, “Truth is what the chief said and history is what the highest chief said”.41

However, even within the hegemony of the Tongan elite there is dissension on how the past should be constructed and how that construction is to be remembered and interpreted. Descendants of old rivals and ancient factions will still tell different versions of the same past event. However, a wider acknowledgement of those versions and their significance hinges upon the success of one’s ancestors. To be “unknown” in the corpus of Tongan traditional knowledge indicates the political and social end of the line for a lineage and the ignominy of such a state is often remarked upon. The descendants of unsuccessful factions may be deleted or “forgotten” due to the subsequent failure of the lineage to re-establish themselves. There would be no reason for individuals, aside from their direct descendants, to remember these people or to recount their deeds. Before the establishment of the Tongan Constitution in 1875 which fixed the rules of titular succession, competition between eligible candidates for a title was often fierce. Struggles between competing lineages for power and status often lasted for several generations and ended with the vanquished slipping into historical obscurity. Such was the fate of Tu’i Vava’u Vuna who was, most likely, Tu’iha’ateiho Fā’otusia. Although powerful during his lifetime, his political ambitions did not survive him.

The visit to Vava’u of the Malaspina expedition in 1793 provides a brief glimpse into events and individuals, like Tu’iha’ateiho Fā’otusia, who are not be well remembered in the corpus of Tongan oral traditions. The expedition’s records, locked away in Madrid after the seizure of the material following the expedition’s return to Spain, have not been accessible to those interested in Tonga’s past. It is somewhat ironic that the very cause of the journals’ exclusion from the Tongan historical record is also one of its strengths –that is, a relatively unknown snapshot of late 18th century Tonga. It provides an interesting, albeit imperfect, glimpse of time from the perspective of someone who was not particularly successful in his bid for power. An account which is not encompassed in the hegemonic construction of the Tongan past is

41 Elizabeth Wood-Ellem, personal communication.
instructive—no matter how imperfect. In this case, the Malaspina journals ask us to look back further in Tongan history for the beginning of the internal conflict which would erupt into all-out civil war by the end of the 18th century.
MORE FAMOUS FOR THEIR MISFORTUNES THAN FOR THEIR SCIENTIFIC DISCOVERIES?

Malaspina’s Scientists and Their Contribution to His Expedition

James Braund

The University of Auckland
Writing in his *Political Essay on the Kingdom of New Spain*, Alexander von Humboldt described Alejandro Malaspina, his namesake and predecessor on a journey to the New World, as an “able navigator”, who

[…] is still more celebrated for his misfortunes than his discoveries. After examining both hemispheres, and escaping all the dangers of the ocean, he had still greater to suffer from his court; and he dragged out six years in a dungeon, the victim of a political intrigue. […] The labours of Malaspina remain buried in the archives, not because the government dreaded the disclosure of secrets, the disclosure of which might be deemed useful, but that the name of this intrepid navigator might be doomed to eternal oblivion.¹

There was quite probably a personal element in these remarks. Humboldt, after all, had personally met or corresponded with at least two members of the expedition.² He had even sailed past the very castle where Malaspina was imprisoned as he embarked on his own journey to the New World in 1799.³ However, as is the case with all generalisations, the somewhat sweeping assessment that Humboldt makes here about Malaspina’s fate and the burial of his labours in unnamed archives can be disputed in several respects. There were, of course, probably a number of factors besides the arrest of its leader that conspired against the large-scale and prompt publication of the results of the expedition (the revolution in neighbouring France and its political consequences were an obvious distraction from such a task), and similarly the same political intrigue which resulted in Malaspina’s imprisonment did not lead automatically an abrupt and total end to the careers of

2 They were Malaspina’s botanist Luis Née (see below) and the hydrographer José de Espinosa. With regard to the former, see Alexander von Humboldt, *Personal Narrative of Travels to the Equinoctial Regions of the New Continent during the Years 1799-1804*. Transl. by Helen Maria Williams. London: Longman, Hurst et al., 1818, vol. 1, p. 24; with regard to the latter, see Humboldt, *Political Essay on the Kingdom of New Spain*, vol. 1, p. xxv.
3 Humboldt, *Personal Narrative of Travels to the Equinoctial Regions*, vol. 1, p. 43.
everyone else who had sailed under him. Nor, as we shall see, did all the material collected in the course of the expedition languish completely unpublished or totally unseen for years afterwards due to purely political reasons—Humboldt himself had been able to consult some of this material prior to setting out for the Americas. Misconceptions, however, are not always quickly dispelled, and to a certain extent the main criteria by which Humboldt seems to be judging the overall success (or rather the failure) of Malaspina’s expedition—namely, dangers faced, misfortunes suffered, and the failure to publish results achieved—could just as easily be applied to the three naturalists who made up his primary scientific staff, only one of whom ever actually returned to Spain: Antonio Pineda (1753-1792), Luis Née (1734-1807) and Tadeo Haenke (1761-1816). In what follows, I will briefly survey the prior careers of these men, their work during the expedition, and their respective chequered fates. I will also consider just how typical their experiences actually were, compared with those of other scientific visitors to the Pacific of their time.

The chief naturalist on Malaspina’s scientific team was Antonio Pineda. He had been born in Guatemala to Spanish parents but had returned to Spain while still at a young age, where he was educated and later entered the military, eventually rising to the rank of first lieutenant in the Spanish army. After taking part in the siege of Gibraltar in 1782, he had taken up studies in the natural sciences, physics and chemistry, achieving a high degree of competence in all, and in 1788 was assigned to the Royal Museum of Natural Science where he completed a comprehensive study of the bird specimens on display there. Malaspina had decided on him as the head of his scientific staff in October of that year, and in a letter to the Spanish

---

5 Most notably the botanical collections brought back from the voyage that were then being overseen by Née. See Humboldt, Personal Narrative of Travels to the Equinoctial Regions, vol. 1, p. 24.
Minister of Marine Antonio Valdés described him as a man possessing

not only all the intelligence and capacity necessary for that science [i.e. natural history], but also an admirable energy and disposition, and that true love of new studies and new honors which can be the only motive and regard of such enterprises.  

Pineda’s appointment to the expedition was confirmed by the king two months later.

The second member of Malaspina’s scientific team was Luis Née, whose primary responsibility for the voyage lay in its botany. Née had been born in France, at le Perray en Yvelines, near Rambouillet, Île-de-France, to French parents, but had later moved to Spain and become a Spanish citizen. In the years prior to the expedition, he had botanised extensively in the Navarre and Basque regions of northern Spain, and was eventually placed in charge of the Royal Pharmaceutical Gardens (a private garden of the royal family) in Madrid. He was approached by Pineda to join the expedition in late 1788. Pineda described him as

a botanist with wide knowledge, consummate both in the theoretical and applied aspects of botany, an indefatigable man appropriate for this investigation having long experience in plant collecting in far provinces and mountains of the Kingdom.

Née’s appointment to the expedition also received royal confirmation, in February 1789.

The third member of Malaspina’s scientific staff, who appointed some five months later, was Thaddäus (or Tadeo, as he

---

was subsequently known in Spanish service) Haenke, who hailed from the small town of Kreibitz in German-speaking Bohemia, now part of the Czech Republic. Haenke was the youngest of the three main scientists on the expedition (twenty-seven years of age at the time of its departure, compared with Pineda’s thirty-six and Née’s remarkable fifty-five), but he was also by far the best trained, the most talented, and – in my own subjective opinion – the most interesting. The son of a large but impoverished family, he had studied medicine and botany in Prague and Vienna. In the latter city, he had come into close contact with and later enjoyed the patronage of some of Austria’s leading Enlightenment figures, most notably the botanist Nikolaus von Jacquin and the mineralogist Ignaz von Born. He was also known to the composer Mozart, and evidence has recently emerged in Vienna which suggests that he may have inspired the figure of the bird-catcher Papageno in Mozart’s opera *The Magic Flute.*

Haenke seems to have held hopes of sailing to the Pacific as an assistant to Georg Forster on the planned Russian expedition of Captain Grigory Ivanovich Mulovsky, but after this was cancelled in 1788, Born was instrumental in having him appointed to the Malaspina expedition instead. Although primarily

---


13 On Haenke’s appointment to the expedition, and Born’s role in it, see Renée Gicklhorn, “Neue Dokumente zum Beginn der Forschungsreisen von Thaddäus
a botanist, Haenke was really a jack-of-all-trades, as Donald Cutter very correctly describes him, and as the expedition progressed, he made a useful contribution to the areas of zoology, geology and ethnography as well.

Perhaps the most striking feature of this scientific team is the diverse national backgrounds of its three members. It was, of course, by no means unprecedented for eighteenth-century European voyages of exploration in the Pacific to have foreign nationals on their respective scientific staffs. The Russians, for instance, had allowed foreign scientists to sail on their ships as early as the 1740s on Bering’s second voyage, and would continue to do so for years after Malaspina returned home –most notably on the five great round-the-world voyages that Russia would send out between 1803 and 1826. More recently, Cook had taken Swedish and German naturalists with him to the Pacific –or at least until his patience in dealing with often difficult naturalists ran out, and he is alleged to have cursed all scientists and all science thrown into the bargain. 

---


15 The obvious example is of course the German naturalist Georg Wilhelm Steller, who sailed with Bering on the ill-fated *St Peter* and ministered to its survivors after it was wrecked, but there is also the French-born academician Louis Delisle de La Croyère who sailed on its sister-ship the *St Paul*, only to perish as it limped back to safety in Kamchatka. On both, see O. W. Frost, *Bering: The Russian Discovery of America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003, *passim*.

16 These scientists included Wilhelm Gottlieb Tilesius von Tilenau, Johann Caspar Horner, Georg von Langsdorff, and Karl von Espeberg (all of whom sailed on the 1803-1806 circumnavigation commanded by Adam Johann von Krusenstern); Adelbert von Chamisso and Martin Wormskiold (on the first circumnavigation of Otto von Kotzebue of 1815-1818); Emil Lenz, Ernst Hofmann, and Ernst Wilhelm Preis (on von Kotzebue’s second circumnavigation of 1823-1826); and Friedrich Heinrich von Kittlitz (on Friedrich Benjamin Lütke’s circumnavigation of 1826-1829). One naturalist – Johann Friedrich Eschscholtz – sailed on both of von Kotzebue’s voyages, thus making him the first German-speaking scientist to circumnavigate the globe twice. The two German scientists who were appointed to the Antarctic expedition of Fabian von Bellingshausen of 1819-1821 are mentioned below.

17 Namely, the Swedes Daniel Carl Solander and Herman Diedrich Spöring on his first voyage; and the German father-and-son team Johann Reinhold and Georg Forster, and their Swedish assistant botanist Anders Sparrman, on his second. J. C.
In a Spanish context, however, the international aspect of Malaspina’s scientific team is perhaps somewhat unusual, given the secrecy which Spain had traditionally employed to deny geographical knowledge of its possessions to its perceived rivals. This break with tradition could possibly have reflected the more progressive attitudes and the relative openness to intellectual and scientific exchange which was allowed to flourish under Carlos III.\(^18\)

The same spirit of scientific internationalism can also be seen in the impressive list of books which Pineda requested—and obtained—for the expedition prior to its sailing: it included works by Linnaeus, Buffon, Thunberg, Pallas, Pennant and the Forsters— to name just a few.\(^19\)

The voyage itself did not get off to a good start for one of our intrepid naturalists. Appointed to the expedition at the last minute, Tadeo Haenke suddenly found himself having to make a frantic dash across all of central Europe in order to reach Malaspina’s ships on time. Leaving Vienna on 26 June 1789, he travelled west via Munich, Strasburg, Paris (which he reached on the fourth of July, just ten days before the Bastille was stormed), Bordeaux, Bayonne, Madrid (where he had an audience with King Carlos IV), and finally arrived on the docks at Cádiz on 30 July—only to find that the two corvettes which made up the expedition, the \textit{Descubierta}, commanded by Malaspina himself, and the \textit{Atrevida}, commanded by his friend and fellow officer José de Bustamante, had sailed two hours previously. Haenke set off after them three weeks later on the next available ship, a Catalan merchantman with the seemingly reassuring name of \textit{Nuestra Señora del Buen Viaje} (“Our Lady of the Good Voyage”)— only for it to be wrecked as it pulled into the River Plate three months later. Haenke staggered ashore into Montevideo, having salvaged the few possessions that he could—only to be informed that the expedition had sailed for Cape Horn and the Pacific coast eight days earlier. With the assistance of the

\[\text{Beaglehole, } \textit{The Life of Captain James Cook}. \text{ Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974, p. 502.}\]
\[\text{\(^18\) See Engstrand, } \textit{Spanish Scientists in the New World}, \text{ pp. 3-12.}\]
Viceroy, Haenke replaced his equipment and set off on the overland route instead, crossing the pampas and cordillera, collecting hundreds of plant specimens along the way, and eventually catching up with the expedition at Valparaiso at the beginning of April the following year. Inauspicious as the start of his travels had been, he would not, however, be the last naturalist to miss a voyage of exploration to the Pacific. Thirty years later, Karl Heinrich Mertens and Gustav Kunze, two German botanists appointed to the Russian Antarctic expedition commanded by Bellingshausen, likewise failed to show up at the outset of their voyage.\(^{20}\)

Malaspina’s three scientists would not have known it at this time, but before them there now lay a further three years and three months of voyaging in Pacific waters and exploring the (mainly Spanish) territories that bordered the Pacific.\(^{21}\) First came several months’ sailing up the coast of South and Central America, which was broken by a series of calls, sometimes lasting up to several weeks, at Callao (in Peru), Guayaquil (in Ecuador), Puerto Perico (in Panama) and Puerto Realejo (in Nicaragua). On arriving at each location, the naturalists would rush ashore and busily collect all manner of botanical and zoological specimens, visit mines, and climb mountains. Specimens of marine life would also be collected, both in port and at sea while moving between stops. At each call – and indeed over much of the voyage as a whole– the expedition received valuable practical and logistical assistance from the local Spanish authorities, thus allowing the ships to be reprovisioned and

\(^{20}\) Unlike Haenke, however, Mertens and Kunze do not appear to have made any serious effort at all to try and make their appointed rendezvous in time, and Bellingshausen understandably regarded their non-appearance as “very annoying at this late hour”. See Bellingshausen, *The Voyage of Captain Bellingshausen to the Antarctic Seas, 1819-1821*. Transl. and ed. by Frank Debenham. London: Hakluyt Society, 1945, vol. 1, pp. 12, 18, and 33-34. Malaspina, by contrast, makes no comment in his journal about Haenke’s absence at the expedition’s sailing.

\(^{21}\) The most accessible outline of the work conducted by Malaspina’s scientists in the Americas is that provided by Engstrand in her study *Spanish Scientists in the New World*. For discussions of more specific aspects of their work, see also Engstrand’s articles “Of Fish and Men: Spanish Marine Science during the Late Eighteenth Century”, *The Pacific Historical Review* 69 (2000), pp. 3-30, and “Antonio Pineda and his Environmental Impact Survey of 1791: A Research Note”, *Colonial Latin American Historical Review* 9 (2000), pp. 487-508. For a more detailed account of the voyage as a whole, see David et al. (eds.), *The Malaspina Expedition*. 
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consignments of scientific material and associated reports to be expedited back to peninsular Spain at regular intervals along the way. In this respect at least, the Malaspina expedition—and its scientists—held a distinct advantage over other European missions into the Pacific up to that time which could not tap into the many resources afforded by a colonial infrastructure of their own.

Arriving at Acapulco in April 1791, Malaspina found new orders waiting for him which instructed him to head north and settle once and for all the question of a Northwest Passage, and also to investigate the Spanish outpost at Nootka Sound on present-day Vancouver Island, the conflicting claims to which had very nearly led to war with Britain the previous year. Abandoning a planned visit to Hawaii, Malaspina left Pineda and Née behind to travel to Mexico City and explore the surrounding parts of the viceroyalty while he took the two corvettes north. Haenke would be the sole naturalist on the ensuing five-month leg of the expedition, which sailed as far north as Port Mulgrave (now Yakutat Bay) in Alaska, before returning via Nootka Sound and Monterey (in California).

Haenke threw himself into his work, busily collecting items of scientific and ethnographic interest, and even recording the songs of the indigenous Tlingit people. In doing so, he became the first trained scientist to explore the mainland of the Pacific Northwest. In Monterey in particular, he became the first botanist to describe and collect samples of the giant redwood (Sequoia sempervirens), and while there he also observed in their natural habitat two trees that a hundred and fifty years later would come to occupy such a prominent place on the New Zealand landscape and in the New Zealand economy—the Monterey pine (or Pinus radiata) and the

---

23 For an outline of the Pacific Northwest leg of Malaspina’s voyage, and especially the visits to Alaska and California, see e.g. Engstrand, Spanish Scientists in the New World, pp. 58-75; Donald C. Cutter, Malaspina in California. San Francisco: John Howell, 1960; and Donald C. Cutter (ed.), Journal of Tomás de Suría of his Voyage with Malaspina to the Northwest Coast of America in 1791. Fairfield [Wash.]: Ye Galleon Press, 1980.
Monterey cypress (\textit{Cupressus macrocarpa}, known in here as the macrocarpa).\textsuperscript{25}

Returning to Acapulco in October 1791, the expedition was re-joined by Pineda and Née, who in the interim had not only amassed a valuable scientific haul, but had also obtained a comprehensive picture of life in New Spain.\textsuperscript{26} Malaspina now made ready to take the corvettes across the Pacific to the Philippines. Shortly before the expedition left in mid-December, Pineda sent a progress report to his colleague Gómez Ortega at the Royal Botanic Garden in Madrid in which he praised the work of Née and Haenke, and also gave a running total of some of the scientific results achieved so far: more than seven thousand plants had been collected, over five hundred species of animals described, and at least four hundred fossils examined.\textsuperscript{27}

The expedition then spent some seven weeks sailing across the Pacific to Guam, where it stopped for two weeks in the middle of February 1792, before sailing on to the Philippines, and dropping anchor there at the end of March. The expedition would remain based there until the following December. Malaspina’s scientists began to explore the main islands of the group with their customary enthusiasm and industry, but in early July, Antonio Pineda’s scientific zeal finally got the better of him, and he died of heatstroke out in the field, to the grief of all, leaving Tadeo Haenke as the principal scientist on the expedition for the next fifteen months.\textsuperscript{28}

Sailing from the Philippines at the beginning of December, Malaspina now steered his corvettes east then south towards the far southwest tip of the South Island of New Zealand, his primary objective being to conduct gravity experiments at Doubtful Sound.\textsuperscript{29}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item See the “Report of lumber produced at Monterey and useful for ship building and for houses” that was drawn up by members of the expedition and which is reproduced (in translation) in Cutter, \textit{Malaspina in California}, p. 78.
\item For an outline of Pineda and Née’s work in the meantime, see Engstrand, \textit{Spanish Scientists in the New World}, pp. 76-100.
\item Engstrand, \textit{Spanish Scientists in the New World}, pp. 101-102.
\item For a detailed report of Pineda’s death and burial, see David et al. (eds.), \textit{The Malaspina Expedition}, vol. 2, pp. 410-414.
\item See Robert J. King, “Puerto del Pendulo, Doubtful Sound: The Malaspina Expedition’s Visit to New Zealand in Quest of the True Figure of the Earth”, \textit{The}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
His three-day visit to our shores from 23-25 February 1793 was—sadly—an extremely brief one, and the science historian can only speculate wistfully what might have happened if our great navigator had decided not to proceed so soon to Port Jackson, and put in to nearby Dusky Sound instead after all—if only for a week or two. Malaspina may well have been surprised, and possibly a little alarmed, to see that a gang of sealers from New South Wales had already set up base amid the greenery—thus marking Britain’s first commercial expansion eastwards out of New Holland.30 Haenke and Née, meanwhile, would no doubt have gone about examining the dense but luxuriant local flora—when they weren’t being eaten alive by sandflies—and would also have marvelled at the teeming bird and marine life which Cook’s German naturalists Reinhold and Georg Forster had so admired when he called at the sound twenty years earlier.31

Alas, it was not to be. The only landing that actually did take place in the course of Malaspina’s visit to New Zealand was extremely short—no more than several hours—and was undertaken by just a handful of men in the Descubierta’s armed pinnace under the command of the junior officer Felipe Bauzá. Whether Haenke or Née were among that small group of men who were the only representatives of Spain to set foot on New Zealand soil in the eighteenth century is unclear. Malaspina makes no mention in his journal of them accompanying Bauzá, but he nevertheless makes the intriguing remark that Haenke “recognised” the dominant vegetation of the area, “a type of shrub of medium height”.32 As it would have

---

30 The gang had been left there by Captain William Raven of the Britannia in December 1792; he returned to relieve these men the following September. On Raven’s visits to Dusky Sound, see A. C. and N. C Begg, Dusky Bay. Christchurch: Whitcombe & Tombs Ltd., 1966, pp. 182-208.
32 This remark was struck through in the original draft of the journal. See Ricardo Cerezo Martínez, Diario General del Viaje por Alejandro Malaspina (In: La
been difficult for Haenke to identify any vegetation from the deck of the *Descubierta*, which was standing at least a couple of miles offshore during the landing, one naturally wonders if he managed to handle a sample of that vegetation somehow –perhaps one that had been brought back to the ship by the landing party. 33 If this was indeed the case, then that single piece of wood which was given to Haenke to examine as the *Descubierta* bobbed about at the entrance to Doubtful Sound may well have been the only piece of New Zealand biota that he or Née ever managed to hold, and in scientific terms it would certainly have symbolised the fleeting brevity of Malaspina’s visit to that particular neck of our woods. Perhaps the most enduring memorial to his scientists that now remains there is the fact that Née’s name now graces the group of small islands that lie at the entrance to Doubtful Sound –the Nee Islets 34– while the visit of the expedition itself is commemorated by a bronze plaque that was placed on Marcacines Point, on the south-east tip of nearby Bauza Island in the entrance to Doubtful Sound, in 1984. 35

 Eventually driven back from a possible landing by a raging gale, Malaspina turned for Port Jackson, where he arrived not quite two weeks later. 36 During the month that his expedition stayed there, Haenke and Née carried out further botanical work, 37 and Haenke also immersed himself in an examination of the zoology and mineralogy of the area around the young penal colony. 38 As far as Australian zoology is concerned, letters from Haenke now held in

---


33 My thanks to Robert J. King (Canberra) for his advice on this particular aspect of the visit of the Malaspina expedition to Doubtful Sound.

34 David et al. (eds.), *The Malaspina Expedition*, vol. 3, p. 59, n. 6.


38 Haenke’s assessment of the local geology is reported by Malaspina in his “Political Examination of the English Colonies in the Pacific”, cited (in translation) by King, *The Secret History of the Convict Colony*, pp. 104-105.
the archives of the Royal Botanical Gardens in Madrid provide a fascinating list of the specimens he sent back—and what he tried to call them. These were: four dried possums, a dried kangaroo, three kangaroo foetuses, three “squirrels”, a lizard, a “vampire”, two “weasels”, more than forty birds of fourteen different kinds, and a shark. Shortly before leaving Port Jackson, Haenke sent a letter, in Latin, to Joseph Banks, in which he wrote rapturously about the local flora.\(^3^9\)

The last stop of the expedition in the South Pacific was a ten-day visit at Vava’u, Tonga, at the end of May. As far as the natural history side of the visit there is concerned, Haenke dedicated most of his time to studying the local fish and bird species.\(^4^0\) Had he have been able to visit Dusky Sound two months earlier, he may well have encountered again, and certainly been reminded of, here in Vava’u, a distinctive red-beaked, purple-feathered swamp hen endemic to the South Pacific region—\textit{Porphyrio porphyrio}, or as we call it, the pukeko.\(^4^1\)

Alejandro Malaspina’s nineteen-month trans-Pacific cruise came to an end as his two corvettes dropped anchor two months later in Callao, Peru. Tadeo Haenke detached from the expedition there in September with instructions to make his way overland via Cuzco and Potosi, attending to botany, zoology and geology as went, and then to meet up with the ships again in Montevideo. Luis Née also detached from expedition shortly afterwards, when it called in Concepción in November of that year. As instructed, he travelled along the cordillera to Santiago, and then overland to Buenos Aires, where he rendezvoused as arranged with Malaspina, and sailed back to Spain with the expedition, finally arriving there in September 1794.

Née was the only one of Malaspina’s three scientists to actually return home. Upon arriving back, he set about trying to


\(^{4^0}\) See Storrs L. Olson, “Birds, including extinct species, encountered by the Malaspina Expedition on Vava’u, Tonga, in 1793”, \textit{Archives of Natural History} 33 (2006), p. 43.

\(^{4^1}\) Olson, “Birds, including extinct species, encountered by the Malaspina Expedition”, pp. 47-48.
write up the botanical results of the voyage—which was clearly going to be an enormous task. By Née’s own estimate, the entire botanical haul from the voyage amounted to just under 16,000 specimens, of which he claimed to have personally collected around 12,000.\footnote{Madulid, “The Life and Work of Luis Née”, pp. 44-45.} By comparison, Banks and Solander had collected a “mere” 3,000 specimens on Cook’s first voyage, while Humboldt and Bonpland would collect around 6,000 on their journey to the Americas between 1799 and 1804.\footnote{Estimated totals for the respective collections of Banks/Solander and Humboldt/Bonpland have been taken from: Domingo A. Madulid, “The Botanical Results of the Malaspina Expedition (1789-1794)”, 
*Kalikasan. Philippine Journal of Biology* 12 (1983), p. 2.} As it happened, Humboldt would examine Née’s collection in Madrid as he prepared for his own expedition to the New World, and would later describe it as “one of the greatest herbals that was ever seen in Europe”.\footnote{Humboldt, *Personal Narrative of Travels to the Equinoctial Regions*, vol. 1, p. 24.} Time, however, was against Luis Née. Already aged sixty on his return to Spain, he only ever managed to publish four short articles on the botany of the voyage, and eventually died in October 1807.\footnote{A number of the plants Née had collected during the expedition had, however, been described in the meantime by Antonio José Cavanilles, the director of the Royal Botanic Gardens in Madrid, in volumes 4, 5, and 6 of his *Icones et descriptiones plantarum* (Madrid, 1797-1801). Née’s own publications are discussed by Madulid, “The Life and Work of Luis Née”, pp. 43-44.}

Haenke, meanwhile, who had set off from Callao in the autumn of 1793 with instructions to cross overland to Montevideo, never got beyond the highlands of Upper Peru.\footnote{The best sources for Haenke’s activities in South America are Gicklhorn’s *Thaddäus Haenkes Reisen und Arbeiten in Südamerika*, and Ibañez Montoya’s *Trabajos científicos y correspondencia de Tadeo Haenke*.} After spending several years exploring the area and conducting scientific work in the services of the Viceroy, he eventually settled near Cochabamba in present-day Bolivia, where he spent the remainder of his life practising medicine, botanising, and attending to the interests of the local Indian people—to name just a few activities. Curiously, he seems to have regarded himself as a member of the expedition for many years after it had actually returned home, and, even more curiously, he continued to draw a salary as such from the government for many years afterwards too—which was possibly not
a wise thing to do, given that the hot winds of revolution had started to blow through the continent. He was ordered back to Spain in 1810, but politely declined, citing the deteriorating political situation as an excuse.

Haenke eventually died, suddenly, in November 1816. Legend has it that he accidentally poisoned himself—which would appear most implausible given his training as a doctor, but perhaps not quite so implausible given the misfortunes he endured in getting to the Americas in the first place. Haenke had continued to send natural history material back to Spain for some years after leaving the expedition—this included some forty crates of material as late as 1799—and his own collection of plants gathered both during and after the voyage may well have amounted to some 15,000 specimens. However, a large part of this has not survived, and what is left has been dispersed among a number of institutions around the world. He is also known to have left an equally massive collection of papers describing what he saw both on the voyage and afterwards in South America, but sadly a large part of this has been lost as well. Several thousand manuscript pages do survive in Spanish archives, but Haenke’s use of multiple languages, personal code and old German script tend to beggar the efforts—and the patience—of scholars who consult these notes.

47 The exact date of Haenke’s death (4 November) remained a mystery until it was established by Renée Gicklhorn in the course of extensive detective work in South America in the late 1960s. See her article “Neue Ergebnisse der Haenkeforschung”, Bohemia 11 (1970), pp. 348-360, but in particular pp. 354-355.
49 Madulid (“The Botanical Results of the Malaspina Expedition”, p. 10) lists some twenty-three institutions known to hold (or to have held) plants collected by Haenke. The largest surviving collection of plants made by Haenke is that which made its way to Prague, part of which was described by Karl Presl and published under the title of Reliquiae Haenkeanae, seu Descriptiones et icones plantarum, quas in America meridionali et boreali, in insulis Philippinis et Marianas collegit Thaddaeus Haenke (Prague: J. G. Calve, 1830).
50 For a discussion and overview of the surviving manuscript material, see e.g. Gicklhorn, Thaddäus Haenkes Reisen und Arbeiten in Südamerika.
By the time of Haenke’s death in November 1816, two decades had already passed since the trial and imprisonment of his former commander Alejandro Malaspina. The latter’s great voyage, as is apparent from his choice of naturalists and the tasks they performed en route, had been conceived and undertaken with a clearly stated scientific objective in mind from the very beginning, although there were, of course, other less explicitly stated objectives of a more political nature that also underlay the mission, such as inspecting Spain’s overseas empire and ascertaining how far other European powers were seeking to encroach into regions which Spain regarded as its own. This combination of scientific and geopolitical interests was by no means unique to Malaspina’s voyage of exploration, and the French expedition commanded by Nicolas Baudin to Australia (1800-1803) is but one other contemporary example that can be given here of an expedition that combined natural history objectives with elements of a strategic reconnaissance.

Nor was the experience of Malaspina’s scientists on his voyage by any means exceptional either. I have already mentioned one or two things that these men had in common with other naturalists visiting the Pacific, and in concluding now, I will just mention one or two more. If we ignore, for the moment, the somewhat unusual fact that their commander was imprisoned soon after completing what was generally considered a successful mission, and if we also ignore the fact that Malaspina frequently and unstintingly praised his scientists in his journal (and captains of his day did not always suffer travelling naturalists gladly), then the

---

51 See e.g. Cutter, “Introduction”, p. xxix.
52 This, of course, was one of the reasons why Malaspina called at Port Jackson; see King, The Secret History of the Convict Colony.
53 On Baudin, see e.g. Frank Horner, The French Reconnaissance. Baudin in Australia. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1987, esp. pp. 53-56. Baudin’s expedition to the Pacific – which he had begun, like Malaspina a decade earlier, with two corvettes – was actually his second voyage with a scientific objective: between 1796 and 1798, he had also commanded a natural history expedition to the Caribbean.
54 See David et al. (eds.), The Malaspina Expedition, passim.
various experiences of these three men throughout the expedition—and afterwards—are actually quite similar to what we know about other scientists travelling to, in, and from the Pacific around that time.

Singly or collectively, Pineda, Née and Haenke had to endure the extremes of tropical heat and the frigid cold of high latitudes; they had to contend with storms at sea and frantic bursts of scientific activity once they hit land; they had to avoid close encounters with poisonous animals and plants; and they also found themselves confined to cramped cabins, surrounded by ever growing collections of smelly specimens which they had to protect as best they could from extremes of climate and from hungry insects. There is also the fact that scientists who travelled to the Pacific in the long eighteenth century did not always return home to the same port on the same ship on which they had left. It was not unknown for travelling naturalists to detach from an expedition at an intermediate point (e.g. Sparrman, who left Cook’s second voyage at the Cape of Good Hope, 56 and Langsdorff, who left Krusenstern’s voyage at Kamchatka),57 sometimes never to return home (e.g. Bougainville’s Commerson, who died at Mauritius).58 Nor was it unknown for travelling scientists to die in the course of the expedition (e.g. all of La Pérouse’s remaining scientists when that expedition was lost).59 There was even a precedent for a former voyaging scientist dying in a foreign land years later after being trapped there by a revolution—

59 As far as can be ascertained, La Pérouse had a scientific staff of four when his ships were eventually lost in the autumn of 1788: the astronomer Joseph Lapaute Dagelet, the zoologist and chemist (and chaplain) Jean-André Mongez, the botanist Joseph Boissieu de Lamartinière, and the gardener Nicolas Collignon. His geologist, Jean Honoré Robert de Paul de Lamanon, had been killed when the landing party he was in was ambushed in Samoa in December 1787, and the chaplain-naturalist Claude François Joseph Receveur succumbed several weeks later, to wounds he had sustained in the same affray, while the expedition was visiting Botany Bay in February 1788. See John Dunmore, *Where Fate Beckons. The Life of Jean-François de la Pérouse*. Auckland: Exisle Publishing, 2006, pp. 188-190; cf. pp. 242-243 and 247-248.
namely Georg Forster, who died in Paris in 1794.⁶⁰ And last but not least there is the important fact that it was very much the rule, rather than the exception, for travelling scientists of the day not to get around to publishing the results of their voyage after the event. Indeed, what eventually did appear under their name often appeared posthumously: the elder Forster’s definitive account of the zoology of Cook’s second voyage, for instance, did not appear until 1844,⁶¹ while the younger Forster’s major work on that voyage’s botany only began to be published in 2003.⁶² In this context, it is perhaps worth remembering also that the journal of Archibald Menzies, the botanist on the voyage of George Vancouver (1791-1795), has never been published in its entirety to this day.

To put all this very succinctly, then: There never was an easy or safe eighteenth-century voyage to the Pacific, nor was there ever a perfectly documented one either—and in these key respects, the trials, tribulations and general misfortunes of Malaspina’s scientists were entirely typical for seagoing naturalists of their age.

⁶⁰ For more information on Forster’s last days in Paris, see e.g. Ludwig Uhlig, Georg Forster: Lebensabenteuer eines gelehrten Weltbürgers (1754-1794). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004, pp. 325-342.
⁶¹ The manuscript was edited by Heinrich Lichtenstein, and appeared under the title Descriptiones Animalium, quae in itinere ad Maris Australis Terras per annos 1772, 1773 et 1774 suscepto collegit, observavit et delineavit Ioannes Reinoldus Forster (Berlin, 1844).
PROFILES OF CONTRIBUTORS
AND ABSTRACTS
José Colmeiro

Preface. European Explorations in The South Pacific: The Underexplored Narratives of the Malaspina Expedition

The “scientific and political voyage” led by Alejandro Malaspina around the Pacific in 1789-1794 is being hailed nowadays as the most important Spanish contribution to the Enlightenment. This view, however, does not reflect the way things have been in the not-too-distant past. The trajectory of Alejandro Malaspina is in itself a fascinating history lesson, running in parallel to the development of Spanish and world history in the last two centuries. Upon his return to Spain from his five-year long expedition, Malaspina was received with great honours, was promoted to Rear Admiral, and plans for publication of his journals were officially sanctioned. However, political turmoil and Malaspina’s reformist views condemned him and the results of his expedition to historical oblivion for a long time. Interestingly, in one of those uncanny historical coincidences, the death of Malaspina in exile in 1810 took place on the same year of the declaration of independence of Mexico, and the beginning of the end of the Spanish Empire. In retrospect, it could be argued that Malaspina saw it coming, but nobody cared to listen.

Professor José Colmeiro received his PhD from the University of California, Berkeley. He currently holds the Prince of Asturias Chair in Spanish Studies at the University of Auckland since 2010. He works on modern Spanish cultural studies, in the areas of narrative, cinema, popular culture, gender, and memory studies. His research interests include comparative literature, transatlantic, and lately, transpacific studies. He has published extensively on varied topics such as historical memory, detective fiction, exile cultural production, testimonial literature, representations of Gypsies in popular culture, and Galician rock, among others.
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Not a Trace, however Remote, of Inhabitants: Malaspina’s Visit to Doubtful Sound, New Zealand, 25 February 1793

When Malaspina’s expedition made landfall off Doubtful Sound on 25 February 1793, Don Felipe Bauzá was despatched with an armed boat to explore and chart the fiord. During his visit, Bauzá saw very few birds and a few small limpets on the rocks, but no seals nor signs of local inhabitants. This brief essay will discuss Malaspina’s fleeting contact with New Zealand.
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Ceremonial Encounters: Malaspina in the Pacific

After Quirós’ 1606 voyage, the Spanish crown did not sponsor any voyages to the South Pacific until the eighteenth century. Following upon the new era of Pacific exploration, the Spaniards took a renewed interest in this part of the globe. Five significant Spanish explorations took place during this time, the last one of which was the five-year ‘scientific expedition’ led by Alessandro Malaspina. The expedition reached the Vava’u group of
islands in the Tongan archipelago, travelling from the North Pacific to the Philippines, Australia and New Zealand, where it left some names on the landscape in 1793. At Vava’u, which had been ‘discovered’ twelve years earlier by another Spanish explorer, Francisco Mourelle de la Rúa, Malaspina’s expedition participated in the series of ceremonial encounters on which this essay will concentrate. The artists of Malaspina’s expedition produced a large number of drawings and sketches of Vava’u, paying special attention to coastal profiles, personal portraits and ceremonial gatherings. These representations are a form of observation which embraced nature and non-European cultures, all visible from the gaze that Mary Louise Pratt labelled ‘imperial eye’. Unlike coastal views, however, the ceremonial drawings undermine the notion of a ‘disembodied viewer’ whose gaze is cast upon a world apprehended in panorama-like form. Instead, they reveal the gaze of a masculine eye/I that provides an early example of ethnographic ‘participant observation’. The drawings, moreover, trace some interesting associations between indigenous people, women and the land that rehearse Jan van der Straet’s paradigmatic representation of Amerigo Vespucci’s arrival in the Americas.
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The Malaspina Expedition in Vava’u 1793

European explorers entered the Pacific in the late 18th and early 19th century on august scientific expeditions with clear designs to describe and categorize all that they saw. The Pacific, with its seemingly geographically discrete islands, was thought to provide a perfect and natural environment for this encounter. The 1789-1794 voyage commanded by Alejandro Malaspina and José Bustamante y Guerra has been categorized as Spain’s biggest contribution to these great expeditions. In May 1793 the Spaniards spent two weeks in the archipelago of Vava’u. While completely unfamiliar with Tongan custom and history, except for what was gleaned from the accounts of James Cook, the Spanish created an interesting snapshot of the archipelago at a significant time in the history of Tonga. This essay examines the nature of the ethnological descriptions and images from the Spanish visit to Vava’u.
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More Famous for their Misfortunes than for their Scientific Discoveries? Malaspina’s Scientists and their Contribution to his Expedition

Any discussion of the achievements of Malaspina’s expedition will inevitably be overshadowed by the fact that Malaspina himself became entangled in palace intrigues soon after his return to Spain. Consequently, the results of the expedition remained largely unpublished for many decades afterwards. It is easy and tempting, perhaps – although, of course, quite wrong – to equate the failure to publish the results of a mission promptly with the failure of the mission as a whole. However, to what extent did the unfortunate blanket of silence that descended upon the Malaspina expedition after its return also affect the achievements and scholarly reputations of the three principal naturalists on the voyage – Antonio Pineda (1753-1792), Luis Née (1734-1807) and Tadeo Haenke (1761-1816)? In order to answer this question, this essay will briefly survey the prior careers of these three men, their involvement in the Malaspina expedition, and their respective chequered fates. It will also briefly compare their experiences with those of naturalists participating in other eighteenth-century voyages to the Pacific, and, in doing so, will attempt to ascertain just how typical their trials and tribulations actually were for sea-going scientists of their time.
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