

INTRODUCTION TO A FUTURE SCHOLARLY EDITION OF *ALICE'S ADVENTURES IN
WONDERLAND AND THROUGH THE LOOKING-GLASS AND WHAT ALICE FOUND*

THERE

by

HAYLEY ESTHER HEDGPETH

(Under the Direction of Simon Gatrell)

ABSTRACT

Despite Lewis Carroll's foremost position in the children's literature canon, a scholarly edition of his two most famous works, *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking-Glass and What Alice Found There*, has yet to appear. This thesis introduces a projected edition of these two works, in which I examine how the publication history and Carroll's revisions influence editorial decisions.

INDEX WORDS: Lewis Carroll, Charles Lutwidge Dodgson, *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland, Through the Looking-Glass*, Text, Edition, Textual criticism, Publishing, Macmillan, John Tenniel, Illustration, Children's literature

INTRODUCTION TO A FUTURE SCHOLARLY EDITION OF *ALICE'S ADVENTURES IN
WONDERLAND AND THROUGH THE LOOKING-GLASS AND WHAT ALICE FOUND
THERE*

by

HAYLEY ESTHER HEDGPETH

BA, University of Missouri-Columbia, 2011

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2014

© 2014

Hayley Esther Hedgpeth

All Rights Reserved

INTRODUCTION TO A FUTURE SCHOLARLY EDITION OF *ALICE'S ADVENTURES IN
WONDERLAND AND THROUGH THE LOOKING-GLASS AND WHAT ALICE FOUND
THERE*

by

HAYLEY ESTHER HEDGPETH

Major Professor: Simon Gatrell

Committee: Jonathan Evans
Casie LeGette

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2014

DEDICATION

To Bryan, for all the times you nodded your head and feigned interest.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Simon Gatrell. Without his guidance, knowledge, and patience, I would never have pursued or completed such an important project. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Casie LeGette, for her invaluable insight during our conversations, and Dr. Jonathan Evans, for his willingness to be a part of this project.

Special thanks go out to my fellow MA students—Barry Shelton, Jamie Garner, James Edge, Mike Weaver, Jessica Roberts, and Weldon Pless—who have all played important roles in bringing this thesis to fruition, either by fixing a sentence or by commiserating on a Friday afternoon. Alyssa Leavell, in particular, read an early draft and offered thoughtful criticism, and for that I am eternally grateful.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family for their support during this process: to my husband, Bryan, who was always willing to drive to Athens when a phone call wasn't enough, and to my parents, whose belief in education led me here in the first place.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
CHAPTER	
1 GENESIS OF THE TEXT AND PUBLICATION HISTORY	1
Overview.....	1
<i>Alice</i>	2
<i>Looking-Glass</i>	13
People's Edition.....	21
1897 Final Revised Edition.....	24
2 REVISIONS.....	29
Nature of Revisions as a Whole.....	29
Pre-publication.....	30
Post-publication	35
People's Edition.....	39
1897	44
3 EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION.....	52
State of the Work	52
Editorial Principles	54
Copy-text	56

Emendations.....	58
Appendices.....	60
WORKS CITED AND CONSULTED.....	61

CHAPTER 1

GENESIS OF THE TEXT AND PUBLICATION HISTORY

Overview

Alice's Adventures in Wonderland and *Through the Looking-Glass* and *What Alice Found There* have yet to go out of print since Charles Dodgson, known to his readers as Lewis Carroll, wrote them over 150 years ago. While *Alice* and *Looking-Glass* continue to endure and delight a diverse readership, the current appeal of the books extends beyond the text that lies within their covers. In the preface to the first volume of his last book for children, *Sylvie and Bruno*, Carroll showed his own understanding of what later readers and scholars would find so fascinating: the story *behind* the story, or the way in which his books came about:

I really believe that some of my readers will be interested in these details of the 'genesis' of a book, which looks so simple and straight-forward a matter, when completed, that they might suppose it to have been written straight off, page by page, as one would write a letter, beginning at the beginning; and ending at the end. (xi)

In effect, Carroll wrote a sort of textual introduction himself, describing a composition process that holds true when applied to *Alice* and *Looking-Glass*. But, more importantly, Carroll referred to the finished *book*, not just the finished *text*, a distinction that hints at his broad notion of authorship and his belief that both form and content affect the experience of the reader.

As Carroll himself suggests, the "story" of *Alice* and *Looking-Glass* involves more than the details of his early writing process, more than the "isolated genius" of an individual author:

the development of his two most famous works is the result of a complex interplay of both authorial control and collaboration between author, publisher, printer, illustrator, and reader. Therefore, presenting their development requires bringing together the social and textual history of the works and charting their reciprocal relationship. This starts, necessarily, with the history of composition, publication, and transmission, which reveals how Carroll's interactions with various agents of the publication process affect the texts of his works and, consequently, influence editorial decisions.

The reconstruction of this history, and ultimately the generation of a scholarly edition, is helped along by a wealth of primary material: Carroll left behind meticulous records—diaries, letters, lists—as did his publisher, Macmillan. Carroll's diaries, though only nine out of the original thirteen survive, have recently been edited in full by Edward Wakeling, superseding Roger Lancelyn Green's earlier version from 1953. Morton Cohen has published a two-volume collection of Carroll's letters, though since Carroll wrote and received over 98,000 in his lifetime, the collection is far from complete. To supplement this collection, Cohen has published a separate volume containing Carroll's correspondence with Macmillan, an invaluable resource for understanding their relationship.

Alice

The *Alice* we know today began as an oral tale, told to Carroll's favorite child companions—Alice, Lorina, and Edith Liddell—during a boating excursion on July 4, 1862. Carroll recorded the trip with the Liddell girls in his diary for that day, but, as Collingwood notes, only later did he add a marginal annotation that refers to the story: “On this occasion I told them the fairy-tale of ‘Alice's Adventures Underground,’ which I undertook to write out for Alice” (*Diaries* 4: 85). Reflecting on this day much later, Alice remembered begging Carroll to

record the story: “I have such a distinct recollection of the expedition, and also, on the next day I started to pester him to write down the story for me” (qtd. in *Biography* 91). Robinson Duckworth, the fifth member of the famous excursion, gave a similar account of the “extempore romance,” adding that “the story was actually composed and spoken over my shoulder for the benefit of Alice Liddell” while rowing to Godstow (*Unknown* 358). In 1898, Stuart Dodgson Collingwood, Carroll’s first biographer, brought these and many other accounts together in *The Life and Letters of Lewis Carroll*. In this way, the composition history of *Alice* has itself become a work of fiction, told and re-told by Carroll, Alice, biographers, and scholars.¹

A diary entry from November 13 of that year reveals that Carroll had started drafting, transforming the oral tale into something less ephemeral: “Began writing the fairy-tale for Alice, which I told them July 4, going to Godstow. I hope to finish it by Xmas” (4: 142). As Carroll himself would recollect in “Alice on the Stage,” an article printed in *The Theatre* in 1887, his writing process was episodic; when writing out *Underground* he “added many fresh ideas, which seemed to grow to themselves upon the original stock” and pieced together the “bits and scraps” into a coherent story (*Unknown* 163-70). He finally finished the text of the MS on February 10, 1863.

Carroll began thinking of publication at the urging of his friends soon after he finished the text in 1863. This suggests that multiple versions of Alice’s final gift manuscript existed, as he did not give her the famous MS—carefully handwritten and containing thirty-seven of his own drawings—until November 26, 1864. In fact, many read a version at Dean Liddell’s, his home at Oxford receiving much notable traffic. Henry Kingsley, brother of Charles Kingsley,

¹ The specific biographical details that may have also contributed to *Alice*, and later, *Looking-Glass*, and a record of Carroll’s earlier writings for his family magazine are covered more fully in Roger Lancelyn Green’s biography of Carroll, *Lewis Carroll*.

who had recently published *The Water Babies* with Macmillan, read the MS here, “urging Mrs. Liddell to persuade the author to publish it” (*Unknown* 360). After its publication, Kingsley wrote a letter to Carroll thanking him for the “charming little book” and professing that “I could not stop reading...till I finished it” (qtd. in *Macmillan* 40). Another prominent children’s writer and close friend of Carroll, George MacDonald, read the story aloud to his children, who gave their enthusiastic approval (qtd. in Green 38). Carroll noted their response in his diary: “Heard from Mrs. MacDonald about *Alice’s Adventures Underground*, which I had lent them to read, and which they wish me to publish” (4: 197). With these and other favorable “reviews,” Carroll began searching for a publisher.

His search did not need to extend far outside Oxford: Alexander Macmillan, of the firm Macmillan and Co., had just been named “Publisher to Oxford University” that year, and on October 19, 1863 Carroll met him at the home of their mutual friend, Thomas Combe, Director of the Clarendon Press and Oxford University printer. By the time of this first meeting, Combe and Carroll were already in the first stages of printing: three months earlier Carroll recorded that he “received from Mr. Combe a second trial page, larger for ‘Alice’s Adventures’” (4: 217). While typically a publisher would be the one to work directly with the printer, Carroll bypassed the normal role of an author in this process, putting himself in a position to control more than the *words* of his text. In this way, Macmillan entered the publication process and would remain as a mere distributor, though Carroll often sought his advice.

The first surviving letter from Macmillan to Carroll is dated September 19, 1864, and Macmillan is already suggesting changes to the title page and a potential publication date of late October or early November (*Macmillan* 11). Prior to this letter, then, Carroll and Macmillan must have already set the terms of their publishing agreement. Their agreement, which would

last throughout Carroll's lifetime with only minor changes, established that Macmillan would publish Carroll's books on commission, receiving ten percent of the profits. Publishing on commission, while not uncommon, limited the publisher's risk by shifting the decisions and payments for printers, illustrators, engravers, binders, and, for Carroll, even advertising, to the author (14). Not only did the commission basis give Carroll the authorial control he desired, but it also put pressure on him to produce a work that would sell well, as he stood to lose much by its failure. To accomplish this, Carroll educated himself on various publishing and printing practices, and by the end of his life he was even dictating whether the sheets of his books should be printed and folded in quarto or octavo.

Because of the nature of his agreement with Macmillan, Carroll took on the full responsibility of finding and dealing with an illustrator. On December 20, 1863, Carroll wrote to Tom Taylor asking if he knew John Tenniel, the renowned illustrator and cartoonist of *Punch*, well enough to introduce them. Carroll was prompted by his realization that his own drawings from the gift MS "would not be satisfactory after all," but he decided to send the MS book to Tenniel anyway, "not that [Tenniel] should at all follow my pictures, but simply to give him an idea of the sort of thing I want" (*Letters* 62). This letter hints at the complicated relationship that would develop between the two men: Carroll recognized the necessity of Tenniel's name and skill for a general audience but also desired some form of control. In other words, Tenniel was Carroll's original marketing tool, and his status secured *Alice* from being another children's book by an unknown author. With an introduction from Taylor, Carroll approached Tenniel on January 25, 1864, and he consented to illustrate the book on April 5 (4: 272, 284).

While he was negotiating with Tenniel, Carroll was also moving forward with the typesetting of his text. He sent Combe a "batch of MS. from the first chapter" on May 6 and

chapter three on August 2 (4: 298, 347). On December 16, 1864, he sent Macmillan a complete copy, in fact his “only complete copy” of *Alice* in “slip” (*Macmillan* 36). Carroll became accustomed to receiving pages in “slip,” or “galley slip” as it is more accurately called, and then correcting and arranging the text with illustrations in mind, a process detailed in a letter referring to the projected *Alice’s Puzzlebook*: “I think it would be a good thing to get all the MS, that is ready, set up in slip, that I may correct and arrange it at leisure” (105). Having the type set first in slip rather than pages gave Carroll and Tenniel the opportunity to determine illustration placement in relation to the typed lines of text but kept the printer from having to constantly reset pages as the two men arranged the layout.

Some time early in 1865 Carroll wrote out a plan that detailed the size, placement, number of lines, and often a caption of text for all forty-two illustrations.² As Michael Hancher points out, “Carroll...probably chose which narrative moments Tenniel was to illustrate, so as to control, himself, the novelties of emphasis that illustrations inevitably bring about,” but he also notes that Carroll “was willing to be advised by Tenniel about the details of book design even at this early stage,” asking Tenniel before he authorized a change in page size (100). Carroll would allow the artist more input when illustrating *Looking-Glass*, even deleting an entire episode when Tenniel could not draw the character Carroll described.

However, Tenniel’s progress on the illustrations slowed the entire publication process. Tenniel had not started on the illustrations as of June 20, 1864 and had only completed one by October 12 (4: 210, 5: 16). On November 20, Carroll informed Macmillan that Tenniel “is hopeless of completing the pictures by Xmas,” and proposed Easter as a new publication date, to which Macmillan agreed. But for Tenniel this deadline, too, would prove impossible. Carroll

² A facsimile of this “plan,” originally reproduced in the *Lewis Carroll Handbook*, and the later one for *Looking-Glass* would be contained in an appendix with other documentary material.

received the “1st 12 proofs from Tenniel” on December 16 and the “last 3 proofs from Tenniel” on June 18, 1865 (*Letters* 72). In Tenniel’s defense, Carroll was probably micro-managing the artist’s process, demonstrated by the incredibly detailed directions contained in the illustration plan. Additionally, having the illustrations engraved on woodblocks was a tedious task. Once Tenniel had completed the original pencil drawings, he used tracing paper to transfer an outline onto the block, and then he went over the outline in more detail. When he was finished, he sent them to Dalziel, the engravers, who then cut away at the pencil markings to produce a “relief” image. Finally, after much back-and-forth between Tenniel and Dalziel, the blocks were electrotyped to prevent wear on the originals (Hancher 107).

During this time, the title, through the input of various friends and Macmillan, had morphed into *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*, though Carroll had considered numerous alternatives. On June 10, 1864, Carroll wrote to Tom Taylor asking for his opinion on a new title, as *Alice’s Adventures Underground* sounded “too like a lesson-book, in which instructions about mines would be administered in the form of a grill” (*Letters* 65). Carroll, who described *Alice* as “an attempt to strike out a new line of fairy-lore,” wished to avoid aligning *Alice* with the didacticism more typical of children’s literature of the early Victorian era. In the same letter, he proposed “Alice among the Elves/Goblins” and “Alice’s hour/doings/adventures in elf-land/wonderland” but preferred “‘Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland’,” because he wanted “something sensational” (*Letters* 65). No reply from Taylor exists, but the references to the book in his diary suggest that Carroll had settled on the title soon after this letter.

On May 24, 1865, Carroll wrote to Macmillan that “we hope to begin working off on Monday,” and later recorded that the first printed copies were sent to Macmillan on June 27, presumably for Macmillan to look over and send to the binder (*Macmillan* 36; *Letters* 72).

Combe printed 2,000 copies of the first edition and, at Carroll's request, sent fifty to Macmillan to be bound early as presentation copies, one of which was Alice Liddell's special copy, bound in white vellum. But this haste was premature; though Carroll initially found nothing wrong with the edition, he received a letter on July 19 from Tenniel, who was "entirely dissatisfied with the printing" (5: 97). The next day, Carroll showed the letter to Macmillan and concluded, "I suppose we shall have to do it all again" (5: 97). Tenniel does, in fact, take the blame, writing to Dalziel in 1865 that "I proclaimed so strongly against the disgraceful printing that he *cancelled the edition*" (qtd. in Engen 82). The "disgraceful printing," according to Harry Morgan Ayres, was the result of both over-inked illustrations and "fourteen 'widows'" (155). In his comparison of an 1865 and 1866 edition, he provides several instances where lines were adjusted to avoid "crowding" or "broken lines," and notes that the changes sometimes "permitted a better placement of picture" (155-56). He goes on to say that the illustrations themselves "have been reproduced a little lighter" in the 1866 edition, a claim that has since been verified by other scholars, though the difference between the two editions is minor.³ This costly "fiasco," as Carroll would later call it, alludes to Tenniel's increasing role as co-author and Carroll's own concern with the *appearance* of text and illustrations on the page, not necessarily the content. In fact, in a letter concerning a later American printing of *Alice*, Carroll wrote of his desire to keep the American and English editions separate, as the English 6s. edition was first and foremost an "edition de luxe," where the intention is to produce a book as finely and perfectly finished as possible" (*Macmillan* 90).

³ For a more detailed discussion of the faults of the 1865 printing, see W. H. Bond's article, "The Publication of Alice's Adventures in Wonderland," Selwyn Goodacre's "The 1865 Alice: A New Appraisal and a Revised Census," and Warren Weaver's "First Edition of Alice's Adventures: A Census."

On July 31, Carroll wrote to Macmillan and proposed four courses of action for the “cancelled edition”: to “reserve them until next year, to ‘sell in the provinces’”; “sell them at a reduced price (say 5s.) as being avowedly an inferior edition”; “select all such sheets as happen to be well printed—use these along with the London-printed copies, and sell the rest as waste paper”; or “sell the whole as waste paper” (37). On August 2, Carroll had “finally decided on the re-print of *Alice*, and that the first 2000 shall be sold as waste paper”; however, he changed his mind again in April 1866 after hearing from Macmillan about an offer from Appleton in America that would give him 5d. per copy.⁴ After consulting Tenniel, he consented to sell the sheets (*Macmillan* 66; 5: 140). The 1,952 copies of unbound sheets recorded in the Clarendon Press ledgers were given new, tipped-in title sheets printed at Oxford, bound in England, and shipped off to America accordingly (*Handbook* 33).

Soon after cancelling the first edition, Carroll sought Macmillan’s advice about a new printer, ultimately choosing Richard Clay, one of the three printers Macmillan typically used (Barker 258). Though the relationship did not always prove satisfactory, Clay would print all of Carroll’s trade books. Clay began working on the new *Alice* quickly, and according to the *Handbook*, he reset the type using a copy of Combe’s first edition but did not make new electrotypes of the illustrations. Carroll read proof of this edition, and noted that he “rec. 1st proof-sheet from Clay” on August 11 (*Letters* 72). With so much of his own money still out of pocket from the first edition—a cost that he detailed in his diary on August 2—Carroll understandably had reservations about printing such a large number again. Ultimately, however,

⁴ Throughout his lifetime, Carroll would attempt to sell what he considered “inferior” copies to American publishers, though they eventually obtained electrotypes. Carroll’s lack of control takes away any textual authority the American editions might have, and I have consequently neglected these editions; however, his attitude toward his American readers and what text they should have is interesting nonetheless.

Carroll decided to go with the original number, and Clay printed two impressions of 2,000 copies each (5: 50).

This second edition of *Alice*, the first to reach the general public, came out at Christmas, with 1866 as the publication date and a price of 7s. 6d. Carroll received his copy on November 9, pronouncing it “*far* superior to the old, and in fact a perfect piece of artistic printing,” and on November 28 he “heard from Tenniel, approving new impression” (5: 115; *Letters* 72). Though success was not immediate, Carroll recorded that “500 *Alices* are already sold” as of November 30, and less than a year later, as of October 19, 1866, “it is ‘out of print’—i.e. 3900 copies have been sold,” a number that includes the second impression of the 1866 typesetting (5: 117; *Letters* 72). On September 3, a month before it went “out of print,” Carroll recorded that they were printing a new edition of 3,000, an edition comprised of the 5th through 7th thousands. Beginning with this edition, Carroll had Macmillan label each title-page with the appropriate “thousand,” a logical feature he felt helped future sales by advertising the “good sale” of the book, especially once they reached certain milestones such as the tenth thousand (*Macmillan* 142). For the new 3,000, Macmillan wanted to use cheaper paper, and Carroll, always concerned that quality should be equivalent to price, asked to lower the price to 6s., the price that the “Ordinary” or “6s.” edition would remain at during his lifetime. Carroll also asked for “a specimen sheet to be sent to Mr. Tenniel as soon as possible, as I shall certainly not consent to its publication unless he approves of the effect,” showing how sensitive he had become to Tenniel’s opinion (44).

This was followed by the fourth edition in 1867—printed in an “incomplete” edition of 2500—and the fifth edition in 1868—printed in an edition of 1500 to get back to the consistent thousands (*Handbook* 35-36). It does not appear that Carroll read proof for any editions

following the second, though he did send various lists of “errata.”⁵ Beginning with the 12th thousand in 1868, Clay had electrotypes made of the text and illustrations together, a more permanent printing technique that signified “a certain aura of achievement” for an author, but that also limited his ability to revise (Dooley 58). In fact, the electrotyped 12th thousand came out in October 1868 without Carroll’s knowledge, and upon receiving a “new *Alice*” on December 3—a copy of the 12th thousand—he wrote to Macmillan requesting that “If you are now going to keep it permanently in type, I wish you would send me a proof, in sheets, on common paper, that I may correct it for the next issue. The punctuation is capable of a good deal of improvement” (*Macmillan* 72). Macmillan and Clay had neglected to inform Carroll of the electrotypes, a point that Carroll did not figure out until February 17: “You alarm me by the words ‘having the book electro-typed, we have nothing to pay for, etc., etc.’ I hope this does not mean that you have electrotyped the pages, text and all—if it does, there will be a good deal to cancel, I fear, as I cannot endure having the book perpetuated with its present misprints” (78). Though Macmillan and Clay were acting within the typical boundaries of publisher and printer, Carroll’s complaint highlights his desire for control and authority within spaces that were not typically the realm of the author. Macmillan replied the same day, informing him that “misprints can be easily

⁵ I have followed the *Handbook*’s method in calling these early printings of *Alice* “editions,” as numerous scholars have maintained that these were not made from standing type. Additionally, Macmillan’s *Bibliographical Catalogue* from 1843-1889, which makes the distinction between “edition”—“an impression from type set up afresh”—and “reprint”—“an impression from standing type or from Stereotype or Electrotypes plates”—cites them as different editions, only designating them as reprints after the book has been electrotyped. However, the catalogue only cites the 8th-11th thousand as one edition, instead of the two that the *Handbook* lists. To confirm or deny whether these constitute editions or impressions, i.e., whether the type was reset or left standing, I would need to examine multiple copies of each thousand myself. In fact, Carroll himself asked the same question in regard to the second edition: “is it being kept in type? as, if so, I shall have a few ‘errata’ to send in case more copies are to be struck off.” Unfortunately, Cohen claims that Macmillan’s reply is missing (*Macmillan* 40).

corrected in the plates,” but Carroll would have to wait until the People’s Edition of 1887 and the final revised edition of 1897 to perform the large scale punctuation “improvements” he desired.

Though the sale began modestly, the initial press reviews were almost all positive. Carroll, hyper-concerned with the public and critical opinion of *Alice*, often asked Macmillan to send him copies of various reviews, and he listed nineteen in his diary, starting with *The Reader* on November 12 and ending with *Aunt Judy’s Magazine* on June 1 of the next year (5: 11-12). While mostly positive, the reviews tended to gloss over Carroll’s text, directing their praise instead to “the appearance and presentation of the books” (Cripps 34). As Elizabeth Cripps notes, reviewers commented on elements of book design such as page size, gilding, cover design, and color, possibly as a result of *Alice* coming out during the Christmas “gift book” season, though Carroll himself acknowledged the importance of these factors. Likewise, many of the reviewers considered Tenniel’s illustrations the greatest strength of *Alice*, further cementing the co-authorial nature of the finished work (35). One noteworthy exception occurred in the *Athenaeum*, which found fault in both Tenniel’s “grim and uncouth” illustrations and Carroll’s “strange adventures,” claiming, “We fancy that any child might be more puzzled than enchanted by this stiff, overwrought story” (qtd. in Cripps 38). However, reviews continued to appear with subsequent printings of *Alice*, and they increasingly acknowledged Carroll’s ability, with a review in the December 1866 issue of *John Bull* pronouncing it “a work of genius” (qtd. in Cripps 36). Consequently, just as the “reviews” of his *Underground MS* had encouraged publication, the positive reception of *Alice* prompted Carroll to begin thinking about a new story for children.

Looking-Glass

Less than a year after the publication of *Alice*, on August 24, 1866, Carroll mentioned a potential sequel to Macmillan: “It will probably be some time before I again indulge in paper and print. I have, however, a floating idea of writing a sort of sequel to *Alice*” (*Macmillan* 44). By February 6, 1867, Carroll had started thinking about the sequel in practical terms of publishing, and he asked Macmillan if the page size of *Alice* could be made “half-way between that of the 4th and 5th thousands” in future printings. “My chief reason for this is,” he continued, “is that I am hoping before long to complete another book about *Alice*, and if this is also printed of the ‘half-way’ size, it would bind up with any of the 3 sizes. You would not, I presume, object to publish the book, if it should ever reach completion?” Macmillan again gave his approval, writing, “I shall be very glad to hear when your new *Alice* is ready” (*Macmillan* 48-49). Clearly, despite Carroll’s meticulous, and at times, demanding tendencies with the production (and recall) of *Alice*, Macmillan’s willingness to take on the “new *Alice*” indicates a firmly established relationship between the two.

Carroll began writing what he originally called “Looking-Glass House” in late 1867 or early 1868, this time aiming at a general readership from the outset, though stories told to and about the Liddell girls would again constitute much of the material. Carroll does not provide any diary entries or letters that reveal his inspiration for Alice’s second set of adventures, but in her memoir, Alice Liddell (Hargreaves) claims that *Looking-Glass* evolved from her and her sisters’ visits with Carroll (qtd. in *Interviews and Recollections* 86). In his biography of Carroll, Cohen also makes this point, providing numerous biographical details that coincide with scenes in *Looking-Glass*. Most notably, the railway carriage scene comes directly from a train ride from Gloucester to Oxford Carroll took with the Liddell girls after visiting them in early 1863 (137).

He also found inspiration in his own earlier writing, as in the well-documented transformation of the 1855 “Stanza of Anglo Saxon Poetry” into “Jabberwocky.”⁶ On January 16, 1868 Carroll mentioned writing the manuscript for the first time: “I have also added a few pages to the 2nd. volume of *Alice*” (5: 379). The text itself developed slowly, as Carroll was also working on “Phantasmagoria,” a volume of poetry that came out in early 1869.

Since illustrations had proved to be an integral part of *Alice* and its positive reviews, Carroll began approaching illustrators as early as 1868, before he had written the bulk of the manuscript. After Tenniel’s initial rejection in April, at which time he claimed he was too busy, Carroll called on Richard Doyle, Tenniel’s predecessor at *Punch*, who seemed willing, according to Carroll, but later declined. He then asked George MacDonald to apply to Sir Noel Paton, who turned out to be “too ill to undertake the pictures for *Looking-Glass House*” and also suggested that “Tenniel is *the* man” (6: 30). He even considered William Gilbert, “Bab,” but found his illustrations too “grotesque” (*Macmillan* 65). After these setbacks, Carroll wrote to Tenniel again, this time offering to pay his publishers at *Punch* for the next five months, a sum that would have amounted to £200, as he worked on *Looking-Glass* illustrations (Engen 87). At the same time, Carroll wrote to Macmillan with almost no hope of securing an artist, and, consequently, no hope of publication: “So, unless you can find me an artist, the MS must remain as—a MS” (*Macmillan* 65). But on June 21 Carroll’s persistence paid off; Tenniel finally consented to illustrate *Looking-Glass* “at such spare time as he can find” (6: 37-38). Tenniel’s change of heart goes undocumented, but whatever his motivation, Carroll clearly considered illustrations a large part of his manuscript becoming a published work.

⁶ For an extended discussion of this development, see Collingwood’s *Unknown Lewis Carroll* and Roger Lancelyn Green’s *Lewis Carroll*.

On December 9, 1868, Carroll ambitiously wrote to Macmillan that “I shall probably have a lot of MS ready, before the end of this month, to be set up in slip for the new volume of Alice...I want if possible to get some slip into Mr. Tenniel’s hands by the end of the year” (73). In fact, on January 12, 1869, Carroll had only “Finished and sent off to Macmillan the first chapter of *Behind the Looking-Glass, and What Alice Saw There*” (6: 76). As this and previously quoted diary entries show, Carroll had not yet settled on the title, and just as he had with *Alice*, he sought the advice of others. Collingwood claims that a “Dr. Liddon,” identified in the *Handbook* as Canon Liddon, proposed the title, but Carroll paid particular attention to Macmillan’s suggestions. As they worked out the typographical details of the title page, about which Carroll was exceptionally meticulous—he asked for and received twenty copies of the title pages for correction—they also discussed the wording (*Macmillan* 84). Macmillan praised Carroll’s original “Behind the Looking-Glass,” and preferred it over a suggestion by Carroll for “Looking-Glass World,” which he claimed was “too specific” and that he would “regret it” if Carroll chose the latter. At some point during that same day, Carroll must have proposed “Through the Looking-Glass,” and Macmillan gave his approval in a second letter: “Your new title is admirable... ‘Through’ is just the word—you’ll never beat it” (85). This, of course, became the title it bears today.

Carroll finally finished the manuscript of *Looking-Glass* on January 4, 1871, and by January 13 he had “received from Clay slips reaching to the end of the text” (6: 140). Two days later he sent the proofs to Tenniel in hopes of having the book out by Easter. But Tenniel, as he had predicted, was slow to provide illustrations, and on April 25, Carroll recorded, “*Through the Looking-Glass* yet lingers on, though the text is ready, but I have only received 27 pictures as yet” (6: 145-46). Tenniel still had almost half of the illustrations to do, and on August 29, Carroll

wrote of his disappointment at delay again: “Wrote to Tenniel, accepting the melancholy, but unalterable fact that we cannot get *Through the Looking-Glass* out by Michaelmas. After all it must come out as a Christmas book” (6: 178-79).

Carroll did not draw his own illustrations for *Looking-Glass* as he had with *Underground*, which may partially account for the delay. Without Carroll’s own amateur drawings as inspiration, Tenniel had more freedom, but Carroll, with an artistic vision, also dictated certain details. As Collingwood observes in *Life and Letters*, “Mr. Dodgson was no easy man to work with; no detail was too small for his exact criticism. ‘Don’t give Alice so much crinoline,’ he would write, or ‘The White Knight must not have whiskers; he must not be made to look old’—such were the directions he was constantly giving” (130). Indeed, the progression from Tenniel’s early sketches to the finished blocks, reproduced by Justin Schiller, show a significant decrease in the amount of “crinoline” on Alice’s dress (104-105). But again, Tenniel exercised his judgment and influence, asking Carroll to change “The Walrus and the Carpenter / Were walking hand-in-hand” to “close at hand” (Hancher 114). Hancher infers that Tenniel could not draw the two “hand-in-hand,” as the finished illustration shows the Walrus “with flippers that look like flippers—not hands” (114).

The illustration plan for *Looking-Glass*, similar to the one written out for *Alice*, must have been composed about this time, and it provides a record of these exchanges, decisions, and later alterations regarding placement within the text. As Edward Wakeling notes, the two men worked together on fine details such as the “dissolving view” of Alice’s entrance into Looking-Glass world, which consists of two illustrations that are mirror images of each other on the recto and verso of the same page (33). Wakeling sums up the importance of this plan: “the creative and productive partnership between writer and author...can be glimpsed at through the perspective of

this piece of paper; a working document showing how the illustrations for *Looking-Glass* were brought to fruition” (38).

As Wakeling points out, the illustration plan also provides documentary evidence of Carroll’s decision to substitute the original frontispiece, the Jabberwock, with the White Knight, a change first recounted by Collingwood in *Life and Letters*. In 1871, Carroll sent the following letter to “thirty of his married lady friends, whose experiences with their own children would make them trustworthy advisors”:

I am sending you, with this, a print of the proposed frontispiece for *Through the Looking-glass*. It has been suggested to me that it is too terrible a monster, and likely to alarm nervous and imaginative children; and that at any rate we had better begin the book with a pleasanter subject.

So I am submitting the question to a number of friends, for which purpose I have had copies of the frontispiece printed off.

We have three courses open to us:

- (1) To retain it as frontispiece.
- (2) To transfer it to its proper place in the book (where the ballad occurs which it is intended to illustrate) and substitute a new frontispiece.
- (3) Omit it altogether.

The last named course would be a great sacrifice of the time and trouble which the picture cost, and it would be a pity to adopt it unless it is really necessary.

I should be grateful to have your opinion, (tested by exhibiting the picture to any children you think fit) as to which of these courses is best. (*Handbook* 61)

Cohen claims that the recipients of this letter “confirmed his fears,” and ultimately Carroll decided to go with the second option, replacing the frontispiece with the illustration of the White Knight (*Biography* 132). Similar to his queries to friends regarding the titles of his books, his letter and his resulting choice illustrate a conscious effort to appeal to his intended audience and take their suggestions into account.

On November 1, 1871, Carroll noted that “*Alice Through the Looking-glass* is now printing off rapidly: I have already received five sheets in the finished state,” and on the 21st he “Sent authority to Clay to electrotype all the rest of the *Looking-Glass*: this was by telegraph. I afterwards sent two corrections by post. So ends my part of the work. It now depends on the printers and binders whether we get it out by Christmas” (6: 187-88). From these two statements, it appears that Carroll checked the pages one final time before the typesetting was electrotyped. Unlike *Alice*, which was reset for each printing until October 1868, Clay made electrotypes of the text and illustrations from the beginning, a procedure done in anticipation that the book would sell at least as well as *Alice* and therefore would need new impressions printed often. The electrotypes were not unwarranted, and on November 30, before the book even came out to the public, Carroll wrote, “Heard from Macmillan that they already have orders for 7,500 *Looking-Glasses* (they printed 9,000) and are at once going to print 6,000 more!” (6: 189-90).

Even though Carroll was initially pleased with the high demand, he became concerned with how the printer’s and publisher’s haste was affecting the physical quality of the book, and on December 17 he expressed his fears to Macmillan. Again, Carroll was prompted by Tenniel, who was “vexed” at the quality of the illustrations as they were printed, but the tone of Carroll’s letter is much more authoritative than when he recalled the Oxford *Alices* six years earlier. Instead of the passive, defeated, “I fear that the whole thing must be done again,” Carroll

claimed, “I can see for myself that several of the pictures have in this way quite lost all *brilliance* of effect,” and commanded the printers to avoid “pressing between sheets of blank paper” and to let the pages “dry naturally,” no matter how long it would take (Macmillan 97). By now, Carroll was more financially stable and confident in his printing knowledge, and in the same letter he reiterated to Macmillan how strongly he desired a quality product: “As to how many copies we sell I care absolutely nothing: the only thing I *do* care for is, that all the copies that *are* sold shall be artistically first-rate” (97). As Cohen notes, “[after the *Alice* incident] the only sensible course was to try to insure that engravers, printers, binders, and publishers did the work that he was paying them to do. [Carroll] simply had to stay alert and to supervise every stage of his books’ production. He must at some point have resolved to do just that, and the correspondence with Macmillan shows how he fulfilled that resolve” (*Macmillan* 18).

Carroll received his first complete copy of *Looking-Glass* on December 6, the same month it came out to the public, though the title page is dated 1872 (6: 190). As the early orders make clear, *Looking-Glass* did not have the same slow start as *Alice*; readers already knew Carroll’s name and were anxious to get copies of his new book. After only seven weeks, *Looking-Glass* had already sold 15,000 copies, and Wakeling adds that “by the end of 1872, *Looking-Glass* was in its 33rd Thousand” (6: 200). Clay would continue to print impressions from the electrotypes as needed, though Carroll, concerned with cost, limited him to 3,000 at a time (*Macmillan* 103).

Most reviews of *Looking-Glass* were positive. The *Athenaeum*, the magazine that had negatively reviewed *Alice*, now praised Carroll and Tenniel: “It is with no mere book that we have to deal here. . . . It would be difficult to over-estimate the value of the store of hearty and healthy fun laid up for whole generations of young people by Mr. Lewis Carroll and Mr. John

Tenniel in the two books” (qtd. in *Biography* 133). The *Globe*, *Illustrated London News*, *Aunt Judy’s Christmas Volume*, *Saturday Review*, *Spectator*, and many more reviewed the book favorably. The *Examiner* was one of the few reviews that pronounced *Looking-Glass* inferior to *Alice*, but still claimed it was “quite good enough to delight every sensible reader of any age” (qtd. in *Biography* 133). Though critics still debate the *literary* value of *Looking-Glass* compared to *Alice*, the sequel has never sold quite as well as its predecessor.

Reprints of *Looking-Glass* survived both Carroll’s and Tenniel’s scrutiny until 1893, when Clay printed the 60th thousand impression. This time, however, Carroll was the one to find fault with the printing. On November 21, 1893, Carroll wrote in his diary:

I received six copies of *Through the Looking-glass*, some of the 60th Thousand, and on examining them, I found the pictures so badly printed that the books are not worth anything. Of the fifty pictures, twenty-six are over-printed, eight of them being very bad. I am glad to find that the 60th were done (this year, about May) as a separate batch: and that sixty only have gone. I sent orders that nine hundred and forty are to be destroyed: so the book will be ‘out of print’ for some time. (9: 105-106)

A few days later, Carroll had a slight change of heart, deciding instead, as he did with some copies of the 1865 *Alice*, to give away the remaining spoiled copies to “Mechanics Institutes, Village Reading-Rooms, and similar institutions” (9: 107). Of course, Carroll had them stamped on the title-page to indicate their difference from “good” copies and to prevent any *buyer* from accidentally paying for one from the inferior batch. Selwyn Goodacre undertook the collation of a copy of the 60th thousand impression with the 59th thousand and, after a careful comparison, agrees with Carroll’s complaints about over-printing, though the difference is slight. In other

words, the 60th thousand impression would only be rejected at a financial loss by someone as perfection-oriented as Carroll (“Rejection” 255).

Both *Alice* and *Looking-Glass* continued to sell well in the years following their initial publication. In response to Carroll’s query on May 13, 1883, Macmillan claimed, “We are now in the 70th 1000 of *Alice* and the 52nd 1000 of *Looking-Glass*” (165). Though Clay had authority to print new impressions as needed, Carroll continued to keep a careful eye on each impression, occasionally sending corrections to misprints or commenting on “worn out” plates. However, the electrotypes, which could last for up to half a million impressions (Dooley 71), remained in good condition, and new editions, i.e., a complete resetting of the type and new electrotypes, were only made two times during Carroll’s lifetime: the People’s Edition of 1887 and the Revised 6s. Edition of 1897.

People’s Edition

Carroll envisioned a “cheap” English edition of *Alice* as early as 1869, and from the beginning acknowledged it as something lesser than the 6s. edition. In a letter dated February 15, 1869, Carroll asked Alexander Macmillan “to consider once more the idea I suggested to you—of bringing out a “cheap edition” of *Alice*” (77). His motivation, as he claimed, “is not commercial,” but rather he thought that “the present price [6s.] puts the book entirely out of reach of many thousands of children of the middle classes, who might, I think, enjoy it (below that I don’t think it would be appreciated)” (77). To make the edition more affordable, Carroll wanted to use cheaper paper and binding, have more text on a page, and only retain ten to twelve illustrations. In the subsequent exchange, Carroll and Macmillan argued over “quality and quantity” in terms of pages and illustrations, with Carroll, of course, preferring the former. Finally, Macmillan convinced him to use the current electrotypes and save by having cheaper

binding and paper, but upon seeing the specimen, Carroll decided it was “too nearly like the 6s. edition.” He went on to say that he was “in favour of making it quite another book,” as he “should like the purchasers of the 6s. copies to be able to feel that they really did get a good deal more for the money than the purchasers of the cheap edition” (79). The negotiations ceased at this point, possibly because of Carroll’s preoccupation with the first edition of *Looking-Glass*, but clearly a cheap edition was in demand. *Happy Hours*, “a penny weekly paper,” began printing extracts from *Alice* in March and April 1870 without permission, claiming that as “no cheap edition has yet appeared of it, and, as its price makes its circulation rather exclusive, a slight sketch of the story, and a few quotations from its fascinating pages, may not be unwelcome to our little readers” (qtd. in *Macmillan* 86). Even so, it was not until fifteen years later that Frederick Macmillan—Alexander Macmillan’s nephew who took over the company in later years—and Carroll would again begin considering a “cheap” edition of both books, which eventually became the People’s Edition (131).

The early discussion of the People’s Edition mimics Carroll’s previous negotiations with the elder Macmillan, and Carroll again imagines it as something completely separate from the 6s. edition. On March 16, 1887, Carroll wrote to Frederick Macmillan, “I have gone through *Alice’s Adventures* and made a tolerably exact estimate of the text and pictures which I should like to retain for a cheap edition” (222). On June 14, he proposed even more drastic cuts and distinguished what he believed the intended audience of this edition deserved:

I wish to have the dedicatory verses, and the 3 supplementary pages at the end, omitted. They would not be appreciated by the poorer classes, for whom the cheap edition is meant: and I feel clear that the purchasers of the 6s. edition ought to have something more than those who get the cheap one. (231)

In the same letter, he suggested “as a further distinction” removing fifteen of the “less important illustrations” from *Alice*.

Frederick Macmillan responded by describing the difference between a “cheap Edition” and an “abridgment”: “In our opinion the true plan to adopt in publishing a cheap edition is to give everything contained in the original edition but printed and bound in a cheaper form. If you leave out anything you produce not a cheap Edition but an abridgement which is quite another thing and which many people will refuse as incomplete” (232). Macmillan managed to persuade Carroll that his excisions would “make no appreciable difference in the cost of production, whereas...it might interfere with the sale,” but this was a difficult concept for Carroll to come to terms with given his relentless emphasis on price being equivalent with physical *quality*, not necessarily the *quantity* of content. Still searching for something to set the edition apart, Carroll proposed placing [CHEAP EDITION] at the top of the title-page; however, Macmillan advised using the phrase “People’s Edition” as “cheap” was “not a nice word to see in a book,” and Carroll agreed to his suggestion (237).

In the end, Carroll satisfied Macmillan by cheapening the physical aspects of the book: “the paper would be, of course, of a cheaper kind than what we use in the 6s. edition...the boards might be covered with bright red *paper* instead of cloth: no ornamentation on the sides...edges of leaves cut smooth and left white” (*Macmillan* 222). Carroll also shortened the length of the book by using small pica type instead of pica, thinner leading, and narrower margins, thus increasing the number of lines per page (231). Accordingly, Macmillan and Carroll priced the separate *Alice* and *Looking-Glass* at 2s.6d. and the combined volume at 4s.6d.

While it is unclear how Carroll prepared the altered text, or what he sent to the printer, he did read proof of the edition, though only in sheets, not galleys. Citing a letter from Macmillan to

Carroll, Cohen records that Macmillan sent “specimen pages” to Carroll on July 26, 28, and August 5 (236). In a letter to Macmillan, Carroll wrote, “You can put the cheap books in hand as soon as you like and can electrotype the sheets as fast as I pass them for Press” (235). On November 3, Carroll “Passed, for electrotyping, the last sheet of the ‘People’s Edition’ of *Alice*,” and on December 16 he recorded, “Passed, for ‘Press,’ the title-page of the double volume of People’s Editions of *Alice* and *Looking-Glass*. That ends *my* part of the work” (8: 370-71).

The People’s Edition of the separate *Alice* and *Looking-Glass* came out in December 1887, and the combined volume came out a month later, in January 1888. As of April 6 Macmillan, satisfied with the sale, wrote to Carroll that “We have disposed of 6000 *Alice*, 3500 *Looking-Glass*, and 1200 of the double volume” (243). Citing sales figures, Selwyn Goodacre claims that “the People’s Editions were immediate bestsellers,” and that they caused a decrease in sales of the 6s. edition: by 1897 the 6s. edition of *Alice* was in its 86th thousand while the People’s Edition of it was in the 67th thousand, and the 6s. edition of *Looking-Glass* was in the 61st thousand while the People’s Edition of it was in the 45th thousand. By 1908, the People’s Edition had surpassed the 6s. edition of both (“1887 Corrections” 132). The People’s Edition was selling so well that when Carroll mentioned new electrotypes for the 6s. edition in 1896, Macmillan asked “whether it is worth while to have them in any other form” and proposed gilding the edges to make them more appropriate for “gift-giving” (qtd. in *Macmillan* 329). But Carroll felt that there was an audience for the more expensive original edition, and he reminded Macmillan that the 6s. edition had been selling “at the average rate of 495 a year” (329).

1897 Final Revised Edition

Carroll’s final revision to the 6s. edition—the only time this edition was entirely reset during his lifetime—was initially driven by his dissatisfaction with the printing of the

illustrations in the 60th thousand impression of *Looking-Glass*. However, three years earlier, on February 28, 1890, Carroll had written of his growing concern for printing quality: “I’ve thought a good deal about the Quality of the recent impressions of the 6s. *Alice* and *Looking-Glass*: and am not at all comfortable about them. They are so distinctly inferior to the earlier ones: and I don’t wonder to see, as I did, a day or two ago, in a second-hand catalogue, an 1866 *Alice* advertised at £4.4.0” (274). As his complaint indicates, Carroll desired a return to the appearance of the first editions of *Alice* and *Looking-Glass* (or, more accurately, the second edition of *Alice*), and wrote to Macmillan, “Unless we can come a great deal nearer, than this, to the beauty of the earlier copies, I will not have the book reprinted at all” (301).

Carroll’s hesitation was mostly directed at Clay, as the 60th thousand *Looking-Glass* had left him much less sure of the printer’s abilities. On January 29, 1896, he inquired about securing a different printer:

Do you think, remembering the signal ‘fiasco’ which Messrs. Clay made with the last 1000 *Looking-Glass*, that they can be trusted to produce a thoroughly artistic result, in case we decided to set up both books with fresh type, and have new electros taken from the wood-blocks, and to return to the better quality of paper which we discontinued a few years ago? My own *inclination* is, I confess, to employ some other printer: but I shall be largely guided by your opinion.

(*Macmillan* 329)

On August 27, Carroll wrote a similar letter, professing, “I own it is with a rather heavy heart that I contemplate trusting so important a task to *them*” (340). On both occasions, Macmillan assured Carroll that no other printer was “capable of producing a better result” (329). But Carroll went further, maintaining that “I have no such confidence in Mr. Clay as to be willing to trust

him, in any important matter,” and he asked Clay to sign a “written guarantee” that required him to take responsibility for improperly printed sheets (342). With Macmillan’s favorable opinion and Clay’s contract, Carroll allowed Clay to move forward with the printing.

However, as Cohen notes, Carroll’s relationship with the publishing firm was also beginning to suffer around this time, partially because Carroll was working “almost exclusively with Frederick Macmillan,” rather than Alexander (27). The younger Macmillan did not seem to have the same understanding of Carroll’s demands, and Carroll became more and more critical of the firm’s practices. It seems that Carroll was not getting the careful attention that Alexander Macmillan had paid to him, even receiving correspondence simply signed “Macmillan & Co.” until he asked to communicate with an individual again. Referring again to the 60th thousand *Looking-Glass* “fiasco,” Carroll placed some blame on the publishing firm:

I can by no means acquit *you*, as publishers. I consider it to be part of the duty of a publisher to examine the books received from the printer, and to refuse to take them, if improperly printed.

When I also recall the omissions, in advertising, which I pointed out in my letter of October 1, I cannot help feeling that the Firm has suffered much by losing the personal supervision of Mr. Alexander Macmillan. (293)

Carroll also recorded the incident in his diary, “blaming Clay for carelessness, and [Macmillan and Co.] for negligence” (9: 106). He added that he would rather “find a new publisher, and end a connection of nearly 30 years” than offer “the Public an inferior work” (9: 106). With some additional reassurance from Frederick Macmillan, however, Carroll maintained his relationship with the firm until his death in 1898, though it was decidedly less personal than in his early career (*Macmillan* 27).

Perhaps because of his diminished trust in both printer and publisher, Carroll went through multiple stages of revision for this edition, making changes in an earlier copy of the 6s. edition and later corrections in proof. Additionally, Carroll asked Tenniel to “read” proof of the illustrations and then expected Clay to take care that “the printed sheets correspond exactly with the prints as passed by Tenniel” (*Macmillan* 342). Macmillan, well aware of Carroll’s watchful eye, even asked for his authority to alter the margins slightly, though “the difference necessary to give the proper effect is very small” (345). Carroll, in reply, thanked him for “the evidence it gives of the thoughtful care you are giving to a matter of so much importance to me” (345). All parties involved were apparently striving to avoid another “cancelled” edition, and when Carroll complained about the amount of time between his passing of the sheets for press and the printing, Macmillan subtly criticized Carroll for his hypocrisy: “Our view has been that perfect printing was of more importance than publication at this time of year” (352). In the new preface for the edition, Carroll confirmed the extreme care taken during the process: “If the artistic qualities of this re-issue fall short, in any particular, of those possessed by the original issue, it will not be for want of painstaking on the part of author, publisher, or printer” (“Preface”).

Though the new edition was ready in July, Carroll and Macmillan decided to delay its publication “until September, as this is a bad time of year for it to appear” (9: 326). Carroll received his copies of the new edition on September 23, and though he believed that “the pictures seem to *me* some under and some over done,” Tenniel pronounced it “fully equal to the original issue” (9: 340; *Letters* 1149). Due in part to Tenniel’s opinion, he ultimately felt the 1897 edition did conform to his idea of quality, and for this reason, the 1897 6s. edition perhaps best represents Carroll’s desired outcome for his “edition de luxe.” Even so, he would continue to inform Clay and Macmillan of “over-inked” and “under-inked” illustrations in subsequent

impressions, even obtaining the opinion of a “Professor Powell...an authority on artistic questions” (*Macmillan* 364).

The final revised 6s. edition reflects Carroll’s constant and continued interest in the state of his work up until his death in January 1898. Writing to Macmillan about some “incomplete” copies that had the title page omitted, he stated, “You have known me long enough not to be surprised at my regarding this as a *very* serious matter, greatly affecting my reputation as an author” (*Macmillan* 348). Carroll saw *Alice* and *Looking-Glass* as an extension of himself, and believed his reputation was bound up in the quality of his books. In this way, the development of *Alice* and *Looking-Glass* is also the development of their author: from extempore storyteller to the creator of the so-called “Alice Industry,” Carroll had become nearly as knowledgeable about the publication and printing process as Macmillan and Clay, and his contemporary and modern reputation as a “difficult” author may be complimentary rather than derogative considering the success he received from his lifelong attention to detail.

CHAPTER 2

REVISIONS

Nature of Revisions as a Whole

At different stages, Carroll's revisions reflect how his awareness and control over all aspects of the publication process—illustrations, intended audience, and printing constraints—consequently influenced his changes to the text. These changes, while not as extensive as those of many authors, are nevertheless important when considering the development of the work of an author so adamant about its quality. In fact, the revisions Carroll made often required him to strike a balance between this concern with the quality of his text and the quality of its appearance on the page.

Carroll's revision patterns separate themselves into two obvious stages: pre-publication and post-publication. Though the pre-publication materials are scarce, they are characterized by extensive revision and emphasize collaboration, as noted in the publication history. The post-publication changes, however, reveal his desire for control over the entire book. As a result of his role as author, publisher, and printer, Carroll understood the typographical consequences of major revision, and with the aesthetic qualities of his book foremost on his mind, he limited his substantive changes. Instead, he focused on the overall printing quality of each edition and impression, improved the expression of a few phrases, and corrected accidentals according to certain patterns. In this way, Carroll's post-publication revisions to the text of *Alice* and *Looking-Glass* do not constitute a process of creation or even revision, but instead, a continuous quest for quality in presentation and consistency.

The immense popularity of *Alice* and *Looking-Glass* both helps and hinders access to various editions. While much of Carroll's work has been reproduced in facsimile, locating and handling the highly collectible objects certain editions of his books have become would require more time and considerable expense. For this reason, I have relied on facsimiles and online versions, and, at times, I have had to trust previous scholars' collations and lists of changes. To achieve a more complete understanding of Carroll's revisions, I would need to collate and examine multiple copies of each edition and impression myself. Additionally, the lack of primary material and scholarship on his printer, Richard Clay and Sons, inhibits any attempt at understanding the specific practices of the printing house after they had received Carroll's MS batches, including any work done by compositors. Accordingly, I make conjectures based on the evidence currently available to me.

Pre-publication

The absence of any other surviving holograph MS brings us back to *Alice's Adventures Underground*, an early version of the text intended for a very small, definable audience. Alice's gift MS, though most likely proceeded by a less coherent MS, reveals Carroll's early concern with bibliographical features, as this was essentially a published MS *book* complete with a hand-drawn title-page and illustrations, perfectly straight lines of text that aligned both on the page and with the illustrations, and a leather binding. Carroll himself understood the value of this MS in the development of the book and had a facsimile made in 1886. He believed that "considering the extraordinary popularity the books have had...there must be many who would like to see the original form" (*Letters* 561). Though the facsimile was not a commercial success in his lifetime, Carroll's preservation of the MS has proved a valuable resource for later scholars.

This MS reveals the most extensive record of Carroll's composition process, as the text doubled in length when he prepared it for publication, growing from around 12,715 to 26,708 words (*Handbook* 144). According to Collingwood, the length is its principal difference from the published form: "The 'Wonderland' is somewhat longer, but the general plan of the book, and the simplicity of diction...are unchanged. His memory was so good that I believe the story as he wrote it down was almost word for word the same that he had told in the boat" (92). Though Collingwood is right—Carroll's original conception of the story and his distinctive style seem to have remained the same—his superficial assessment does not account for the thoroughness with which Carroll revised his text for publication.

As Roger Lancelyn Green has observed, the most significant revision that Carroll made to the MS was to lessen the amount of biographical material, thereby appealing to an audience outside the Liddell household: "Out came the more definite references to the picnic at Nuneham, and also Alice's slighting references to Gertrude and Florence (probably friends or cousins of her own) to be replaced by 'Ada' and 'Mabel' who could not be identified," and "The Caucus Race was substituted for the warm fire and blankets at Sandford" (38). To make "'Wonderland'...somewhat longer" and more coherent, Carroll expanded existing episodes such as the trial scene and incorporated two completely new chapters: "Pig and Pepper" and "A Mad Tea-Party." Additionally, Green points out that Carroll substituted different parodies for Alice to recite, including "Will You Walk into My Parlour, Said the Spider to the Fly" for "Sally Come Up" and added new ones, including a parody of the well-known "Tis the Voice of the Sluggard" by Isaac Watts (Green 38-39). Watts, particularly, would have been recognizable to most young children at this time. Through these large-scale revisions, Carroll transformed the MS into a work with which many children could, and still can, identify.

Carroll also made numerous smaller changes to words and phrases, or substantives, and to accidentals. To illustrate this, I have collated the first chapter of *Underground* with the first chapter of the of the 1866 second edition of *Alice* to give an idea of the types of changes between the two versions, though the analysis of only one chapter limits the conclusions I am able to draw. As a whole, the substantive changes illustrate Carroll’s desire to refine or improve words or phrases simply by substituting a different word or by adding adjectives and adverbs, though many go beyond refinement and create a more specific description. For example, when examining the locks of the doors in the hall, Alice does not merely check “all round it,” she goes “all the way down one side and up the other, trying every door” (7). However, some of the changes—“Dinah will” to “Dinah’ll” and the addition of “seems to” or other means of expanding verb phrases—are similar to the changes Carroll would make for typographical reasons post-publication.⁷ The MS also offers our closest glimpse at Carroll’s original, authorial punctuation in a form that was more polished than that of his letters or diary entries and perhaps captures some of the rhetorical nuances present in the oral tale. In this MS as in the later versions, Carroll’s punctuation and spelling are, at times, as idiosyncratic as some of his nonsense words. Most notably, Carroll has a few instances of “shan’n’t” and “won’n’t,” a spelling of the contraction that he would later enforce throughout published editions of both *Alice* and *Looking-Glass*, typical hyphenation and italicization, extensive use of long dashes, and —: before poems.

But, as has been touched on elsewhere, perhaps the most effective way Carroll prepared his text for a larger audience was by recognizing the inadequacy of his own drawings and

⁷ Without any intervening documentary evidence—a later MS, galleys, or proofs—it is impossible to discriminate between changes possibly made for typographical reasons and those made to improve the text, though both were made to transform the MS into a published work. Even so, this small collation points out that the development of *Underground* into *Alice* deserves more attention and that a more thorough analysis of all of the changes would yield greater insight into Carroll’s early, and most extensive, revision process.

employing John Tenniel. Though there can be no doubt that Tenniel's drawings are superior, the similarities to some of Carroll's drawings and the correspondence of placement in the text suggest that Carroll originally envisioned the text and image working together to highlight specific narrative moments, as Michael Hancher has observed (120). Of the forty-two illustrations in *Alice*, twenty-two have earlier forms by Carroll in *Underground*, and "with only one exception, all the let-in illustrations in the manuscript stand next to the passages that they illustrate" (127). For example, the illustration of Alice's large arm reaching out of the rabbit's second-story window occurs flush with the left margin and with text on three sides in both *Underground* and *Alice* (*Alice* 48). They also both occur next to the appropriate "caption": "she suddenly spread out her hand, and made a snatch in the air" (48). Hancher provides additional examples from the published version that show how the illustration reinforces a description, as in the case where Carroll describes Alice responding to the Hatter "with some severity," and Tenniel's illustration shows her "glowering" (122). In other words, Carroll, who left spaces in *Underground* to add his later drawings, clearly felt that their alignment with the text was important.

Though no MS of *Looking-Glass* exists, a few early, authorized documents reveal a pattern of revision similar to the changes from *Underground* to *Alice*: Carroll's ability to add and delete large sections of text and Tenniel's continuing influence. The most famous of these early revisions is the "Wasp" episode. In *Life and Letters*, Collingwood mentions that "[*Looking-Glass*], as originally written, contained thirteen chapters, but the published book consisted of twelve only. The omitted chapter introduced a wasp, in the character of a judge or barrister, I suppose, since Mr. Tenniel wrote that 'a wasp in a wig is altogether beyond the appliances of art'" (146). Collingwood also reproduces a letter from Tenniel in facsimile, in which Tenniel

wrote, “Don’t think me brutal, but I am bound to say that the ‘wasp’ chapter doesn’t interest me in the least, & I can’t see my way to a picture. If you want to shorten the book, I can’t help thinking—with all submission—that *there* is your opportunity” (146). Carroll, always sensitive to Tenniel’s suggestions, deleted the “Wasp” episode, once again privileging Tenniel’s wishes over his own, and hence illustration over text.

For seventy-five years after Collingwood’s tantalizing allusion, scholars had been speculating about what had happened to the chapter, where it belonged, and if it even existed in the first place. On June 3, 1974, “the lost chapter” of *Looking-Glass* or, the lost “episode” as it is now called, surfaced in Sotheby Parke Bernet and Company’s catalogue. The catalogue described the episode as “galley proofs for a suppressed portion of ‘Through the Looking-Glass,’ slip 64-67 and portions of 63 and 68, with autograph revisions in black ink and note in the author’s purple ink that the extensive passage is to be omitted” and placed the episode within the “White Knight” chapter, just as Alice is about to cross over the last brook and become queen (qtd. in *Wasp* ix). Martin Gardner, the editor of the facsimile edition, has confirmed its placement in the “White Knight” chapter, citing the actual numbering of the galleys and the mid-sentence start of the text (2-3). Edward Wakeling has since added to this evidence, placing the episode within this chapter based on the illustration plan, which substitutes the “Knight in ditch” illustration for the crossed out “Wasp” on page 179 of the text (37).

After examining the episode, most scholars agree with Collingwood’s original assessment: despite Tenniel’s inability to provide an illustration, the “Wasp” episode “was not considered to be up to the level of the rest of the book” (*Life and Letters* 146). Gardner is one of the few scholars to acknowledge the merit of the episode, calling it “unmistakably Carrollian” in its style and arguing that Alice’s patient interaction with a lower-class wasp depicts Alice as

more considerate just before she becomes queen. However, even he claims that “the writing seems cruder at times than elsewhere,” particularly in the wordplay (4). Regarding this point, Gardner cites the more typical opinion of Peter Heath, who goes further and condemns the repetition of themes from earlier chapters. Both sides of the debate are valid, and though Carroll himself never disclosed whether the deletion of the episode was ultimately the product of Tenniel’s inability to draw the “Wasp in a Wig” or of his own dissatisfaction with the text, either way, the final decision was authorial.⁸

Still, the “Wasp” episode has textual value; it forms an integral part of what Carroll’s “lost” manuscript might look like and sheds more light on Tenniel’s influence late in the printing process. Additionally, before excising the episode, Carroll made a few alterations to the galleys. He made only two substantive changes—“and she went a little way back again” became “looking anxiously back” and “laughing” became “laughter”—but made more changes to punctuation and capitalization—usually by inserting commas—which anticipate the conservative strategy he would employ in post-publication revisions to the text of *Alice* and *Looking-Glass*.

Post-publication

After the initial publication of *Alice*, Carroll recorded sending multiple “lists of errata” to Macmillan, but only one has been found, in a copy of the 1866 second edition of *Alice*, held in the Parrish Collection at Princeton. In 1928, M.L. Parrish made a facsimile of this page, and the list, written on the “back end-paper” of the book, contains “37 corrections” in Carroll’s handwriting. Most of the notes point to errors in the typesetting or printing process: “picture too light,” “p. 192 lines 3, 4 thinner lead,” or “Dedication-1st page-leave same margin below as in p. 2” (Parrish Plate II). The changes to the words and punctuation are fewer, indicating that Carroll

⁸ For a more detailed analysis of the episode, see Martin Gardner’s introduction to the facsimile edition and Morton Cohen’s “The Lost Chapter Revealed.”

was probably more concerned with the quality of printing than the text as this was the edition following the 1865 *Alice*. With these aspects as his highest priority, it seems that Carroll merely flipped through the book in order to identify typographical errors, correcting the textual errors when he chanced upon them. Even so, he does make a few corrections to errors and to punctuation.

Goodacre, who collated each new typesetting of *Alice* until the electrotyping of the 12th thousand, shows the development of Carroll's "standardized" accidentals and his apparent resistance to the alteration of substantives post-publication. His first collation—of Carroll's changes for the 5th through 7th thousands—reveals that the printer incorporated all of Carroll's changes to the text indicated in the notes in the 1866 Parrish copy and that Carroll made additional changes, perhaps sending the printers a more complete list of extended "errata." Between the four editions, Carroll made only a few minor substantive changes, including the substitution of "go" for "walk" in the famous exchange between Alice and the Cheshire-Cat; his changes to the words more often simply corrected verb tense or rearranged a phrase such as "Alice said" to "said Alice." However, Carroll made a significant number of alterations to accidentals and corrections to misprints: he hyphenated eight words, inserted numerous commas, and made other small changes to punctuation such as substituting semi-colons for commas when they occurred before a coordinating conjunction, all of which indicate a logical progression from similar forms employed in *Underground*. Though we cannot know for sure that Carroll made these changes, they are similar in kind to the more consistent, comprehensive changes he would

make in later authorized revisions: idiosyncrasies of spelling, hyphenation, and comma insertion and deletion that are particular to his style.⁹

Because *Looking-Glass* was electrotyped beginning with the first edition, Carroll was even more limited in his ability to revise than in early editions of *Alice*, though some alteration was still possible. For this reason, it seems likely that Carroll only corrected literal errors from the printers or from wear on the plates; even so, I would need to collate copies of each impression to confirm my assumption. The *Handbook* follows this logic, citing a few misprints that were corrected in various impressions. In the first edition, “wade” was substituted for “wabe” in the first verse of “Jabberwocky.” This would be an easy error for the typesetter to make and the printer’s reader to miss, as “wade” would make more sense when setting and reading the type quickly. Adding to the confusion, the first stanza of “Jabberwocky” was printed backwards—as it would be seen through a looking-glass—before the full text of the poem, though “wabe” was printed correctly in the backwards stanza. All impressions after the first have the error corrected (*Handbook* 65). Another printing error occurs in a later impression of

⁹ A recently “re-discovered” early form of *Alice*, a copy of the 1865 typesetting known as Macmillan’s file copy, further contributes to the question of authority concerning accidentals, though without more definitive evidence of its place in the transmission of the text, I cannot cite it authoritatively. Originally, scholars believed that this copy, which has marginal markings in purple ink and untrimmed edges, contained changes made by Carroll; however, Justin G. Schiller, who acquired the file copy in 1980, believes that this was actually the file copy that “Macmillan used sometime between 20-24 July to evaluate the quality of printing” (13). Schiller does present a convincing case; in addition to this occurrence of purple ink pre-dating Carroll’s own use, which was not until 1870, he cites physical factors such as hand-folding that indicate its use within the publishing office (17-21). Schiller claims that in addition to markings denoting errors in spacing and alignment, “on several pages there are also portions of sentences crossed out, an initial letter capitalized, word order changed, &c.,” which would have been the work of “the assigned inspector” (14). Importantly, he goes on to say that “none of these textual alterations occur in subsequent printings,” which seems to indicate that Carroll either rejected the changes in later proof or the compositor knew not to set unauthorized changes to the text. If these changes truly are the work of an “assigned inspector,” the omissions imply Carroll’s authority and control.

Looking-Glass: on August 30, 1878, Carroll wrote to Macmillan that “I have made an annoying discovery in the forty-second thousand of *Through the Looking-Glass*. Both the Kings are omitted from the chess diagram. They are in their proper places in a copy I referred to of the tenth thousand: but in which thousand the misprint first appeared I have not the means to discover” (*Macmillan* 147). In response to Carroll, Macmillan speculated that “when the form was passing from the compositor’s hands to the electrotyper’s those two squares [containing the kings] may have dropped out and were replaced by blanks” (*Macmillan* 147). Carroll then had a “slip” inserted into the remaining copies, calling attention to the misprint, and had a new electrotype made of the page. The *Handbook* clarifies that “The Kings were first omitted in the 25th thousand, 1872, and replaced, with a new and enlarged board, in the 45th thousand, 1878” (101). Though this error again reveals Carroll’s preoccupation with the printing post-publication, the six-year time lapse between the occurrence of the error and Carroll’s detection indicates that he generally trusted the stability of electrotypes.

As Goodacre asserts, the editions and impressions between the first edition and the final edition of both *Alice* and *Looking-Glass*, and their variants, should be regarded as “transition” texts (“Towards” 41). Indeed, Carroll’s early revisions indicate an author attempting to make his text as polished as possible within the constraints of electrotypes, as demonstrated by the number of changes to the early un-electrotyped editions of *Alice* compared to the number of changes to the electrotyped impressions of *Looking-Glass*. However, his later revisions—with the freedom provided by a new typesetting—show his willingness to make more comprehensive changes, though he would still allow the physical elements of the book to influence his revisions to the text.

People's Edition

Carroll's most extensive post-publication revisions occur in the 1887 People's Edition, the reset "cheap edition" subjected to the numerous physical changes detailed earlier. Goodacre, who first noticed the alterations to the text in 1971, collated a pre-1886 6s. impression of both *Alice* and *Looking-Glass* with their respective People's Edition texts and then thoroughly listed and described the changes in "Lewis Carroll's 1887 Corrections to *Alice*." He not only found extensive changes to accidentals, which "anticipate the alterations of 1897," but also a number of changes to substantives (133). After examining the changes holistically, Goodacre believes that these corrections are the work of Carroll; however, though these changes are most likely authorial, Goodacre does not adequately account for the printing constraints of this edition.¹⁰

Most obviously, a comparison of the People's Edition and the 6s. edition reveals that a number of the illustrations in the People's Edition no longer align with their "captions" or "descriptions" as outlined in the illustration plans and in the 6s. edition of *Alice* and *Looking-Glass*. The new, rather arbitrary placement of illustration with text does not fit with the extreme care Tenniel and Carroll had taken when constructing these plans for the 6s. edition. However, these changes seem to be a response to the new typesetting: with more lines per page, chapters containing multiple illustrations in succession had to be rearranged so that the illustrations did not occur on the same page or pages facing each other.

The numerous substantive changes to the text, however, indicate a move *completely* out of character for the author based on his conservative revision strategies in the early reset 6s. editions of *Alice*. Though Carroll originally wanted to make more extensive cuts to content for a "cheap edition," as noted in the publication history, he did not make any large excisions; instead,

¹⁰ I have trusted Goodacre's collations, using his lists as the basis for my analysis. In the future, I would collate the changes with the 6s. edition of 1886.

approximately two-hundred one to ten word deletions *and* additions are interspersed throughout the text. At first glance, these substantive changes do not seem to follow any definable pattern, but when examining the changes in light of Carroll’s alterations to the physical elements of the text—smaller type, thinner leading, narrower margins, and smaller paper, along with an increase from twenty-two lines per page to twenty-five lines per page—the insertions and deletions of substantives do create a pattern.

Taken as a whole, the changes do not seem to improve the text: the deletions take away a degree of specificity, while the additions are superfluous in a text that already abounds in descriptive language. Most often, Carroll substituted a longer or shorter synonym for a word, altered verb tense through auxiliary verbs or the infinitive form, or simply added or deleted a qualifier such as “very”; however, he also made more substantial additions or deletions to longer descriptive phrases. The diverse nature of these changes obscures any creative motivation, but when examining the layout of the type, the majority seem to occur to keep a word or sentence from “dangling” at the top of a page—a widow—or at the end of a paragraph—an orphan. Widows, it will be remembered, contributed to Tenniel’s “disgraceful printing” claim and Carroll’s subsequent withdrawal of the 1865 *Alice*, and they do not occur at all in post-1865 printings of the 6s. edition of *Alice* nor in the 6s. edition of *Looking-Glass*, except in a few cases of a freestanding line of dialogue. Additionally, though more difficult to verify without measuring each line, some of the changes produce better justification, or spacing of words in a line. This was also a constant priority of Carroll’s: in the 1876 typesetting of the *Snark* he criticized Clay for “having a very open line followed by a *very* crowded one” and complained about the time-consuming process of revision that each instance required (*Macmillan* 125).

When Carroll began revising for the People's Edition, his changes suggest that these typographical issues—the way the words looked on the page and in relation to the illustrations—were his principal concern. In the “Mad Tea-Party” chapter of the People's Edition of *Alice*, “the other two were using it as a cushion, resting their elbows on it” becomes “the other two were resting their elbows on it,” saving one line and thereby avoiding a widow at the top of the next page (95). When Alice is describing the actions of the cook in “Pig and Pepper,” Carroll altered “but the cook was busily stirring the soup, and seemed not to be listening, so she went on again” to “but the cook was busily engaged in stirring the soup, and did not seem to be listening, so she ventured to go on again,” which pushes a line of text to the next page and avoids a widow (84). In the “Queen Alice” chapter of *Looking-Glass*, Carroll deleted “Alice was puzzled” before she utters her puzzled remark, which while less specific, keeps “the same rule—” from becoming a stand-alone line. These are only a few of the many examples. Even the seemingly arbitrary rearrangement of two words that run next to vertical illustrations, such as “spoken first” to “first spoken” and “Alice whispered” to “whispered Alice,” fits better in the narrower margins, and hence narrower justification of type.

Furthermore, certain successive or more extensive deletions occur in chapters of the People's Edition that have only one or two lines to spare on the page ending the chapter in the 6s. edition. As Carroll was attempting to construct this edition as cheaply as possible, any additional typeset pages would cost more, and because Macmillan had advised against deleting illustrations, poems, and prefatory matter, Carroll probably tried to save where he could. In “The Garden of Live Flowers” chapter of *Looking-Glass*, Goodacre lists sixteen deletions of words but only one addition, which corrects a potential widow. In the People's Edition, this chapter has only one line to spare, and the deletion would account for the carryover. The same happens with the “Humpty

Dumpty” chapter, which has one line to spare, fifteen deletions, and a few alterations, and with the “Lion and the Unicorn” chapter.

Adding or deleting text for typographical reasons was not unfamiliar to Carroll, and he accepted it on a small-scale as part of a MS becoming a published work. Originally, page 170 of the 1866 second edition of *Alice* contained twenty-three lines instead of twenty-two, and in the Parrish autograph list of errata, he instructs the printers to alter the text: “to save a line read ‘I hadn’t begun my tea above a week or so—’” (Parrish Plate II). In 1866 the line read “I hadn’t but just begun my tea—not above a week or so—” and the alteration moved “tea—” up, avoiding the extra line (170). Even so, Carroll disliked the practice on a large-scale. As he makes clear in the preface to *Sylvie and Bruno*, “Sometimes, in order to bring a picture into its proper place, it has been necessary to eke out a page with two or three extra lines: but I can honestly say I have put in no more than I was absolutely compelled to do” (xi). Pre-publication, Carroll had the luxury of working in galley slip to make his revisions and draft the illustration plan, which only necessitated a few typographical changes after the printers had set the type and illustrations in pages. The People’s Edition, however, forced him to rearrange the layout in sheets. In this way, Carroll’s careful balance concerning his text and its appearance on the page was upset.

While the new typesetting accounts for the majority of substantive changes, this is not universally the case. This suggests that once Carroll started revising for typographical reasons, he may have continued making a small number of similar changes even when they were not strictly required for the better alignment of type.¹¹ While none of the changes significantly affect the reader’s experience of the text, when analyzed closely, they improve the text in some cases

¹¹ In the future, I would have more definitive evidence for the typographical and non-typographical changes obtained by measuring each line in the People’s Edition with its corresponding line in the 6s. edition. A list of these changes, separate from the comprehensive list of changes to the People’s Edition, would be reproduced in an appendix.

but worsen it in others. When Humpty Dumpty defines “impenetrability” for Alice, Carroll altered “mean” to “intend” which, as Goodacre notes, “avoids the repetition of the word twice in 4 lines” (“1887” 139). In the “Pig and Pepper” chapter, Carroll actually *created* an orphan by changing “went” to “went out,” a typical addition of a preposition that seems to more specifically describe Alice leaving the Duchess’s house. Although Carroll’s willingness to create an orphan suggests that this change was important, the previous sentence reads “she hurried out of the room” which makes the change from “went” to “went out” redundant (*Alice* 78). Carroll also altered multiple instances of “upon” to “on” and rearranged the word order of a few phrases, changes he made in other places to fix the justification of a line. In this way, these ambiguous cases do not reveal a pattern of revision different from the other changes made for typographical reasons.

One could even make an aesthetic argument for some of the *required* typographical changes in the People’s Edition, though this involves a deeper level of subjective interpretation. For example, Carroll deleted “triumphantly” from the phrase “exclaimed triumphantly” when it occurred within one page of another instance of “exclaimed triumphantly” (*Looking-Glass* 227-28). He also altered “stories” to “histories” when Alice remembers reading “several nice little stories about children who had got burnt, and eaten up by wild beasts and other unpleasant things, all because they would not remember the simple rules their friends had taught them,” a change which separates Carroll’s nonsense from the didactic children’s literature of the past (*Alice* 10). In fact, though Goodacre does not distinguish certain changes as the product of typographical constraints, he proposes choosing among the changes to the People’s Edition based on “whether they are improvements, and particularly whether they are what Dodgson would have considered improvements” when constructing a “definitive edition,” a very liberal

and interpretive procedure that gives an editor authority over Carroll (“1887” 143). He suggests that Carroll “must have forgotten he had made the earlier revision,” but this seems unlikely given Carroll’s constant attention to his works.

1897

When Carroll decided to revise the 6s. edition in 1897, he explicitly rejected the substantive changes he made to the People’s Edition, disproving Goodacre’s rationale and confirming my assumption: “I find the 2s. 6d. *Alice* books are not at all adapted for reprinting the 6s. editions, as I had made many little alterations to suit the new pages, and of course all these have to be altered back again...I must have recent copies of the 6s. editions, to correct” (*Macmillan* 344). From this statement, we can infer two relevant points: Carroll had copies of the People’s Edition on hand when beginning to revise for the 6s. edition, and he was well aware of his earlier alterations. In fact, Carroll does not include a single substantive change from the People’s Edition in the 1897 revision.

Additionally, Carroll’s word choice in this statement is telling; he termed his changes to the People’s Edition “alterations,” but merely wanted to “correct” the 6s. edition. In other words, the new typesetting for the 6s. edition finally presented Carroll with the opportunity he had been denied in 1868 when Clay and Macmillan electrotyped *Alice* without his knowledge: the chance for a “good deal of improvement” to the punctuation. Most notably, Carroll was free of the physical constraints of the People’s Edition: the new typesetting reverted to the original layout of the 6s. edition, preserving the precise illustration placement and pagination, with only a few words moving to new lines. Though following the layout of the old typesetting limited his ability to revise substantives, Carroll’s choice indicates that the arrangement of the words on the page and their alignment with the illustrations was of greater importance than a major revision of the

text. In this way, the 1897 edition represents the marriage of consistency in accidentals and quality in physical aspects in what Carroll referred to as the “genuine” edition (*Macmillan* 92).

However, the stemma for Carroll’s final revision is slightly more complicated than a simple dismissal of the People’s Edition and correction of the most recent 6s. edition. Because Carroll had suppressed the 60th thousand *Looking-Glass* and ordered that no more *Alices* were to be printed, “recent copies of the 6s. editions” were non-existent, as both books were “out of print.” Macmillan offered Carroll their “publisher’s file copy” to use for corrections, but instead Carroll obtained copies of both books bound in one volume from May Barber, an 1882 *Alice* and an 1880 *Looking-Glass*. In 1958, Stanley Godman examined these copies and published an article in the *Times Literary Supplement* listing Carroll’s “final corrections” for the 1897 text.¹²

Of course, as Goodacre has pointed out, though all except two of the changes in Barber’s copies were incorporated into the final text, Godman’s list does not account for all the changes because Carroll continued to revise in proof as the sheets came from Clay. In response to Godman’s “incomplete” record of changes, Goodacre collated an 1882 copy of *Alice* with the 1897 edition, and, lacking access to an 1880 *Looking-Glass*, I have collated the first edition with the 1897 edition. A comparison of Godman’s list to our collations reveals that Carroll used Barber’s copies to revise substantives and to begin the standardization of punctuation and other accidentals, while his proof revisions merely add to or further the changes already made. For example, he altered two instances of the Dormouse’s gender in Barber’s copies—“he” becomes “it”—and caught two additional references in proof, though as Goodacre notes, he missed a few more in later chapters. Similarly, he deleted thirty-six commas before quotation marks in

¹² I have trusted Godman’s list, but I would need to examine Barber’s copies to verify that he did not miss or mis-transcribe any corrections. With that said, it would be difficult to miss Carroll’s purple ink next to the type.

Barber's copies but deleted sixty-six in the final text. The autograph changes in Barber's copies give authority to the later changes, which are merely extensions within these categories.

Unsurprisingly, most of Carroll's changes to the 1897 edition, in order of frequency, are to punctuation, spelling, capitalization, italicization, and hyphenation. Many of these changes coincide with the earlier changes to accidentals for the People's Edition and reinforce the assumption that Carroll was referring to copies or lists of the People's Edition changes and incorporating those he deemed improvements, though he re-altered a few of the variants. However, he used the 1897 revision to achieve consistency on a grander scale: he inserted 144 commas, mostly before an adverb phrase, deleted 100, mostly before quotation marks, continued changing commas to semi-colons before coordinating conjunctions, and had more regular capitalization and arrangement of punctuation throughout. Some obvious misprints appear, often when single inverted commas immediately follow quotation marks, but overall the punctuation follows the patterns Carroll established in early revisions to the *6s. Alice*.

Carroll's earlier unsystematic alteration of the spelling of contractions, including "can't," "won't," and "shan't," achieves a more comprehensive "standardization" in 1897. This was not an entirely new practice, however. He had begun altering the spelling in the People's Edition, but he had also used these forms as early as the *Underground* MS, though rarely. In the 1893 preface to *Sylvie and Bruno Concluded* he explains the logic of his preferred spelling:

As to 'ca'n't', it will not be disputed that, in all other words ending in 'n't', these letters are an abbreviation of 'not'; and it is surely absurd to suppose that, in this solitary instance, 'not' is represented by 't'! In fact 'can't' is the proper abbreviation for 'can it', just as 'is't' is for 'is it'. Again, in 'wo'n't', the first apostrophe is needed, because the word 'would' is here abridged into 'wo': but I

hold it proper to spell ‘don’t’ with only one apostrophe, because the word ‘do’ is here complete. (x)

In the 1897 revision he altered every instance of the contractions in *Alice*, but missed two instances of “won’t” in *Looking-Glass*. Though these spelling changes, hyphenation, and italicization are certainly Carroll’s idiosyncratic style, the more conventional changes to semicolons, colons, and other punctuation—which are still most likely authoritative given Carroll’s control of his text—may also represent an acquiescence to the influence of standard styles.

Overall, the changes to substantives are more in keeping with his pre-People’s Edition practices; in other words, they are conservative. Carroll included the changes noted by Godman in Barber’s copies and made a few more in proof, none of which drastically alter the original reading. In this way, the substantive changes seem, like the accidental changes, to be an effort at a more polished final product. In his collation of *Alice*, Goodacre records twenty-eight words and phrases altered, the most significant of which occur in the trial scene, though they are merely a better expression of Carroll’s original idea. After the king rationalizes the Knave’s guilt, the Queen changes her response from, “That proves his guilt” to “That proves his guilt, of course...so, off with—” (182). The Queen’s extended statement fits with Carroll’s characterization of the Queen, who sentences numerous characters to the same fate in the earlier “Croquet-Ground” chapter. Carroll also altered Alice’s response to the Queen: “It proves nothing of the sort” becomes “It doesn’t prove anything of the sort,” which puts more emphasis on Alice’s disagreement and simply sounds more colloquial. This, too, fits with the development of Alice into a more confident character by the end of the story.

Looking-Glass, as usual, receives slightly less revision. One striking change is the deletion of the “Dramatis Personae” from the front matter, which Godman does not list as a

change in Barber's copy. Carroll's diaries and letters do not offer any explanation, but the change must be authorial, as no compositor would have deleted such a large component without permission. In the text, Carroll only altered nine words or phrases, and like *Alice*, only a few of the variants actually affect meaning. When Alice comes upon Tweedledum and Tweedledee for the first time, Carroll alters "looking round" to "going round" (66). Though subtle, the change better fits with Tenniel's illustration, which shows Alice far enough away from Tweedledum and Tweedledee that she would have to "go" rather than just "look" in order to see the backs of their collars. In another important substantive change, Carroll changes the Red Queen from "one of the thorny kind" to "one of the kind that has nine spikes, you know" (141). Godman quotes Roger Lancelyn Green, who attributes this to Carroll's desire to make the text less personally associated with the Liddells, just like his revision of *Underground*. Green claims that Carroll modeled the Red Queen on the Liddells' governess, Miss Prickett, whom the children had nicknamed "Pricks," and adds that the girls would have recognized the Red Queen as "one of the thorny kind" as a reference to Miss Prickett (270). These changes obviously affect meaning, but the latter change particularly fits with Carroll's intention for his published text, which was to separate it from the "biographical" oral tales told to the Liddells.

Two passages that had received ongoing substantive changes since earlier editions of *Alice* reach their completed form in 1897: the "Mouse's Tale" and "'Tis the Voice of the Lobster." The typographical and textual history of the "Mouse's Tale" has been covered in depth by Goodacre. It will suffice to say that Goodacre notes nine distinct versions, each of which emphasizes Carroll's concern with typography as he continued to rearrange words to create a

new “bends” in the tail.¹³ The changes to “’Tis the Voice of the Lobster,” however, exemplify all the textual problems an editor must face when dealing with Carroll.

Originally, the major extension to “’Tis the Voice of the Lobster” was included in the 1887 6s. edition of *Alice*. As Goodacre notes, Carroll made a few changes to the text before he made the large-scale alterations for the People’s Edition, and that the “alterations were first included in the newly-set-up 6s. Editions of the two volumes” (“1887” 133). The *Handbook* does style both—the 79th thousand *Alice* and the 57th thousand *Looking-Glass*—as separate editions, though the books were not entirely reset. The *Handbook* cites a letter to Macmillan from November 9, 1886 in which Carroll asked the publisher to proceed with printing “when title-sheet, mouse’s tale, and pp. 159 etc., have been corrected” (148). Page 159 contained the second stanza of the poem, and the “etc.” included the final two pages in the chapter. Additionally, on November 18, 1886, Carroll thanked Macmillan for sending sheets to correct, but claimed he asked for sheets ““from p. 157 to end of chapter only, not to end of book.’ I return the superfluous sheets” (213). This, of course, makes sense, as the printer would have only needed to reset one chapter to accommodate the lines.

These changes, Goodacre speculates, were most likely prompted by the forthcoming stage production of *Alice*, put on by Henry Savile Clarke in December of 1886 (133). In fact, Carroll’s letters confirm this. Savile Clarke had written to Carroll about adapting the text on August 28, 1886, and two days later Carroll consented, with the stipulation that no “coarseness, or anything suggestive of coarseness, be admitted” (*Letters* 637). As this attempt at control implies, Carroll stayed involved in the production of the play, offering Savile Clarke occasional

¹³ See Goodacre’s authoritative article, “Mouse’s Tale,” in *Jabberwocky*.

suggestions, and, likewise, Savile Clarke would solicit Carroll's opinion about certain changes to the original text.

While preparing the stage adaptation, Savile Clarke must have asked Carroll to extend "'Tis the Voice of the Lobster," and on October 31, Carroll sent him the new version:

I have written the extra lines you wanted, and enclose them. It was a hard job: I can't write verse 'to order': I have to wait for it to come of itself: and in this case there was no more hymn fit to parody (for instance, the line 'But ne-er reads his Bible, and never loves thinking' would be quite out of the question): so I had to take a new 'departure.' The lines are poor, I feel, but they may do to sing. (*Letters* 644)

Though Carroll condemned the lines in this letter, he later included the new version in each successive printing of *Alice*. Carroll called attention to his change in a new preface included in the 1887 6s. edition, perhaps solely to help market the book or the play: "As Alice is about to appear on the stage, and as the lines beginning "'Tis the voice of the Lobster' were found to be too fragmentary for dramatic purposes, four lines have been added to the first stanza, and six to the second, while the Oyster has been developed into a Panther" ("Preface to 79th thousand" qtd. in *Handbook* 35). Goodacre records that the extended poem stays the same except for the final line:

Stage version: And concluded the banquet by eating the Owl.

79th thousand and People's Edition: And concluded the banquet—

86th thousand [1897]: And concluded the banquet by— ("1887" 135)

Goodacre believes that the deletion of "eating the Owl" "better anticipates the inevitability of the ending," but the explanation seems much simpler. In Carroll's text, Alice is reciting the poem at

the request of the Mock Turtle and the Gryphon, and ending the sentence or, more accurately, not ending the sentence, with “by—” allows the Mock Turtle to interrupt in the line immediately following Alice’s almost complete recitation and better fits with the Gryphon’s statement that “Yes, I think you’d better leave off” (159). While it is unclear what changed Carroll’s opinion of the new version of the poem and prompted him to include it in 1886, Carroll asked the printers to insert the additional lines in the 1897 edition (Godman 248). In any event, Carroll must have considered the change a sufficient improvement to be willing to pay for a new electrotype containing the chapter in 1886, though an improvement he could still improve upon for his final edition. As his multiple revisions to “Tis the Voice of the Lobster” illustrate, Carroll used the new typesetting of 1897 to refine the 6s. edition according to his consistent, though somewhat unattainable, ideal of perfection.

CHAPTER 3

EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION

State of the Work

In 1898, the same year as Carroll's death, Macmillan issued the "Sixpenny Series," and editions have since proliferated, not to mention the numerous abridgements and adaptations. At their best, these editions use one version of the text—the first edition, People's Edition, or 1897 edition—but at their worst they use multiple versions and introduce new errors. More importantly, to date there has been no edition of Carroll's works that takes into account and displays all relevant textual and bibliographical factors. In other words, despite Carroll's foremost position within the children's literature canon, there has been no edition of his works that may adequately be termed "scholarly."

With the exception of the *Lewis Carroll Handbook*, most of the "textual criticism" on *Alice* and *Looking-Glass* reaches us in sporadic and unsystematic articles by various scholars, collectors, and bibliographers who have, at times, informed my own study. The most notable and productive of these is Selwyn Goodacre, who has access to many different editions of *Alice* and *Looking-Glass* in his own large collection. Goodacre has twice attempted to put into practice the editorial rationale that has developed out of his collations, providing the edited text for Barry Moser's Pennyroyal Press edition in 1982 and Ralph Steadman's edition in 1986. For both editions, he creates what he calls an "amalgamation": he uses the 1897 edition as copy-text but incorporates the People's Edition changes. For the Pennyroyal Press edition he also corrects other "deficiencies," including typical "'Carrollian' alterations" to commas and hyphenation and

“experimental” changes to “asterisks to denote size changes” and the “inconsistent gender of certain characters” (Moser 138). Most tellingly, he terms the editions “experimental,” and indeed they cannot be considered “definitive” or “scholarly” without textual notes (and certainly not without Tenniel’s original illustrations), though the Pennyroyal Press edition does include a two-page rationale of his editorial principles.

In a review of this edition, Peter Heath condemns Goodacre’s changes, arguing that the emendations have a “cumulative effect” and create a new version that is “not quite the Alice that we have all been used to so far” (210). Instead, Heath calls for a variorum edition, “using 1865 as the base text, and with each of the revisions distinguished separately in the footnotes” (210). He does give Goodacre some credit, stating that “it is one great merit of the present ‘experiment’ to have shown both the need and the possibility of such a final solution to these long-neglected problems” (211). Goodacre, too, has since recognized the insufficiency of the editorial principles behind the Pennyroyal Press and Steadman editions—though he still insists upon the inclusion of the People’s Edition changes—and the title of his article from 1991, “Towards a Definitive Text for Alice’s Adventures,” alludes to the continuing absence of a proper scholarly edition.

In the ensuing discussion of editorial principles, I have attempted to answer Heath and Goodacre’s call for a “definitive” text of Carroll’s works, but the nature of this project has proved well beyond the scope of an MA thesis. Throughout this paper, I have merely highlighted some of the more pressing issues that an editor must consider, and it is with these substantial limitations that I make editorial judgments. As I acknowledge in the “Revisions” section, with more time and unlimited access to the materials, I would no doubt be able to provide a much

more informed analysis. Nevertheless, I will present the following information as if I were introducing a scholarly edition.

Editorial Principles

Carroll's work is perfectly positioned to reveal the problems of certain theories in textual criticism: neither Goodacre's eclectic text nor Heath's variorum edition can best account for *Alice* and *Looking-Glass*, because authorial intention encroaches on concerns traditionally in the domain of the publisher and printer, and vice versa. For this reason, an editor must reconcile three relevant but seemingly competing factors that affect the text: Carroll's control of his text, book, and audience; the influences of Macmillan, Tenniel, and his readers; and the necessary constraints of printing and publication. Put more simply, a thorough analysis must view the text through both an intentionalist *and* a sociological perspective.

As social texts, *Alice* and *Looking-Glass* are the products of collaborative publication, a process that typically deemphasizes the author's intended *text* and emphasizes the whole *book*—text, typography, illustrations, paper, binding, etc.—as the carrier of meaning. Within this collaborative space, however, Carroll exercised nearly complete control, resulting in a published work that was only “social” insofar as he allowed it to be. As the publication history and revisions sections make clear, certain elements of book design were of utmost importance to Carroll, and he sanctioned and actively engaged in the publication process, granting the most authority to Tenniel. An editor, then, must not try to recover some pure, authorial form of the text uncorrupted by outside influences—a version Carroll himself preserved in the facsimile of *Underground*—but to clarify how author *and* publisher created the book, not merely the text, that Carroll intended.

Though their approaches differ, Goodacre and Heath both fail to reconcile these two critical perspectives. As Heath suggests, Goodacre's proposed "amalgamation" of the 1897 text and the People's Edition conflates two versions that Carroll never intended as one and, furthermore, gives authority to substantive variants that Carroll himself rejected. More importantly, though, Goodacre focuses on producing an edited text and ignores the crucial function of a textual apparatus. Heath's variorum edition, containing variants in footnotes, comes closer to the goal of a true scholarly edition and the expectations of its audience in that it displays the development of the text, but his insistence on using the 1865 *Alice* as base text resurrects and privileges a state of Carroll's text that never actually reached its intended audience. Still, choosing the subsequent improved printing and first "public" edition of *Alice* as base text—the 1866 edition—would not be adequate because Carroll continued to exercise authorial control over later editions, and modern readers of *Alice* and *Looking-Glass* would expect certain revisions to appear in the copy-text, most notably, the later wording of the Cheshire-Cat's famous quote and the extension of "Tis the Voice of the Lobster." The same, of course, holds true for the first edition of *Looking-Glass*.

In contrast to Goodacre and Heath, the purpose of this edition is necessarily twofold: to provide a historical introduction, textual notes, and appendices that display the development of the text and book at all stages in the process and to present an accurate reading text that conforms to Carroll's intentions. Though this approach privileges one version, anchoring the text in a particular moment in its development, a reader may use the textual apparatus to reconstruct variant readings that resulted from collaborative and authorial changes to both the text and book at different points in its history.

Copy-Text Choice

As we have seen, Carroll exercised an unprecedented amount of control over his own work, and he took pains to secure this control, even sacrificing his own financial security by publishing on commission with Macmillan. In a letter to his publisher in 1883, Carroll made his position very clear: “It is of course understood that the author has the control, and that no details will be carried out without his actual or implied consent. In fact, of course no change would be made of any kind, without consulting me, with the one exception of the *numbers* ordered, as to which we have hitherto gone on the system of your ordering at your own discretion” (*Macmillan* 171). Carroll’s statement and the overwhelming evidence showing how he fulfilled this resolve throughout his lifetime limits the typical concern with compositor interference, allowing an editor to accept changes to both substantives and accidentals as authorial.

Based on this principle, there are three separate versions of *Alice* and *Looking-Glass* that an editor could choose as copy-text or base text: the first 6s. edition of 1865 and 1872, the “revised” and reset People’s Edition of 1887, or the revised and reset 6s. edition of 1897. However, while the changes for each of these editions are certainly authorial, the People’s Edition represents a separate version of the *book* based on audience. As noted earlier, the cheapening of certain physical aspects for this edition affected the typographical layout, which, in turn, initiated mandatory textual changes. In this way, the revisions for the People’s Edition do not reveal an author attempting to improve his *text*, but an author who consciously constructed a cheaper book and was consequently constrained by his own bibliographical choices. With Carroll’s own rejection of the changes on these grounds, the People’s Edition loses its textual authority, and the more crucial choice for copy-text comes down to the two separate typesettings of the 6s. edition.

While a plausible case might be made for preserving either the first edition or the final edition, this edition presents the 1897 6s. edition, also known as the 86th thousand *Alice* and the 61st thousand *Looking-Glass*, as copy-text because it is the culmination of a social process and, more importantly, Carroll's final intentions. Some textual purists, in the tradition of Greg, and later, Bowers and Tanselle, would argue that in the absence of a manuscript, the first editions of 1865 and 1872 should provide the copy-text as they are closest to the author's *original* intentions, and indeed Heath maintains this view in his discussion of the Pennyroyal Press edition. This may be true, but while the product of later intentions, the types of changes Carroll made to the 1897 text were simply a better expression of an idea, not a new conception of the works themselves. As the ongoing typographical changes to the "Mouse's Tale" suggest, throughout his lifetime, Carroll continued to develop his book into a better product—a more polished book—for his readers. In other words, because of Carroll's control over every aspect of his publications stemming from his strong desire for artistic quality, a text that contains his final alterations for consistency actually conforms *more* to his original intention for the 6s. edition as a "perfectly and finely finished" edition de luxe.

In fact, though over twenty-five years elapsed between the first edition and the final revision, it is my view that Carroll's conscious intentions for the 6s. edition of his work and its audience remained unchanged from 1865 to 1897. While it would be naïve to suppose that Carroll as an author did not change, his revisions over this span of time all move in the same direction, and in the absence of major substantive changes, his intention for the 6s. edition may most accurately be termed a lifetime motive of control and consistency. From the "cancelled" edition of the 1865 *Alice* to the "suppressed" 60th thousand *Looking-Glass*, Carroll exhibited a desire for artistic quality, with these printing "fiascos" providing the chance for subsequent

revisions to the text. The 1897 edition attempts a retrieval of the superior printing of the early editions while also furthering the “quality,” or standardization, of accidentals, a process begun with the first edition of *Alice* but hindered by the later electrotypes. In this way, the two editions were prompted by the same driving force, or authorial intention, for ideal presentation, but the 1897 edition comes closest to a full realization of this lifetime motive.

While the actual text chosen as the copy-text usually receives careful attention in a scholarly edition, the illustrations may be relegated to an appendix or only mentioned tangentially. The illustrations of *Alice* and *Looking-Glass* demand a different approach, as Carroll and Tenniel were essentially co-authors, collaborating on details and precise placement of text and illustrations to turn the MS into a published work. Most editors of *Alice* and *Looking-Glass* are content to include the illustrations in their appropriate chapters; however, as the foregoing discussion has shown, Carroll demonstrated that the placement of illustrations with individual lines of text—the “caption”—were important to the reader’s experience. For this reason, the illustrations have been integrated with the text according to their placement in the 1897 edition, which is, of course, the same as the first edition.

As noted in the editorial principles above, so that the reader may follow Carroll’s logical integration of his patterns over time, all variants—including the changes to the text of the People’s Edition—are contained in the textual notes at the bottom of each page of the copy-text, beginning with the fair copy MS of *Underground*, which shows a stage of composition, and even small-scale “publication,” that is free even of the authorized influences on Carroll’s text.

Emendations

Following Carroll’s desire for control of the text, I have taken a very conservative approach to emendation, but I have also followed his demonstrated intention for consistency. I

have limited my emendations to two types and listed them separately in an appendix. First, I have emended the few instances that can be proven as printing errors, both in the sense that the printers neglected an authorized change or made an error when setting up the text. Second, I have made a few changes to accidentals to further polish the text according to Carroll's revision patterns, though all instances are supported and documented. Obviously, this list is by no means complete; however, the principles underlying my theory of emendation would remain the same regardless of the additional errors or overlooked accidentals that I might uncover with more research.

I have inserted two authorized changes in May Barber's copies that failed to make it into the 1897 edition: the addition of a comma after "And" in the opening line of the penultimate stanza of "And, hast thou slain the Jabberwock?" of "Jabberwocky" and the spelling alteration from "smooth" to "smoothe" in the "Wool and Water" chapter (Godman 2). Of course, there is a chance that Carroll altered these changes back in proof, but the comma has even more grounds for appearing. Carroll had also inserted a comma in the opening line of the fourth stanza of "Jabberwocky": "And, as in uffish thought he stood" (22). A comma in both instances would indicate a slight pause before a similar sounding phrase, and emending the second comma makes the poem more consistent.

With Carroll's own explicit rationale as grounds, I have altered the two instances of "won't" noted by Goodacre that were not changed to "won'n't" in *Looking-Glass*, either overlooked by Carroll in his revision or missed by the compositor. I have also deleted the remaining commas that occur before speech. I have not attempted to emend hyphenation, except in one case noted by Goodacre: the chapter heading "Croquet Ground," which is otherwise hyphenated in the running heads and table of contents.

A few obvious printing errors occur in the 1897 text, though by this time Carroll had caught and corrected most earlier errors. The most frequent error, which occurs three times in *Looking-Glass* and three times in Goodacre's list of *Alice*, is the incorrect use of single and double quotation marks. I have corrected all instances, as this was a typical error that had persisted in various impressions.

Appendices

The appendices would contain the lists of variants and emendations cited earlier: the early changes, the People's Edition changes, the changes in May Barber's copy, the 1897 revision, and any editorial emendations, all listed separately. Separate appendices would contain facsimiles of any documentary evidence that might be of interest to a reader, including a facsimile of the illustration plans constructed by Tenniel and Carroll and the "Wasp in a Wig" galley slips, also cued to their placement in the text in a note. Additionally, the various source texts that Carroll parodied would be included in a separate appendix, a list already well researched and collected in the *Handbook* (307-16).

Certain paratextual material not included in the 1897 copy-text would also be reproduced in an appendix. Goodacre has thoroughly analyzed the textual importance of different prefaces, including "Easter Greetings," "Christmas Greetings," "To All Child Readers of 'Alice,'" and other sheets that were inserted at various times, though I would need to examine each one to understand potential effects they had on reception. Often, Carroll used the prefatory material to call the reader's attention to various textual or bibliographical details, as he did with the inserted sheets apologizing for the omission of the kings from the chessboard in a few early impressions of *Looking-Glass*. In this way, these insertions again point to another way that Carroll attempted to control his published work.

WORKS CITED AND CONSULTED

- Ayres, Harry Morgan. "Carroll's Withdrawal of the 1865 'Alice'." *Huntington Library Bulletin* 6 (Nov. 1934): 153-63. *JSTOR*. 9 Sep. 2013. Web.
- Barker, Nicolas. "Macmillan: or, 'Tis Sixty Years Since." *Macmillan: A Publishing Tradition*. Ed. Elizabeth James. New York: Palgrave, 2002. 257-65.
- Bond, W. H. "The Publication of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*." *Harvard Library Bulletin* 10 (1956): 306-24.
- Carroll, Lewis. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. 1866 Facsim. ed. New York: Knopf, 1984.
- . *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. People's Edition. London: Macmillan, 1887.
- . *The Letters of Lewis Carroll*. Ed. Morton N. Cohen. 2 vols. New York: Oxford UP, 1979.
- . *Lewis Carroll: Interviews and Recollections*. Ed. Morton N. Cohen. Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1989.
- . *Lewis Carroll's Diaries: The Private Journals of Charles Lutwidge Dodgson*. Ed. Edward Wakeling. 7 vols. Clifford, Herefordshire: Lewis Carroll Society, 1993-2007.
- . "Preface." *Sylvie and Bruno*. London: Macmillan, 1889. ix-xxi. *Archive.org*. Web. 10 Nov. 2013.
- . "Preface." *Sylvie and Bruno Concluded*. London: Macmillan, 1893. ix-xxiii. *Archive.org*. Web. 10 Nov. 2013.
- . *Through the Looking-Glass*. People's Edition. London: Macmillan, 1887.
- . *Through the Looking-Glass*. London: Macmillan, 1897. *Archive.org*. Web. 15 Dec. 2013.
- . *Through the Looking-Glass*. 1872 Facsim. ed. New York: Knopf, 1984.

- . "The Wasp in a Wig." Ed. Martin Gardner. New York: Clarkson N. Potter, 1977.
- Cohen, Morton N. "Alice: The Lost Chapter Revealed." *Telegraph Sunday Magazine* 4 Sep. 1977: 12-18.
- . *Lewis Carroll: A Biography*. New York: Knopf, 1996.
- Cohen, Morton N., ed. *Lewis Carroll: Interviews and Recollections*. Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1989.
- Cohen, Morton N., and Anita Gandolfo, eds. *Lewis Carroll and the House of Macmillan*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.
- Collingwood, Stuart Dodgson. *The Life and Letters of Lewis Carroll*. New York: Century Co., 1898.
- . *The Unknown Lewis Carroll*. New York: Dover, 1961.
- Cripps, Elizabeth A. "Alice and the Reviewers." *Children's Literature* 11 (1983): 32-48. *Project Muse*. Web. 4 Mar. 2014.
- Engen, Sir John Tenniel. *Alice's White Knight*. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1991.
- Gardner, Martin, ed. *Annotated Alice: The Definitive Edition*. New York: Norton, 2000.
- Godman, Stanley. "Lewis Carroll's Final Corrections to *Alice*." *Times Literary Supplement* 2 May 1958: 248.
- Goodacre, Selwyn H. "The 1865 Alice: A New Appraisal and a Revised Census." *Soaring with the Dodo*. Ed. Edward Guiliano and James R. Kincaid. New York: Lewis Carroll Society of North America, 1982. 77-96.
- . Editorial Principles. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. By Lewis Carroll. Illus. Barry Moser. Berkley: U of California P, 1982. 137-39.
- . "Lewis Carroll's 1887 Corrections to *Alice*." *The Library* 5.25 (1973): 131-46.

- . "Lewis Carroll's Rejection of the 60th Thousand of *Through the Looking-Glass*." *The Book Collector* (Summer 1975): 251-56.
- . "The Textual Alterations for the 1897 6s Edition of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*." *Jabberwocky* 11.3 (1982): 67-76.
- . "Towards a Definitive Text for Alice's Adventures." *Jabberwocky* 76 (1991): 38-41.
- Green, Roger Lancelyn. *Lewis Carroll*. Bodley Head Monographs. London: Bodley Head, 1960.
- Hancher, Michael. *The Tenniel Illustrations to the "Alice" Books*. London: Macmillan, 1984.
- Heath, Peter. "Review of Alice Illustrations by Barry Moser." Rev. of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, ed. Selwyn Goodacre. *Analytical & Enumerative Bibliography* 8 (1984): 204-211.
- McGann, Jerome J. *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.
- . *The Textual Condition*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991.
- Parrish, M. L. *A List of the Writings of Lewis Carroll (Charles L. Dodgson) in the Library at Dormy House, Pine Valley, New Jersey*. Philadelphia: Privately Printed, 1928.
- Schiller, Justin G. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland: An 1865 Printing Re-described and Newly Identified as the Publisher's "File Copy"*. New York: Battledore Ltd., 1990.
- Tanselle, G. Thomas. *Bibliographical Analysis: A Historical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009.
- Wakeling, Edward. "The Illustration Plan for *Through the Looking-Glass*." *Jabberwocky* 78 (1992): 27-38.
- Williams, Sidney Herbert, et. al, eds. *The Lewis Carroll Handbook*. Rev. ed. Hamden: Archon Books, 1979.