

THE ANGUS & ROBERTSON ARCHIVES*

IN JUNE 1977 the N.S.W. Government purchased for the Mitchell Library for \$70,000 the business archives of the publishing firm of Angus & Robertson, covering in the main the period 1932-1970, but including some earlier material.

The Library had purchased, in 1933, a collection of A & R publishing manuscripts and correspondence which covered the period up to 1932, and had rounded this out with the purchase, in 1959, of 353 original drawings which had been commissioned by the firm for its various publications. The recent purchase, which is the subject of this article, means that the Library has the archives of this most important of all Australian publishing houses for the period to 1970.

But this particular collection meant more to us at the Mitchell than the acquisition of a very important body of primary source material. It was apposite not only that these archives should be lodged in the repository which houses material which can complement them — such as the archives of A & R for the earlier period, and the papers of so many of the authors and artists associated with the firm, and of people and organisations involved in books and literature in N.S.W. and Australia — but also that they should be lodged in the Mitchell Library, because without George Robertson, one of the founders of the firm, David Scott Mitchell might not have been such a keen collector of Australiana, and without Mitchell we would not have had his Library and the flowering of Australian studies which such an institution, established as early as 1910, fostered and the results of which Angus & Robertson helped to disseminate.

George Robertson, in his role as bookseller, had a very close association over a long period with Mitchell and gave his support to the establishment of the Mitchell Library. Initially, Mitchell's interest was in collecting works of English literature. Although the exact date when he turned to Australiana is not certain, both Frederick Wymark and J.R. Tyrrell have claimed that it began when A & R acquired Thomas Whitley's collection in 1887. Gordon Richardson, in the T.D. Mutch Memorial Lecture in 1961, stated that if Robertson

did not actually initiate this new interest, [he] at least assiduously fostered it, both as a good bookseller with an eye to business and perhaps with a far-seeing vision as well: there seems to be no evidence that Robertson either foresaw or influenced the ultimate disposal of Mitchell's library but he was fully aware of the importance of forming such a collection and of having it in Australia. For some time during the 1880's Mitchell had first refusal of anything that Angus and Robertson bought.¹

Arthur Jose, in an obituary of Robertson in the Brisbane *Courier* in August 1933, said that it was Robertson who suggested to Mitchell that he collect Australiana.

*A revised version of a paper read to members of the Bibliographical Society of Australia and New Zealand, 3 September 1977. Quotations from the correspondence of H.M. Green are reproduced by kind permission of Mrs Green.

When it was proposed, in accordance with the terms of Mitchells' will, to erect a building to house his collection, George Robertson gave the following evidence before the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on 19 October 1905:

In its [the Australasian portion of Mitchell's collection] formation hundreds of booksellers in all part of the world have been laid under contribution, but, when I say that during the past twenty-one years Angus & Robertson have travelled many thousands of miles collecting Australiana for Mr. Mitchell, and that the sum of his purchases from us is a huge one, it will, I think, be conceded that I have some claim to be heard.²

Indeed, A & R itself has claimed credit for encouraging Mitchell. One of the manuscripts included in our purchase is a typescript copy of a history of the firm dated 1936 which was intended to be published but, for some reason which may possibly be revealed in some other part of the archives, never was. It is entitled "The house of Angus and Robertson A record of fifty years 1886-1936". On pages 15-16 of this typescript it is stated: "David Scott Mitchell, who had been a large buyer of general literature, was influenced by Robertson to turn his attention to the purchase of some of the rare items of Australiana displayed in the Market Street shop, and soon he developed that keen interest in the great subject ..."

An interesting letter in the collection recently purchased, which most likely had been kept for its historic value and therefore not sold to the Library in 1933, is that from George Robertson to James Tyrrell, who was at that time an employee of A & R and in Britain. It is dated 16 August 1897. Robertson wrote: "Do not purchase any Australian books except for Mr. Mitchells order." In referring to manuscripts and watercolours relating to Australia, he said that "Mr. Mitchell will always give us a profit on such — you know how keen he is and I would be sorry to miss anything of the kind."

It is particularly satisfying, therefore, to have the records of the firm Robertson helped to found permanently lodged in the Library Mitchell started.

The size of the collection is considerable, occupying around 330 feet of shelf space. Perhaps, before I actually describe the collection, I should make a diversion and explain the mechanics of acquiring this 330 feet of records, as I am sure many scholars who use the collections at the Mitchell do not realize just how much work went on before they even reached the Library.

During November — December 1976 and January 1977 a colleague and I trundled out to Kingsgrove, a suburb of Sydney, where A & R had its warehouse and where Halstead Press, the printery owned by the firm, had been located. The archives had at one stage been organized, but the organization had been allowed to lapse. There was a large amount of material, such as recent invoice books and

computer print-outs of stock holdings, which we were not interested in retaining, either because the information contained therein was trivial or because it was recorded in some other part of the archives. Standing on a concrete floor in a warehouse in the heat of summer, moving around dusty records in large, heavy boxes is not particularly pleasant work, but the value of this collection easily compensated for any physical discomfort.

Most of the correspondence had been kept together alphabetically by name of correspondent so this was not so difficult to organize, although we kept on finding more packets of correspondence in other parts of the archives which had to be incorporated into the first sequence. The rest of the material was not so well organized. The correspondence had been kept in old lockers. The rest of the material was mostly stored in very large cartons. Into each massive carton we had to peer to determine what were the contents and whether they were the same as the labelling on the carton indicated. Then we had to segregate what we wanted to retain, organize it, and pack it into our own more suitable containers. And, of course, prepare a preliminary list as we went. All the art work was gone through piece by piece in order to determine what was to be retained with the collection. A pantechnicon van was used to transport the material we had selected to the Library from the A & R premises at Cremorne, where it had been taken. The whole operation was still not finished, for I spent another two days at Cremorne going through all the photographic files, sorting out duplicates for retention by the Library. Those photographs for which duplicates do not exist will be copied eventually and will be added to the archives.

At the moment the collection is not fully catalogued, but it has been organized so that individual items can be located fairly easily. A detailed list of correspondence files has been compiled. We will publish this list, together with a description of the other parts of the collection, probably towards the end of 1980.

Perhaps the most important part of the collection is the correspondence, although even here I am wary in using the definite article. This is an invaluable source for all types of research. The person interested in the mechanics of book publishing, such as print-runs, the cost of publishing an item, how well it is selling, will find the answers here. The author-publisher relationship, the role of the editor, the detailed negotiations needed for the publication of a certain work — light is shed upon all these matters. Not least, of course, are the opinions of authors about their own books and, indeed, about the work of others. I like Kenneth Mackenzie's views, as expressed in the following extract from a letter dated 19 September 1953:

By this mail I'm sending on to you the natty proof copy of *The Refuge*. I am full of black despair: it is the first novel of mine I've ever read, and it will be the last — if I ever write another. It's a pity, in some ways, it could not have come out before Christmas, when people get reckless and will buy just anything — which about sums the thing up, for me.

Or this extract from a letter by H.V. Evatt on the publication of his biography of W.A. Holman in 1940: ‘... this is the best thing I have ever done or will ever do.’ Vance Palmer had written to the Judge in December 1939 — and a copy of this letter is with the correspondence with Evatt — to say that ‘... I am impressed with the immense historical importance of the work. It lights up the political side of a crucial formative period in a masterly way. There is nothing like it, and probably won’t be in our time.’

The correspondence relating to H.M. Green’s *A history of Australian literature* is instructive. This massive work, which was from the beginning never seen as a very profitable undertaking,³ took years from the time the manuscript was finished until it was actually published, part of the reason being that at this time A & R were involved heavily in the production of the second edition of the *Australian encyclopaedia*. Even though Green’s opus was not seen as a money-maker, the most conscientious work was nonetheless expended on it. A & R actually used their staff to search out copies of books that Green could not obtain from libraries. They supplied typing facilities, which necessitated deciphering Green’s writing. Green himself was most punctilious in checking his manuscript. In a letter dated 10 August 1955 he wrote:

It’s not only that the retyping adds to the expense of the book, which of course is your affair; it also adds considerably to my work, since every time a chapter is retyped, I have to go over the new copy slowly and carefully, looking for even a misplaced comma. No typist can be trusted absolutely and you’d be surprised to see the mistakes even a first-rater will make, even when its not a question of bad writing.

This attitude contrasts with that of Vance Palmer. A & R wrote the following to Nettie Palmer about his novel *Seedtime*:

Since Vance’s copy is always so carefully prepared, and since it was left as he wrote it, we took the liberty of telling the London Office to go ahead without sending proofs. The only possible alterations would be minor house-style ones, i.e. hyphens and traditional Oxford spellings. We felt sure that Vance having his next work so much in mind, would be with us in proposing to ensure publication this year.

A sentiment with which Palmer did not disagree.

As the delays in publication stretched out, Green became more and more concerned, not least because the delays meant that the book was becoming out of date. In October 1956 he was writing to Beatrice Davis:

I am sorry to make a nuisance of myself like this, but you can understand how I want to get the damn thing behind me, and it gets more and more out of date, though I am doing what I can to help bridge the gap between 1950 and publication by adding in notes, death dates and important publications by writers mentioned in the text. There are also appearing quite a number of

discussions in which what I have said in the book should at least have played a part.

It was not until 1961, of course, that his book finally appeared.

There was disagreement between Green and A & R over the lay-out of the book, the most important point being the matter of paragraphing. "We are perturbed at the scarcity of paragraphs," Green was told, "in the first place because of the heavy look this will give; and in the second place (more importantly) because any word added or deleted in proof would mean the resetting of every subsequent line to the end of the paragraph — which, as the MS stands, would involve untold trouble and expense." Green's reply is worth quoting in full:

In effect, you want me to alter the whole style of the book. The paragraph is of course an inseparable part of the style, and to use comparatively short pars along with comparatively long sentences such as are used here would be quite inconsistent and produce a very bad effect. To shorten the paragraphs would mean shortening the sentences, and even if this were possible at this time of day, I should hate the idea. I have, as you must have seen, deliberately lightened the treatment wherever I could, but this is another thing. This book is intended in the first place as a work of literary scholarship, and I don't think such a work ought to be written with the short sentence and paragraph which are fashionable nowadays. The marks of journalism are all over Australian literature, and affect it, I think, for the worse; but indeed they also affect modern literature as a whole: it is a passing fashion, and reflects one of the tendencies of the age. By the way, I am not referring (except as to the short par and sentence) to first class journalism; they are necessary to all journalism, but not to scholarship. This book is addressed primarily to readers to whom the long sentence and paragraph will not seem unnatural, at least after they have read a few pages, and not those whose ideas of style are based on that of the newspapers and most novels. That style is all right, perhaps necessary, in its place; what I am contending is that this is not the place for it.

In describing the *Bulletin*, Green originally wrote:

This now seventy year old newspaper - magazine, the same and yet markedly different, has reorganized itself in various ways; it has exchanged a few old features for new ones; and it has worked round the circle from red-rag republicanism to an imperialism and a conservatism so marked that, what with its still unaltered headings 'Business, Robbery, etc.' and 'The Wild Cat Column' and with its dread of a Communist under every bed, it resembles in some respects a conventionally respectable old lady attired in the rather startling garments of her flighty youth.

A & R were unhappy with this description and suggested omitting all of the

second part of this paragraph, after the words “an imperialism and a conservatism”. Green suggested that perhaps the following sentence could be added to the original paragraph: “Nevertheless the contrast is not unattractive, and now and then the communist may really be there.” However, what appeared eventually in the published work was almost identical to the suggestion made by the firm.

A similar instance is Green’s comments on Malcolm Ellis. In discussing his biography of Macquarie, Green had written: “On the side of expression this book has however serious faults: there is no doubt about its scholarship, but there are occasional doubtful assertions, and the scholar is in unfortunate partnership with a journalist who sometimes clothes it in meretricious artificialities, melodrama, clichés, and cheap humour; still the book’s merit as a historic record and the recreation of a notable historic character remain.” The final version as published omitted all the words after “journalist” — that is, the phrase “who sometimes clothes it in meretricious artificialities, melodrama, clichés, and cheap humour.” Green’s view that to leave the word “journalist” unqualified would be incorrect because “a good journalist does his best to avoid journalese, which involves the sort of fault I have mentioned” was, I think, a valid complaint.

Before I leave Green and his work I want to mention just one further matter which may be of interest to bibliographers. Originally Green had put forward the view that a publication entitled *The History of George Godfrey* was the first Australian novel. In Green’s original manuscript, which he donated to the Mitchell Library in 1962, he had this to say about this novel:

Of . . . the *History of George Godfrey, Written by Himself* (3 vols., London, 1828), and of its author, nothing is known outside the book itself. It is treated here as Australian because it is set in Australia and because internal evidence suggests strongly that many at least of the events described are based upon the experience of the author; and it is treated as a novel because it is quite clear that the imagination has been at work upon the events so that no more than a basis of actual fact remains.

The proofs for that part of the manuscript had been completed when the apple-cart was upset by a note by Morris Miller in the November 1957 issue of *Biblionews* which identified the author of this novel as Thomas Gaspey. So, as it appeared certain that this novel was the work of a minor English novelist, it was not the first Australian novel and, of course, had no place in the *History*. Consequently all reference to it had to be removed from the proofs and that page re-set.

The correspondence, like any business firm’s records, reflects the social history of the times. In a letter to Vance Palmer, 28 January 1942, W.G. Cousins wrote: “The man-power problem is affecting our output tremendously. Our chief trouble is the lack of binders. We are doing the best we can and will probably overcome the difficulty by the employment of women, but we have to confer with the Binders’ Union before this can be done.”

Literary historians would no doubt be interested in a remark Vance Palmer made in a letter in July 1958, very soon after reading Thea Astley's first novel, *Girl with a monkey*: "Congratulations on Thea Astley's little novel. It is the promise that strikes one"

Mention of Thea Astley leads me on to the next sizeable part of these archives — the publishing manuscripts. Miss Astley is one of many authors whose edited manuscripts are here. As well as manuscripts by authors such as Miles Franklin, Zora Cross, Norman Lindsay, Joseph Furphy, Hal Porter, A.D. Hope, Kylie Tennant, Steele Rudd, Ivan Southall and Hesba Brinsmead, which have been published, there are also manuscripts which have not been published, such as several by Eve Langley, a play by Morris West entitled "The Illusionists", and a manuscript by Dorothy Wall, creator of Blinky Bill, entitled "Horri Kiwi and the Kids", with original illustrations. There is the uncut version of Xavier Herbert's *Soldiers' women* and a collection of original manuscript poems by Hugh McCrae in his own charming script.

Another item is the manuscript for Kenneth Slessor's selected prose, entitled *Bread and wine*,⁴ along with those items not included in the selection. Douglas Stewart has given us an account of the editing of *Bread and wine* in an article he wrote for *Southerly* in December 1974 which has been reprinted in his book *A man of Sydney: an appreciation of Kenneth Slessor*.⁶ Slessor was supposed to make a selection of his prose and bring this selection in to A & R. In a manner reminiscent of the attitude to Green's *History*, Stewart reports that "George Ferguson, as was his way when anything of value to Australian literature was proposed, agreed without hesitation to publish the prose selection, though he did at one stage wonder, 'who are we going to sell this book to?'"⁶ Nevertheless, it was Stewart who ended up with the job of selecting the prose. After a couple of years of procrastination on the part of Slessor, Stewart reports:

We hit upon the obvious device. We gave him a contract and an advance on royalties; and, being the soul of honour, Slessor instantly fished the suitcase of his prose out from under his bed, crammed the whole lot of it into a brown-paper shopping bag and an exceptionally large brief-case (which he had bought because it would accommodate half a dozen bottles of beer), and brought it in to me at Angus and Robertson's. But . . . he couldn't possibly sort it out himself, he said; he'd lost the capacity to judge it. He would be glad to let us make the selection ourselves, he said.

There are a couple of boxes of material, including original sketches, relating to the first *Australian encyclopaedia* and about ten cartons of material relating to "Cayley's Birds of Australia" and "Australian Bird Biographies" covering the period c.1919–c.1936. This was a projected publication in parts which was never completed, but the material here should prove of great interest to ornithologists.

Speaking of the first *Australian encyclopaedia*, a passage from the typescript history of the firm, which I have mentioned earlier, perhaps is noteworthy:

It was well known to him [Robertson] and his fellow directors that the publication of books of such an expensive and scholarly type [as the 1st *AE*] could not be regarded as a paying proposition, and would result in a heavy monetary loss, but such losses have been compensated for by the more popular publications. Those controlling the business have always considered it their duty and privilege to keep the cause of Australian education and literature from time to time by publishing certain works of outstanding merit, irrespective of the question of profit or loss.

One of the gems amongst the manuscripts is Francis Webb's *A drum for Ben Boyd*, with original pen and ink sketches by Norman Lindsay. This illustrated edition was published in 1948 when Webb was only 22. As Douglas Stewart has commented: "When I first read it in manuscript my opinion could be stated in two words: it was major poetry."⁷ The sketches complement the text: when Webb speaks of "a pioneer . . . Tall, once robust, but wavering like a spring when tension runs out of it", Norman Lindsay has translated this superbly into the visual medium.

As I have said, some of the manuscripts are of works subsequently published — sometimes these are edited and sometimes not — and others are of works which were not published. The reader's reports on those items which were not deemed to be publishable make interesting reading. I found the following report on a work by Ethel Anderson a revealing comment on the times. The report is dated 22 September 1934 and is on a manuscript called "Eight Gardens". This, as the reader noted, "records the impressions left upon a sensitive and poetical spirit by some memorable gardens and their settings . . . the paradisaean gardens of the Mogul emperors and of Kashmir; lowlier but lovely gardens in England and Australia. And not only the gardens but those who made them." As the report summed up, this was "A manuscript glowing with beauty, redolent with perfume, and musical with spiritual undertones." However, a recommendation was made against publication, the reason being that "the average reader, here, could no more appreciate its qualities than a confirmed beer-chewer could a fine wine."

In dealing with the manuscripts and correspondence I have only really dealt with that which relates to general publishing. However, there is quite a large collection of manuscripts and correspondence relating to the Educational & Technical Division, covering mainly the 1950s and 1960s.

A & R maintained a file of newscuttings, mainly of reviews of its publications, and this is quite extensive, beginning in c.1895. In the absence of an Australian newspaper index this is a very valuable tool. As well as reviews, the newscuttings cover other subjects of interest to A & R such as copyright and censorship. On the last topic, one of the items collected for its historic value and filed with the

archives is a newspaper poster for the Sydney *Sun* for 24 April, 1946 which announces in massive black letters 'A.I.F. Book "Obscene" Publishers Fined'. This refers to Lawson Glassop's *We were the rats*.

Routine business records may seem dreary in comparison with some of the items I have been describing, but for some researchers they are just as valuable as the other items. There are some early letterbooks, 1898-1916, some directors' minutes, 1907-1928, publishing ledgers, contracts, and also the records of the A & R subsidiaries, Robertson & Mullins, the Melbourne bookseller and publisher, and H.E.C. Robinson, the map publishers. One fascinating item is a list of publications sent for review and where they were sent, covering the years c.1897-c.1947.

One contract which is particularly interesting is dated 10 October 1895 and is for Henry Lawson's first volume of verse published by A & R. The volume was to be "printed in similar type and form to "The Man from Snowy River"." It was Paterson's *Man from Snowy River*, published in 1895 with a preface by Rolf Boldrewood, which was A & R's first major publishing success. Lawson sold his copyright and interest in this first volume of poems for £54. £14 of that had been paid already and £5 was to be paid on the signing of the contract, the "remainder to be paid as I shall require it." There follows a series of dates throughout 1895 with amounts of money written beside them as a record of payment until the whole £54 was expended.

Besides these major categories of material, there is also a series of what could be called 'historic' items which pre-date 1933, and which had been retained by the firm because of their interest, some of which I have mentioned, as well as some incidental items. One of the most fascinating of the incidental items, certainly the one which attracted most people's attention when it went on display, is the diary of Harry Lasseter. This diary, written in pencil, records Lasseter's last days before his death in the Petermann Ranges country early in 1931. One extract should be enough to give you the flavour:

This agony is awful, 4 plums in three days why is no relief sent what became of Paul. The suspense of not knowing is the worst of all why do I cling to life when a shot would end my torment its just because I want to know why everyone has failed me to die a lonely horrible death is bad, but not to know why is worse.

A bit too melodramatic, do you think? The diary was used by Ion Idriess as the basis for his book *Lasseter's last ride* which was published by A & R in 1931. Fred Blakeley, leader of the expedition from which Lasseter separated, has suggested in his book *Dream millions*, published in 1972, that Lasseter did not die and that this diary, written by Lasseter, was a hoax. Whatever the story, one can now examine some of the evidence for oneself.

My favourite group of incidental papers is a group of personal papers of Louisa Lawson. I find particularly moving two letters received by Louisa. One is

from her son, Henry Lawson, while he was on the staff of the *Boomerang* newspaper in Brisbane and, therefore, probably it should be dated 1891. It includes the following sentence: "Am, as you may guess, rather lonely at times, but will pull through." At 23, this could almost be a statement to cover his whole life. The other letter is from Rose Scott, early feminist and cousin of David Scott Mitchell. The letter is dated 10 June 1915 and notes that there had been "... some remarks ... calling me the mother of W[omen's] suffrage — I certainly worked devotedly for it — but you were the Pioneer." A fine tribute indeed. Louisa founded and edited *The Dawn* from 1888–1905. This was a feminist paper printed by women. Several letters from very prominent women renewing their subscriptions are in the collection. Louisa won a bronze medal for printing at the Woman's Work Exhibition, Sydney, in 1892 and this is one of the association items in the archives, as is her wedding ring. It was, of course, Louisa who first published a collection of her son's poetry in 1894, and there is a letter from A.G. Stephens, dated 11 February 1896, which says how much he values Louisa's own edition of the poet's work, despite the successful publication of Lawson's first major collection of verse by A & R, which had just appeared. Julian Ashton wrote a charming letter to Louisa on 11 February 1893:

Though every year of my life I am getting to doubt more and more whether it would not be advisable to limit the power possessed by women instead of increasing it, yet the tender heading of your Circular leaves me no option but to give you my vote.

Finally, there is the note Louisa wrote to her daughter, Gertrude, on 4 March, (the year is not given but I think it is 1920) from the Mental Hospital, Gladesville: "The Doctor is kind and the food is good but I would like to die withall I find little now to live for."

An item of some historic interest is a contract with Angus & Robertson Ltd. for the sale of the Cinematograph Film Rights of the *Man from Snowy River*, *Rio Grande* and *Saltbush Bill*, J.P. by A.B. Paterson dated 1919. The contract was with Frank Beaumont Smith. Beaumont Smith's company was one of the few Australian film-making companies to survive the First World War. Adapting Steele Rudd's Dad and Dave concept, Smith made a series of comedies about the Hayseeds family. He made also a film of selections from Henry Lawson's *While the billy boils*, with an appearance by Henry Lawson.

I would like to conclude on the note on which I began, that is how special this collection is to us because of the links between A & R and the Mitchell Library. I want to quote two pieces dealing with a former Mitchell Librarian, Miss Ida Leeson. In a letter to George Ferguson in April 1949, Miles Franklin recounted her experiences in autographing books for the public. Ida Leeson had recommended her as a suitable candidate for such an enterprise. She hated it but added: "I could not let Miss Leeson down." The following memorandum written to George Ferguson from Beatrice Davis in 1961 will close this article on a note that reflects not unfavourably upon both A & R and the staff of the Mitchell Library:

Miss Leeson seems very depressed — Mainly through lack of occupation. Knowing what useful work she can do, and how short staffed we are, I should like to give her something if I could before the Indexes of the Barnard and Helen Heney's Strzelecki which I want her to do. Can you think of anything? She suggested proof reading?

She came in apparently to tell me that there were nasty errors in the names mentioned in the article by Green in the *Bulletin* — asked whether she might read proofs of the Green. I know it is too late for this, but in case you thought it worth while for her to read any proofs for which there is time before printing, I put this on record. The mistakes in the *Bulletin*, might of course, have been the B's.

I know if you yourself had seen her you would have thought it urgent that we give her some job to make her feel she was still with the living.

Paul Brunton,
Mitchell Library,
State Library of New South Wales.

¹ G.D. Richardson, 'David Scott Mitchell', *Descent* Vol. 1, part 2, 1961, pp. 4-14.

² New South Wales. Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, *Report, together with minutes of evidence relating to the proposed Mitchell Library*, Sydney, 1905.

³ Mrs Green has quite properly pointed out to me, however, that since its appearance it has had steady and quite respectable sales and has no doubt added to the reputation of Angus & Robertson as publishers.

⁴ Kenneth Slessor, *Bread and wine: selected prose*, Sydney, A & R, 1970.

⁵ Douglas Stewart, *A man of Sydney; an appreciation of Kenneth Slessor*, Melbourne, Nelson, 1977.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁷ Douglas Stewart, *The broad stream: aspects of Australian literature*, Sydney, A & R, 1975, p.202.

Copyright of Full Text rests with the original copyright owner and, except as permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, copying this copyright material is prohibited without the permission of the owner or its exclusive licensee or agent or by way of a license from Copyright Agency Limited. For information about such licences contact Copyright Agency Limited on (02) 93947600 (ph) or (02) 93947601 (fax)