

have been merely an oversight by the Government Printer but it covers hundreds of entries chiefly those which Collier obtained from Poole's Index and from Dr Scheppig of Kiel. Presumably when Collier saw the Doctor's preliminary work twenty years earlier the entries were without notes or he would not have so confidently made the charge in the beginning of the lengthy quotation above that this idea Hocken had borrowed from the reviewer. Again, where Hocken has used the exact words of Collier in an annotation he should have inserted quotes although as Collier himself acknowledged Hocken's own wide knowledge and industry enabled him to make an infinitely greater number of useful notes than the few which he borrowed.

What of the examples specifically quoted? The first Schirren (Collier, p 63; Hocken, p 185) is not clear-cut although it appears that Hocken has much shortened and paraphrased the note of his predecessor while adding to the example the names of Percy Smith, Fornander and others. The book is not in the Trimble catalogue of the Hocken Library which does not necessarily prove anything while the section of the note to which Collier took exception that relating to Hochstetter has been recast and could have been done from the original work. The second example Reybaud (Collier, p 28; Hocken, p 90) is a clear paraphrased borrowing for Collier has seen the work but Hocken has inserted an asterisk. In the case of *Cassell's Picturesque Atlas ...* a common work readily available to both, all that Hocken appears to have done is to summarise in his own words the New Zealand sections of the book. Here, however, Collier may be correct for he, Collier, overlooked in Vol 2, *Wellington and its surroundings* as, more significantly did Hocken also. The note under Esquiros (Collier, p 78; Hocken, p 216) in the second work is a clear borrowing, as there is also in the second Andrew Lang reference (Collier, p 164; Hocken, p 380) but not in the first (Collier, p 153; Hocken, p 353) where Hocken's rewording implies at least a reference to an intermediate source if not the original.

What then is a considered judgement? It would have been better in some instances to have used quotation marks and it was unfortunate that the explanation of the asterisk was not given. Collier may have made over-much of the borrowings and Hocken in his last sickness was over-concerned. Merely to claim one's own is not to be pervaded by a jealous spirit. And Collier continued to conclude on a note of unqualified praise... 'The careful collations of difficult works are beyond praise. Errors of any moment are non-existent.' And in that same mood we may leave the controversy. A. G. B.

REFERENCES

- ¹ *Evening Post*, 3 April 1909.
- ² Secretary, Royal Colonial Institute to Colonial Secretary, NZ 7 March 1895, re listing of NZ publications and reply on file Col.Sec. 95/1063. Col.Sec. 96/1649.