

A.W. JOSE: ANGUS & ROBERTSON EDITOR

A.W. JOSE, REMEMBERED CHIEFLY as official war historian or author of *A History of Australasia*, was in his day known too as a teacher, university lecturer, journalist, and as publisher's reader for Angus & Robertson. Well-known in Sydney's literary and artistic circles, he numbered amongst his friends Christopher Brennan, George Lambert, George Robertson and C.E.W. Bean, through whom he influenced the development of national ideology. His behind-the-scenes activities at Angus & Robertson as publisher's reader and reviser I will outline in the second part of this article. While the importance of Angus & Robertson to the development of Australian literature is generally known, the firm's influence has not attracted critics' attention as the *Bulletin* and Archibald have. Robertson employed many readers and revisers — amongst them were Jose, Hugh Maccallum, Bertram Stevens, Christopher Brennan, David McKee Wright, Brereton, and T.G. Tucker, but it was Jose who was employed in this capacity for the longest period — from the early 1890s to 1926. Before discussing his contribution, however, it is necessary to provide some theoretical background to the question of editing in general.

Australian literary critics in commenting on the work of publishers' editors have often been negative in their assessments. This has been partly because the fate of some of Lawson's work furnishes us with an example of editorial intrusion at its worst. But it derives partly too from the prevailing attitude in textual criticism before Gaskell, Thorpe, Pizer and McGann. McGann, summarising the new stance, pointed out that Greg, Bowers, Tanselle and others had equated the publisher's editor with the scribes of classical and biblical texts: he was seen as a contaminating influence upon the 'pure' text.¹ Thorpe and McGann, however, have seen the role of publisher's editor differently. Thorpe spoke of 'composite authorship':

The literary work is frequently the result, in a pure sense, of composite authorship. We do not have to meddle with the unconscious, the preconscious, or the race consciousness in order to hold this view. In a quite literal sense, the literary work is often guided or directed or controlled by other people while the author is in the process of trying to make it take shape, and it is subject to a variety of alterations throughout its history. The intentions of the person we call the author thus become entangled with the intentions of all the others who have a stake in the outcome, which is the work of art.

In conclusion, he observed:

Various forces are always at work thwarting or modifying the author's intentions. The process of preparing the work for dissemination to a public (whether that process leads to publication in printed form or production in the theatre or preparation of scribal copies) puts the work in the hands of persons who are professionals in the execution of the process. Similarly, the effort to recover a work of the past puts it in the hands of professionals known as textual critics, or editors. In all of these cases, the process must be adapted to the work at hand, and the work to the process. Sometimes through misunderstanding and sometimes through an effort to improve the work, these professionals substitute their own intentions for those of the author, who is frequently ignorant of their craft. Sometimes the author objects and sometimes not, sometimes he is pleased,

sometimes he acquiesces, and sometimes he does not notice what has happened.²

Thus the author does not compose in solitary fashion; the writer responds to the society in which he lives. His social context includes the suggestions, pressures and responses sometimes of an immediate circle of friends, sometimes of publishers, their editors and readers, reviewers and the public. Final authorial intentions (when apparent) are formed by many people.

Thorpe also noted that the view of the creative process as seen by earlier scholars was heavily influenced by Romanticism. It was Coleridge who saw the imagination as 'divinely inspired'. As such it should not be tampered with. Interestingly enough, a man whose work Jose admired, Richard le Gallienne, also observed the tendency of writers to view their work in a Romantic way; in an important article, 'Poets and Publishers' (1894) he wrote the following:

Ideally, a poem, like any other beautiful thing, is beyond price; but, practically, its value depends on the number of individuals who can be prevailed upon to purchase it. In its ethereal — otherwise its unprinted — state, it is only subject to the laws of the celestial ether, one of which is that it yields no money; properly speaking, money is there an irrelevant condition . . . The transactions of poetry and of sale are on two different planes. But so soon as, shall we say, you debase poetry by bringing it down to the lower plane, it becomes subject to the laws of that plane. An unprinted poem is a spiritual thing, but a printed poem is subject to the laws of matter. In the heaven of the poet's imagination there are no printers and paper-makers, no binders, no discounts to the trade and thirteen to the dozen; but on earth, where alone, so far as we know, books exist, these terrestrial beings and conditions are of paramount importance, and cannot be ignored.³

Thus we might say that McGann was anticipated by Le Gallienne ninety years ago; their attitudes to publishers and authors were surprisingly similar in being socio-centric, in viewing writers as subject to popular and social pressures and, once published, as part of the world of a literary institution.

In conclusion it should be noted that McGann's and Thorpe's concept of 'composite authorship' is a reminder of the complexity of the creative as well as of the revising process.

* * * * *

From this theoretical appraisal of the editor's role, one should now ask how Jose was seen by writers, what his role was at Angus & Robertson and what his goals were in revising. It is helpful to compare these with Archibald's and the *Bulletin's* goals in order to better understand the different editorial influences operating on writers during the period.

In manuscript sources of the 1890s, various opinions are found on Jose's work as editor and critic. Brennan, who corresponded from Europe with Jose, when he was Acting Professor of Modern Languages at the University of Sydney, called him the

'Australian Brunetière'; Victor Daley, in replying to Robertson over editorial arrangements for *At Dawn and Dusk* (1898), wrote: 'I send you scrap-book with corrections and alterations made almost, if not quite, exactly as suggested by your Mr Jose — in whose opinion I believe (almost) implicitly'. Edward Dyson consulted Jose extensively over his verse, *Rhymes from the Mines and Other Lines* (1896), and wrote to Robertson:

Have included Mr Jose's corrections in my proofs . . . Regret that I did not know as much in the first place as I know now . . . Mr Jose must have found it weary work, meddling with these things. I am obliged to him for a considerable improvement in the work.⁴

In a later period, David McKee Wright in referring to Jose's editing of Zora Cross's 'Man and Woman' in *The Lilt of Life* was less than complimentary: 'He appears to lack all feeling for blank verse, whatever may be his skill in other stuff.' 'Banjo' Paterson thought Jose 'a hopelessly bad judge where humour is concerned'.⁵ Both Walter Murdoch and James Brunton Stephens expressed the opinion to Jose that they thought his approach to problems of metre mechanical. It is important to note that both Paterson and Murdoch nonetheless revised in response to Jose's criticisms. In the case of Murdoch, this is particularly significant because the criticisms and discussions occurred in the course of a casual correspondence, not in connection with any pending publication.⁶

All the comments quoted above fit McGann's description of the publishing process: authors and their literary agents (or employers) have collaborated to varying degrees in the transmission of literary works. Sometimes these relationships operate smoothly, sometimes the author will struggle against every sort of intervention, and between these two extremes falls every sort of variation. Nevertheless, as soon as a person begins writing for publication, he or she becomes an author, and this means — by (historical) definition — to have entered the world of all those who belong to the literary institution.⁷

Jose's and Robertson's influence were intertwined. In the nineties Robertson's primary objective was to keep the firm solvent in a country with a small population, by publishing those manuscripts which had more than a fair chance of becoming popular. He took many of his cues from the *Bulletin*. In the nineties 'popular' works, by and large, were those with a nationalistic flavour, and nationalistic ballads in particular were best sellers. He encouraged or rejected authors, sometimes led by readers' reports, sometimes overriding them on the basis of his own instinct. Jose's influence as reader is not always obvious. His role as editor could not be compared with Edward Garnett's or Max Perkins' in scope.⁸ Apart from any other considerations, Robertson's energy, ambition and possessiveness precluded such a possibility. Jose was not a talent scout. His work was confined to reading and revising. Furthermore, just as he revised other subeditors' work, Robertson employed him in the post-Federation period in conjunction with other revisers. But for all this, the stamp of his style can be seen in the revisions of authors' works. In addition to this, his Kiplingesque vision of the Australian bush came to play a central part in Angus & Robertson's publishing policy. The bush which they wanted to see depicted was a world which was rugged, where man

could triumph — a place where the tough survivor evolved, and humour was born from the desperateness of life. Just as Jose sought such material for the *Australian Magazine*, so too was Robertson's life marked by a search for an Australian novel on these lines. For example, as late as the 1920s he wrote to Father Hartigan ('John O'Brien') about his manuscript of a novel, *Australian-born*, which he had been encouraging the priest to write over a period of years:

all my publishing life I have been looking out for an Australian novel in which humour and 'tenderness' and 'story' combine . . .

Isn't it a wonderful thing that in the hundreds of tons of MSS. which have been showered on me during the last 30-odd years there has not been even a second-rate novel? ('We of the Never-Never', 'My Brilliant Career', and so on, didn't come my way). The labourers have been many, their fields fertile, but the harvest a dud. Yet, think of Coolgardie as a scene in which to 'plant' a thrilling yarn — and the Great North-West, and anywhere and everywhere! (14 January 1922)⁹

In the 1890s he approached Lawson, Dyson and George Essex Evans asking them to write a novel. It is likely that Paterson's *An Outback Marriage* was an attempt at the sort of novel Robertson was seeking. A trade order form for *Saltbush Bill J.P.* summarises the pattern of Australian bush life which both Robertson and Jose liked to see:

His appeal is to the natural man as he knows him, the lover of a horse, of a fight, of a clever ruse, of a deed of dering-do, of a touch of pathos, of the wide, free country-life.¹⁰

In 1920 Robertson wrote to Paterson asking him for a long verse poem on station life. Robertson's directions leave us in no doubt that his Kiplingesque nineties vision was fossilised in his mind. He asks that the poem be descriptive of station life: 'keep drought out of it, or in the background, anyway'. He asks that the world be peopled with jackeroos, station hands and neighbours of 'virtues (microscopical) failings (colossal) . . . Make us like them *for* their 'shortcomings', not in spite of them.' Robertson goes on to suggest there be 'a Shearer's Wedding, or a Christening, or both together . . . "Time the present — after recent rains"'.¹¹ Robertson's nationalism and patriotism, as found in the works of non-fiction which appealed to him, are also likely to have been inspired in part by Jose. Here we think of those larger works such as the *Australian Encyclopaedia* and the *Official History of Australia in the War of 1914-1918*.

It would be inaccurate, however, to stereotype Jose as 'jingoistic'. Brennan found in him a ready audience. They corresponded, for example, on Greek tragedy and shared a deep interest in the French Symbolists. Later, when Brennan's reputation as a scholar was in danger of being overshadowed, he drew attention to his unique contribution also as a poet.¹² Similarly, he drew attention to Victor Daley's 'finely wrought' poetry and was unable to accept English indifference to *At Dawn and Dusk*.¹³

An examination of proofs reveals that Jose's revisions in the 1890s were both skilful and subtle in their effects; his editing was non-interventionist in the sense that he made suggestions but authors always retained the right to veto them; the number of

suggestions is small. Furthermore, *on the whole*, they reveal an appreciation of the authors' intentions and an ability to enhance them.

While space does not allow a detailed examination of all revisions, one can say that in his editing of Dyson, Lawson and Paterson, Jose was primarily concerned with style and technique. This was partly because in the 1880s and 1890s, as Jarvis observed, there was an increased interest in the principles of fictional technique with the reputation and recognition of the influence of the French realists and English writers such as Eliot and Henry James.¹⁴ Technique was made even more important for those authors who hoped for publication in Britain.

In order to better understand Jose's aims, it is simplest to examine how these resembled and differed from those of Archibald and the *Bulletin*, and how they differed from Robertson's. An integral part of Jose's colonial nationalist outlook and Kiplingesque vision was an essentially optimistic interpretation of the Australian setting. Stated more accurately one might say he disliked what he considered to be the realist excesses of pessimism and sensationalism, as cultivated by the *Bulletin*. On the other hand, as was indicated, Jose, like the *Bulletin* in this period, was particularly interested in technique. In Jose's case the preoccupation extended from fiction to include verse; furthermore, it was the technique of realism in which he was interested.

The various stylistic features of the short story which the *Bulletin* under Archibald discouraged and cultivated have been enumerated by Jarvis, namely the dislike of bare authorial intrusion, especially moralizing, and a preference for the dramatic method where the characters reveal themselves through dialogue and action; the handling of the story element was important — 'the *Bulletin* wanted a concise realistic tale with an unexpected ending'.¹⁵

In Jose's suggested revisions to Paterson's *An Outback Marriage* (1906), there is a preference for 'realistic' characters, a realistic treatment of setting but, above all — as with the *Bulletin* — it was the handling of plot which was important. This was a feature with which he was concerned in the revising of Dyson's *Goldstealers*. While the original version of *An Outback Marriage* does not appear to be extant it is possible to deduce a certain amount from Jose's skeleton of it, and from comparing a version which appeared in the Melbourne *Leader* in 1900, entitled *In No Man's Land*, with the Angus & Robertson edition, *An Outback Marriage* (1906).

One should note that the time-lag between the appearance of the book in the *Leader* and its eventual publication suggests Paterson probably sought further opinions about revising it; one should note that Jose was overseas from 1899 to 1904 but also that his recommendations did not go unheeded. Jose considered that Paterson's heroine was 'too perfect'.¹⁶ The original heroine, Ellen Harriott, was scaled down; however, a new one, Mary Grant the heiress, was created. She was not without her failings, the most obvious one being her blindness to Blake, who is revealed to the reader as mercenary in the extreme. With regard to the handling of setting, although Jose, like the *Bulletin*, favoured the use of local colour, such a preference was tempered by the Realist's respect for life-like observation. He wrote of one chapter, 'This is piling on the local colour too much. You can't put all of Australia into one pint pot'.¹⁷ The most significant alteration is that made to the handling of the setting. Jose had

concluded, 'Too much is attempted. A 'local-colour' novel should confine itself to one locality for colour, but this tries to sample all the brands of both N.Q. and the Monaro district. There must be some selection made'.¹⁸ He considered too that the plot needed condensing. In the early chapters of *In No Man's Land*, Paterson had included 'En Voyage', a description of a voyage to Queensland from New South Wales, Queensland town life, and the Barcoo. In doing this, he was sacrificing control of the pace of the plot and making the early part of the book rather like a breezy travelogue. By omitting this, and concentrating on the trip from Sydney to 'Kuryong' — the geographical and thematic focal point of the plot — a sense of expectation is created. Furthermore, in selecting one area, we have that detailed and precise observation, favoured by the Realist. In *An Outback Marriage*, the Queensland setting is introduced later; it is dealt with more briefly and deftly. It occurs as an integral part of the plot, being part of 'The Second Search for Considine'. Once again, this is in line with Jose's recommendations.

Jose considered that the plot needed condensing. In the final version of the book it is handled more tightly by omitting much of the superfluous detail. In the early version of the book he felt that there were too many interruptions in the early stages: many of the things Jose suggested ought to be omitted were. He thought there was a lack of momentum from chapters nine to twenty-two; this was remedied by the introduction of romantic sub-plots and further cuts and compressions. Jose was alert to the need for suspense and the value of mystery. There was a heightening of both with the creation of the romantic sub-plots. By the introduction of Mary Grant and Blake tension was established in the rivalry between Hugh Gordon and Blake for Mary. With the death of old Grant, the question of who Mary will marry becomes more critical — if she marries Blake, Hugh and the Gordons will have to leave 'Kuryong'. Jose's suggestion that Paterson withhold the explanations of Peggy's behaviour in snubbing Considine is aimed at heightening the suspense and engaging the reader's interest.

Jose revealed a preference, found also in the *Bulletin's* editorial policy, for an unexpected ending or 'final twist'. He felt that the story should conclude with the break up of the trial:

Alter the trial business. Get us into Court & keep us in Court. Let's have part of Manasseh's opening eloquence, & feel it cut short, & feel cut short ourselves, & wonder what the dickens is up now. And then take us out of Court & tell us about Peggy & Considine.¹⁹

But Paterson, rather than concluding with the surprise ending of Peggy and Considine resolving their differences, preferred the coda of the 'happy ending' — the prospect of Hugh and Mary's marriage. Before continuing it must be said that one other noticeable difference between the draft and *In No Man's Land*, on the one hand, and *An Outback Marriage*, on the other, is the absence of anti-semitism in the book. Originally there had been a crudely-drawn stereotype of a character, Isaacstein, who wanted to marry Peggy in order to share the Gordon estate. Jose had suggested this be cut in Chapter 18 of the original version, ostensibly because it delayed the action. The character of Isaacstein, however, does not occur in *An Outback Marriage*.

But Jose's appreciation of technique is seen at its most interesting in his revision of Lawson's stories. It is sufficient here to note that Jose's concern for technique can be seen in his recommendations for the handling of the narrator and for the endings of the stories in *While the Billy Boils* (1896).²⁰

Jose's interest in technical issues reveals itself in his many comments made when he was revising Edward Dyson's *Rhymes from the Mines* (1896). Jose recognized that if Dyson, like Lawson, was to use the device of a 'worker-narrator' — in this case, a miner — it was all the more important that other stylistic elements be expertly handled lest the audience, observing the lack of technical expertise, confuse narrator with author. The problem was not only that technique was highly valued in England, where Dyson hoped to be published, but that his style was essentially naive.

In preparing Dyson's verse for publication Jose was concerned with its need of metrical improvement. In this he aimed at competence rather than virtuosity. The difficulty was that Dyson was most inexpert in the handling of metre. His work lapsed to doggerel at its worst; at its best it had a primitive quality. Jose's broad aim was to make the verse scan. He employed two principal methods of effecting this. He suggested maintaining a pattern based on the number of syllables in a line. In doing this, he frequently makes corrections to the opening word or foot of a line to eliminate any uncertainty, and make its metrical pattern readily identifiable. Secondly many revisions have been made which open up or eliminate consonantal groups and thus improve the flow of a line. Taken together, the ease and fluency of the revisions is in keeping with the overall style of the verse.

As noted earlier, Robertson did not share Jose's belief in the importance of technique. This emerges in their reactions to Paterson's *Rio Grande's Last Race* (1902) and *An Outback Marriage*. Paterson himself had mixed feelings about the exaggerated boisterousness in the novel:

I will look in about Monday if you can then spare time to go into the question of what wants writing up most, & the more important question of what wants writing down. I fear the lovemaking is very flat, & there is too much fight & drink all through it. Still I have to please a large section of the public & if we do that the critics wont break our hearts. (3 August 1899)²¹

It is in Jose's and Robertson's response to Paterson that we become aware of a divergence of opinion. In the above letter of Paterson's there is an assumption that the views of critics and 'the public' are mutually exclusive. Yet Jose's criticisms of *An Outback Marriage* were particularly attuned to the average reader's sensitivity at least in regard to plot. It should be said that his attitude to language was more complex. In the following letter, discussing the poet's *Rio Grande's Last Race* (1902), we note that Robertson, while sensitive to critics, nonetheless shared Paterson's assumption. We also see the edges of a dispute which has important literary ramifications of which Robertson was barely, if at all, aware:

ABP seems unhappy about *Rio Grande* & asked me whether I could suggest someone to run through the proofs with an eye to rejection of unworthy pieces. I have given the matter some thought on the train & can think of no one more fit than Maccallum . . . I take it that ABP wishes independent judgement

brought to bear on the job — that of someone capable of steering between his own forebodings & his publishers' natural wish to make a fat 5/- volume. He ought to be perfectly satisfied if nothing below the standard of Snowy River goes in — I don't mean below the highest standard in Snowy, but generally speaking. Maccallum knows the Snowy book well, he knows what the reviews praised and blamed, & he has a good idea of what the general public approved in it. Ask him to take the proofs and size up the various pieces with reference to the Snowy standard . . . M. has considerable knowledge of technique (an opinion isn't considered worth a damn unless this word is dragged in) and if he will only remember that Paterson isn't, never will be & isn't wanted (by either the Public to whom he appeals or his Publishers) to be a Keats or a Milton he'll do it all right. The only question he has to answer about each 'pome' is — Is it as good as the poorest piece of the same sort in Snowy River . . .

Curiously enough both Jose and Maccallum thought very little of Snowy when it was passing through the press. Jose preferred Dyson! But they were wrong because ABP has gained not only cash but fame by the bard. You have to think of the people you are appealing to — & it isn't the Keats crowd. (n.d.)²²

In Robertson's reference to the 'Keats crowd' we see his perception of a polarised literary taste in the population and it is the popular, not the educated or esoteric, group to whom he sees Paterson appealing. But of far greater importance here is Robertson's rather grudging reference to technique. His concept of it, rather than simply denoting poetic style or the way in which the basic elements of poetry are combined and employed, seems to suggest high artifice. For in his playing down of technique we are provided with evidence for a hypothesis that Robertson was pushing the popular or 'low-stream' writers even further to one extreme. Robertson seems to imply that technique is not really of importance for the popular Australian audience. Jose, on the other hand, placed a premium on technique, as can be seen not only in his frequent mention of it in reports but also in his revisions. To Jose technique was part of the essence of any appeal, popular or otherwise; it cut across all boundaries and would enhance both popular and esoteric literature alike. Furthermore, if the writers had aspirations to be published and accepted in Britain — and Jose shared these desires — technique and polish were indispensable.

On the other hand, we should note that Robertson probably did want his publications to be polished. Certainly he implicitly concurred with one of Jose's most frequent criticisms of manuscripts — that they were carelessly written — in that he passed these alterations. In his effusive obituary for Robertson Jose wrote:

Imagine for a moment the early A. and R. books without him, the slapdash Banjo, the crude, irregular and disciplined [sic] Lawson; most of the serious books never written, simply because no other publisher would have risked the loss on them; the issue of mediocre volumes because authors were willing to pay for them, or because the half-educated public taste would swallow sloppy work. Imagine, too, the lack of standards, the lack of that warning and teaching and encouraging voice to which every one of his authors reacted — or ceased to be authors of his.²³

The description tells us as much about Jose's own opinions as Robertson's.

Teresa Pagliaro,
Melbourne.

NOTES

1. Philip Gaskell, *From Writer to Reader, Studies in Editorial Method* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978); James Thorpe, *Principles of Textual Criticism* (San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 1972); Jerome McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983). See also Peter Shillingsburg, 'An Inquiry into the Social Status of Texts and Modes of Textual Criticism', in *Studies in Bibliography*, 42 (1989): 55-79; McGann, pp.34-5.
2. Thorpe, pp.30 and 48.
3. Richard le Gallienne, 'Poets and Publishers', in *Prose Fancies* (London: Elkin Mathews & John Lane, 1894), pp.82-3.
4. Angus & Robertson papers, Mitchell Library, Sydney, 314/22, Victor Daley file, Daley-Robertson, June 1897; 314/28, Edward Dyson file, 9 October.
5. Angus & Robertson papers 314/21, Cross file, Wright-Robertson [October 1918], p.777; 314/66, Paterson file, 8 August 1899.
6. When Jose was subediting *Convict Once*, J. Brunton Stephens wrote to him, 'On the whole I think your metrical standard a little *too* mechanical'. (Angus & Robertson papers, v.314, J. Brunton Stephens file, Stephens-Jose, 10 September 1899). When Jose criticised the irregularity of Murdoch's verse, Murdoch replied, 'I scorn your prosodic puritanism. Why shouldn't a man become trochaic in the midst of an iambic poem if it suits his genius so to do? I'll quote you plenty of precedents, if it's precedents you want. Vide Saintsbury *passim*.' Murdoch revised the poems as Jose suggested, conceding that he thought the revisions an improvement but headed the verse, 'Stanzas altered to fit Procrustean Bed of Prosodic Enthusiast' (Walter Murdoch – Jose, 18 October 1912, in Jose papers, Mitchell Library).
7. McGann, p.53.
8. See George Jefferson, *Edward Garnett: A Life in Literature* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1982) and A. Scott Berg, *Max Perkins: Editor of Genius* (New York: Dutton, 1978).
9. 314/189, Fr P.J. Hartigan file.
10. 314/66, Paterson file, p.411.
11. *ibid.*, 6 January 1920.
12. A.W. Jose, *The Romantic Nineties* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1933), p.29-31.
13. *Ibid.*, p.13.
14. Doug Jarvis, 'Lawson, the *Bulletin* and the Short Story', *Australian Literary Studies*, 11(1983): 58-66.
15. *Ibid.*, pp.59-60.
16. Jose noted in his 'Skeleton & Remarks', 'Isn't Ellen rather too much of a universal genius?' (314/41, Jose file).
17. 'Skeleton & Remarks'.
18. *Ibid.*
19. *Ibid.*
20. More detail is found in Teresa Pagliaro, 'Jose's Editing of *While the Billy Boils*', *Bibliographical Society of Australia and New Zealand Bulletin*, 14, 3(1990): 81-93.
21. 314/66, Paterson file.
22. *Ibid.*, Robertson – Thomson. We might note here that it is probably *An Outback Marriage*, rather than *Rio Grande's Last Race*, which is referred to in the anecdote of Paterson which Jose relates in *The Romantic Nineties*, p.15: 'My memories of him are connected mainly with proofsheets and occasional suggestions; but I have a letter he wrote once to George Robertson enclosing a manuscript and exulting in the fact that 'Thank God, Jose is in England, and you can't loose him on me!'
23. See Newspaper cutting book of A.W. Jose's articles for the *Brisbane Courier*, p.56 in Jose papers, Mitchell Library.

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)