The origins of the name *New South Wales*

In the 250 years since Lt James Cook first bestowed it, the name *New South Wales* has been applied to a variety of areas of the Australian continent and beyond. There has been a great deal of confusion over when, where and why Cook gave the name to the land that he claimed for King George III at Possession Island on 22 August 1770:

I now once more hoisted English Coulers and in the Name of His Majesty took possession of the whole Eastern Coast down to this place by the name of New South Wales, together with all the Bays, Harbours Rivers and Islands situate upon the said coast…

Much of the confusion about what name was given to Cook’s ‘Eastern Coast’, and when, results from different versions of the *Endeavour* journal being available to different writers over the years since the voyage.

Eventually Beaglehole managed to sort out the likely pattern of events. In the Textual Introduction to his edited version of Cook’s *Endeavour* Journal he exhaustively traced the provenance and content of the various journal copies. Beaglehole’s edit is based on the Canberra Manuscript (CM, now housed in the National Library, Canberra). CM is the holograph, autograph or original Journal. There are earlier versions which differ in content. CM did not emerge from private collections until 1923 and, as Beaglehole (writing in the 1950s) says, this version is ‘the product of a great deal of writing, drafting and redrafting, summarising and expanding, with afterthoughts both of addition and deletion’. As writers before Beaglehole depended on earlier versions, their accounts vary, and this has led to confusion about the name that Cook settled on.

*continued page 3*
From the Editor

To round off the 250th anniversary year of James Cook’s navigation of our eastern coast, we asked Trevor Lipscombe if he could tell us why Cook came up with the name New South Wales and what he might have intended by that. You’ll already have noticed that it’s our front-page article this time...

The other defining characteristic of 2020 has been the COVID19 virus: toponymically-named viruses have been a feature of recent issues. Our final viral effort for the year, by Jan Tent, gives a guernsey to Dandenong (p. 11)—but if you look carefully you’ll see that there’s yet another toponymic virus mentioned on page 13.

David Blair
<editor@anps.org.au>

We recommend...

...a recent publication that will be of interest to many of our readers. More than mere words is a collection of essays in honour of Australian linguist Peter Sutton which is co-edited by our colleague Michael Walsh. There’s a selection of chapters on language as a reflection of connection to place, and the book is recommended as ‘perfect for anyone interested in the study of Indigenous Australian place names’. The list of contributors reveals names well-known to readers of Placenames Australia: as well as Michael Walsh, authors include Luise Hercus, Clair Hill, Harold Koch, David Nash and Jane Simpson. Published in July 2020 by Wakefield Press, this paperback volume is available from Amazon and other outlets.

Boiling Springs -- replies from our readers

We asked if any readers could help entomologist Allen Sundholm to identify the location ‘Boiling Springs’, found on an old specimen label he was working on.

David Nash noted that Boiling Springs (northwest of Hopevale, near Cooktown) apparently was an alternative name for the Lutheran Mission there. And he also pointed out Boiling Springs Rd at Cooranga, northwest of Toowoomba.

John Schauble passed on newspaper references from the Trove archive, including several to what is clearly the Hopevale location near Cooktown.

Barbara Crighton pointed out Boiling Springs Lookout, off Boiling Springs Rd, near Cooranga—as did Glen French who also provided a mapping illustration.

Sally Cripps (Queensland Country Life) found an archived story for us, referencing the Boiling Springs Droughtmaster stud at ‘Croydon Park’ property, near Meandarra.

Allen says thankyou to all those who replied. He’s inclined to go with the Cooranga location, since it’s the nearest to where the beetle is known to occur.

Puzzle answers - (from page 14)

1. Denmark
2. China Bay
3. England Creek
4. New South Wales
5. Scotland Island
6. Chile Head
7. Holland Lake
8. Mount Italy
9. Spain Bay
10. Little Austria
11. France Bay
12. Indian Island
13. Egypt
14. Siberia
15. Japan Creek
16. Canada Bay
17. America Bay
18. Africa Gully
19. Cuba State Forest
20. Jordan River
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There were at least three copies of the Journal aboard *Endeavour* when the ship reached Batavia (today's Jakarta) in October 1770. One of these, now known as the Mitchell Manuscript (and now housed in the Mitchell Library, Sydney), was despatched to the Admiralty by Cook from Batavia on 24 October 1770, while CM and another more complete copy, the Admiralty Manuscript, stayed with the ship until its return to Britain.

Beaglehole explains that ‘It is clear that the name was not given at once, and that in fact Cook took possession of the east coast without naming it at all’. At some time on the voyage between Possession Island and Batavia a naming decision was made and the name *New Wales* was added to the journal copies. At Batavia the Mitchell Manuscript was despatched to Britain showing this name. Then, at some time during the voyage between Batavia and Britain, *New Wales* was changed to *New South Wales*.

Hence the first Journal to arrive in Britain had the name *New Wales*, while those that arrived on Cook’s return showed the name as *New South Wales*. It should be remembered that Cook had previously revised initial naming decisions, so that (according to Beaglehole) Sting ray’s harbour became, successively, Sting-Rays Harbour, Botanist Harbour, Botanist Bay and Botany Bay.

The question arises, why *New Wales* and later *New South Wales*? There seems to be no definitive answer to this question, but many theories. It was the fashion of the day to link the names of new European discoveries with the old lands of their finders. Examples for Cook were readily at hand in the already named New Holland and the recently visited New Zealand.

Beaglehole says:

*The obvious guess is that as there was already a New Britain and a Nova Scotia, New Wales might not come unnaturally to Cook's mind. There was also Carteret's New Ireland, but Cook did not know that yet. But then there was a New Wales—named also New South Wales—in existence on eighteenth century maps: what corresponds to the present north Ontario, abutting on Hudson’s Bay… It looks as if Cook settled on his name, New Wales; remembered that it was already taken; then, forgetting that New South Wales was also taken, inserted South to make the distinction.*

Having spent several recent summers charting Newfoundland and parts of today’s Canada, and having a professional interest in charts, one might expect that Cook would have been aware of both these names, bestowed in the early 1600s.

Other suggestions include that on the same day, Cook, who had been sprinkling royal names in the area including York Cape, had named Prince of Wales Isles which might have brought Wales to mind. Or maybe it was Banks’ suggestion, as he had spent many happy summers visiting an uncle on the south Wales coast? Or was it that the land resembled the coast of South Wales—hardly. It has also been suggested that the addition of ‘south’ may have been a reference to the southern hemisphere, as if ‘New’ was not enough.

Before Beaglehole, confusion about the final name was strongly influenced by three widely read authors, all of whom asserted that Cook had named New Wales.

Frank Murcott Bladen was the editor of Volume 1 of the Historical Records of New South Wales, 1893, which covers Cook’s exploration of the eastern coast.
on yet another Journal fragment showing New Wales, and was also aware of John Hawkesworth’s first published account of the voyage (1773) which uses New South Wales. Hawkesworth had access to the latest copies of the Journal brought back to Britain by Cook in 1771. Bladen wrote ‘it is a remarkable fact that nowhere in the original papers of either Cook or any of his officers does the name of New South Wales appear’. He claims that the first mention of New South Wales is in Hawkesworth, and concludes ‘It will be seen from the above that there is no foundation for the popular impression that Cook bestowed the name New South Wales on the territory in consequence of a fancied resemblance of the coastline to parts of the coast of South Wales. It is evident that, if Cook had taken possession of the country by the name of New South Wales (as stated by Hawkesworth), reference would have been made to it somewhere in the many original logs’. He concludes ‘it very greatly strengthens the contention that the name “New South Wales” originated with Hawkesworth’.

William J L Wharton’s edited edition of Cook’s Endeavour Journal, Captain Cook’s First Voyage, published in London in 1893 was based on the Mitchell Manuscript sent to Britain from Batavia, and so also used the name New Wales. Wharton was a British Rear Admiral and Hydrographer of the Royal Navy for 20 years. This was a key source for students of Cook’s Endeavour voyage until the publication of Beaglehole’s edition, based on the Canberra Manuscript, in 1955.

G. Arnold Wood wrote in his Discovery of Australia (1922): ‘Cook has a way of naming places without giving his reasons; and when his reasons are given by another, they are not always reasons that would have occurred to everybody’. Perhaps influenced by Bladen, he also suggests that the name New South Wales originated in Hawkesworth’s editing.

In short, there is no clear explanation of why Cook chose New Wales as the name for the eastern coasts he explored on the Australian continent, or for his later decision to change the name to New South Wales. Thanks to Beaglehole, we do know, approximately at least, when these names were given and where.

Cook might have been surprised that the name he chose for the eastern coasts of New Holland has since identified a bewildering range of different land (and sea) areas. In 1787 Arthur Phillip was appointed to:

be Our Captain General and Governor in Chief of Our Territory called New South Wales extending from the Northern Cape or Extremity of the Coast called Cape York in the Latitude of Ten Degrees thirty seven Minutes south, to the Southern Extremity of the said Territory of New South Wales, or South Cape, in the Latitude of Forty three Degrees Thirty nine Minutes south, and of all the Country Inland to the Westward as far as the One hundred and Thirty fifth Degree of East Longitude, reckoning from the Meridian of Greenwich including all the Islands adjacent in the Pacific Ocean within the Latitudes aforesaid of 10º 37’ South, and 43º 39’ South, and of all Towns, Garrisons, Castles, Forts, and all other Fortifications, or other Military Works which may be hereafter erected upon the said Territory, or any of the said Islands.

This was the vast area which Phillip later proclaimed, defining the western extent to include nearly half of the continent, and now including Van Diemens Land, plus ‘all the Islands adjacent in the Pacific Ocean’ for an unspecified distance to the east.

This area was later extended westward to 129 degrees east in 1825, at which point New South Wales reached its largest extent. In the same year Van Diemens Land became a separate colony, and New South Wales began to shrink as other colonies were established from it. It assumed its current extent following the excision of the Australian Capital Territory and Jervis Bay Territory in the early 1900s. As an afterthought in 2001, the remaining and present day New South Wales was officially named and had its boundaries declared.

---

**References**


Did Tasman name Groote Eylandt?

It is commonly claimed that Groote Eylandt was named by Abel Tasman in 1644 (Anindilyakwa Land Council; Appleton & Appleton, 1992; Cole, 1983; Encyclopaedia Britannica; Hill, 2013; Ingleton, 1988; McHugh, 2006; Northern Territory Place Names Register; and Reed, 1973). None of these sources provide any evidence to substantiate the assertion; this may be because there seems to be no cartographic or historical documentary evidence to support the claim.1

Groote Eylandt is Australia’s fourth largest island, measuring some 50km east to west by 60km north to south, with an area of 2,326 sq km. It lies just off the eastern coast of Arnhem Land. The traditional owners of the island are the Warnindhilyagwa people who speak the Anindilyakwa language. David Nathan (Linguist, Groote Eylandt Language Centre, p.c. 24/4/2020) notes Ayangkidarrba is the Anindilyakwa name for the island, and simply means ‘island’.

There is no doubt Flinders sighted and circumnavigated the island in 1803 during his 1801-03 circumnavigation of the continent. He paid tribute to the Dutch who preceded him by adopting, where appropriate, the names he noted on the ‘old charts’ which he had in his possession either during the voyage or after. His journal entry for January 4, 1803 reads:

The weather remained squally, and wind unsettled during the night. In the morning our course was continued to the northward, leaving extensive land, which I supposed to be the Groot Eylandt of the old charts, six or eight leagues on the starbord [sic] hand. […]

Flinders (Vol. II, 1814:182)
Holland, Staeten Landt (NZ), and the south-western Pacific, and includes Tasman’s sailing tracks of his 1642-43 and 1644 voyages. It clearly indicates his route between Groote Eylandt and Arnhem Land. The former, mysteriously, remained unnamed.

I have examined 126 maps and manuscript charts, dating from 1644 to 1859, showing the Gulf of Carpentaria. The vast majority of these show an unnamed Groote Eylandt. The first to show an appellation for the island were two anonymous maps (one of which is attributed to Isaaq de Graaff, official cartographer for the VOC) dated sometime in the 17th century. These maps show Groote Eylandt named as Vander Lyns Eylt. The next map to show a name for the island is de Haan [1760?] which similarly names the island Vanderlijns Eijlandt. The first map to bestow a form of the current name, Groote Eyland, is that of Sayer (1787). From that date an increasing number of maps give the name variously as: Great I., Groote I., Great Eyland, Gr. Eyland, Great Land, Great Isle, Grooder Eyland, Groote Eyland and, ultimately, Flinders’ Groote Eylandt of 1814. Interestingly, none of these maps was published by a Dutch map maker until that of Bogaerts (1857) who labelled it Groot Eiland.

In January 1803, Flinders circumnavigated Groote Eylandt. He initially simply labelled it ‘m’. On a working sheet dated 1804 he named it Groote Eyland (Bréelle, 2013), later changing it to Groote Eylandt (Fig. 2.)

Flinders does not specifically say from where he adopted the name, nor does he mention the name was conferred by Tasman, but merely makes an oblique reference to ‘the old charts’, which could refer to any of the English charts of the later 17th century that bore the name.

**Documentary Evidence?**

Unfortunately, no documentary sources exist, prior to Flinders’ journal entries, that provide any details of the naming of Groote Eylandt. However, there are some VOC documents which show that considerable confusion existed during the 17th and 18th centuries as to the actual referents of a number of toponyms relating to islands in the region of Groote Eylandt. Great uncertainty existed as to the referents of Arnhems Land and Speultslandt, Arnhems Eijland and Speulds Eijland (also referred to as Eijlanden Arnhem or eijlant Arnhem, and Speult or Speuls eijlant), and Van der Lijns eijlant. This confusion is clearly articulated by the renowned Dutch historian Heeres (1899, vi):

In the course of the same expedition [i.e. that of Carstenszoon & van Coolsteerdt in 1623] discovery was also made of Arnhemsland on the west-coast of the Gulf of Carpentaria, and almost certainly also of the so-called Groote Eyland or Van der Lijns-island (Van Speultsland). The whole of the southern part of the gulf remained, however, unvisited.

**Linguistic Evidence?**

Another method of establishing whether Tasman named Groote Eylandt or not involves analysing his naming practices; in other words, his language use. The examination of linguistic style (language use) is known as ‘stylometry’, which utilises statistical analyses of texts in evaluating an author’s style to attribute authorship. This practice has legal as well as academic applications in that it is often used to attribute authorship to anonymous or disputed documents and texts (e.g. the authorship of purported Shakespeare works).
For the present case, all of the names and appellations bestowed by Tasman on his two voyages of discovery were noted and totalled, itemised and classified according to the ANPS toponym typology (Tent & Blair, 2009/2014; 2011) and geographic feature class (see Blair, 2014). In all, 68 separate locations named by Tasman were noted (see Table 1). If the five copied toponyms are added to the 43 eponymous ones (because copied toponyms may be considered a form of eponymous name), then there are a total of 48 such names. The relative frequency probability (RFP) of an eponymous toponym is $RFP = \frac{48}{68} = 0.70$. There are eight descriptive toponyms (giving a RFP of $\frac{8}{68} = 0.12$), six topographic descriptors (RFP $\frac{6}{88} = 0.09$), four occurrent toponyms (RFP $\frac{4}{68} = 0.06$), and two associative toponyms (RFP $\frac{2}{68} = 0.03$). It may be concluded from these figures that the probability of Tasman conferring an eponymous name upon Groote Eylandt is significantly higher than his giving it a descriptive name (which Groote Eylandt is): $RFP = 0.70$ vs $0.12$, respectively.

Very similar patterns of RFPs are seen when the naming patterns of the 25 island names are considered: eponymous (+ copied) names (RFP $\frac{17}{25} = 0.68$), descriptive (RFP $\frac{2}{25} = 0.08$), occurrent (RFP $\frac{2}{25} = 0.08$), associative (RFP $\frac{2}{25} = 0.08$), and topographic descriptor (RFP $\frac{2}{25} = 0.08$). From this second perspective it can again be seen that the probability of Tasman bestowing the descriptive name Groote Eylandt on the island is significantly less than an eponymous name: $RFP = 0.08$ vs 0.68, respectively. Moreover, given Groote Eylandt is such a prominent terrestrial marine feature, it seems highly unlikely, at least from a stylometric standpoint, that Tasman would have furnished it with a descriptive name. This is corroborated by probability theory. The other conspicuous features—estuaries(streams), bays, capes, anchorages and bights—all bear more eponymous names than any other type of feature, thus also increasing the RFP of Tasman conferring an eponymous name on Groote Eylandt.

### Conclusion

#### What do we know?

1. There was considerable confusion within the VOC as to the geography of the north-eastern coastline of Arnhem Land, with various appellations given to what are possibly the same feature.
2. The first cartographic evidence of Tasman’s 1644 voyage is shown on the Tasman Bonaparte Map.
3. For some reason Groote Eylandt remained unlabelled on this map.
4. The first maps on which the island was labelled appeared sometime during the 17th century. It was then identified as Vânder Lyns Eyl.
5. The first map to show a form of its current name was Sayer’s map of 1787, with other maps following suit relatively soon after, with all bearing variations of the name. None of these maps is Dutch until the Bogaerts’ map of 1857.
6. It is not known from where Sayer obtained the name Groot Eyland.
7. Flinders circumnavigates the island in 1803, and initially labels the island ‘m’, later adopting the name Groote Eyland, and subsequently Groote Eylandt.
8. It is not clear from where Flinders sourced the name.
9. Stylometric evidence does not support Tasman’s bestowal of the descriptive name Groote Eylandt.
10. Directly transparent documentary sources from the VOC that reference the bestowal of the name have not been found.

Tasman’s charts show that he was astute in showing the names of prominent and important topographic features he discerned on his two voyages. This was, after all, a

### Table 1. Toponym types by their feature class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Class</th>
<th>Eponymous</th>
<th>Copy</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Occurrent</th>
<th>Associative</th>
<th>Topographic Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Island (n. 25)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estuary/Stream (n. 14)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay (n. 8)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape (n. 6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage (n. 4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point (n. 3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bight (n. 3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain (n. 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoal (n. 2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring/Stream? (n. 1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(+ copied) names (RFP $\frac{17}{25} = 0.68$), descriptive (RFP $\frac{2}{25} = 0.08$), occurrent (RFP $\frac{2}{25} = 0.08$), associative (RFP $\frac{2}{25} = 0.08$), and topographic descriptor (RFP $\frac{2}{25} = 0.08$). From this second perspective it can again be seen that the probability of Tasman bestowing the descriptive name Groote Eylandt on the island is significantly less than an eponymous name: $RFP = 0.08$ vs 0.68, respectively. Moreover, given Groote Eylandt is such a prominent terrestrial marine feature, it seems highly unlikely, at least from a stylometric standpoint, that Tasman would have furnished it with a descriptive name. This is corroborated by probability theory. The other conspicuous features—estuaries(streams), bays, capes, anchorages and bights—all bear more eponymous names than any other type of feature, thus also increasing the RFP of Tasman conferring an eponymous name on Groote Eylandt.

### Conclusion

#### What do we know?

1. There was considerable confusion within the VOC as to the geography of the north-eastern coastline of Arnhem Land, with various appellations given to what are possibly the same feature.
2. The first cartographic evidence of Tasman’s 1644 voyage is shown on the Tasman Bonaparte Map.
3. For some reason Groote Eylandt remained unlabelled on this map.
4. The first maps on which the island was labelled appeared sometime during the 17th century. It was then identified as Vânder Lyns Eyl.
5. The first map to show a form of its current name was Sayer’s map of 1787, with other maps following suit relatively soon after, with all bearing variations of the name. None of these maps is Dutch until the Bogaerts’ map of 1857.
6. It is not known from where Sayer obtained the name Groot Eyland.
7. Flinders circumnavigates the island in 1803, and initially labels the island ‘m’, later adopting the name Groote Eyland, and subsequently Groote Eylandt.
8. It is not clear from where Flinders sourced the name.
9. Stylometric evidence does not support Tasman’s bestowal of the descriptive name Groote Eylandt.
10. Directly transparent documentary sources from the VOC that reference the bestowal of the name have not been found.

Tasman’s charts show that he was astute in showing the names of prominent and important topographic features he discerned on his two voyages. This was, after all, a
stipulated requirement of the VOC, who instructed their mariners to accurately describe in their journals hitherto unknown regions they encountered and to note these on their charts. The instructions made it clear that such descriptions and annotated charts were ‘an aid to clarify political, military, economic, cultural, and administrative particularities in order to make sound decisions.’ (Zandvliet, 1988, p. 1445).

Groote Eylandt features prominently on almost all the maps from the mid-17th century to the late-18th century. In view of Tasman’s diligent bestowal of names on prominent geographic features, it seems somewhat out of character for him not to have conferred a name upon such a large island.

Misattributions are perpetuated when authors and researchers unquestioningly rely on the works of previous writers or secondary (indirect) sources. Such has been the case with Tasman’s alleged naming of Groote Eylandt. And as with many investigations into the origin of a placename, this one currently does not have a totally satisfactory conclusion. Until supplementary documentary and cartographic evidence comes to light, the naming of Groote Eylandt will remain enigmatic.

Jan Tent

Endnotes
1 This is a much abridged version of Tent (forthcoming).
2 The ‘relative frequency probability’ (RFP) (or ‘empirical probability’) of a specific type of toponym occurring is the proportion of times that toponym type occurs over the total number of toponyms recorded. If \( A \) is the type of toponym in which we are interested, then the RFP of \( A \) occurring, denoted by \( P(A) \), is computed from:
\[
P(A) = \frac{\text{Frequency of type } A}{\text{Number of recorded toponyms}}
\]
A RFP of 1.0 indicates that such a toponym will occur in 100% of cases. So the RFPs of 0.70 (overall) and 0.68 (for islands) for eponymous toponyms mean that they will occur 70% and 68% of the time.
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The south-west corner of the Northern Territory was one of the last areas of Australia to be explored and yet remains one of the most perplexing in regard to its placenames. As a COVID-19 pastime, I have been attempting to trace the route taken by William Henry Tietkens during his 1889 expedition from Alice Springs westward to Lake Macdonald, and thence east to Kata Tjuta (Mount Olga) and Uluru (Ayers Rock).1

As almost every map I consult supplies a different range of names and locations for some sites mentioned by Harry Tietkens, the following historical background may be of interest.

**Bloods Range**

Bloods Range was named by Ernest Giles on 14 March 1874 on the return journey eastward from his 1873-1874 ‘second expedition’ aimed at finding a route from South Australia across to the settled districts of Western Australia.2 Having climbed a hill at ‘the most eastern point of Curdie’s Range’, Giles noted that the north ‘was bounded by a long wall-like line, stretching across the horizon but ending about north-east; they (the ranges) were mostly in disconnected chains and apparently of the same character as the Petermann Range. This I named “Blood’s Range”, after Mr. Blood of the Peak.’ By ‘virtually’ standing (in Google Earth) on the highest point at the eastern end of Curdie’s Range, and tipping the horizon, one can see what Giles saw, as the abrupt, steep southern side of Bloods Range comes into view, and looking at Giles’ map of the expedition3 it is clear that he intended the name to apply to a range extending from about longitude 129° E to 130° E, at about latitude 24° 38’ S.

Despite the precision of Giles’ record and the subsequent use of the name Blood’s Range in 1889 by Harry Tietkens (who, incidentally, was with Giles on the 1874 expedition), the application of the name Bloods Range seems to have become muddied over time. One of the ‘disconnected chains’ has been renamed the Rowley Range and another, the Pinyinna Range; and a more southerly range (McNichols Range) seems to have been included as an additional part of Bloods Range.4 Moreover the names given by Harry Tietkens to two of the high points in Bloods Range appear to have been mis-located on today’s maps.

**Rowley Range, Pinyinna Range, McNichols Range**

I have been unable to determine the origin of the name Rowley Range—it does not appear on the maps of Giles or Tietkens. However, it is shown—perhaps for the first time—on the map of Terry’s 1930 expedition to the Petermann Ranges.5 Later maps copied Terry in using this name.

The name Pinyinna Range is undoubtedly Aboriginal. It first appeared on Herbert Basedow’s map of the Mackay 1926 expedition6 (Figure 2, next page), on which the more southerly range (McNichols Range) is labelled the Karkunya Range. On today’s maps4 the Rowley Range, Pinyinna Range and McNichols Range are all included under the broader banner of Bloods Range, which is very confusing.

**Mount Harris and Mount Carruthers**

Two high points within Bloods Range were named by Harry Tietkens in 1889. The more westerly and highest point he named Mount Harris ‘after Mr. Charles Hope Harris of the Survey Department; a high point to the east of Mount Harris, and only separated from it by a deep ravine, I have named Mount Carruthers after Mr. Carruthers of the Trigonometrical Survey Department, who is now engaged in an important survey of the Musgrave Ranges... Mount Harris and Mount Carruthers...""
seem to be quite separate, having a narrow pass between them..."1 From this description it would seem clear that the two points were very close to one another, only separated by a narrow deep ravine. Yet the two points shown on today’s maps are about 9km apart and separated by a shallow valley almost 3km wide. The only two high peaks which meet Tietkens’ description are those at 24° 38’ 41” S, 129° 35’ 58” E, (labelled Mount Carruthers on today’s maps but which must be Mount Harris, as it is the most westerly and the highest) and at 24° 38’ 00” S, 129° 36’ 37” E. These two points are just 1.6km apart and are separated by a cleft that might appear, from some distance to the north, to be quite deep. The Mount Harris shown on today’s maps is about 190m lower than that labelled as Mount Carruthers and about 150m lower than Tietken’s Mount Carruthers and so can hardly have been seen by Tietkens as ‘the highest point’.1

On Herbert Basedow’s map of the Mackay 1926 expedition,6 Tietken’s Mount Harris (i.e. present-day Mount Carruthers) is labelled Eringana Bluff, which is perhaps another pre-existing Aboriginal name, although Basedow’s map needs to be interpreted with caution as he labelled present-day Mount Harris as both Mount Hardie and Mount Unapproachable, neither of which is correct.

Lesley Brooker

Endnotes

Annual General Meeting—Placenames Australia (Inc.)

The next AGM will be held in Brisbane on Thursday 18th February 2021, hosted by Land & Spatial Information, Queensland Department of Natural Resources, Mines & Energy.

The exact time and location will be emailed shortly to Supporting Members, who are encouraged to participate in person or by teleconference.

A Special Resolution to allow attendance by teleconference at future AGMs will be tabled.

Nominations for office bearers (President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer) and up to five Committee Members are welcome.

Helen Slatyer, Secretary <secretary@anps.org.au>
I first heard of it in the ABC’s Radio National four-part series, *Patient Zero*.1 Episode 3, ‘The December Transplant’, was first broadcast in late August: it recounts the very tragic case of three Melbourne women who suddenly and mysteriously died of febrile illness 4 to 6 weeks after receiving liver or kidney transplants from the same donor on the same day (Palacios et al. 2008).

Extensive RNA analyses revealed the women had died of a novel Old World arenavirus. These viruses form a large and diverse family that include several causative agents of severe viral haemorrhagic fevers, and belong to the most devastating emerging human diseases and serious public health problems (Moraz & Kunz, 2011, p.49). Arenaviruses have long been known to cause disease in people who have been exposed to rodent urine and droppings. Arenaviruses are classified as ‘Category A’ biological agents because of their ability to cause severe human illness and are very easily disseminated as an aerosol. Unfortunately, there are currently only limited preventative and therapeutic options for patients infected with these highly pathogenic viruses. (Shao, Liang & Ly, 2015).

The organ donor to the three women had recently returned to Australia from a three month stay in Serbia, where he may have been subject to rodents in the rural area he visited (Palacios et al., 2008). The novel arenavirus was first reported by Palacios et al. (2008) in the *New England Medical Journal*. As was often the case, this new virus derived its name from the place where it was first detected, Dandenong. The name *Dandenong Virus* seems to have been first used in a publication by Paveska et al. (2009).

So, to matters toponymic. Dandenong is situated on Dandenong Creek, and is a suburb of Melbourne, approximately 22km from the well-known Dandenong Ranges. The suburb began as a township in 1852, and by the 20th century was an important regional city with its own suburbs. It later became a significant manufacturing and commercial area. Prior to European occupation, the area was inhabited by the Woiwurrung/Boonwurrung peoples. Clark and Heydon (2002, p. 71) do not provide a meaning for the name, but do note that the name originates from the Woiwurrung/Boonwurrung languages’ word/toponym *Dandinnong*. However, as is so common with many Indigenous-derived placenames, various theories have been put forward as to the original meaning and form of the name.2 The most common one seems to be ‘lofty/high mountain’ and was originally rendered as *Tanjenong* or *Tangenong* (Wikipedia; Uhl, 1972; Aussie Towns <www.aussietowns.com.au>; Victorian Places <https://www.victorianplaces.com.au>).

It has been an unfortunate custom to name new human (and animal) diseases after the places where they were first detected. Such names do very little for the reputation of those places. With this in mind, the World Health Organisation (WHO) issued guidelines in May 2015 which outlined best practices for the naming of new human infectious diseases. The guidelines aim ‘to minimize unnecessary negative impact of disease names on trade, travel, tourism or animal welfare, and avoid causing offence to any cultural, social, national, regional, professional or ethnic groups.’ The document lists six best practices to be adopted in the naming of a new infectious disease:

1. Use generic descriptive terms, e.g. respiratory disease, hepatitis, neurologic syndrome, watery diarrhoea, enteritis
2. Use specific descriptive terms, e.g. progressive, juvenile, severe, winter
3. Use causative pathogen names, if known, e.g. novel coronavirus respiratory syndrome
4. Use short names that are easy to pronounce, e.g. H7N9, rabies, malaria, polio
5. Evaluate potential acronyms to ensure they also comply with these best practice principles
6. Use names that are consistent with the guidelines from the International Classification of Diseases (ICD) Content Model Reference Guide.

In our June and September 2020 issues we discussed Covid-19 related placenames and Australian toponymic viruses in general, says ANPS Director Dr Jan Tent, and I thought it apt now to report on another Australian toponymic virus, one that’s little-known but extremely lethal.
The document then stipulates that disease names should **not** comprise:

1. Geographic locations: cities, countries, regions, continents, e.g. *Middle East Respiratory Syndrome, Spanish Flu, Rift Valley fever, Lyme disease, Crimean Congo hemorrhagic fever, Japanese encephalitis*
2. People’s names, e.g. *Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease, Chagas disease*
3. Species/class of animal or food names, e.g. *Swine flu, bird flu, monkey pox, equine encephalitis, paralytic shellfish poisoning*
4. Cultural, population, industry or occupational references, e.g. *Occupational, legionnaires, miners, butchers, cooks, nurses*
5. Terms that incite undue fear, e.g. *Unknown, death, fatal, epidemic*

These guidelines seem eminently sensible to me. It is a shame that some people refuse to move with the times, or scorn the WHO. For a very interesting article on the naming of the novel coronavirus, see Gorvett (2020).

Jan Tent

---

**Endnotes**

2. These will be considered in a future *Placenames Australia* article.

**References**


---

...another toponymic virus

(Image source: https://monashhealth.org/contact/dandenong-hospital)
Places with ‘No Name’

“Just because you didn’t put a name to something did not mean it wasn’t there.” — Jodi Picoult, *Handle with Care*

The part-of-speech we call a noun is important, and for toponymists proper nouns are vital: without them we couldn’t refer to things or identify them. However, there are places that don’t have a name, at least not in the traditional sense. I once discovered a rather quirky eatery in Sydney, an Italian restaurant called *No Name*. I have since discovered that there are other establishments with such a label. There are bars in Bethlehem (Pennsylvania), London, Toronto and Melbourne, all labelled *The Bar With No Name*. Their declaration of a lack of a name is in fact their name—an interesting paradox, but testament to the truth of Jodi Picoult’s quote from above. The contradiction lies in a declaration of non-existence and a simultaneous existence.

Similarly, there is a town in Tennessee named *Nameless*, a suburb of Glenwood Springs in Colorado called *No Name*, and in the Pilbara near Tom Price (WA) there’s a feature once called *Mount Nameless*.

Such labels are sometimes referred to as ‘contronyms’ or ‘auto-antonyms’—individual words or phrases with contradictory or opposite meanings. All these places are using *No Name* or *Nameless* for both ‘no place’ and ‘a definite place’. Another contronym is Sir Thomas More’s famous fictional island in the Atlantic Ocean, *Utopia* (coined from the Greek: οὐ ‘not’ and τόπος ‘place’). So *Utopia* literally means a ‘no-place’. The paradox again is the declaration of the non-existence of the place while the name declares its existence.

Other entities with ‘no name’

We must not forget the ubiquitous No Name line of generic or unbranded grocery and household products in black and yellow packaging, where No Name is its name.

In 1993, a new virus was isolated in the Four Corners area of south-western United States, and was labelled *Four Corners Virus* or *Muerto Canyon Virus*. For obvious reasons, residents vehemently objected to the virus being named after their town, and so it was renamed *Sin Nombre Virus* ‘No Name virus’ (Strauss & Strauss, 2008)—just one more example of a virus’s geographic name that caused offence.

The concept of other entities with ‘no name’ has a long tradition in literature dating back at least to Ancient Greek mythology (see Niva, 1964). When Odysseus and his men are held captive by the cyclops Polyphemus, Odysseus declares his name to be ‘Nobody’. The Cyclops, blinded by Odysseus, calls out to the other cyclopes for help. When they ask what the matter is, Polyphemus replies that Nobody has blinded him. The ambiguity of that message allows Odysseus and his men to escape.

Shakespeare uses an allusion to Nobody in *The Tempest*, and Dickens’ story *Nobody’s Story* tells of the indifference of the governing classes toward common labouring people, their spokesperson being Nobody. And in Lewis Carroll’s *Through the Looking Glass*, Alice uses ‘nobody’ as an indefinite pronoun (a universal negative for ‘no person whatever’) whilst the King is using ‘Nobody’ as both ‘no person’ and ‘a definite person’. He is aware that anything can both ‘be’ and ‘not-be’ at the same time, because in giving a proper name to someone who does not exist, he also asserts that the person is not real. Jules Verne also uses a character in *Twenty Thousand Leagues under the Sea*, in Captain Nemo (i.e. ‘No-name’).

Jan Tent

Endnotes

1 In total, Australia has nine features with *No Name* as specific, three with Nameless as specific, four with Unknown as specific, and one with Unnamed as its specific.

2 Today, the general meaning of *Utopia* has changed and describes a fictional society that is supposedly better than contemporary society. The name *Eutopia* (from the Greek Ἔὖ ‘good/well’ + τόπος) would, strictly speaking, be the appropriate term to describe such a place.

References


Placenames Puzzle Number 76

Country name toponyms

Can you identify the names of other regions, countries or continents that appear on the Australian map?

**Example**—(NSW, range) small country through which a shipping canal runs: *Panama Range*

1. (WA, south coast town) home of Lego
2. (VIC, cove on Western Port Bay) country where the compass was invented
3. (QLD, stream and locality west of Brisbane) country where the Angles settled
4. (Formerly, the whole eastern half of Australia) country of coal mines and male choirs
5. (NSW, island in Pitt Water) alternatively, Caledonia
6. (WA, headland south of Cape Leveque) a very long and narrow country
7. (NSW, lake near Mildura) a ‘country’ known for its water engineering feats
8. (NSW, mountain near Michelago) Florence Nightingale’s country of birth
9. (TAS, cove in Port Davey) where Henry VIII’s first wife was born
10. (NSW, hill in Kosciuszko NP) the country known in German as the ‘Eastern Realm’
11. (NSW, cove in western Sydney Harbour) Emma Watson’s country of birth
12. (NT, island in Bynoe Harbour) the country often called ‘the subcontinent’
13. (QLD, locality near Toowoomba) country where Rudolf Hess was born
14. (NSW, location in Kosciuszko NP) Russian region notorious for its isolation, cold and forced labour camps
15. (VIC, stream in the Alpine NP) home of cherry blossoms in the rising sun
16. (NSW, cove in Sydney Harbour near Homebush) Margaret Atwood’s country of birth
17. (NSW, cove in Ku-ring-gai NP) the land named after the Italian explorer Vespucci
18. (TAS, gully near Dunalley) the dark continent
19. (NSW, state forest near Leeton) island country famous for cigars
20. (TAS, river NNW of Hobart) country and river in the Middle East

[Compiled by Jan Tent
Answers on page 2]

Become a Supporting Member!

We realise that not everyone who wishes to support the Australian National Placenames Survey can do so by carrying out toponymic research and supplying information for our database. There is another way — become a supporting member of Placenames Australia! In doing so, you’ll help the Survey and its volunteer researchers by providing infrastructure support. In return, you’ll have the assurance that you’ll be helping ensure the continued existence of this prestige national project, and we’ll guarantee to keep you in touch with our progress.

Please consider carefully this invitation. If you wish to become a Member

- send a cheque for $25 to Placenames Australia Inc.
- or arrange a bank transfer for $25 to bsb 032089 a/c 275989

Please advise our Treasurer of the transfer by one of the following methods:

**Email:** treasurer@anps.org.au
**Mail:** PO Box 5160, South Turramurra NSW 2074
**Website:** www.anps.org.au

Articles for Placenames Australia

Material for publication in Placenames Australia is always welcome. Please send all contributions to the Editor, David Blair, by email: 

<editor@anps.org.au>

Supporting photographs or other illustrations are greatly appreciated.

Closing dates for submissions are:

- March Issue: 15 January
- June Issue: 15 April
- September Issue: 15 July
- December Issue: 15 October