

**BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY
OF
AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND**

BULLETIN

Volume Fourteen, Number Three

Third Quarter, 1990

(Issued April 1991)

JOSE'S EDITING OF *WHILE THE BILLY BOILS*

A.W. JOSE, THE ANGUS & ROBERTSON reader and editor, introduced significant alterations to Henry Lawson's *While the Billy Boils*. Doug Jarvis has argued that Lawson wrote his early stories according to the *Bulletin's* model and later departed from it, developing his own technique.¹ While one would not wish to argue that this later development was solely the result of Jose's influence, there can be no doubt that the Angus & Robertson editor revised Lawson's stories with an eye to improving their technique and, in addition to this, is likely to have had an indirect influence on Lawson, who presumably revised with the Angus & Robertson reader's advice in mind.

In focussing on technique, Jose directed his attention to Lawson's handling of the narrator. In order to appreciate Jose's editorial contribution in this area one needs to examine his concept of Lawson's narrator and the means he employed to enhance this important figure.

Critics have described Lawson's narrator in various ways. Hadgraft observed his manner as that of the 'yarner'. Jarvis noted the strong authorial presence and that Lawson's public image became a prominent factor in his stories; he felt that the narrator was masquerading as Lawson.²

There is another way of seeing the narrator, and it seems to me that this is how Jose saw him, namely as an intricate blend of 'author-narrator-yarner'. Furthermore, an examination of Jose's editing reveals that he not only saw the potential richness of Lawson's new creation, which represented a radical departure from current literary fashions, but encouraged Lawson to maximise its potential. Jose's concept of Lawson's narrator was broad and flexible, and he sought to delineate the outer limits of the 'author-narrator-yarner' while encouraging Lawson to exploit the fluidity of the inner boundaries of this new creation as story or occasion demanded.

It is essential to note that Lawson's new narrative device had an importance in addition to its intrinsic creative value. Jose was aware that it had the capacity to solve technical problems. The 'yarner' element, often mentioned by critics, is crucial. The author *as yarner* is, while he speaks, on a level with the characters. Thus Lawson could acquit himself of the accusation of pure authorial intrusion disliked by the realists, and in this Lawson may well have been accommodating Archibald, the editor of the *Bulletin*. Rather, he is a character revealing himself by his speech, and this instead fulfils one of the realist canons. As character, the 'author-narrator-yarner' becomes the

modern Australian realist hero, the sardonic bushman. But secondly, and most importantly for Lawson and Jose, the 'author-narrator-yarner' — in theory at least — could solve a problem for Lawson, who, like many Australian authors, was hoping to have his work accepted in England. In technical terms, the 'author-narrator-yarner' could be allowed a measure of casualness and unorthodox language which would not be allowable to a conventional narrator — or author — in England.

Various features are to be found in Jose's editing which have had multiple effects. While Jose no doubt had many reasons for the revisions, the aim of carefully balancing and blending the omniscient author with the bush yarner seems to have been his chief and ultimate goal. This is suggested first by Jose's choice of title, secondly by his treatment of those features which could emphasise the role of author-narrator-yarner on the one hand as distinct from the characters on the other — namely their use of language — and finally in his concern for the author's display of skill.

To my knowledge, until now it has been an unknown fact that it was Jose who gave Lawson's 1896 anthology of stories the title *While the Billy Boils*. It is a vital piece of information for those who might harbour generalized and negative opinions of Jose's editing, indicating that a closer examination of his practices is called for. That Jose should choose such a title indicates the extent to which he appreciated the 'yarn' element in Lawson's stories, crystallizing and drawing attention to Lawson's new technical creation. Perhaps he was prompted in part by Mitchell's concluding line in 'A Love Story': 'Ah, well — never mind . . . the billy's boiling, Joe'. Critics have recognized the title as encapsulating the spirit of the yarn and as catching up the casualness of the style.³ Jose was placing the stories firmly within the literary-oral tradition. The title he selected was also the same as the title of a poem by Keighley Goodchild, published in a centenary anthology, *Australian Ballads* (1888), edited by a literary acquaintance, Douglas Sladen. Its opening stanza runs as follows:

While the ruby coals in the dull grey dust
Shine bright as the daylight dies;
When into our mouths our pipes are thrust
And we watch the moon arise;
While the leaves, that crackle and hiss and sigh,
Feed the flames with their scented oils,
In a calm content by the fire we lie,
And watch while the billy boils.⁴

Such was the perceived popularity of the title that it was used again and again by Angus & Robertson for other editions. Its nationalistic overtones were reinforced by its occurrence in Paterson's 'Waltzing Matilda'.

But it is essential to realise that just as Jose appreciated the stories as the yarns of the swagman-like figure he equally valued the role of the author-narrator in these stories. His understanding of the complexity of the 'author-yarner-narrator' is evident in his comment on 'A Good Tuckertrack': 'And the story's unfinished — too unfinished, I mean, even for Mitchell'.⁵ This meant that Jose paid particular attention to the authorial element and, in particular, to the conclusions of the stories.

Jose's fears that English critics would think of the 'author-narrator-yarner' simply as a naive narrator who could be identified with the author, who was a semi-literate colonial, were unfortunately realised in one quarter, where a reviewer of *Joe Wilson and His Mates* wrote:

These stories are so good that (from a literary point of view, of course) one hopes they are not autobiographical. As autobiography they would be good; as pure fiction they are more of an attainment. We think the author will see what is meant here . . . the Australian poet's name was surely Kendall, and not 'Kendal' (p.61). 'She was always impulsive, save to me sometimes' (p.96). If the author will think that over he will decide that he did not mean to use the word 'impulsive', or not, at all events, without some qualification. 'A character like what 'Kit' might have been' (p.160). This phrase must be amended before the book goes into a second edition, as the reviewer hopes it will. Also, on p.313, the awkward reiteration of 'bush fashion' requires correction.⁶

Jose, anticipating just such a reaction, had thought that the casualness, ease and simplicity of the outback-raconteur ought to be emphasised but that clumsiness and unorthodox features or 'incorrect' features of style would have to be modified. The bush-yarner was to be only apparently artless. The author must supply the art, and his skill, however subtle, must be evident; there are two further categories of emendations made to this end: changes made in an attempt to make Lawson's style more concise and the excision of parts which appeared, to Jose, rough or crude. In this, once more, he was anticipating the response of English critics.⁷ At this point we might digress for a moment to note that Jose is likely to have been well aware of the mixed reception which Kipling's work had met with in London. Even his admirers criticized his style, which they found wanting. Amongst these were Humphrey Ward, W.E. Henley and Stevenson. His frequent use of slang was disapproved of, and Quiller-Couch accused him of 'facile vulgarity'.⁸ This is relevant not only because Kipling influenced Australian writers — amongst them Lawson — but more particularly because reviewers frequently made analogies between Kipling and Australian writers, and Jose is likely to have wanted to forestall the reviewers' criticisms.⁹ This is not to argue, however, that Jose was overreacting to the English. It seems to me that a frequent feature of Jose's editorial style was its retention and emphasis of what was 'natural' and quintessentially Australian. Indeed, I would argue that Jose achieved with ease in his non-fiction and editorial style what he was not able to achieve in his fiction. Thus the *Athenaeum* reviewer of *Two Awheel and Some Others Afoot*, with a journalistic generalization, observed that Jose 'becomes English as soon as he puts pen to paper'.¹⁰

It is essential at the outset to note that there were two different sorts of formality which Jose and Lawson assumed to be necessary for written English. Furthermore, Professor Roderick, in his criticisms of Jose's editing, fails to distinguish between them. Roderick notes Jose's expansion of abbreviations and his emendations of slang and colloquialisms but not the alterations made toward a natural and easy style. His description of Jose's editing as mechanistic is uninformed.¹¹ For Lawson formality suggested an over-literary quality manifested sometimes by the use of complicated words where simple ones would equally suit the occasion, even the use of archaisms

and journalese. For Jose, formality meant a style which would be natural, simple and, in the style of Lawson's narrator, even casual. However, orthodoxy in the author-narrator's mouth was essential.

The first category of corrections made to enhance the authorial element in the narrator's new role might be described as regularisation — it encompassed various elements. In addition to those mentioned (that is, correction of grammatical mistakes, expansion of contractions, removal of slang) one finds the neutralization of colloquialisms and the alteration of phrasing to avoid clumsiness. To balance all this and accentuate the 'yarning' element one finds an emphasis of the natural.

The most frequent type of alteration is the neutralization of the colloquial element in the narrator's speech. In 'Settling on the Land' Lawson wrote: 'Then his plough horses took bad with something the Teuton called "der shtranguls"'. Jose toyed with the idea of altering 'took bad' to 'went down' but dismissed the thought. Further down in the story Lawson had written, 'Tom's dog did his best; but he took sick'.¹² Here Jose emended 'took' to 'fell'. It is noticeable that his suggestions are not stiffly formal. In 'Remailed' Jose replaced 'sort of' with 'so to speak' in the following sentence:

There were points, of course, upon which Bill and Jim couldn't agree — subjects upon which they argued long and loud and often in the old days; and it sometimes happens that say, Bill comes across an article or a paragraph which agrees with and, sort of barracks for a pet theory of his as against one held by Jim . . .¹³

Jose, in making the narrator's speech more fluent has, of course, reduced the homeliness or personal quality of the yarner. In attempting the 'balancing act' something is often lost. Another example is provided in 'When the Sun Went Down':

he reckoned that he had six or, perhaps, eight feet to drive, and he knew that the air could not last long in the new drive — even if that had not all fallen in and crushed his brother.¹⁴

Here, Jose emends 'all' to 'already'. Similarly, in the example below, 'else' is emended to 'or':

The selector's dog chewed the other and came to his master's rescue just in time — else Tom Hopkins would never have lived to become the inmate of a lunatic asylum.¹⁵

As mentioned above, there were many occasions where Jose, in emending, sought to enhance the natural and simple quality which was part of the narrator's character. A good example of this is to be found in 'Across the Straits'. The last sentence of the fourth paragraph had read:

. . . and the 'John Smith' (Newcastle) goes down with a 'swoosh' before the cook has time to leave off peeling his potatoes and pray.¹⁶

Jose emended 'pray' to 'takes to prayer', which is rather more like Lawson than Lawson. Similarly, in the opening of the second paragraph, Jose altered 'last year' to 'a year or two ago', which is perhaps more natural and colloquial by virtue of its vagueness. In 'A Drover's Wife' there are two important instances of Jose's emendations exhibiting a simplicity more in keeping with what might be judged by

some critics as Lawson's anecdotal style. Speaking of the drover's wife, the narrator says:

She has a keen, very keen sense of the ridiculous; and some time or another she will amuse bushmen by relating this incident. She was amused once before in a similar manner in some respects.

Jose's emendations, which Lawson adopted for both *While the Billy Boils* and *The Country I Come From*, read:

... and sometime or other she will amuse bushmen with the story. She has been amused before like that.¹⁷

There are instances where Lawson's language is almost over-formal. When he was revising his stories for *While the Billy Boils* he replaced original expressions by more formal language. While Professor Roderick has assumed that this was the influence solely of Jose, there is evidence to suggest that this process started taking place before Lawson came into contact with the Angus & Robertson editor (as will be seen by the composition dates of the stories given in brackets).¹⁸ It is likely that from quite early on Lawson was thinking of the British public. Curiously enough, Roderick, in his commentary on 'The Bush Undertaker', comes close to recognizing an obvious example of Lawson adjusting his language for the English audience. He observes that the story had been published in 1892 in the English edition of *The Antipodean*, in 1894 in *Short Stories in Prose and Verse*, in 1896 in *While the Billy Boils*, and then in 1901 in *The Country I Come From*. He writes:

Most of Lawson's 1894 emendations were restorations of Australian idiom or vocabulary; for example the genteel 'hermit' and the pretentious 'solitaire' of 1892 became the earthy 'hatter' of 1894... The London editor of 1892 had felt it necessary to explain, in parenthesis, that a 'gohanna' was an 'iguana' — a common misconception which Lawson dispelled by preferring 'gohanna' in 1896, only to find himself obliged to accept the English idea of the reptile in 1900 and revert to 'iguana'.¹⁹

We should note here that, in fact, in 1894 Lawson used both 'iguana' and 'gohanna' and also 'gohanna' in inverted commas. In 1896 he did not restore 'gohanna' but used 'iguana' for the narrator's speech and 'gohanner' for that of the bush undertaker. These forms were maintained for *The Country I Come From*.²⁰

There are archaisms, Americanisms and expressions bearing an English influence to be found in Lawson's prose of the early 1890s. These linguistic tendencies can be seen as part of Lawson's search for an appropriate literary persona. The formal emendations which he made appear to be designed for the narrator of books as opposed to the narrator of stories in magazines or newspapers. As will be shown, Jose sometimes emended Lawson's more wooden archaisms, preferring a more natural style. In 'Remained' (1894), in the last sentence of the second paragraph, Lawson had written:

The paper is generally 'bespoke' in the following manner, to wit:²¹

Here, Jose deleted 'to wit'. In the second-last sentence of the seventh paragraph (commencing "There were points, of course..."):

Or, mayhap, it might be a good joke — or the notice of the death of an old mate.²²

Jose deleted 'mayhap' and altered 'might' to 'may'.

Further examples of Jose removing the archaic or over-literary elements in Lawson's stories are to be found in 'The Union Buries its Dead' (1893), where, for example, the more usually English 'an hotel verandah' is altered to 'a hotel verandah'.²³ In 'The Man who Forgot', in the fourth paragraph, it is possible that Jose thought that the phrase 'try their larks' carried English overtones in sharp contrast with the colloquial language surrounding it:

... but Tom interfered and intimated that if they were skunks enough to try their larks, or chyack or try on any of their 'funny business' ...²⁴

He suggested that the phrase be deleted. Similarly, in the last sentence of the third paragraph, there is another jarring combination of the formal and colloquial:

Tom had ... studied them with great interest ... except the individual with the rats, who reckoned Tom had an axe to grind, that he in short wanted to cut his Rat's liver out ...²⁵

Here Jose thought 'that he in short' should be omitted.

Another emendation of Jose's in 'The Man who Forgot' illustrating his natural style is that which he made at the end of paragraph sixteen. Lawson had written:

[He] ... would beg you to favour a humble worker in the vineyard by kindly accepting a tract and offering to friends after perusal.²⁶

Jose proposed the following:

... and passing it on to friends after perusal.

It was mentioned above that, apart from the formal language Lawson used in the early 1890s, there was also a considerable amount of formalisation which he introduced in 1896 and then maintained for the stories when they were to be re-published in *The Country I Come From* in 1901 in England, when Edward Garnett was reading his work. Furthermore, it becomes apparent from one of his letters to Angus & Robertson that Lawson was revising carefully, so the retention of 1896 revisions was a considered choice.²⁷ In the circumstances, Lawson's over-formal language cannot be considered solely the result of Jose's influence.

Jose, in his editing of Lawson, was emphasising the difference between the author-narrator-yarner on the one hand and the characters on the other. In this way he was contributing to the slow evolution of the persona of the narrator. This can be seen in his emphasis on ease, naturalness and orthodox language in the mouth of the narrator and his preparedness to leave the unorthodox speech of characters. It is seen in particular in Jose's treatment of Lawson's use of 'phonetic' spelling.

The nineteenth-century vogue for using 'phonetic' spelling found in Dickens and Mark Twain was popularised further by Kipling, mainly in his *Barrack Room Ballads*. Lawson, Dyson and C.J. Dennis were a few of the Australian authors who adopted its usage. To Jose, it was a device to be employed with care, regulated by two other considerations. As implied above, the first of these differentiated between the speech

of the narrator and that of the characters. The second consideration is that which Jose quoted in his Notes to Dyson, when he was revising his *Rhymes From the Mines*:

General Note . . . I was talking to Henry Lawson about his [spelling], & he agreed that a) There ought to be no useless mis-spelling (i.e. 'sez', because it doesn't indicate a mis-pronunciation) b) it is simpler to leave the g's in: people will drop them in reading if they usually do so. His tales are g'd almost everywhere in the book.²⁸

Where incorrect spelling does not really represent a different pronunciation, as in, for example, 'sez', 'agen', 'fite', 'kum', 'dood', etc., it should not be used at all, either for narrator or characters. Jose wished to reduce the presence of an element which could be interpreted as betraying a condescension toward the characters.

However, one must immediately observe the different ways in which Jose applied the second rule in the cases of Dyson and Lawson. With Dyson, there was to be no 'useless' misspelling at all (that is, that which did not represent a different pronunciation). However, in Lawson's case, Jose often leaves uncorrected a certain number of these 'useless mis-spellings'. There are several reasons for this, but space does not allow an exploration of the matter here. It is sufficient to note that, with Dyson, Jose in effect edited out phonetic spelling even when it *did* represent a different pronunciation, if it was used by a narrator. On the other hand, in Lawson, such spelling — rare though it be in the narrator's speech — is usually uncorrected by Jose. In the matter of Lawson's narrators' pronunciation, Jose accorded them a latitude they required as 'bush-yarners'. It goes without saying that Lawson's unintentional spelling mistakes were corrected by Jose: the authorial voice also necessarily present in the narrator's speech should not be muffled.

Of course, in regard to the question of 'phonetic' misspelling being 'useless' or, on the other hand, representing a different pronunciation, a difficulty arises in that sometimes the pronunciation differences represented are minimal. A matter of particular importance here is where 'minimal' differences in fact represent what Delbridge has called that 'rather slow syllabic utterance of the Australian bush character'. Its editing would call for extreme caution. However, as Delbridge also observed, the display of linguistic idiosyncrasies can distract the reader's attention from the plot, characters, etc.²⁹ Instances of minimal differences are found in the spelling of 'there' as 'theer' or 'what' as 'wot' or 'gohanna' as 'gohanner'.³⁰

As in Dyson, there are instances where Lawson was inconsistent in his use of different spellings for the same word (spoken by the same character). For example, in 'That There Dog o' Mine', we have the forms 'old' and 'ole' for 'old'.³¹ Possibly it was the combined effect of occasional inconsistency and the grey area of minimal differences which prompted Jose towards the idea of regularisation in his Note (quoted in full above, p.86):

. . . it is simpler to leave the g's in: people will drop them in reading if they usually do so. [Lawson's] tales are g'd almost everywhere in the book.³²

One notes here the qualifying word, 'almost'. In the proofs of 'That There Dog o' Mine' there is a difference of opinion between Lawson and Jose. Here Lawson, who in the original version of the story in the *Sketcher* had omitted d's and g's, wanted them

inserted throughout. Jose, however, wrote beside Lawson's revisions: 'doubt if all these ought to be inserted: it's dialogue'.³³ That is, Jose felt that the rule of differentiating between the speech of characters and the narrator should be invoked where there was also represented by the misspelling, a minimal difference of pronunciation. It is also worth noting that Lawson insisted that all the d's and g's be included.

Jose emended also with a view to making Lawson's style even more terse or concise. In this one can see the realist vogue. Conciseness has been recognised by critics as one of the principal characteristics of the *Bulletin* model and one to which Lawson conformed, particularly in his early stories.³⁴ Jose's alterations manifesting this influence are to be found in the occasional phrase or sentence. Most frequently they involve the conclusions of stories. But alterations to the conclusions of the stories are more likely to have been made so that the skill of the author and the authorial presence in Lawson's yarner-narrator-author are left lingering in the reader's mind. In paying attention to Lawson's radical new creation, thematic statements sometimes become overshadowed. Jose's suggestions for some of the endings of the stories are such that they might prompt bibliographical scholars to adopt the extreme position of regretting his collaboration at all, even though this would leave them with the theoretical problem of relinquishing his valuable contributions.

Of the fifty stories in *While the Billy Boils*, Lawson was undecided about the conclusions of thirteen, as is apparent from an examination of the proofs. Jose made suggestions for resolving problems in eleven. The alterations are designed to bring about a crisper ending. While eight of Jose's suggestions for the conclusions were adopted, Lawson rejected those for 'The Bush Undertaker', 'The Union Buries its Dead' and 'Some Day'.

At the close of 'The Bush Undertaker', after Brummy has been buried, Lawson finishes the story:

He sat down on a log nearby, rested his elbows on his knees and passed his hand wearily over his forehead — but only as one who was tired and felt the heat; and presently he rose, took up the tools and walked back to the hut.

And the sun sank again on the grand Australian bush — the nurse and tutor of eccentric minds, the home of the weird, and of much that is different from things in other lands.

Jose suggested the final paragraph be deleted, Lawson preferred it as it was, Robertson agreed with Lawson's judgement, and it was published in Lawson's preferred form for both *While the Billy Boils* and *The Country I Come From*. The last paragraph has been seen as expressing the quintessential nature of the Australian bush. Roderick saw it as expressing 'Nature's indifference to human activity'. Barnes saw the shepherd as one of a type whose eccentricity was formed by the bush as described in the final paragraph.³⁵ While many of the different factors enumerated at the outset are likely to have influenced Jose in his suggestion that it be deleted, one is tempted to see in his recommendation his dislike of the portrayal of the bush as a dark, uneasy place. It would be as well to note that such a glib device as the 'happy ending' did not find favour with him either. This becomes evident in 'Stragglers' in his suggested omission

of Lawson's new conclusion, which brings the longed-for rain. It is a story of rouseabouts and shearers who 'have a kind of stock hope of getting a few stragglers to shear somewhere; but their main object is to live till next shearing'. Thus it is that Lawson, with quiet dry irony, suggests that the men are rather like the stray sheep they are looking for. In the *Bulletin* version, the ending ran as follows:

The Irishman has lost his match-box, and feels for it all over the table without success. He stoops down with his hands on his knees, gets the table-top on a level with the flicker of firelight, and 'moons' the object, as it were.

Time to turn in. It is very dark inside and bright moonlight without; and every crack seems like a ghost peering in.

Some of the men will roll up their swags on the morrow and depart; and some will take another day's spell. It's all according to the tucker.³⁶

In the proofs of *While the Billy Boils* Lawson added yet another 'ending' after a row of asterisks:

Pitch dark again — Flash! — Crash! — Rattle and roar — The Rain! — Thank Heaven!

Lawson deleted the ending. Beside it Jose had written 'Omit?'. Of course, we should note that the ending of 'Stragglers' also provides an illustration of Jose's tendency to revise on those occasions where he found 'multiple endings' or a series of conclusions.³⁷

'In a Dry Season' and 'Some Day' manifest the same pattern of multiple endings. 'In a Dry Season' is an account of a train journey, the landscape and people, the conversations of passengers travelling on a country train. The *Bulletin* edition of the story ended as follows:

At 5.30 we saw a long line of camels moving out across the sunset. There's something snaky about camels. They remind me of turtles and iguanas. Somebody said, 'Here's Bourke.'

The above is written more in sorrow than anything else and if it lacks interest it isn't my fault.

P.S. Never tackle the bush without a good mate. With one you can do anything and go anywhere.

In the proofs for *While the Billy Boils*, Lawson deleted the ending, from 'The above is written . . .', and inserted 'And so it was' after 'Here's Bourke.', so that the conclusion then ran:

At 5.30 we saw a long line of camels moving out across the sunset. There's something snaky about camels. They remind me of turtles and iguanas. Somebody said, 'Here's Bourke.' And so it was.³⁸

Jose thought that 'And so it was' should be omitted and that the story should end with 'Here's Bourke'. At that point in the proof he wrote, 'Stop here'. It is not known whether Lawson crossed out the remainder of the story in response to Jose or whether Jose's direction was a clarification for the benefit of typesetters. The fact remains, however, that we have another instance of Jose's preference for the terse ending. Roderick regretted that Lawson agreed to omit 'And so it was'. Indeed, the narrator's

silent inward observation provided a meditative note consistent with the rest of a story in which the narrator has been a silent observer throughout. The phrase in its simplicity and emphasis seems to point to the symbolic significance of Bourke, that almost mythical place, the ultimate geographical point before the 'Never-never' in a country at the bottom of the world.

Such is the outback of 'Some Day', where Marsters, who has been renamed Mitchell, tells his tale of unfulfilled love. It is a landscape described by Heseltine as 'purgatory'.³⁹ The reasons why Mitchell's love remains suspended, as it were, are not given. The hope suggested by the title is undercut by the sarcasm:

'Some Day! That's it; it looks like it, don't it? We all say 'Some day'. I used to say it ten years ago, and look at me now.

Jose considered that the story should end with Mitchell's final sentence:

'I think we'd best turn in, old man; we've got a long, dry stretch before us tomorrow.'⁴⁰

In the version of the story published in the *Worker*, there followed the narrator's comments:

They rolled out their swags on the sand, laid down, and wrapped themselves in their blankets. Marsters covered his head with a piece of calico, because the moonlight and wind kept him awake.⁴¹

Lawson ignored Jose's recommendation and kept the conclusion, so expressive of Mitchell's discomfort, for *While the Billy Boils*.

Jose's dislike of bare authorial intrusions and his tendency to delete the explicit can be seen in 'In a Wet Season', the companion piece to 'In a Dry Season', another description of a train journey through the bush. The symbolic terms of reference for the New World purgatory are familiar: 'scrub indescribably dismal — everything damp, dark, and unspeakably dreary'. Through such a landscape tramps a swagman, 'dummy'-like:

The rain recommenced. We saw another swagman, about a mile on, struggling away from the town, through mud and water. He didn't seem to have heart enough to bother about trying to avoid the worst mud-holes. There was a low-spirited dingo at his heels, whose sole object in life was, seemingly, to keep his front paws in his master's last foot-print. The 'traveller's' body was bent well forward, from the hips up; his long arms — about six inches through his coat sleeves — hung by his sides, like the arms of a dummy, with a billy at the end of one and a bag at the end of the other; but his head was thrown back against the top end of the swag, his hat-brim rolled up in front, and we saw a ghastly, beardless face which turned neither to the right nor the left as the train passed him.⁴²

Lawson conceived of the idea of adding to the description the following:

His eyes were fix[ed] straight ahead — looking for God perhaps —

Jose recommended that it be omitted; Lawson agreed. We might note a parallel between the bush undertaker and the swagman. Of the former story, Heseltine observed:

'The Bush Undertaker' finds its deepest motivation in the juxtaposition of an absolutely hopeless, sterile existence with the possibility of redemptive change.⁴³

Another characteristic of Jose's recommendations for the conclusions is his preference for Lawson ending with dialogue. Once again one sees Jose attuned to the particular style of the author, for this is also a feature of Lawson's style.⁴⁴ In this one might see the influence of the *Bulletin*, which, as Jarvis commented, favoured characters revealing themselves by their speech.⁴⁵ But Jose is also likely to have seen it as a convenient technical device or obvious solution for a writer adept at representing exactly the nuances of spoken language, who liked to strike the right note at his conclusions but had difficulty doing so. Jose encouraged Lawson to use this particular talent.

It becomes apparent that an interplay of factors influenced Jose in his revising of Lawson's work. Two of these are likely to have fed each other: the literary fashion which valued highly literary technique and the consideration of the English audience. It is likely that Jose felt that Lawson's success in England depended on his display of technical competence, not only because technical virtuosity was fashionable, but because as an Australian he would be dismissed as uneducated if he did not display it.

Teresa Pagliaro,
Melbourne.

NOTES

1. Doug Jarvis, 'Lawson, the *Bulletin* and the Short Story', *Australian Literary Studies*, 11 (1983): 58-66. This paper is based on an examination of the working copies A1867 and A1868 in the Angus & Robertson papers at the Mitchell Library, Sydney.
2. Cecil Hadgraft, *Australian Literature: A Critical Account to 1955* (London: Heinemann, 1962), p.101; Jarvis, p.60.
3. John Barnes, *Henry Lawson's Short Stories: Essays in Australian Literature* (Melbourne: Shillington House, 1985), p.14.
4. Goodchild's 'While the Billy Boils' was included in his privately printed book of verse, *Who Are You?* (Echuca, 1883) and in *Australian Ballads*, edited by Douglas Sladen (London: Walter Scott Company, 1888). The information concerning the origin of the title is to be found in the Angus & Robertson papers, Vol. 314/47 at the Mitchell Library, Sydney, in correspondence with Hugh Wright, where Robertson raised the question with the Mitchell Librarian. The relevant letters are 13 February, 21 March, 26 March 1919. In the first, Robertson asks Wright if the title had been used before: Wright replied initially that he had not heard of it. Wright then corrected himself, citing Goodchild's poem in *Australian Ballads*. In the third letter Robertson wrote, 'Mr Jose had suggested the title, 'While the Billy Boils' and I always thought it his own invention until Shenstone told me the other day that he had seen it somewhere else.'
5. 314/41, Jose file, 27 October 1896. It should be mentioned that the word 'unfinished' could be interpreted as meaning either inconclusive or unpolished. Given the context of the comment, and the evidence from the proofs of Lawson's difficulties with the conclusions of his stories, I think the former interpretation is more likely.
6. *Athenaeum*, London, 4 January 1902, quoted in Colin Roderick (ed.), *Henry Lawson Criticism 1894-1971* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1972), pp.120-1.

7. A reviewer in the *Manchester Guardian* (30 January 1901), describing *On the Track*, wrote: 'Mr Lawson's positively strong points are his terseness, concentration, and economic use of language'. In a review of *The Country I Come From* and *Joe Wilson and His Mates* in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* (December 1901) the critic wrote:
 But we see no reason why the writings of Mr Lawson, already favourably regarded in his own continent, should not attract attention wherever the English language is spoken, so keen is his eye for the essential, so brisk and business like his faculty of presentation.
 Edward Garnett in 'An Appreciation', published in *Academy and Literature* (8 March 1902), commented, 'Lawson, as an artist, is often crude and disappointing, often sketchy and rough . . . If Lawson's tales fail to live in another fifty years . . . it will be because they have too little beauty of form, and there is too much crudity, roughness and uncookedness in the matter.' See Roderick (ed.), *Henry Lawson Criticism, 1894-1971*, pp.104-5, 117-20, 121-6.
8. See J.I.M. Stewart, 'Kipling's Reputation' in John Gross (ed.), *Rudyard Kipling: the Man, His Work and His World* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1972), pp.157-8.
9. For further discussion of Kipling's impact on Australian literature see my 'Kipling and "the Barbaric Beyond"', in a forthcoming edition of *Quadrant*.
10. The review is quoted in John Barnes, *The Order of Things: A Life of Joseph Furphy* (Melbourne: OUP, 1990), p.327.
11. Colin Roderick, *Henry Lawson: Commentaries on his Prose Writings* (Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1985), p.4.
12. A1867, 'Settling on the Land', pp.2 & 3.
13. A1867, 'Remailed', p.2.
14. A1867, 'When the Sun Went Down', p.2.
15. A1867, 'Settling On the Land', p.3.
16. A1867, 'Across the Straits', p.1.
17. A1867, 'The Drover's Wife', p.8. 'Another' has been changed to 'other' by either Robertson or Lawson.
18. Colin Roderick, *Henry Lawson: Commentaries on His Prose Writings* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1985), p.3.
19. *Ibid.*, p.26.
20. For examples of 'iguana' and 'gohanner' in the proofs of *While the Billy Boils*, see A1868, 'The Bush Undertaker', pp.3,5, & 7.
21. A1867, 'Remailed', p.1.
22. *Ibid.*, p.2.
23. A1867, 'The Union Buries Its Dead', p.2.
24. A1867, 'The Man Who Forgot', p.1.
25. *Ibid.*, p.1.
26. *Ibid.*, p.2.
27. 314/45, Lawson - A & R, 15 May 1901, ' . . . Blackwood's selected edition of prose, under the title of 'The Country I Come From' is being pushed on. I have revised carefully and will send you a list of pages containing corrections which you may like to make in your future Australian editions . . . '
28. 314/28, Edward Dyson file, p.803.
29. Arthur Delbridge, 'Australian English' in Laurie Hergenhan (ed.), *The Penguin New Literary History of Australia* (Ringwood, 1988), p.57, refers to Lawson's spelling of innocent as 'innercent'.
30. For the spelling 'theer' see A1868, 'The Bush Undertaker', p.5; for 'gohanner', *ibid.*, pp.3, 5, & 7; for 'wot' see A1867, 'The Man Who Forgot', p.2 and 'The Shearing of The Cook's Dog', p.2.
31. A1867, 'That There Dog O' Mine'; the spelling, 'old' is found in the last paragraph of p.1. and the first and second paragraphs of p.2 of the story. The spelling 'ole' is found in the third paragraph of p.2.
32. Jose's Notes for Dyson in 314/28, Dyson file, p.803.
33. A1867, 'That There Dog O' Mine', p.2.
34. Laurie Hergenhan (ed), *The Australian Short Story: An Anthology from the 1890s to the 1980s* (St Lucia: UQP, 1986), Introduction, p.xiv; Barnes, *Henry Lawson Short Stories*, p.17; Jarvis, p.63.
35. Barnes, *Henry Lawson Short Stories*, p.21.
36. *Bulletin*, 27 May 1893.
37. A1867, 'Stragglers', p.4.
38. A1867, 'In a Dry Season', p.2.
39. Harry Heseltine, *The Uncertain Self: Essays in Australian Literature and Criticism* (Melbourne: OUP, 1986), p.48.
40. A1868, 'Some Day', p.2.
41. *Ibid.*
42. A1868, 'In a Wet Season', p.1.

43. Heseltine, p.47.
44. This can be seen in Jose's recommendations for 'Some Day', 'A Visit of Condolence' and 'In a Dry Season'. Lawson had concluded 'Steelman', 'The Shearing of the Cook's Dog', 'That There Dog O' Mine', 'Steelman's Pupil', 'The Geological Spieler', 'Our Pipes', and 'Bill, the Ventriloquist Rooster' all with direct speech as well as some of his later stories – 'The Boozer's Home', 'The Loaded Dog', and 'Joe Wilson's Courtship'.
45. Jarvis, p.59.

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)