Te Reo 23 (1980)

THE HEINEMANN DICTIONARIES

K. Smithyman
(University of Auckland)

Harber, Katherine *et al.* *Heinemann Australian Dictionary.* Melbourne, Heinemann Educational Australia Pty Ltd, 1976. ix + 1259 pp. $NZ 8.00.

Orsman, H.W. *et al.* *Heinemann New Zealand Dictionary.* Auckland, Heinemann Educational Books (NZ) Ltd, 1979. ix + 1339 pp. $NZ 9.95.

(1)

In 1976 Heinemann Educational Australia published the *Heinemann Australian Dictionary* prepared by an editorial team led by Katherine Harber (with nine associates) helped by thirty-three of their colleagues at La Trobe University as consultants and by forty other 'Consultants in other fields'. At the outset (according to the Preface) an original headword list was divided up into two hundred or so subject areas. The list for each area was treated as one group and checked by consultant(s), after which (and after alphabetizing by computer) where possible a general definition for any word was written and entered. The Preface gives *mate* as an example.

The subject area of *mate* is 'nautical terms', so the particular case is 'an officer next in rank below the master of a ship', the general case is 'one of a pair, especially a partner in marriage'. Between the general and the particular appears another case, *mate* 'habitual companion or fellow worker: "my *mate* and I worked the shearing sheds around here for almost 30 years".' The arrangement seems to imply two orders of generality, one "polite" or formal, which takes precedence over specialised sense. People may be inclined to wonder about this, for if talk of the general is to apply and to imply more rather than less common use, is it true that *mate* these days has much currency in talk of partners in marriage although it undoubtedly holds in talk of pairing of non-human species? In both metropolitan and antipodean (if not in other colonial vernaculars as

well) is not the colloquial the dominant usage? To raise this question is perhaps merely to rediscover the editor's needs to make decisions. At the same time one has to recognise that the decision when made conveys authority of the printed, moreover the 'printed-in-a-dictionary', word. It is an authority likely to be challenged by the Royal Australian Navy or the RNZN if the particular sense of *mate* comes to their notice. That may do for the Merchant Marine, scarcely for the Navy.

To return to the particular case mentioned above, Navy language retains compound terms reflecting the subordination of *mate* to *master* as in the relationship of *bosun's mate* to *quartermaster* or a specific role term *master-at-arms*, which is listed as a particular case. (In passing, *quartermaster* is not rightly defined.)[1] What would have been helpful with *master* itself would have required going against the dictionary's working principle of avoiding archaic terms or senses, that is, to include the old sense of *master* which recurs in nautical histories or maritime fictions, which is commonly not well understood and which reference to the Australian Heinemann dictionary will not clarify. Archaic it may be but it nonetheless occurs for readers, and a lot of people are still readers. The New Zealand dictionary is more inclined to recognise the force of this.

A lot of people and their needs is what the dictionary aims to serve. On the whole the Australian Heinemann dictionary will serve them well. I have not meant to be quibbling or querulous in the remarks above, conscious that the working principle is firmly stated in the Preface:

> Dictionaries can no longer afford to be quasi-literary works, and this book is intended to be as useful to the student of science or social studies as to the student of English literature.

Yet, would those students not be better served by specialist dictionaries? The student of social science who wants to know what *anomy* or *anomie* may be is not going to find out, the science student who wants to know about *anorexia* can be informed: 'an illness causing complete loss of appetite'. Yes, but ... one would scarcely wish for science students to be content with that, or for the Eng. Lit. student to conclude significantly that he was anorexic the last time he had a three day flu. (Strictly, this may be, but at present surely any mention of *anorexia* in conversation or in the press is likely to be understood as referring to *anorexia nervosa*. If so, then the specific condition deserves mentioning.) Some scientists in the making or lay readers of the *Scientific American* will be

better served, for example, by:

> *germanium* 'element number 32, a rare metal used as a semiconductor' See CHEMICAL ELEMENTS in grey pages.

That tells one lay reader what to do, go hunt the grey pages for which a page number (p.1256), might thoughtfully have been provided, where he learns that the symbol is *Ge* and the number of protons in the nucleus is 32. Reference back gives a clear statement of *nucleus*, reference further gives a lead to *proton*, proton to *elementary particle*, and to *ion*. Whoever wrote the physics entries are clearly enthusiastic and competent expounders. The social science reader will not be so well served. Not only will he go uncertain of his *anomy/anomie*, he may not find out about that matter so dear to his craft, the *parameter* '*Maths*: a variable', or be much enlightened by *paradigm* 'any pattern or example'. As definitions they do not well define. The hardcore sciences seem catered for admirably, the social sciences less so. When you pass to other disciplines things seem to grow less controlled. The theologically-minded reader will find *charisma*, but not *charismatic*. He will not find *kenosis*. The person interested in the arts is (I think) likely to come out worst of all. I tried some not too esoteric and some not overly fashionable terms without profiting, trying to choose instances of a more likely currency in, for example, the context of literature than *germanium* in its context, then tried the obvious:

> *poem* 'a composition with a rhythmic form, often in rhyme'.

You beaut! (*beaut!* [*informal*] 'splendid or enjoyable'.)

I understand that revision of the Harber dictionary is already under way.

(2)

Patently, some things are more susceptible than others of concise ready definition. The aim of the Australian dictionary is to provide 'information in its simplest, most accessible form' which must in some cases go to work at risk. The aim is restated for the Preface to the *Heinemann New Zealand Dictionary* by H.W. Orsman *et al.*, but the New Zealand volume, whatever its relationship to the Australian on which it is based, plays up another relationship, 'being written in partnership with the English dictionary' under preparation in London (with Geoffrey Payton in charge), but plays down a matter stressed for the Australian market, that the Australian volume was especially intended to provide for 'Australian secondary students'. The

unduly curt definition of *parameter* instanced above might be defended by saying, "Well, it gives a context (mathematics) and a lead (it has to do with variables), so a student gets a clue to follow" which will not necessarily be acceptable for older readers.

The New Zealand Dictionary rejects the brevity of the Australian definition and prints:

> *parameter:* (1) *Maths*, a variable in terms of which other interrelated variables are expressed and upon which they may then be regarded as being dependent.
> (2) A numerical characteristic of a statistical population.

The New Zealand provision seems to me rather better than the Australian but if the departures from the Australian precedents are wholly in character with the kind shown in the treatment of *parameter* the New Zealand volume is going to be more suited to the upper secondary school or to levels of readership beyond. However, if *paradigm* is checked change may be seen but not more illumination. The New Zealand entry expands: *paradigm:* a pattern or example, especially of the principal parts of irregu- verbs, etc. What this most shows is that the New Zealand entry seems more in debt to the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* definition than the Australian but surely what both need is an illustration of the way the word is used these days, the demonstration provided for many entries in both the Australian and New Zealand dictionaries under the head of 'Usage'.

A point fairly to be remarked about both volumes is that they try not only 'to define' but to show how usage requires to be taken into account. The concern is with language of the day, language in action, and is entirely commendable. The entries of *paper*, for instance, seem to be more useful and are certainly easier to command than those in the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*, partly because the Oxford density of text body is eschewed, partly because of the presentation that follows once space is allowed and readability is allowed for. (Both legibility and "readable" language come under that term.) The easiest way to see what this conveys is to look at features marked out in the double-page spread 'How to use the dictionary' (Australian, pp.1212-3, New Zealand, pp.1284-5) which could perhaps be better placed at the beginning of the volumes. The sorts of things shown are the headword or headwords of different derivation, part of speech, pronunciation, the stressed parts (in bold), any subheadword(s), crossreference words, directly related words, simple etymology; words likely to be confused, subject label, definition(s), words illustrated in a context. Provision

is made for dual headwords, alternative pronunciation, relevant examples of grammatical propriety, colloquial usages, and those which tend to be metaphorical along with 'translation of sense'.

A main aim is to talk about linguistic items in the language of those who use the language, to provide a stock which is 'International English' plus items which in the New Zealand dictionary are 'New Zealand English' (which includes Maori words or phrases), and to explain about pronouncing what is presented, using 'familiar language sounds instead of phonetic symbols' (the Australian dictionary, which is repeated as a principle in the New Zealand volume). In the New Zealand dictionary interestingly a good deal more is said about pronunciation than the Australians seemed to have thought was called for and no comment will be made on this manifestation of sensitivity or concern although readers of, for instance, *The Bulletin* will know that some Australians are neither insensitive nor unconcerned about their language.

(3)

The observations on New Zealand pronunciation announce that R.P. 'is not automatically accepted as standard New Zealand pronunciation'. The New Zealand dictionary aims for pronunciations which approximate to 'those most commonly used in New Zealand speech. There is no "correct" New Zealand pronunciation of any word'. Alternative pronunciations are permissible, regional variations are to be expected in such productions as the Central Otago 'r' or in the intonations taken over from Maori speech in Northland, although in what sense Northland is a 'predominantly Maori area' is not immediately apparent. It is an assertion likely to be challenged.

The guide to pronunciation adopted is straightforward. In both the Australian and New Zealand volumes it works like this:

NOBELIUM (*say* no-BEEl*i*um)[2]

Straightforward to a point. The reader is not well informed here. Does he say 'lie-um', or 'lee-um'? If he looks up something comparable, *radium*, he is told to say 'RAY-dee-um' (do people stress the 'ray'?) so he may reasonably expect in the other case to say 'no-BEE-lee-um', but are people doing this, or are they more likely to say 'no-BEE-lyum'? Or, 'no-BEEL-yum'? The simplified system (if systematically applied) must, as anyone will sympathetically concede, get its straightforward character at expense, the expense which in the Australian volume is perhaps undue and in the New Zealand volume is at least strained. The Australian seems to be more swayed by some residual influence of "What people should say".

For example, I doubt that Australians actually do pronounce *nonchalant* as 'Nonsha-lont' or that they should aim to do so; I am happier to be told that New Zealanders favour 'NONsha-l'nt'. Likewise, even those lacking respect for the classics may feel that it is not right for Australians to practice at 'non kompis MENtis' and that the New Zealand 'kompus' is likely a better approximation. No doubt there are differences between dominant Australian pronunciations and dominant New Zealand ones and very likely the dictionaries are pointing up these differences. No phonetician, the present writer may only wonder at the differences represented for the Australians, suspecting that the New Zealand versions are not only registering differences. They are as well refining on the Australian handling of a system which is supposed to be one which enables readers to treat more competently with what is put before them. Another thought occurs here: how is the Latin of *non compos mentis* regarded? Is it necessarily (but not needfully) to be anglicized?

The Australian principle is to observe "What most (educated?) people say", a principle at base of accepting anglicizing although, as was remarked, the New Zealand volume is more sensitive about pronunciation. The Australians announce no specific principle, but since the system operates on an authoritative basis - even implicitly authoritarian - a principle of some kind is invoked by the very occurrence of the imperative 'say...'. The New Zealand volume endorses the majority principle, but with advertised tolerance as of regional or other differences. It then makes an exception, Maori words, which are to aim to follow Maori pronunciation (although p.1289 allows for some exceptions). All New Zealanders know why this practice, in the circumstances anomalous, which becomes a principle, is advanced. Explanations for it would run from the cynical to the starry-eyed. It is a business of degree of respect for ethnic distinction which is cognate with linguistic identity, of propriety exercised in several highly sensitive fields. In the matter of a principle which cuts across the complex aspects of what is diachronic and what is synchronic language is there not at least as much of a case for advocating the "proper" pronunciation of Latin taken over into the majority usage as there is for advocating respect for a pure Maori?

(4)

The Australian dictionary in its Grey Pages has a section of 'Foreign Words in English' among which are words from New Zealand Maori (p.1251), six of them, *kauri, kiwi, moa, paua, poi, tiki*. *Kauri* is defined (p.563) as 'a massive, New Zealand, evergreen tree, which grows to 60m and has thick, parallel-

veined leaves'. Australians are instructed to '*say* KOW-ree'.

The New Zealand dictionary in its Grey Pages lists (p.1330) seventeen Maori words, including *Maori* 'language' as of 1828 and *Maori* 'people' of 1834. Of the words given *kauri* is again one, defined (p.595) as 'a massive cone-bearing timber tree of the northern North Island, prized for its straight grained timber'. New Zealanders are to '*say* KAH-oo-ree'. *Kauri* is supported by *kauri gum* which figures also on p.1330 but could usefully have been crossreferred to p.483 entries, *gum-digger, gum-field,* and *gum land.* Why the hyphens in two of the three? As a point of consistency, since *kauri-gum* (1836) of p.1330 lost its hyphen why hyphenate gum/digger and gum/field but not *gum land*, and are not *gumfield* and *gumdigger* more likely to be seen?

If we check for something comparable *gold-digger* is consistent, but still looks odd? Consult other dictionaries, and *gold-digger* is warranted. Still, given *goldsmith* one may wonder if there is any point in trying to preserve the hyphenated style, and wonder again looking at *gold rush.* Incidentally, neither the Australian nor the New Zealand Heinemann dictionary lists *gold field* or variants on that.

To return to *kauri.* The New Zealand definition again seems better than the Australian, especially in drawing attention to the use made of the wood (by way of *timber*) which is an eminent claim for this tree being known, but both seem to fall short in one respect. That is, the Australian may suggest that the kauri tree is peculiarly a New Zealand tree, the New Zealand suggest that it is even more limitedly 'of the northern North Island' or even more if you take what relates to the tree, *gum-field* 'the land in North Auckland where fossil gum could be found'.

The fact is that gum was, and until at least recently continued to be, obtained from lands south and east of Auckland as well as from the north. The broader statement about 'the northern North Island' is more apt. (The southern limit of growth of the tree was roughly along a line from Kawhia to Maketu, approx. 38° S.). The suggestion of peculiarity is justifiable to a degree, but at expense. The kauri, *Agathis australis* (Cockayne and Turner, 1958:19), is only one member of a family which extends up into the Western Pacific. The timber trade produced a referent which may still maintain, *Solomon Island(s) kauri*, especially of Vanikoro which had direct milling links with the Kauri Timber Company of Auckland, although this compound may be a conversion of the Western Pacific *kaori* of *Agathis* spp. found in New Caledonia (to which Professor K.J. Hollyman has drawn my attention). *Kaori* may itself have been acquired from North Auckland in the early nineteenth century contact phase. The

Australian and New Zealand dictionaries alike would be more useful here if the definitions were more scrupulous and, in view of the principle of advantaging 'scientific and technical' readers, the case for including the botanical name is obvious.

The pronunciation now. People may agree that to '*say* KAH-oo-ree' is right, the Australian '*say* KOW-ree' is wrong. Nonetheless, the great part of New Zealand's population is likely to go on saying 'kow-ree' for some time to come and to exhort people to do otherwise is at odds with the general working principle. When allowance has been made for formal and informal senses in usage, when respect for variant pronunciations is otherwise allowed for and no single standard or R.P. is contemplated, surely the case is that two pronunciations should be put forward after the fashion of the implied relative status of formal and informal senses. But see section (8) below.

Pronunciation, intonation and stressing are recognisably not thoroughly served by non-phonetic (phonic?) guides. (Try *necessary* in the New Zealand volume.) I do not want to quibble about this because the phonic guides of the Australian and New Zealand dictionaries seem likely to function pretty well, but another consideration may be raised. This takes me back for the moment to *gum land* above. The distinction of *gum-field* and *gum land* may be properly made, but the New Zealand dictionary statements need looking at again. *Gum land* or *gumland* first. *Gum land* conveys to me, a former Northerner, a sense or nuance in writing or in speech of undeveloped land, not broken or brought into production, "waste land", whereas *gumland* implies development. I should (I think) in speaking try to communicate the condition by difference in stressing. If there is an actual difference apart from what may be my own idiosyncracy then the definition 'areas of poor soil, once supporting kauri forests and containing kauri gum' is apt for *gum land* but not apt for *gumland* because incomplete. My intonation is likely to be different, because implicitly evaluative (as a child of my time and my place) in *gum land* (a present disparaged condition) and *gumland* (a prior but now transformed condition). I tried this out on a onetime Southerner who has acquired North Auckland affiliations of twenty and more years standing and, for what it is worth, he concurs.

Take another of the words from Maori mentioned above, *paua*. The Australian dictionary gives *paua* 'an edible shellfish of the abalone family, the multicoloured shell of which is used for decoration', which is exactly repeated by the New Zealand dictionary. The Australians are instructed to *say* 'power', the New Zealanders to *say* 'pah-oo-ah'. The Australian seems quite unacceptable, the New Zealand instruction a better one than for *kauri*, but again the majority pronunciation is

surely 'pah-wuh'. In both you may refer to *abalone* 'an edible marine shellfish [the Australian dictionary has 'snail'] with an ear-shaped shell lined with mother-of-pearl'. The New Zealand entry but not the Australian is crossreferred to *paua*.

Ear-shaped? Whatever likeness exists is scarcely evident when you look at the upper surface of the shell. Nevertheless people asked about this are content with the likeness as were their forebears, and the Japanese (I am given to understand) call their *abalone* (their *awabi*) 'Ear shells', even if their shells are not quite the same shape as ours. The French have *oreille de mer* which, reduced, affords *ormer* recorded on both sides of the English Channel. The change from the Australian 'snail' to the New Zealand 'shellfish' may probably be put down to a wish to prevent a false imagining of shape or to preclude confusion since, although 'snail' is proper, an ear-shaped snail is not easy to imagine and *paua* anyway do not look at all like those snails which most of us would adopt as our mode of reference. In both dictionaries, again, the reader would be helped if given a lead by referring to the *Haliotidae*, a very widely distributed family which in New Zealand waters has more than one member. Talk of '*an* edible shellfish' is misleading. Eminently *Haliotis iris* is edible, but *paua* is used (for instance, by A.W.B. Powell, 1967:33) to cover six kinds of *Haliotis*, just as Allan (1950:54-6) uses 'Ear shells' to cover 'a few of the most notable' - eight of them - of the Australian members of the family.

For New Zealanders *abalone* is more a word met in print than in speech. In Australia *abalone* has apparently come to dominate in *parole* since Allan (1950) who favoured 'Ear shell(s)' or Cotton and Godfrey who favoured the oldfashioned 'Mutton-fish' (1938:20-3). The Australian dictionary does not crossrefer to *paua*, or list *ear shell* or *mutton-fish* presumably because Harber *et al.* regard these as obsolete if not archaic, yet the currency of 'Ear shell' and 'Mutton Fish' into the 1960s is attested by Macpherson and Gabriel (1962:26) in their text, but their section heading 'Ear Shells or Abalones' testifies to the then increasing status of *abalone*. To attribute this ascendancy particularly to commercial usage as of can labels, which has been suggested to me, seems unwarranted from my enquiries among marine biologists with specific interest in Pacific *Haliotidae*. Perversely, Orsman lists *mutton-fish* (but not *ear shell*) in the New Zealand dictionary while remarking that it is 'an old word for paua or abalone'. True, it is old and its inclusion looks to go against the principle advertised in the Heinemann brochure that archaisms and rare words were avoided. The New Zealand editors turn out to be rather inconsistent about this matter. In respect of *mutton-fish* I have to say that, while I have had

dealings with *paua* over the years both as a consumer and as a small-scale shell collector who associated with marine biologists, I doubt I have ever heard the word used or come across it in print except in old lists or in a context which indicated that the name was out of date. Contrariwise, *mutton-fish* may not yet be extinct in Australian English. One Australian colleague thought that she remembered the name from her Victorian girlhood. It would also seem likely that if *mutton-fish* was current in the 1930s in South Australia it has not yet wholly disappeared.

Cotton and Godfrey (1938:23) refer to 'the mutton-fish shell' being mounted or used as ashtrays and 'lamp shades'. If *mutton-fish* and *ear-shell* are being or have been displaced by *abalone*, what becomes of *mutton-fish shell*? Another colleague raised in Australia, Dr. Stephanie Hollis, offered a distinction out of her experience: if you buy the fish meat you buy *abalone*, but if you make use of the shell for ornamental purposes it is likely to be called 'a *power* shell'. That is, the ultimately Spanish *abalone* (under Californian aegis?) has displaced *mutton-fish* of the shell. At present a little may be known about this. In view of the little which (admittedly cursory) enquiry yields one has to wish that Harber *et al.* were more generous in their crossreferencing and in their information. How, for instance, does *paua* get into Australian English?

Baker (1966:102) has some information on this, quoting from F. Leechman, *The Opal Book* (1961) on *sea opal*, "'pieces of a brilliant New Zealand shell, the paua, used in jewellery'". The conclusion is that *paua* had that measure of regard in the ornament world to preponderate over *mutton-fish shell* and (Australianized in the process) to become the referent term, as *abalone* was in process of becoming the dominant referent for the meat.

This still leaves a need to account for the otherwise extraordinary instruction in the Australian dictionary, to '*say* power' for *paua*. About this we may conjecture. Historically, the kauri timber trade across the Tasman was considerably older than any trade in paua shell, so *kauri* as a sight word predated *paua* as a sight word for most Australians. Whatever the exchanges of population across the Tasman, aural transmission signally failed to register, so seeing rather than hearing has to be the determinant factor. For anyone knowing that for *kauri* you were to say 'KOW-ree' it is reasonable that for *paua* you should '*say* power' or 'pow-uh'. "Power" is an "orthographic" reconstruction in effect. But this is only conjecture. Possibly, it may yet be shown that 'power' was a transitional New Zealandism conveyed to Australia in some phase of social

mobility in the colonies.

In what is above it has been necessary to refer to *ear-shell(s)*, a compound which neither the Australian nor the New Zealand dictionary mentions. The omission may be defended, as suggested, because 'Ear shell' may be regarded as obsolescent if not obsolete or archaic, if applied to *abalone*. The reservation cannot hold for another case where *ear shell* is still the referent for at least two members of the *Ellobiidae*, those known as *Filhol's Ear Shell (Marinula filholi*, Powell, 1959:30) and the *Banded Ear Shell (Ophicardelus castellaris*, Powell, 1959:30). *Ear shell* deserves recording, to help towards clarification. Its omission is regrettable but so too, for example, is the omission of a third sense in the entry in both dictionaries for *volute*, which could usefully point out that *volute* is the term of reference for a number of shells of the *Volutidae* not uncommon on New Zealand beaches.

(5)

From *mutton-fish* to *mutton-bird*, once again with some distaste for the hyphen. Both dictionaries give *mutton-bird* 'any of various seabirds related to the petrel, considered a delicacy because of its distinctive fishy flavour'. Orsman adds the Maori name *titi* and supplements the entry with *mutton-birder* 'a person who catches young mutton-birds for food or sale', which appears to be unknown to Australians (neither Harber nor Baker lists it). Hill (1967:10) refers to Bass Strait "birders", which suggests that *mutton-birders* was probable in Tasmanian speech, but the appearance of "birders" in other reference works suggest that the contraction has quite eclipsed the New Zealand style.[3]

In taking over the Australian definition Orsman has taken over a rather strange language. The sentence could do with rewriting, and rethinking. Related to petrels, yes, but why not say that muttonbirds predominantly are shearwaters? The 'various' seabirds may be misleading, although Professor K. Sinclair who has an interest in a muttonbirding island tells me (personal communication) that he believes it likely that more species than *P. griseus* or *P. tenuirostris* are taken in season. Since Cook's Petrel (*Pterodroma cooki*, Falla, Sibson and Turbott, 1966:52) is called *Titi* as is the Sooty Shearwater and breeds in the same waters (around Stewart Island) it is probable that talk of "various seabirds" may be warranted, but one would like to know just how far the accepted range for *muttonbird* extends. In Australian usage, *the* muttonbird is the Short-tailed Shearwater (*Puffinus tenuirostris*, Kinsky *et al.*, 1970:27) which New Zealanders and Tasmanians (judging by

Sharland, 1958:23) but not mainland Australian ornithologists (going by sundry books at hand) refer to as the Tasmanian Muttonbird. As well as *P. tenuirostris* Sharland names *P. pacificus* as 'Mutton Bird' and *P. griseus* as the King Mutton Bird. Falla, Sibson and Turbott (1966:41-5) list for New Zealand the Tasmanian Muttonbird and the 'Muttonbird, Titi', *P. griseus*. It will be seen that if *the* Muttonbird for Australians is *P. tenuirostris*, for New Zealanders today *the* bird is *P. griseus*, the Sooty Shearwater. Harber has no entry for *shearwater*, Orsman has one which should be crossreferred to *mutton-bird* but to suggest of New Zealand shearwaters that they are "any of various kinds" may be challenged as the shearwaters listed in Falla, Sibson and Turbott are of one kind, *Puffinus* as are the Australian shearwaters listed by Macdonald (1973:50-2).

A different sort of question of kinds follows from the entry for *snapper*: 'any of a group of edible pinkish-white fish found in Australia and New Zealand' (Harber). Orsman repeats this, but adds 'waters'. He might have spread himself and added one or two words more, 'salt' or 'tidal', since the New Zealand snapper is/are not freshwater fish whatever the case may be for the Australian group. In New Zealand *snapper* mainly signifies *Chrysophrys auratus* which in Australia is (Doak, 1978:40) *bream* 'an edible fish with a compressed body and silvery scales' (Harber), which Orsman repeats. That is, the New Zealand *snapper* corresponds to an Australian *bream*, and the New Zealand readers should surely be directed to this. There is a further complication, in that not all New Zealand *snapper* are *bream*, something for which Orsman does not allow and which the Australian dictionary scarcely copes with. In New Zealand waters are found at least two other *snapper*, the Black Snapper, the Maori *parore, Girella tricuspidata* (Doak, 1978:51-2) which is one of the Australian *blackfish* or luderick, and the Golden Snapper, *Trachichthodes affinis* (Doak, 1978:21-3) which is the Australian *nannygai*. Neither of these two fish is by any stretch of imagination 'pinkish-white'. The common *snapper*, the Black, and the Golden, are of a group in that all are called 'Snapper' but are from three different families.

It has to be noticed that the Germanic *schnapper* (even if invariably pronounced "snapper") is the form still favoured by fish shops and remarked by Harber, repeated by Orsman, as the secondary style of name. Cook, 25 November 1769 (Beaglehole, 1955, I:210), recorded taking 'between 90 and a hundred Breams, (a fish so called)' at his anchorage in what he called Bream Bay. The 'so called' presumably follows from likeness to (but with disparity from) the Western European bream which is a freshwater fish or the variant of this, the sea-bream. Doak (1978:41) testifies to another sense of *bream* 'school snapper', signifying "young snapper of uniform size and age... from 15cm

upwards". As for the Black Snapper, it has another name apart from the polite *mangrove fish* which Williams (1971:268) lists, being commonly known as the *shitfish* because of its reputation for hanging around e.g. sewer outfalls. The Maori for Black Snapper, *parore*, is commonly rendered in the northern North Island as though it were "parori".

(6)

Earlier, it was noticed that the Grey Pages of Orsman increase the six Maori words given by Harber to seventeen. Orsman (p.1334) adds more, as 'a representative list of words in "New Zealand English" and the approximate date at which they were first recorded in written form'. This list, true to label, gives only some of the New Zealand items which Orsman publishes elsewhere, as quick comparison of p.1330 or p.1334 and pp.594-5 will show. At that, p.595 could have shown something else, *kawakawa*, since in the immediate neighbourhood seven other botanical names appear and *kava* (described as a Polynesian plant) is listed. In view of the relationship between *kava* and *kawakawa* the omission is a little unfortunate.

Of the p.1330 section and the p.1334 list the seventeen of the first are naturally all Maori words and of the second list thirty-six are outright Maori. Or maybe thirty-five, *pakaru* being a bit suspect? Or fewer, *pakeha* and its compound *pakeha Maori* being likewise suspect, to which *pie on* may be added as another suspect entry, suspect not as a New Zealandism but as Maori, at which point the complexities of the case begin to proliferate.

Here with talk of New Zealandisms one moves on tricky ground, as Orsman more than any of us is aware and which he indicates in his phrasing, '"in New Zealand English"', which properly qualifies the over-assertive heading of the section, 'New Zealand Words'. His first item is *bach* as noun and as verb, about which I recently suggested in this journal that more is to be sought, especially in North America.[4] His further samples are *backblocks*, *bails*, of cows, and *bail up*, of cows and bushrangers. Of *bail*, noun, the comment (p.73) is for sense 3/2 'often plural' which is what Harber has (p.70) but in what respect is this true of New Zealand English? (The only instance which I can think of is the talk of stalls within the cowshed as *bails* e.g. "All the *bails* are in use during milking.") As for *bail*ing *up* of bushrangers, while I have nothing against the Kelly gang so dear to Australians I would prefer a New Zealand example (as of Maungatapu, 1866)[5] to support the entry instead of merely repeating the example from Harber.

With *biddy-biddy* we meet what used to be a difficult name.

Williams' *A Dictionary of the Maori Language* testifies to *piri* (v.) and its various forms, of things which cling or fasten, notably *Acaena anserinifolia*. Whatever the status which formerly maintained for *biddy-biddy* or *biddy-bid* in Australian English there seems little question that this is a New Zealandism from the Maori *piripiri*. Harber does not include the term, which looks as though the New Zealand character of *biddy-biddy* is conceded. The puzzling business which remains is why the entry at p.99 is given as *bidibidi* which one would think was long since superseded.

Blight bird is dated to 1869. There is no Australian entry for this or for *silvereye*, although *white-eye* is given, again with the bothersome phrasing 'any of a group of small singing birds, most of which have a ring of white feathers around the eyes' which presumably is meant to encompass all the Silvereyes of the *Zosteropidae*, eighty-five or so of them. Orsman passes over *blight bird* as a leading entry, giving *blighty* 'see Silvereye. Also called blight bird', and at *silvereye* 'also called Waxeye, White-eye or blighty' - the hyphens again! - which is 'a small bird widespread throughout New Zealand recognizable by the silver ring around its eye' for which *tauhou* is the Maori name, and at *white-eye* crossrefers to *silver-eye* (here hyphenated) 'Also called blighty, blight bird, waxeye or tauhou'. Even if not entirely consistent, Orsman makes a better job of the Silvereye entries than Harber.[6]

Another word better handled by Orsman is *whitebait* 'the young of a group of small fishes, regarded as a table delicacy' which is decidedly more to the point than the Australian 'any small fish which is cooked and eaten whole' but neither is as competent as the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*. Why, however, talk of 'a group of small fishes' without specifically naming for one the New Zealand Minnow, *Galaxias attenuatus* (Powell, 1959:63) and why not give its Maori name, *inanga*, which is the true New Zealand whitebait? There is point to the question beyond quibbling, because shortly in Orsman's list one comes to *cockabully* 'a small freshwater fish', which is *Galaxias fasciatus* (Powell, 1959:63), the Maori *kokopu*, the native trout (which are matters which should have been mentioned). Attention should be drawn to the relationship of *kokopu* and *cockabully*, and some allowance made for the marine *cockabully*, *Forsterygion varium* or *Tripterygion varium* (Morton and Miller, 1968:198) which is a blenny. It is likely that *cockabully* is applied indiscriminately to others of the blennies and even to the rockfish, *taumaka*, *Acanthoclinus quadridactylus* (Morton and Miller, 1968:199) although this fish is commonly distinguished as the *tommy* (not listed in Orsman) or *tommycod*. In this matter of discrimination and particularly in regard to *whitebait*, the

Concise Oxford Dictionary's statement has to do with 'fry' of several kinds, eaten when about two inches long, 'fried in quantities'. *Larousse Gastronomique* (Froud and Turgeon, 1961:1106-7) specifies for English readers and consumers the young of the common herring or of sprat (*Clupea harengus* and *C. sprattus*). If the English *whitebait* is thus to be specified as *Clupea* then surely the New Zealand specific, *Galaxias attenuatus*, deserves mention and particularising. *Whitebait* in New Zealand is used in two senses, one of which (the narrow sense, of *G. attenuatus*) carries with it not only a sense of propriety (Morton and Miller, 1968:540 as scientists recognise only this species as true to label) but also implies a superiority in taste and texture. The second sense, of *whitebait* 'fry', maintains for a range of young fish and implies gastronomic inferiority, "not true whitebait".

Another word (probably, almost certainly) derived from Maori, from a place name, is *boohai*, 'perhaps from the North Auckland township of *Puhoi*'. Sinclair (1959:97) was cautious about this as Orsman was, contenting himself with remarking that Puhoi was 'apparently the origin' of something signifying 'the backblocks' (Orsman) or '"the outbacks"' (Sinclair), and rendered the word as 'the Boo-ay', equivalent to Orsman's alternative spelling *boo-eye*. That pronunciation is favoured by Aucklanders, who know little of Orsman's primary *boohai*. Orsman has 1920 as the approximate time of first recording, which strikes one as being extraordinarily late since the style of the word (if it is from *Puhoi*) and what it connotes forcibly suggest that it comes from forty or fifty years earlier. Another late dating is *crawler*, or *crawlie*, at 1933, signifying 'a small freshwater crayfish, koura' i.e. *Paranethrops planifrons* (Powell, 1959:37) and its kind (there are three species) which are properly lobsters. *Crawler* (which looks to have come from fusing *crawfish* with *koura*) for *koura* must have been around for a long time before being recorded. *Crawler/crawlie* is not crossreferred to *crayfish*, but scarcely needs to be since the one follows on from the other? The New Zealand entry makes a much more useful contribution than the Australian appears to do. The critical eye which focussed on *crayfish* might well have been brought to bear on *snapper*. At that, a more critical look at *crawler* could apply too. A freshwater crayfish, Orsman p.248, *crawler* is crossreferred to *koura*, p.603, where it is also applied to saltwater crayfish. And is *crawfish*, p.248, quite as American as the comment suggests?

Also dated to 1933 is *hori*, of which the only remark is that this is a derogatory term for a Maori. The observation seems unduly brief. The connection of *crawler* and *koura* may be inferred by the active reader, but the reticence about *hori* is

restraint at its most severe. One is left tantalised, asking why, how, did the Maori version of *George* become a derogatory term? I am going to speculate, since the Heinemann New Zealand editor invites comment on the dictionary. (Cf. the jacket. This sensibly announces that no dictionary can remain up-to-date, and solicits contributions from those who use it.) *Hori* as presented is a racist sterotype. It was preceded by sundry other stereotypes, some blatantly derogatory, some ambiguous or invidious, some well intentioned, like Canon Fussell's stories. Among the early stereotype furnishings were generous employments of *plurry* 'bloody' and *py korry* 'by golly'. About 1930 around Auckland and Northland (and elsewhere the mode persisted, so I am told) *hori* was commonly pronounced when used in derogation as *horry*. Only speculatively one may suggest, *hori* arrived, in part as a result of a spreading inclination to deanglicize the delivery of Maori, from *horry*, without ceasing to be derogatory, and that *horry* arrived from two longer standing influences. One, reaching back to the 1880s and 1890s when derogation was very common indeed and was popularly conveyed in the Maori joke drawings of various magazines where "Hori" figures and where *py korry* was likely to feature. The other is inferential, that *py korry* fostered *horry* as an occurence of rhyming slang, which is comparatively rare in New Zealand. An alternative prospect which again has to do with derogation is that *hori* 'George' is only coincidental in this as is anything to do with *py korry*, and that *hori/horry* is a very derogatory appropriation from the Maori *hori* or *horihori* 'false, untrue' as adjective, 'to speak falsely' as verb. The affinity of *hori/horry* with the invidious "Cunning as a Maori dog" is regrettably obvious.

With *kit* 'bag or basket woven from flax' we have purportedly an anglicizing, recorded at 1834, from the Maori *kete*. From the date given one takes it that the 1834 citing in Orsman is as the one in *A Supplement to the Oxford English Dictionary*, that is, from Markham (McCormick, 1963:46). But Markham does not necessarily tell us anything directly about any use of *kete*, only 'They make baskets or Kits as we call them for potatoes'. The 'we' in that is ambiguous or at least unclear, are 'we' "Englishmen of my kind in general" or "English settlers in this district"? There is no doubt about *kete* or its Polynesian variants being indigenous, nor about the presence of woven *kits(s)* in North British. (Markham was from the North Riding of Yorkshire.) The point to be taken is that while the currency of British *kits(s)* in the Eighteenth Century is uncertain, there were British speakers who arrived (whether briefly or permanently) in New Zealand who must be assumed to have had in their vocabulary *kit* 'a kind of long shallow basket used for e.g. crabs or fish'. Markham may, he probably does, testify to

this just as Lady Martin (1884:44) who did not write until late in the century testified to neither the indigenous nor the adapted *kit* but stuck to *kete*. The presence of the British *kit* may be sensed from the compounds which appear in Nineteenth Century New Zealand records, such as *Maori kit* or *flax kit* which, if they are not periphrastic, indicate an active differentiation between a British-type *kit* 'long(ish) shallow basket' and the local artifact although these types are used in common ways.

Kit, then, in New Zealand English seems the product of coincidence of which another instance is the English *cur* and the Maori *kuri*. If *kit* is not coincidental, however unlikely coincidence may be, have we to contemplate something just as unlikely, that is, that the New Zealand Maori *kete* was acquired, transported after 1769, anglicised, disseminated and applied in North Britain where *kit* already existed for one type of container and where another had now to be invented in response to the New Zealand example? Coincidence applies in another way with another of Orsman's representative words, to give rise to a sense which Orsman does not acknowledge. This is for *pakaru*, bracketed with *puckeroo* (p.1334). The latter is entered (p.873) with an attribution to '*pakaru* (of a bowl) to shatter'. Bypassing the questionable felicity of referring to 'a bowl', one may observe that the change of the first vowel from /a/ to /u/ is not likely to be particularly significant, and that this may have to do with reflecting Maori pronunciation of the shortened /a/.

Whether or not Polynesian cognates with *pakaru* are to be traced which antedate British contact as from the later Eighteenth Century there was (and is) a prevalent understanding that something which was 'puckerooed' was something which had been 'buggered (up)'. To use 'puckerooed' was genteelly (or tactfully) to avoid being exposed to censure. Folk etymology traced *puckeroo* to 'Bugger you', and one may see that this could have something to it, given the character of a good many of those who arrived in the early contact phase and indeed of those who arrived thereafter. If 'Bugger you' was to be converted into Maori, *pakaru* is no bad approximation. The matter of the cognates aside for the moment, in New Zealand Maori, if one adopts a very hardnosed view, the earliest recordings of *pakaru* are of course post-contact, the attestations are to a degree open to question if not to scepticism about their thorough reliability, and explanations for *pakaru* may be regarded as of a piece with those in which informants sensible that offence might be offered (for instance, to collectors who were churchmen) tempered the wind of their rhetoric. I do not accept this myself, thinking rather that *pakaru* was established (as far as I may gather) and that it acquired the convenient

sense of 'Bugger you/bugger up' as settlement developed. If *pakaru/puckerooed* had no connection with 'buggered (up)', then what form did *buggered* assume in Maori?

The alternative, which again was supported from folk etymology as a product of language of the beach is *pakeha*, first published (p.1334) in 1817, and compounded later as *pakeha Maori* which p.1334 unfortunately misdates to 1932. At p.771 Orsman does not give the compound. He there lists two senses, *pakeha* 'European, as distinct from a Maori' although the caution of Williams (1971:252) might advisably have been emulated, 'A person of predominantly European descent'. The second sense of Orsman is '*(formerly)* a European living as a Maori', that is, as in (say) "Jacky Marmon was Muriwai's *pakeha*", a relationship entered into (in this case voluntarily) by Marmon, in which Muriwai exercised something of proprietorial right and in return for protection or material compensation had the services and skills of the stranger at his command. A degree of constraint, of possible limitation of movement and choice of activity, is implicit for "so-and-so's *pakeha*" which is less an aspect of *pakeha Maori*. It is a case of the difference between F.E. Maning's status in his first years in the Hokianga and Maning's situation vis-a-vis his Maori marriage-kin, and Marmon's situation in the same district in Marmon's first years. In later years Marmon could rightly be regarded no longer as the *pakeha* of Te Taonui (who succeeded Muriwai) but as a *pakeha Maori*.[7]

If a sense which is acknowledged to be archaic is to be given, and here it deserves to be listed, the distinction of *pakeha* and *pakeha Maori* deserves to be observed as well. The gloss, 'a European living as a Maori', is not well put since even in the early days a *pakeha* of sense 2 or a *pakeha Maori* could be and often was most insistent (like Marmon himself) that he was living with Maoris, but emphatically not *as* a Maori and travellers of the times reported on the fervent Europeanization of *pakeha Maori* homes.

The entries on *pakeha* are followed by one instance of reticence, understandably. The word is simply acknowledged as 'Maori', which makes it of a piece with *kai, kainga, karamu* and the like. Is the case quite so clear? The same strain of folk etymology mentioned for *pakaru* has been known to hold that *bugger* or *bugger off* afforded *pakeha*, or that as *pakaru* acquired the informal sense of *bugger* the language of the beach either produced *pakeha* for *fucker* or *fuck off* to fill what would otherwise be a gap in common exchanges, or attached the informal to the established form. One objection to this is that while change of /p/ and /k/ to /b/ and /g/ may be fairly readily entertained it is not so easy to see /f/ becoming /p/ for a

shift from *fuck(er)/fuck off* to *pakeha*. Nevertheless, Williams (7th edn., appendix) gives several instances where an initial English /f/ is Maorified as /p/, as in rendering *farm, fork, fry* or *frying pan, Friday* and more. As in the instance above, the situation is seemingly dual rather than single. There was undoubtedly language of the beach, coarse language, and we know that a locution could be and was adapted as mode of identification for a group of speakers, notably of the French as *wiwi*. What we are considering here is analogous, identification by means of expletive(s) of people using English, speakers who if native English speakers made use of a range of accents and dialects, augmented by the complement of early ships' crews many of whom were not native English speakers. If this is so, *pakeha* as informal language primarily meant 'English speaking' and the generalised 'European' was a later subsuming.

It will be seen from what is sketched above that while *fuck/fucker/fuck off/fuck you* may have contributed to *pakeha*, by the same token the contribution could be to *puckeroo (or puckaroo?)* and that *bugger* and its modifications could equally contribute to *pakeha*. The critical feature perhaps is that both are objurgations or expletives fairly interchangeable and of unquestionably high frequency in the context of the early contact phase. Assuming that there is some tradition in the use of coarse language (as there is in orally transmitted bawdy songs) and acknowledging the inevitability of some modification along the way, it seems that if *pakeha* was a mode of identification then more likely it signified a stem in *fuck*.

Accepting that *pakaru* antedates the contact phase and was conveniently coincidentally disposed to receive the informal English or British styles from *bugger*, one has to consider whether a like condition applied for *pakeha*. With no competence in Maori I have to say brashly that I remain not wholly convinced of this. Williams (1971:252) in dealing with *pakeha* and *pakepakeha, pakehakeha* and *hao* and *patupaiarehe* will bring one's attention to *keha* and its subordinate sense 7, 'pale, dim, whitish' (which is implicit in sense 2, 'turnip', plainly latecome although early in the contact phase). If *keha* has to do with labelling the strangers from overseas one notices at the same time that this may be, to strain a phrase, qualified coincidence, but that terms for 'pale, dim, whitish' being either like *patupaiarehe* or *urukehu* (*kehu* is otherwise given as 'brown, reddish') end up somewhat short of *pakeha*. This is to pass over *waraki* (Smith, 1910:10) or *maitai* (Smith, 1910:10) both of which Williams passes over as connected with *pakeha*. Also, to pass over *kehua* 'ghost' regarded by Williams as a modern word. There may be some colouring from *kehu/keha*, but there seem to be grounds for regarding *pakeha* as a latecome noun and, if latecome, as primarily English Maorified. In

which case the attribution in Orsman is questionable. About *pakeha* some uncertainty must prevail, but it is probably worth noticing that Markham (McCormick, 1963:40) recorded *tangata ma* 'white man' and *pakeha* 'stranger' when not all "strangers" were Europeans or white.

Comment such as this points up two things. First, understandable as is the need in a work like the *New Zealand Dictionary* to make the entries as economical of space as may be, the economy may be achieved at expense which in an instance like the rewritten *parameter* was apparently recognised. The unduly short statement emerges as something over-positive, not so much simplified as simplistic, in the cases of *pakeha* and *puckeroo*. Second, an evident need appears for a companion work to the *New Zealand Dictionary*, a work for which the scope of 'New Zealand English' may have yet to be determined, where the entries may be viewed historically and etymologically and for which the presentation may be more ample, in sum the dictionary which over the years Mr Orsman has been incited and exhorted to produce.

One reviewer at least commented that 'this book is short on etymology' (J. Gundry, *North Shore Times Advertiser*, 13 March 1979, p.11) and another (K. du Fresne, *New Zealand Listener*, Vol. 91, No.2045, 17-23 March 1979, p.15) has been drawn into a rash pronouncement which fuller account would have prevented. Mr du Fresne's statement that *willie-waw* is a term 'exclusively regional in use' for 'a whirlwind that blows in from the sea in the Sounds' - which Sounds? - is not to be taken from Orsman, p.1262, but something less severe than that page affords might have forestalled misapprehension. *Willie-waw*, more aptly *willy-* or *willi-waw* with or without the hyphen, probably has something to do with the Australian *willy-willy* (a rendering of *willi-willi*, so Baker 1966:278 says) 'a whirlwind caused by a tropical cyclone' (Harber, p.1190), and with the western seaboard of the Americas. The *New Zealand Dictionary* has nothing to say about *willie-waw* being exclusive to the (northern South Island?) Sounds, which is just as well. It is Pacific rather than New Zealand English. Mr Gundry in his turn is moved by *dunny* '*(informal)* a toilet' to qualify this as pseudo-correctly 'South Island for outdoor toilet' which is true up to a point. It is also comprehensible North Island language - a bit outmoded these days one would think, unless one were being playful or affected - and Australian also. To the Australians' credit is the magnificent simile recorded by Baker (1966:426), 'All alone like a country dunny' with its splendidly evocative nuances. But *dunny*, South or North Island, was or is not inevitably rural. In the urbs it might or may be detached or semi-detached. Enclosure or incorporation to the point of involvement seems to go against the nature of *dunny*, and this is one place where

Orsman might happily have been more relaxed and expansive. Let me offer a little anecdote of the non-peculiarly Australian provenance of *dunny* and the South Island and of its obsolescence. That excellent poet Judith Wright visited the house of her Australian compatriot, the novelist Randolph Stow, in Leeds, Yorkshire. She returned from his semi-detached privy beyond his backdoor to say 'That's the first *dunny* I've used in years.'

(7)

Among others of Orsman's representative New Zealand words is *backblock* with a first recording at 1895, along with *block* (of land) recorded at 1852. That is, about the time at which *block* - one has to suppose *blocks* as well - came into use in Australia for districts or parts of districts being delimited and made available for settlement. Since *townships* might be designated as well the more remote of the blocks from these became the *back blocks*, which fused. (I noticed when in Eastern Canada that maps still tended to use *township* for what New Zealanders would regard as *blocks*. It is likely that New Zealanders', and Australians', uncertainty about *township* is a legacy of a degree of confusion around the mid-nineteenth century in a period of intercolonial mobility, about *block, township,* and *district* as well. They are all to a degree shifty administrative terms.) *Block(s)* as an innovation is apparently contemporaneous in the Australian and New Zealand colonies, but *backblock(s)* is attested in Australia (Baker, 1966:39) about twenty years before the New Zealand 1895. Given a lag between the introduction of *backblocks* and its first recording, the primacy of this word as an Australianism seems pretty sure. It is a representative New Zealand word in a way, true, but not in the way of, say, *hokonui* 'illicitly distilled liquor' which is to say moonshine whisky. (This, itself a backblocks product, is an attractive case of a Maori place name being transferred to an alien artifact, which has a reverse condition in the Wellington district's Moonshine Valley.)

If the Australian innovatory *backblocks* is set back a conjectural ten years it comes into the period of the 1850s-1860s at which time Australian pastoralists were entering especially into Canterbury and into land less desirable or less accessible than the holdings of the earlier colonists who formed the substantially English-Anglican Establishment. The intruders were derogatorily termed *shagroon(s)* which Orsman dates to '1851-1870 (approx.)' and glosses as 'an early Australian settler in Canterbury Province' without comment on the source of the term, which has been variously and dubiously derived. *Shagroon* is overtly a New Zealandism but an intensely regional one of

limited duration. There seems little reason to doubt that *shagroon* is an anglicising of the Irish *shaughraun*. Unlike the founders of the Canterbury settlement, Anglican gentry of a superior caste, the *shagroons* were socially inferior settlers who arrived not from England, but from Australia, which carries with it a nuance of convict settlements and Irishry (since so many of the convicts were Irish). *Shagroon* is a scarcely covert sneer, possibly at those who could be hinted as 'ticket-of-leave men' or as men who were smart operators like the fellow of Dion Boucicault's very popular play *The Shaughraun*.

The *shagroon* settlers came in when *backblocks* (which carries an implication of less desirable areas) was being established in Australian pastoral language, into a part of New Zealand where the Establishment term of reference was *back country*, which maintained, and maintains. Turner (1966:143) remarks on the nuances here, *back country* is a term of approval whereas *backblocks* came to suggest 'North Island cow cockies' and a 'more pejorative tone... of rough uncivilized life' contra the often ample realisations of the Canterbury pastoralists. *Back country* pairs with *high country* of the South Island, *backblocks* with *hill country* of the North Island where the less accessible land was, for obvious historical reasons, opened for development later, where there was little comparable to the force of the Canterbury Establishment and where moreover the development of the 1880s and 1890s came after another phase of intercolonial movement of people, thus facilitating the introduction again of *backblocks* into the New Zealanders' language.

If *backblocks* is to be qualified as a New Zealand term so too is *Taranaki gate* (1937) 'a makeshift wire and batten gate' with some pejorative tone to it, some hint of the poor, or the shiftless. While a *Taranaki gate* appears impressively indigenous, has it no precedent in a backblocks *parole* in the *Gippsland gate* of Victoria?

High country mentioned above is dated to 1874, which brings it back towards the *shagroon* phase. It is not listed by Harber, but you may gather in spite of this that grounds exist for regarding *high country* as a regional locution in Australia. H. Gritscher and C. McGregor (1967) have it as their title and in their presentation include a map titled 'The High Country' to delimit land west and south from Canberra pivoting on Kosciusko to bear towards Lake Eildon. McGregor uses 'the high country' repeatedly in his text, commenting that it is 'more a state of mind than anything else', a very diversified landscape yet 'it retains a unity'. As much might be said of the New Zealand *high country*. McGregor, a child of those Australian parts, strikes his reader as picturing what is familiar enough to South Islanders more than to North Island people for whom

hill country is likelier (a distinction which Orsman observes). The upshot is that one is left wondering if *high country* is not an (overlooked) Australian regionalism signifying pretty much what is signified by the New Zealand term, and wondering further. Since the exploitation of the South Island *high country* followed the arrival of the *shagroons* may *high country*, eminently compatible with the Canterbury *back country*, not have been an Australianism before it was a New Zealandism?

This is touching on that part of the New Zealand lexicon which is effectively what E.E. Morris (1898) referred to as Austral English. And, of course, the longterm effect of Morris upon Harber *et al.* and Orsman *et al.* is altogether evident. If Morris is weak, as he is, in dealing with colloquial language so too is Harber, but not so Orsman who freely represents the colloquial which is often, but not exclusively, either of Australian or New Zealand language or is Australasian since common to both. An occurrence of Pacific English was mentioned previously and the misapprehension of the status of a New Zealand usage. Some more guidance about this could be introduced to correct misapprehension. For instance, *bush-lawyer* 'a person who pretends to a knowledge of the law' is common to Harber and to Orsman who gives this as sense (1). Orsman's sense (2) 'a native thorny vine' is consistent with his p.1334 listing where *bush-lawyer* as a representative word is bracketed '(vine)', so a reasonably intelligent reader (if he has consulted p.1334 first) will know positively that the 'vine' is peculiarly of New Zealand, that sense (1) is not so, but will the same reader take this from p.141? One sees that 'native' in sense (2) is supposed to convey a particular advice, but does it clearly do so? Will that reader gather that sense (1) which has an evident relationship of some sort to sense (2) is also an Australian term?

A reader who picks up *dag* from p.1334 has it without any of the bracketing as for *bush-lawyer* and will find on p.265 that, like *bush-lawyer, dag* has two senses, but sense (2) which has sub-senses (a) and (b) is a New Zealand peculiarity. (A third sub-sense, perhaps, could be added, of 'a rough diamond or a hard case' and crossreferred to *hard case*.) This leaves sense (1) as implicitly 'formal' and implicitly not peculiar to New Zealand associated with sense (2) which could be marked as explicitly New Zealand usage. For readers' convenience Orsman's glosses are given here: (1) 'one of the locks of wool clotted with dirt about the hind portions of a sheep.' (2a) 'An extraordinary person or event.' (2b) 'A person with a sense of humour.'

Between *bush-lawyer* and *dag* come *cockabully, crawler/ crawlie* and *'crib* (=cottage)'. Whether or not the reader has

looked at p.1334 when he consults p.251 he will find, quite explicit statement, of three senses for *crib*. Senses (1) and (2) correspond to the Harber definitions but sense (3) is interpolated not just to specify New Zealand peculiarity, but to stress that it is '*South Island*: a weekend or beach cottage' crossreferred, 'See BACH'. Now, *cottage* 'a small simple house, usually old' (Harber and Orsman) is acceptable of Australasian language (although today in the United Kingdom a good many *cottages* so-called would not agree with that) and recognises by its 'usually' that *cottage* has had a return into designers' and *real estate agents'* vocabulary. If we crossrefer to *bach* 'a weekend or beach cottage; a crib' we may not be content, and we may even want to know, if *crib* sense (3) warrants specification as a South Island usage, why *bach* is not marked for the North Island. Whatever one's objections or criticisms, *crib* is handled markedly better than *dag*. As something in passing, while *crib* is undoubtedly linked with the South Island, I have collected one northern *crib* (of the Wellsford, Central North Auckland, area) which may be no more than a local historian's eccentricity. I have some (uncertain) information that *crib* formerly had some currency around Raglan, western Waikato (North Island) coast, and suspect that some record of *crib* may yet turn up from the Waipu settlement (eastern central North Auckland).

(8)

The inconsistency in treatment of *dag* and *crib* is a matter of practice which is noticeable in other instances, which eventual revision of the New Zealand dictionary - that will no doubt follow as it has already followed for the Australian volume - should aim to rectify. Inconsistency of treatment turns up with another housing word, not listed on p.1334 where it might well have been shown, that is, *whare* 'a house or hut' with the brief etymology marker 'Maori'. This is quite insufficient as a definition, but that aside. The guide to pronounciation tells you '*say* fa-reh *or commonly* WORRi.

P.1289 offers a rationale of sorts. It does not read comfortably. A principle is stated: 'Where a Maori word is used more commonly than the English equivalent both are included and crossreferenced'. There is no crossreferring for *whare, house, hut* so the reader takes it that *whare* is not more commonly used, which is correct, but also take it that *house/hut* are equivalents for *whare*, which may be queried. For example, putting aside the restricted formal use of *whare* compounds in Maori communities for e.g. *meeting house* or sleeping quarters, while most Maoris live in *houses* some live in *huts* or *baches*. Is it not the case that to refer to a dwelling place as a *whare* is to imply a degree of dilapidation? That is, *whare* is today

something of a pejorative? On a remote farm which I have visited in recent years were two farmhouses, a hut, and a very battered corrugated iron, unlined, earthfloored shanty which had reached the state of being called the *whare*. Historically, gumdiggers and timberworkers often lived in *whares*, with a corrugated iron or earth chimney, sometimes with a wooden door and frame, commonly a work mainly of canvas or sacking with a fly overhead of corrugated iron for the less itinerant workers but otherwise commonly of *nikau* fronds after the style of the prototype, which is probably how such structures came by transference to be known as *whares*.

As may be seen above, the New Zealand dictionary advances, or favours 'Maori pronunciation rather than anglicized versions' (p.vi) but acknowledges that 'some exceptions do occur' (p.1289) and instances 'kowhai: *say* KAW-fah-ee *or commonly* KO-why'. If 'KO-why' and 'WORRi' why not a 'commonly' for *paua, kauri* and *hapuku*? I am not proposing to scan the dictionary for examples, but I looked to see what was said about *tarakihi*, which gets both formal and informal pronunciation guides, is preceded by *taraire* which gets only a formal guide, and is followed by *Taranaki gate* for which *Taranaki* has only an informal pronunciation. The consistency of all this is not evident.

(9)

To return to the list of p.1334. *Groper*, dated to 1843, is undoubtedly a word used by New Zealanders but what is especially characteristic of it as a New Zealand word? The entry at p.478 recast the Harber entry by adding 'edible' and 'New Zealand' to the 'Australian' statement and by inserting in sub-sense (a) an allusion to *hapuku* while at the same time dropping the (older) alternative spelling *grouper*, which Harber notices, but omitting to notice that use of *groper* 'hapuku' is a mainly southern custom. If regional difference may be noticed as it is for *crib* the same could be noticed here. It could also be noticed that *hapuku* is commonly pronounced 'HAR-pookuh'.

Fantail (dated to 1851) from about the same time as *groper* is given with three senses, (2) and (3) concurring with the Australian entry. This makes the distinction of *fantail* as a New Zealand word to lie with sense (1), for which the Maori names, three of them, are given. (If three, why not four, as in Biggs, 1966:58? Perhaps because as Williams remarks there are numerous variations on the forms of the names, and three will suffice to hint at variety.) The distinctive New Zealand character (disregarding subspecies) of *fantail* sense (1) would be enhanced if the nomenclature of the scientists was employed, a possibly distinctive mode of reference advanced if the informal use of *fanny* was mentioned comparably to the *blighty*

'silvereye'.

While *groper* and *fantail* remain current and while the rest of the representative list may be judged to be current, what is the status of *gyver* (1897) or *pie on* (1941)? I would have thought that *gyver* (which I know only from print) was long gone, and of *pie on* as something at the best obsolescent if not quite obsolete. The date of 1941 for *pie on* seems to me unduly late, perhaps because my father had an expression "(It's) pie on the diddle" uttered with stress on *pie* and *on*. The sense was of *right on, smack on, bang on*, informal, a sense of approval. I have the impression still that it was something from my father's young days, which would be likely to suggest that the exclamation had some provenance of the London music halls, or from his early years at sea which included visiting New Zealand. Orsman gives (p.811) the sense 'to be good at or keen on' which strikes me as only a part of what *pie on* connoted in my young days which were not so remote from his; so his understanding and mine may reflect regional colourings. For some years I have thought of *pie on* as an irritating little puzzle, suspecting that in New Zealand *pie on* is a curtailment of something not local or national (my father's expression) fused with the local (conjecturally, *ka pai* 'it is good') when that exclamation (the exclamatory function recurs, at expense to the informational or communicative) was losing popularity and going out of fashion. It follows that both Orsman and myself, since Orsman makes no reference to any source in Maori, have been inclined to regard *pie on* as what it seems to be, an English New Zealandism. However, when Williams is checked the likelihood of a Maori source, as in 'E pai ana tera, nau i pena mai e pai ana' (Williams, 1971:249) and indeed in 'e pai ana' itself, an expression of suitability or satisfaction, considerably enhances the case for considering *pie on* as anglicised Maori.

In an instance of this kind one wishes forcibly for more of the historical and etymological addenda to the Orsman dictionary, fervently wishing for at least a supplementary volume from Orsman since the present *Heinemann New Zealand Dictionary* may only so far entertain any prospect of economical expansion. Another couple of words which demand more than is offered are in the list of p.1334, *Enzed* (1918) and *zambuk* (1918). The datings are suggestive of military provenance which characteristically fosters use of abbreviations. This is not peculiar to the military, so much as to administrative systems whereby knowingness about the significances of a cryptic language becomes a function of a self-enhancing image to a member of the in-group. Which, in turn, promotes nicknaming.

Is this what lies behind *zambuk*? Consider this as a product of the 'New Zealand Ambulance (Corps or Company)',

conjecturally probably first '(N) ZAmbuC'. The entry (p.1281) says *zambuk* 'a person who gives first-aid at a sporting event', which is possibly true today (although Aucklanders are inclined to think this outmoded) but in postwar years from 1918 the connotation was surely not just blankly 'a first aid person' but quite specifically members of the St. John Ambulance association, in which the 'Ambulance' significantly figures? The 'Ambulance' part is probably older than the First World War, since *Zambuk* as a trade name antedates 1914 if George Orwell is to be relied on, for Orwell (1939) in *Coming Up for Air* makes 'Zam-buk' a product advertised in papers c. 1909 and earlier. If a military style of abbreviations actually holds at all, does it perhaps trace back to Boer War days? Partridge (1967: 1475) regarded *Zambuk* 'first aid man' as Australian slang and dated it to c. 1925, and Johnston (1976:965) is pretty much in agreement, but Orsman's dating at 1918 gives priority to New Zealand usage. In light of Orwell's allusion it seems that Metropolitan English, the source of the name for the (Zambuk) ointment, may be not so much innovating as the agency of transmission.

Of *Enzed* one may be fairly sure that whatever military usage may have had to do with it, it was in use before 1918 perhaps not so much in isolation but as part of a compound as, for instance, in the abbreviated 'N.Z.R.' (p.1297) of 'New Zealand Railways' let alone such others as were current at the same period.

(10)

Not among the 'New Zealand Words' list but in the body of the work is *kuri* 'a dog, mongrel' from Maori, with a secondary sense, its informal sense, 'an unpopular person', who is referred to as a 'gooree'. It is a long time since I heard that sense employed. *Gooree*, synonymous with *mong/mung* (not listed, 'a dog of no pedigree') reportedly survives in rural New Zealand along with contractions of the kind of *pookapook* 'pukapuka', with *gigi* 'kiekie' and *rivarriva* or *riverriver* 'rewarewa', and for that matter, *claddie* 'korari' (for which see Smithyman, 1969:91-4) or *biddybid* 'piripiri'.

The seemingly obvious aspect of such items is that they strike us as oldfashioned, Nineteenth Century modes. The point is, they survive and are transmitted. They are apparently necessarily to be acquired for purposes of communicating, not only for matters affecting registers and collocations (as, for instance, *port* or *porthole* 'the opening in the side of a shearing shed by which shorn sheep are ejected', not in Harber or in Orsman, as *porthole*, Baker, 1966:51 which collocates with

shoot or *shute*, Baker, or *chute*) but with regionalisms; for instance, the Coromandel pub style, "More of that and *I'll step you*" 'I shall ask you to step outside and settle things there'. Or, with the kind of usage restricted to a family in a district, such as, *seggy* for *sookie* or its variants, 'calf'; this goes back to English dialect in referring to the animal, a usage now perhaps eclipsed by *sook* or *sookie* 'child, effeminate, cry baby'. Or, *gooly/ie* 'obtrusive stone in e.g. a roadway or creekbed, something which should be dealt with' which most New Zealanders are probably more aware of by way of *Steptoe and Son* as *goolies* 'stones, i.e. testicles' which again derives from (Northern) English dialect. Or, with craft/trade usages, such as *tippler/toppler/tuppler?*, of part of the machinery in coal-mining which tips over the coal brought up from a mine on the hoist. In England *tippler* is also the designation for British Railways coal-carrying units which tilt sideways to deposit their load. (*Unit*, noun, sense 4, 'a suburban electric train' is listed by Orsman without remark that this has a peculiarly Wellington usage.)[10] Or, with craft/trade disseminated, as in the not peculiarly New Zealand *sprog*.

The question which arises here is, if one puts aside trade or craft terms along with the "family" usages or regional variants, does a group remain (of the kind mainly represented in the first paragraph of this section) which spreads across the suggested lines of demarcation, comprehensible to a part (a mainly rural part) of the population but only limitedly able to be understood (if understandable at all) to a good many New Zealanders? The examples given are oldfashioned, and only selective. The query which follows is, is there one (or more?) mode of language which, while not 'formal' in the fashion in which the Orsman dictionary regards 'formal usage', departs from the 'informal' range so far as to constitute a *patois*? If so, then some attention to it is warranted.

(11)

Orsman contributed several hundred New Zealand words from his files. Everyone (at the time of writing) is happily busy figuring out what was omitted, which amounts to saying that if it did not take long for the decision to revise the *Australian Heinemann Dictionary* it should take even less time to decide to get revision of the New Zealand volume under way. The reviewers fix on what they regard as distinctively New Zealand language, from colloquial-vernacular through slang and are not to be discouraged from wanting to see obsolete slang recorded (which has in some cases been printed) and show interest in regional variants. The reviewers seem pleased to have the formerly 'unprintable' items in print.

One of those which could have some further attention is of the more printable sort, *arse*, noun, an informal for 'the buttocks', an extraordinarily supplemented item since it has appended 'related to the Greek *oura* tail'. Nothing is said of the compounds such as *arsehole* or *arse upwards* or *arse over kite* or *arse first* or the verb forms such as *'arse about/around'*, *'got his arse* where his elbow ought to be', 'can't *tell his arse* from his elbow' or *'get* his arse *into gear'*. *Arse* has not been well handled. The Australians may yet approach this better, who have no *arse* at all in the current edition.

A like insufficiency in treatment of other 'improper' terms may be discerned. It is arguable whether fuller treatment is warranted given the availability of special dictionaries, and given the likelihood that New Zealand inventiveness in respect of "taboo" terms is probably predictably low, but until an inventory is presented and challenged we shall be at loss. We are, as a people, more imitative than innovatory but until the extent of our innovation is displayed we stand at loss, a less identifiable people in a circumstance where identification is often cognate with the language in use. We have not needed, nor do we now need, Heidegger to tell us about identity being cognate with language.

Respectable language will tell us something about our history, and lexical items which fit into registers will probably tell us even more. If you look at *residency* under *resident* you will find nothing to tell you why the Ministry of Works advertises its various office buildings as 'Residency/ies' as a latecome revival of the Nineteenth Century connection with the Madras Survey. If you look under *creek* you will find a very insufficient account of the status of that word and no indication of the ambiguity with which the Lands and Survey people have applied and continue to apply their senses of *creek* to the otherwise usually admirable maps which they publish.

To sum up. *The Heinemann Australian* and *The Heinemann New Zealand* dictionaries are well worthwhile, lexicographically and economically. They are useful, they are suggestive, they are informative. Both need and doubtless will have suitable revision, in the New Zealand case especially in the direction of consistency in treatment of items. Australian lexicographiles have available to them more resources for further consulting than are available to New Zealanders. Recognising the economic considerations, in the New Zealand circumstance what are needed are two matters, a revision of the Orsman dictionary as we have it at present, and another dictionary, more especially a dictionary of New Zealand usages, present and past, which should be etymological and historical. Patently, no one in New Zealand is better equipped to produce this than Mr Orsman.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allan, J. 1950. *Australian Shells*. Melbourne, Georgian House.

Baker, S.J. 1966. *The Australian Language*. 3rd edition. Sydney, Currawong.

Beaglehole, J.C. (ed.) 1955. *The Journals of Captain James Cook; The Voyages of The Endeavour, 1768-1771*. With corrigenda, 1968. Cambridge, Hakluyt Society.

Biggs, B.G. 1966. *English-Maori Dictionary*. Wellington, Reed.

Cockayne, L. and Turner, E.P. 1958. *The Trees of New Zealand*. 4th edition. Wellington, Government Printer.

Cotton, B.C. and Godfrey, F.K. 1938. *The Molluscs of South Australia*. Part I. Adelaide, Government Printer.

Doak, W. 1978. *Fishes of the New Zealand Region*. Revised edition. Auckland, Hodder and Stoughton.

Falla, R.A., Sibson, R.B. and Turbott, E.G. 1966. *A Field Guide to the Birds of New Zealand and Outlying Islands*. Auckland, Collins.

Froud, N. and Turgeon, C. (eds.) 1961. *Larousse Gastronomique*. London, Hamlyn.

Gritscher, H. and McGregor, C. 1967. *The High Country*. Sydney, Angus and Robertson.

Hill, R. 1967. *Australian Birds*. Melbourne, Nelson.

Johnston, G. (ed.) 1976. *The Australian Pocket Oxford Dictionary*. Melbourne, O.U.P.

Kinsky, F.C. *et al.* 1970. *Annotated Checklist of the Birds of New Zealand*. Wellington, Reed for Ornithological Society of New Zealand.

Macdonald, J.D. 1973. *Birds of Australia*. Sydney, Reed.

Macpherson, J.H. and Gabriel, C.J. 1962. *Marine Molluscs of Victoria*. Melbourne, M.U.P.

Martin, M.A. (Lady) 1884. *Our Maoris*. London, S.P.C.K.

McCormick, E.H. (ed.) 1963. Edward Markham, *New Zealand or Recollections of It*. Wellington, Government Printer.

Morris, E.E. 1898. *Austral English: A Dictionary of Australian words...* London, Macmillan.

Morton, J. and Miller, M. 1968. *The New Zealand Sea Shore*. Auckland, Collins.

Orwell, G. 1939. *Coming Up for Air*. London, Gollancz. Repr., 1959, Secker and Warburg, p.55.

Partridge, E. 1967. *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*. 2 vols. Vol. II (Supplement), revised and enlarged edition. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Powell, A.W.B. 1959. *Native Animals of New Zealand*. 2nd edition, Auckland, Unity.

---------- 1967. *Shells of New Zealand*. 4th edition, Christchurch, Whitcombe and Tombs.

Sharland, M. 1958. *Tasmanian Birds*. 3rd edition, Sydney, Angus and Robertson.
Sinclair, K. 1959. *A History of New Zealand*. Harmondsworth, Penguin.
Smith, S.P. 1910. *Maori Wars of the Nineteenth Century*. Christchurch, Whitcombe and Tombs.
Smithyman, K. 1969. "Claddie and Bob". *Te Reo* 12: 91-4.
---------- 1977. "Three New Zealand lexical items". *Te Reo* 20: 83-94.
Turner, G.W. 1966. *The English Language in Australia and New Zealand*. London, Longmans.
Williams, H.W. 1971. *A Dictionary of the Maori Language*. 7th edition, Wellington, Government Printer.

NOTES

1 The Harber definition is 'an officer in charge of supplies, equipment, etc., in the army or navy'. Orsman corrects this, to enlarge on Army usages, and to set apart the Navy understanding, 'petty officer in charge of steering, taking soundings, signalling, etc.'

2 Bold face, used in the dictionaries, is not available for this journal's settings, so caps are used instead.

3 *Birder* has recently emerged in the United States in a novel fashion, signifying a very superior sort of person, superior to the mere *birdwatcher* and distinct from professional ornithologists. All three kinds engage in *birding*, and possibly belong to the American Birding Association or read its bulletin *Birding*, but *birders* set themselves apart. For discussion of this cf. *Audubon*, 81.4: 88-100.

4 In that article (Smithyman 1977) I regrettably overlooked the entries on *bach* in R.W. Burchfield (ed.), *A Supplement to the O.E.D.*, Vol. 1, Oxford, Clarendon, 1972, especially, of *bach* 'bachelor', 1855, and "A cabin... where [three men] were "keeping bach". I have to thank Dr Burchfield for drawing my attention to this.

5 The Maungatapu track, the old connecting way for Nelson and the Marlborough settlements, was in June 1866 the scene of the murder of four men, done to death by a gang of four subsequently frequently referred to as "the New Zealand Kelly Gang", and as "bushrangers". The case was much discussed, especially as one of the gang turned Queen's Evidence and after considerable bitterness quit the colony, allegedly to return in later years and very recently returned again into New Zealand consciousness by way of Maurice Gee's novel *Plumb*.

6 Falla, Sibson and Turbott (1966:223) give *blightie*, not *blighty*. Orsman gives the first attestation of *blight bird* at 1869, at which time there was a quite considerable argument about the bird since the obvious presence of *Zosterops lateralis* in New Zealand was comparatively recent, substantially dating from June 1856, following mass migration from eastern or southeastern Australia, or Tasmania. Earlier records of sightings may go back as far as 1832. The Maori *tauhou*, which primarily signifies 'stranger', is regarded by Williams (1971:398) as a modern usage when applied to the bird. This is a most interesting instance, in which the Maori mode of reference fixed at a point which "named" the bird by implying that it had no name and seemingly Maori made no effort to generate anything local or specifying, nor seemingly was any adaptation from any English name attempted. Moreover, *tauhou* does not appear to have been recorded as a "name" for any other recent or occasional

migrants.

7 John Marmon (c.1800-80) was the first European to settle in the Hokianga district of Northland. He was a runaway convict who took a Maori wife, and had a probably undeserved reputation as "the white cannibal" which he exploited when occasions suited. He was a Sydney-born Irishman, aggressively workingclass whereas F.E. Maning (1811-83), a later Hokianga settler who likewise took a Maori wife, was gentry. Marmon may be thought to figure in Maning's wellknown *Old New Zealand*, published over the pseudonym of "A Pakeha Maori", a work better to be regarded as a work of fiction than as statement of fact.

8 The opinion above, that *dunny* today may be only playful or affected in northern parts, has been disputed by one member of the N.Z. Linguistic Society, whose opinion is worth noting. It is also worth noticing that those who wish to regard *dunny* as Australasian, let alone South Island, may observe that Claudia Wright, writing from Washington D.C. for British and other readers, assumes that she will be understood when she refers to 'public dunny sodomists', *New Statesman*, Vol. 98, No. 2531, 21 September 1979, p. 420.

9 The relationship of *Shagroon* and *Shaughraun* seems fairly sure, but in what way Boucicault may bear on *Shagroon* has more to it than can be conveniently treated here.

10 The Auckland main office of the New Zealand Railways consulted about this emphatically stated that *unit* as a train term was restricted to Wellington, where the association of *unit* and electric power was implicit. Shortly after this enquiry was made there was some newspaper discussion of a proposal put to the Auckland Regional Authority for suburban rail transport *units* to be powered by "a small 50 hp automotive engine". The model proposed was likened "to a bus". Soon after the Auckland Regional Authority was discussing changing the types of (non-electric) buses for city services in terms of *units*. To some extent the talk of *units* as reported was orthodox, conforming to Orsman, sense (1), but the reports may indicate the development of Auckland usages distinct from Wellington's, and otherwise even more unorthodox. Given the economic prospects, there may of course be no development at all.