

## FEATURES

# Island names retain traces of original use

MURICE McGREAL asks why we talk about the North Island, but not about the Stewart Island. People from overseas usually give themselves away by dropping the "the", which sounds odd to most New Zealanders. New Zealanders do not, generally, say things like, "I'm going to South Island next week." This is a matter of whether the name is seen merely as a name or whether it still retains traces of its original use as a description. In general, names do not have a "the"; we do not say "the Wellington" (meaning the city) or "the Australia" (meaning the country). Definitions, on the other hand, do have a "the": "the capital

is from 1773). Stewart Island has never been a description, only a name, and so has no "the". In a similar fashion, we often refer to the university in Canberra as "ANU", while the Australians insist on the definite article, and call it "the ANU" or "The Australian National University.

All of this is fairly straightforward. The real puzzle is why there are a few names which either can or must take a "the": the Hague, the Bronx, the Sudan, the Manawatu, the Waitarapa.

However, we talk about a "tricky question" because a "tricky question" would mean something else. That is a good reason for not using the adjective. In the "Engliland" versus "English" case, we have a per-



Laurie Bauer

## WATCH YOUR LANGUAGE

city", "the lucky country". We keep that little "the" at the front of "the North Island", making it a description, because that is the way we have referred to the islands for more than 200 years (the first quo-

tation for such use in *The Oxford Dictionary of New Zealand English* was in 1882).

When we say the words, we cannot disambiguate "Engliland" in the same way, so perhaps an alternative is required.

In *Coriolanus*, Adrian Mooney, among other

commentators, says,

"I have heard it said, the

fittest time to corrupt a man's wife

is the use of an apostrophe to indicate 'is', as it is now also used for 'has'.

This can also be very confusing:

"He's a servant." Does he have

a servant or is he a servant? That

might indeed be ambiguous,

though no more ambiguous in "have got" in place of the main verb "have".

"Have" means the ambiguity is less likely to arise in the first place.

Mostly speakers avoid the ab-

breviation where "have" is the

main verb and where it might lead

to such ambiguity. This is not an

absolute rule, but a strong

preference. Where "have" is an auxiliary verb, the usage is anything but new.

In *Coriolanus*, Shakespeare says, "I have heard it said, the fittest time to corrupt a man's wife is when she's fallen out with her husband." This certainly looks like a reduced "has", even though "has" is now also used for "have".

"They may find support for this in the fact that we must say "the New Zealand coach" (we have no adjective in common usage). Perhaps the parallel use of the country name supports the use of "England coach".

Finally, we can distinguish be-

tween an "ENGLISH teacher" (some-

"English TEACHER" (a teacher who

comes from England) by the stress

on "English". As he quite rightly

says, "it is good reason not

to. So we talk about "regional gov-

ernment", rather than "region gov-

ernment", but since we have no ad-

jective for "traffic" we have "traffic

light", but two things.

Mostly speakers avoid the ab-

breviation where "have" is the

main verb and where it might lead

to such ambiguity. This is not an

absolute rule, but a strong

Laurie Bauer is a linguist from Victoria University.  
Send your questions about language to [words@dompost.co.nz](mailto:words@dompost.co.nz)