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Abstract

This research investigates the possible criticism and mockery that Lewis Carroll implemented for Queen Victoria, Queen of Great Britain and Ireland (1837-1901), in his works *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking Glass*. With reliance on the New Historicist theory, this dissertation examines the symbolism used by the author and his creation to the fictional character of the Queen of Wonderland. The purpose that leads to the conduction of this research is to discover Carroll’s intentions behind the creation of such sarcastic character, and figure out the hidden meanings he tended to convey about Queen Victoria through a story that is considered as mere children’s literature. Furthermore, several assets of the personality of Queen Victoria’s fictional analogue in the story are explored, analyzed, and compared to the former’s historical real assets, and a considerable resemblance between the two is exposed. Despite the fact that Carroll’s intended criticism of Queen Victoria is implicitly created in a form of a fictional character, that occupies the same royal title as Queen Victoria did, in a surrealistic imaginative literary work, it cannot be denied especially with regard to its compatibility with the historical facts concerning the Queen and its credibility comparing to them. The importance of this research lays in the discovery that Carroll’s work is not a mere collection of children’s stories, however it is a rebellious literary work through which the British empress is indirectly criticized and mocked. Although Carroll’s literary works are categorized as stories for kids, they should not be underestimated for the deep meanings they carry.
Résumé

Cette recherche vise à repérer la possibilité de trouver une critique satirique de la reine Victoria (reine de la Grande Bretagne et Irlande, 1837-1901) plantée dans les deux œuvres Alice’s adventues in Wonderland et Through The Looking Glass de l’auteur Lewis Carroll. Tout en dépendant sur la théorie du New Historicisme, cette dissertation examine le symbolisme usé par l’auteur et sa création du personnage fictif de la reine dans le monde des merveilles (the Queen of wonderland). Les finalités de cette recherche est de découvrir les intentions de Carroll et ses motifs derrière la création d’un personnage pareil et de comprendre le sens caché autour de la reine Victoria à travers ce travail considéré comme de la pure littérature enfantine. En outre, plusieurs aspects du caractère du personnage fictif ont été explorés, analysés e comparés avec les aspects du la vraie personne historique et réelle pour aboutir à révéler une ressemblance considérable. Malgré la critique de la reine par Lewis Carroll était implicitement développée à travers le personnage fictif surréel, on ne peut pas nier la compatibilité entre le personnage et la vraie personne historiquement connue. L’importance de ce travail réside dans la découverte de la nature du travail de Carroll qui, finalement, se montre si loin de la littérature enfantine, et identique à un travail rebelle critiquant d’une manière ou d’une autre la gouvernante de la Grande Bretagne. Finalement, il faut dire que les œuvres de Carroll ne doivent jamais être sous-estimés pour leur sens profondément caché sous plusieurs connotations et surréalisme.
ملخص

يحقق هذا البحث في إمكانية وجود نقد ساخر للملكة فيكتوريا، ملكة بريطانيا وأيرلندا (1837-1901) في كتاب لويس كارول. بالاعتماد على نظرية ئيستوريزم يفحص هذا البحث الرمزية المستعملة من طرف الكاتب والمتمثلة في هيئة شخصية ملكة بلاد العجائب الهزلية. تكمن أهم أهداف هذا البحث في كشف نوايا كارول التي قادته لخلق شخصية الملكة المجنونة والبحث عن المعاني المقصودة أتجاه الملكة فيكتوريا خلال عمله الأدبي المصف صم قصص الأطفال. قد تم الكشف عن عدة أوجه شبه بين شخصية ملكة بلاد العجائب والملكة فيكتوريا ذاتها ونتيجة دالة على أن كارول اعتمد انتقاد الملكة من خلال قصص أطفال بعيدا كل البعد عن السياسة.
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Introduction

By the beginning of the 19th century, and after reaching an undeniable influence on the British literature, the Romantic literary movement was at its end. Space for the individual consciousness and melancholy imagination was no longer given. It was time for the reality of the British society to take over imagination, and the collective awareness over the personal one. By the 1830’s, the Victorian period began with the beginning of Queen Victoria’s reign. During that era, many literary works were produced and published, telling stories about the reality of society back then. The novel surpassed poetry, and served as the major characteristic that defined the literature of the mid 19th century. Leo Tolstoy, Honoré de Balzac, George Eliot and Charles Dickens are some of the most prominent figures who are best known for their realistic works. Their novels are generally viewed as a reflection of reality. Regardless of the fact that their stories might be plain and familiar for people of that time, they carry an endless amount of the Victorian culture and knowledge for people of nowadays. To read a Victorian work is to have a direct access to the Victorian period and an accurate understanding of how life was managed during the reign of Queen Victoria. Among the prominent realist authors, only very few have produced works that are undeniably different from the typical realistic ones.

Charles Lutwidge Dodgson (1832-1898), under his pen name Lewis Carroll, is a Victorian realistic author who wrote what is considered to be the most fabulous imaginative work of all times. The captivating story he narrated to the ten years old Alice
Liddel and her sisters is still mesmerizing for more than two hundred years. Most critics admitted that *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* 1865, and *Through the Looking Glass* 1871, are original, incomparable magnificent works that display the literary nonsense genre. They also serve as the most quoted books after the Bible and Shakespeare in the British traditions and beyond (McCrum n.p.). In these two pieces of writings, Carroll broke every usual pattern concerning the plot and the writing style. This magical, yet illogical set of events is interpreted in so many ways regarding the deconstructing fashion it is framed with. The author’s psyche, its effect on the work, and the problem of identity loss are some of the angles from which Carroll’s works have been treated. However, the possibility of an implemented criticism and mockery towards the Queen within this literary production is the reason why this research is conducted.

These works were created, written and published during the Victorian Age (1837-1901). By that time, Queen Victoria was the ruler of Great Britain and Ireland, most people at that time had nothing to complain about, concerning both, their Queen and her ways of ruling. However, some say that despite the fact that she is the ideal icon for all the Victorians, she had flaws just like any other human being. For that matter, a huge resemblance and an exact characterization to Queen Victoria were depicted in Carroll’s works through his creation of the character of the Red Queen, which makes a strong urge to examine the possible criticism attempted against Queen Victoria.

The common notion about literature is that it is often a mere reflection of society, and Alice’s world inside the rabbit hole is nothing like the world we, ordinary people, are familiar with. This is what triggers the attempt of figuring out the author’s purpose behind writing this puzzling story, the image he tended to reflect, and if by any possible chance, he was criticizing Queen Victoria when he created the character of the Red Queen. Therefore, this research is conducted in order to extract the symbolism used by Carroll in his both
sequels of Alice, decode and highlight the depiction of both the physical and psychological aspects of Queen Victoria, and the possible impact of her character on her own life and the lives of those surrounding her.

Ever since the works were published many scholars and literary critics had their eyes laid on the mysteries of Wonderland. The mysteries kept appearing, after the death of Lewis Carroll, his family members found nude pictures of so many children including Alice and her sisters, that were unexplainable but through the absolute conviction of him having an unhealthy interest in children

Unlike the previous interpretations, this dissertation tends to examine these works deeper, figure out potential existence of any further dimensions and hidden symbols within, and locate the resemblance between the character of Queen of Hearts and Queen Victoria herself and her relationship with her entourage. With reliance on the New Historicist theory, the examination of Carroll’s works indicates that Lewis Carroll was against some traits of the Queen’s personality. Despite his inability of advocating it, he believed that her character had a negative impact on her own private life and certainly on her relationships with the people surrounding her.

This dissertation explores both theoretical and practical sides, and it is divided into two chapters. The first chapter explores the world of the Victorian regime at the level of the social and cultural convictions, ethical and moral manners. It explores the developments and the expansions that Great Britain witnessed during the Victorian age. It also discovers several sides of Queen Victoria’s character in a concise historical overview of her life. Many previous readings of Carroll’s story are set under spotlight in the same chapter.

The second chapter focuses on theoretical part of the dissertation, where the applied theory is concerned with both sequel of the Alice story. In the first sequel of the story
Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland, Queen Victoria’s analogue is the character of the Queen of Hearts, while it is the character of the Red Queen in the second sequel Through the Looking Glass. This chapter serves as an exposure to the similarities between Queen Victoria and her analogues in Carroll’s work.

The outcome of this research lays in decomposing the aspects of the Queen’s personality which Carroll criticised using a fictional character. In addition to that, it also lays in the exposure of the hidden dimensions of Carroll’s works of Alice concerning the Queen, and in the discovery of the critical characterization and its contribution in exposing the real historical facts that have been kept from the public.
Chapter One

Beyond Carroll’s Story of Alice

Among the prominent Realist authors, only very few have produced works that are undeniably different from the typical realistic ones. Charles Lutwidge Dodgson (1832-1898), as one of the pillars of the Victorian literature, is best known for his stories of Alice under the name Lewis Carroll. A young adventurous girl, who enters the mysterious world of wonderland in the search for convenient answers for her doubts, faces several obstacles and incredible creatures. The story was written for the sake of Alice Liddell, the 7 years old daughter of Henry Liddell who was the Dean of Christ Church in Oxford University, and Carroll’s best friend. Therefore, Carroll the protagonist of the story after the little girl and dedicated the novel to her in 1865.

*Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking Glass* are considered as a deconstruction to the typical style of the Realist novel on several levels. First, novels during that era focused on telling stories about the real issues that were faced back then, mostly the economical and social ones such as education, relationships, family, crimes, class-division… etc. ‘Telling’ was the element that forced the literary text to be treated with relation to its author. By contrast to that, Carroll chose to tell a story that was of his own imagination. It was more like a release to a confused state of mind rather than an ordinary believable story. Second, the setting of the Realist novel is the world as we are familiar with it. Authors relied on everyday details of the human ordinary life so that the readers can relate to the stories, knowing that they are not true however they could be.
Meanwhile, Carroll’s choice of the setting of the Alice legacy is a mere imaginative creation that is perfectly compatible with the insanity of the plot. Third, the characters in Realist novels are human beings who live and experience natural, believable events. Realist authors focused on the appearances and behaviors of characters and used the dialogue to make them seem more of life-like people. Carroll used a variety of odd creatures that have absolutely no relation to reality. The Hatter, who is taken for a fool, even though his madness still makes sense to him, works on making hats for the Queen, a colored cat who appears and disappears by choice, gives directions to Alice, the talking Caterpillar and the white Rabbit in a waist coat are only some of the characters that navigate the world of Wonderland along with Alice during her journey. Many other unusual characters appear in and out of Alice’s trip, like the Gryphon and the Mock Turtle. The fourth element is the plot that is plainly structured in the Realist novel. It generally involves a conflict and tension revolving around an obvious problem. Events in the novels of Realism usually take a chronological order. In contrast, Carroll decided to drown Alice in an imaginative world, where concepts like time and logic do not function the way they ought to do, and the problems she has to overcome are nothing like the real life problems that people usually face. Alice keeps worrying about her constantly changing size, and wondering about her true identity and her appropriate placement and function in that crazy wild world. Although Carroll was a brilliant mathematician who believed in logic, his story has a different logic of its own where everything is entirely illogical. In addition to that, the language of the Realist novels was tended to be the everyday plain language. Unlike literature of the Romantic era, when poets and novelists tended to use an artistic extravagant terminology, Realist novels were generally not very sophisticated at the level of the language. Meanwhile, Carroll introduced extremely unusual terms in his works such as: “tureen” (Carroll 160) which means a large deep serving dish with a cover, “askance”
(Carroll 151) which means questioning with suspicion or disapproval, “sluggard” (Carroll 156) which means an ideal slothful person . . . etc.

All of the former different aspects make Carroll a special author, comparing to the authors of his era. As they make the mysterious adventures of Alice a challenging literary work especially for scholars and critics, by all means possible, with regard to the historical context during which it was produced.

Although many critics treated Lewis Carroll’s sequels of Alice as mere works of children’s literature, they carry plenty of mockery towards Queen Victoria and the way she ruled. Therefore, the reliance on the New Historian theory is quite necessary. This chapter contains an overview about the Victorian period and the major characteristics that define it. It covers the developments that took place at the level of economy, politics, society, culture and most importantly literature. After that, the main focus is set on the life of Queen Victoria, her personality and her reign. In addition to the previous, an explanation to the depiction of her existence in Carroll’s literary works is provided.

Generally, the Victorian literature does not tackle the royalties as a major subject, much less to mock them. However, the reflected image of the Queen is quite notable in Carroll’s sequels of Alice through the character of Queen of Hearts. Carroll definitely mocks the Queen and criticizes her, which makes it a necessity to decode the symbolism he uses. The resulted interpretations allow the reader to understand the real personality of the Queen and expose what other authors and critics might have ignored.

By the end of the 18th century, the Romantic era came to an end, and it was time for Victorianism to dominate Great Britain. Unlike the other periods of the British reigns, the Victorian period was named after Queen Victoria. It started the day she sat on the throne in 1837 and ended the day she died in 1901. The most common perception that dominated the
Victorian English society and more precisely the middle class is “sophistication”. Commoners had the aspiration to belong to the noble higher class. What is and what is not proper was their greatest deal of all at that time. People felt that acting properly and keeping a qualified standard image, especially in public, was the major key to reach the socially sophisticated ranking. Therefore, appearance and behavior were the most important pillars through which one can distinguish the real Victorian lady or gentleman.

Rules and proper manners were usually what construct the British Victorian etiquette. Being well-mannered was even included as a part of the British woman’s education. At that time, the British people were too sophisticated to the extent that having a poor speech or falling into the incorrect usage of terminology exposes the socially fake categorization of the person, and determines his/her true position in society. Another perspective that was intensively debatable in Great Britain is the Englishness of people. This notion was also related to the idealized proper behavior. However, it was more associated with the burden that Englishmen, mostly politicians and colonists, took upon themselves to civilize the natives of the British colonies and advocate it as their political and even religious duty. This process took place during the late 18th century and it was considered as the explicit reason for the British imperialism. Great Britain reached the peak of its powers by its successful occupation of the thirteen colonies in America, and the management of its former colonies in Africa, India, and in other parts of Asia. In addition to that, developments of great industrial and scientific advances took place like; the emergence of the Darwinist theory of evolution, and the development of medicines. By that time, doctors and physicians could already master the surgery and perform open-organs autopsy. During the 1850’s, Joseph Lister discovered the “anesthetics” and it was successfully consumed. Housing was flourishing in the Victorian time, most of Britain’s railways and bridges were constructed by then. Progress also covered technology and
means of communication, for the invention of the Telegraph marked the history of the clever inventions.

Politics was one of the most prominent fields that Victorians were notably interested in. Great Britain experienced a great transition in the political arena, the emergence of political movements like liberalism, socialism and even organized feminism took place. British people’s political awareness and their enthusiasm about their geographical explorations in Africa, Asia and America were enormously elevated. During that period of time, the Tory party split forming both the Liberal and Conservative parties, it was then that the opposing administrations appeared, knowing that the Queen was supporting the Conservative party.

Considering this progress from a cultural perspective, the British imperial expansions were among the major factors that helped greatly in the spread and use of the English language. It was quickly transmitted from being the language of the colonizer to being the language of the colonized. This influence contributed in the deep understanding of the British culture outside Europe, including the cultural conventions that the British kept holding on like arranging literary friendly gatherings; where authors, poets, and intellectuals meet to discuss their works and exchange knowledge. Other social parties took place; where people from different social ranks meet and socialize. Theatrical plays and afternoon poetry were how Victorians kept themselves entertained. Even Queen Victoria herself had several preferable things to do aside from ruling; like painting, writing journals, listening to poetry and watching plays performed in her palace.

The most notable thing about Queen Victoria is that her reign was the longest period of ruling in the British history; she was the first female ruler to ever sit on the throne for more than sixty three years (Barrow n. p.). Ridley states that she was the wife to her
cousin/husband Prince Albert of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, and a mother to nine children. Prince Albert was her rock in times of need, her trusted personal secretary and political advisor in national and international affairs. The position he occupied as the Prince consort was not an easy one, but he proved his merit for it through his wisdom and intelligence. The Queen relied on his political abilities and ruling experiences to replace her, especially during her nine labors. He encouraged her to be a better ruler for her people and to be more involved with their social welfare issues and the ultimate solutions for them (Ridley).

Even though her succession in the line of heirs was inevitable, many critics believe that she was not the right person to sit on the throne. In her article about Queen Victoria, Ellie Cawthorne suggests that “Although Victoria assumed her royal responsibilities with remarkable confidence, she hadn’t always been destined for the throne” (Cawthorne 2). Simon Perry also adds in his article “Bedroom Door Locks”, that it “... is a huge deal. After a succession of old men, they had teenage woman running the country.” (Perry 1). Queen Victoria was also idealized among the British society because of her “property” in behavior and the high standards she possessed and expected everyone around her to live up to. She was a strict woman, not to mention a highly sever ruler. According to Cowing, the thing that characterizes her personality most was that she used to lose her temper a lot and get extremely mad whenever things do not work out the way they ought to do (Cowing 2). Unexpectedly, the Queen was anti-feminist; a ruler who is a female is highly likely to be very defensive of women’s rights and the obligation of their equality to men. However, that was not the case concerning the Queen; she has always believed that a woman should normally stay in her domicile serving her husband and children and have no other opinion rather than that. She believed that only men were created to rule, govern and do wars, while women should just listen and obey saying: “I love peace and quiet, I hate politics and turmoil. We women are not made for governing, and if we are good women, we must
dislike these masculine occupations.” (Queen Victoria). She made it very clear that she was very supportive of male superiority over female and that she never liked ruling considering her feminine nature.

One may assume that having nine children in a row may only indicate that the Queen had a passion for kids, in fact, it was quite the opposite for Queen Victoria. In his article “Queen Victoria’s Children”, Denys Blakeway, who is a British documentary producer and a writer, she lacked the enthusiasm to bear babies and take good care of them. “An ugly baby is a very nasty object . . . the prettiest are frightful when undressed . . . as long as they have their big body and little limbs and that terrible froglike action ” (qtd. in Blakeway 2).

Throughout her reigning time, Prince Albert kept standing by his wife’s side until his last day when he passed away in 1861, after years of suffering from typhoid fever. After his tragic death, the Queen remained in a lasting grief for the rest of her life. It was depressing for her considering her troubled childhood being the only child of George III’s fourth son Edward and Victoria Maria Louisa of Saxe-Coburg, sister of Leopold, king of the Belgians. The Queen declared “I had led a very unhappy life as a child . . . had no scope for my very violent feelings of affection . . . and did not know what a happy domestic life was” (qtd. in Blakeway 2). The Queen was the only heir in her family, so after the death of her uncle William IV in June 1837, she had no choice but to occupy the crown. The Queen was not unqualified for ruling; on the contrary, she was well equipped with the necessary amount of knowledge that is needed in every ruler. In his article “Queen Victoria and her Prime Ministers”, Christopher Hibbert argues that her first Prime Minister Lord Melbourne, who was also her political advisor and private confidant, had helped greatly in teaching the young Queen how to be a constitutional monarch. She grew up, politically, to become a powerful leader and have a major influence over the foreign
affairs. Moreover, she was of a great impact outside the British Empire and its colonies, especially due to the marriages of her children all around Europe.

Meanwhile, in her leisure time, the Queen enjoyed theatrical plays performed in her palace. She had so many hobbies like: painting, writing journals, and listening to poetry. During that era, a considerable amount of literary works were produced, when the major purpose of literature was the reflection of the most prominent characteristics of the Victorian society. Many remarkable figures of the 19th century literature have marked their fingerprint throughout history like Charles Dickens, who wrote *Great Expectations* where he describes the financial difficulties and the setbacks of class-division that people went through during that era. He reflects how money defines one’s value as a human being and how important it is in determining the social class of people. *Oliver Twist* is also a very interesting work that shows how poverty as a social issue can contribute to the rise of crime. In her *Jane Eyre*, Charlotte Bronté depicts how hard it is for a lady to break through her path and move on along her journey, and how the typical Victorian lady feels the necessity to depend on a man in order to achieve stability. Jane Austen’s works like: *Sense & Sensibility*, *Pride & Prejudice*, *Weathering Heights*, were almost all about the female Victorian proper manners and how marriage is a sacred establishment that any lady must seek and achieve.

Many other feminist literary works were written and published during the Victorian period that involved the depiction of the common marital situation of having to marry above one’s free will. Simple social acts were treated as traditions for the sake of satisfying the stereotypes of the Victorian society. The obstacles of social classes and the importance of the proper behavior and its effects on people at that time were mostly the similar aspects that the majority of the Victorian literary works share.
The Victorian era as a whole witnessed an undeniable contradiction when it comes to literature and society. People of the Victorian time began to feel exhausted of the stereotypical social codes and the ‘agreed upon’ behaviors, so such matters served often as subjects of satire to literature. Then the notion of aestheticism, the ‘art for art’s sake’, emerged and it completely contradicted with the radical basics of the early notions of literature. This was when authentic creative authors majored, like the brilliant Charles Lutwidge Dodgson who is better known by his pen name Lewis Carroll. He was a creative poet, a passionate photographer and an author to several essays and political pamphlets. He was mostly known for his incredible creation of what is considered as a masterpiece in the Victorian literature: *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* 1865, and its following sequel *Through the Looking Glass* 1871. These two major productions, which are the best examples that display the literary nonsense, came as deconstructive works to the Victorian traditional novel. Ever since his works were published, they have been the centre of attention for many scholars and critics, who are constantly curious about the accurate analysis of his stories. The character of Alice only, was a subject to uncountable analytical works. Carroll’s famous story was treated from a feminist perspective by Megan S. Lloyd, who is an American researcher, she assigned to a group of pupils to write about their favorite unruly heroines. Most of them chose: Mulan, Belle, Jasmine, Cinderella… etc, however only two of them chose Alice. They defended their choice by the argument that Alice is the only genuine unruly heroine. Lloyd adds “They argued that Alice, unlike other fairy-tale heroines, requires no fairy godmother, huntsman, or a good fairy_ just her own wits and ingenuity to navigate through Wonderland successfully…” (Lloyd 8), and it is relatively true comparing to other well-known heroines of the fairy tales. Usually, every female protagonist has either: a magic wand, a flying carpet or an angel to look after her and guide her through the journey, except for Alice, who is a lonely, wild, genuinely unruly
heroine. She, unlike the previous heroines, follows her curiosity into the rabbit hole and has to face the creatures of Wonderland all by herself. Not by any helping means, she overcomes the obstacles she meets and the confusing setbacks of the illogical turn of events. In the eyes of Lloyd, Alice is a character that depends fully on her own senses and logic to go through her mysterious adventure. Other heroines like Aurora\(^8\) and Snow White\(^9\) are portrayed as weak, feminine young ladies who are naïve and incapable of bearing the hardships of their journeys, unless it is with the undeniable assistance of a charming prince, a magical spell, or a group of dwarfs, as it is the case for Snow White.

Females among Lloyd’s group were amazed by the character of Alice. They admired her because she represents a young, curious, intelligent girl who faces an unfamiliar world by herself. She tests her hidden abilities, and goes beyond the expected in order to fit in. On top of that, she creates her own comfortable zone where she co-exists with the insane creatures of Wonderland acquiring wisdom and power.

Lloyd believes that understanding the free spirit and the fearless mentality of Alice during her adventures is what young women need today; the ability to relate to Alice’s revolutionary personality. Considering the Victorian female stereotypes and the dominated social image about women, I find it refreshing to read about the character of Alice, because it is a great idealization of breaking the usual, and it is even greater coming from a man.

Carroll depicted Alice as the “rebellious” character among the likes of her, being the only standing young woman to ever protest against what is not common. Especially, as she rejects the typical ideologies her sister is convinced with; sitting quietly and reading books, obeying whatever society dictates, and never having to question anything.

In her article, Lloyd also treated the notion of “the Impossible & the Possible”. One simply cannot avoid realizing that the “impossible” in the story represents the restrictions
established by the Victorian society and placed upon the Victorian woman. While the “possible” represents the potentials that Alice has, and the things she is able to do as the icon for the revolutionary woman.

Lloyd adds another notion, the fact that “Nice girls don’t make history…” (Lloyd 9) She believes that Alice has all the aspects that both Victorian women and women of today need. This character asks so many questions, speaks her mind very often, opens the door for her, takes a seat in a tea party uninvited, all these behaviors and more are highly unaccepted and considered as improper and impolite by the Victorian social code. Not a lot of women today stand up their rights or at least speak up their minds, much less during the nineteenth century, which is why Alice is seen as the icon of the revolutionary women at all times.

All along the story, Alice gets stuck in moments of confusing dilemmas as she keeps wondering about her real identity. When the Caterpillar asks her: “Who are you?” (Carroll 60), she replies hesitatingly: “I—I hardly know . . . at least I know who I was when I got up this morning, but I think I must have been changed several times since then.” (Carroll 60). The fact that Alice is no longer certain about who she is, opens up many doors of potentials for her, and gives her the chance to restart her journey as any creature she desires. With projection on reality, this perspective teaches all women everywhere that they are perfectly capable of being whomever they want and doing anything they like, despite their oppressing social ties and dominating etiquettes.

Lloyd suggests another notion that is “Motherhood is not a requirement” (Lloyd 10) in the traditional Victorian England, the primary and only function of women was to get married and start producing children. Generally, women were not expected to work outside their domiciles, practice sports, or even participate in interesting conversations, like
discussing politics or economy… because such matters were exclusively the tasks of men. Alice, who excludes the possibility of becoming a mother or even a wife, meets the Duchess’ ugly son and immediately expresses her opinion towards the baby with an honesty that would be defined as rudeness according to the proper manners of that time. She does not make any fake compliments for the baby but instead she shows her disgust and quickly drops the baby on the floor.

Meanwhile, Carina Garland, who is a literary critic and a PhD candidate in Gender and Cultural studies at the University of Sydney, analyzed Carroll’s work from a different perspective to that of Lloyd. She believes that Carroll was surrounded by so many females in his life with no absolute power to control them; therefore his creation to the character of Alice served as a fulfillment to his oppressing desires. She insists that his obsession about female control was expressed through the “representation of food and appetite within the text and the relationship of these to the feminine.” (Garland 1). Carroll describes a very beautiful tea table in *Through the Looking Glass*, and associated it with the presence of Alice which, according to Garland, is an expression to his appetite for food and his desire to oppress Alice. Unlike Lloyd, Garland thinks that Alice represents the icon of the passive feminism, because she is completely controlled by the circumstances of the plot and dominated by the other surrounding characters. Throughout the story, Alice has been pictured as she falls down the rabbit hole, which is by all means the male rabbit’s fault, and as she grows taller or shorter, which happens also when she eats the male Caterpillar’s mushrooms. Alice gets lost in the woods; however she is guided out by the male Cheshire cat. She attends a tea party and drinks tea by the orders of the male Mad Hatter. Therefore it is pretty obvious that Alice is completely controlled and oppressed by the male characters of the story.
Another reading to the story of Alice is built upon the Psychoanalytical criticism. Ever since Carroll’s works were published, they have been a major target for psychiatrists and psychoanalytical critics, like Schilder and Empson. Most of them share the same opinion that the story of Alice is easier to handle if it was treated as a dream. Some others believe that it is actually a dream. However, there have been no exact or stable interpretations for it. In “The Evolution of Alice Criticism”, Humphrey Carpenter insists that the psychoanalytical approach actually exposes Carroll’s repressed sexuality. Taking instances from the novel; after falling down the rabbit hole, Alice is trapped in a hall with several normal-sized doors, however she discovers a tiny door covered behind the curtains, Carpenter believes that the normal-sized doors represent adult women that Carroll could have met and engage with. Whereas the tiny covered door represents a child covered with innocence that needs to be taken in order for the child to be exposed, and this is exactly Alice’s case. Among all the other doors, she was only supposed to go through that tiny door. According to Carpenter, Carroll’s choice to the tiny door reflects his sexual attraction to children. He also believes that Carroll’s use of doors and keys is a mere symbolism of the act of sex, thinking that he, as an adult of thirty-three years old when he produced this work, is at his peak sexual activity although he has never been married before, and that is what confirms the theory of pedophilia. His sexual confusion is depicted in the way that Alice never finds out her actual ordinary size; for moments she is bigger than usual and for other moments she is tinier than usual. Carroll’s sub-consciousness keeps playing by the protagonist’s size in a constant struggle of him never finding his true desires or how to satisfy them. For this depiction, Carpenter and Pumphrey agree that Carroll was stuck between his Id and his superego. In simpler words, one side of Carroll’s psyche tells him to follow his instincts and get intimate with children for his internal satisfaction, being an adult with no interest in female adults at all. However the other side cries out that this act is
socially unaccepted and that befriending little girls shall be enough for him not to ruin his reputation.

One cannot look at Alice from a psychoanalytical approach and skips the theme of “identity” for it is a subject of hyper-sensitivity. During the story, the protagonist is asked so many times to identify herself, but she often does not know how to respond, feeling either too tall or too small to be herself. Comparing the two sequels of the story; at first Alice is chocked by the magical mysterious world of underground, she is often confused and oblivious, and she struggles to make sense of the events going on around her. However in the second sequel Alice is a lot more mature and confident than she was before, she is aware of the happenings and she becomes more familiar with the mysterious sites of Wonderland. She makes her own decisions and fights for them; she is no longer that curious little child who never quits asking questions. The reader can easily detect the transitions in her personality and the maturity she gains realizing that Alice has grown up.

Focusing on the protagonist does not mean that the other characters in the story were marginalized by the literary critics, however many characters were also subjects to criticism; the Mad Hatter who is treated for his obsession with time, time itself that is personified in *Through the Looking Glass*, the tricky Cheshire Cat that represents the tricky people of Carroll’s home town Cheshire, and the Dormouse who is always falling asleep as a symbol for Britain’s withdrawal as a powerful empire.

Another angle from which Carroll’s work has been treated is the application of Karl Marx’ theory of class division and this notion cannot be denied in the story. According to Sarah Pumphrey, Carroll aimed at portraying people of the upper class and mocking the futile positions they occupied. Pumphrey believes that “This may be Carroll making an opinion about the higher classes in society at the time of the novella.” (Pumphrey 1). She
believes that Carroll tended to expose their banal and corny lifestyles. “In Carroll's short novel, a high class is showcased, and parodied. Royals are portrayed as this "mad" and dazed, doing whatever they please.” (Pumphrey 1). He depicted the upper class, both royals and their surroundings, as mad and hysterical through the characters of the Queen of Hearts and her disturbed entourage. Pumphrey insisted that “These "heads of society" (Pumphrey 2) have followers and servants, who seem to understand their madness, but do not possess it.” She believes that the surroundings of the royals; like their followers and servants are pretty much aware of the madness of their masters however they manage to keep their distance of sanity in order not to be mixed with the foolishness of the upper class. She believes that Carroll was influenced by Karl Marx to a considerable extent, and this was reflected through the protagonist of his works “Alice”, whom he wanted to represent as a young woman of high class who enjoys a luxurious life. “[Alice] has obviously lived a privileged lifestyle . . . being a big part of Marx's societal theory, Alice plays into stereotypes . . .” (Pumphrey). As it is common, education is an essential aspect in Marx’ theory and this triggered Pumphrey to detect that Alice is an educated Victorian female who is quite proud of her education “. . . [Alice] is proud of all that she has learned in school. . .” (Pumphrey)

According to Pumphrey, Karl Marx believes that one’s social class can be determined through his/her tone of literature “Marx hypothesizes that the tone of literature reflects the authors' own social class” (Pumphrey). Viewing Carroll from this angle, as the creator of Alice, Marx suggested that the former was a citizen of a lower class “. . . one might infer that Carroll is a lower class citizen, as he speaks of the higher classes with sarcasm and exaggerations. . .” (Pumphrey). In his two sequels of Alice, Carroll addresses the royal class with and obvious sarcasm and he parodies both their physical and psychological aspects through the foolish characters he created. He adds “. . . Carroll was
of a family who was high in the church, and Lewis himself received high education at Oxford University.” (Pumphrey). She also suggested that since Carroll had grown in a highly religious family and he persuaded his studies in the Oxford University, he must have been among the intellectuals of society, and therefore he is criticizing the likes of his people. Describing them as arrogant and passive proves his own rejection to his belonging to their same category. Pumphrey agrees that the works of Carroll really represent the royalty and the aristocracy classes showing the privileges and exaggerations of their lifestyles. The relationship between people of different social classes was depicted via the use of animals and weird creatures that Alice meets with along her journey. At the beginning the creatures are undressed and simple but intelligent and independent and it is the category representing the lower class. Whereas, the creatures she meets later on are well dressed but arrogant and lazy which represents the upper class during the Victorian era.

Unlike the previous mentioned readings of Carroll’s works, I tend to shed light on a certain point that has been, in a way, ignored. After reading his Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking Glass, I could not help but notice that the character of the Queen of Hearts, portrayed as a foolish, angry, and unforgiving ruler, could not be created at random while the story was produced during the Victorian era which is when Queen Victoria reigned. Since Carroll is to be thought of as an opposing element to his own class of intellectuals, it is highly likely that he tended to expose his attitude towards the ruling class. Considering the aspects that distinguish the character of the Queen of Hearts like her uncontrollable foolishness and lack of wisdom, I believe that there must be an absolute mockery of Queen Victoria herself within the lines of his story.
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Chapter Two
A Critical Characterization of Queen Victoria

Section One: Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland

Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland is the first sequel of the mysterious imaginative story of Alice. It was created and published in 1865 in the campus of the Oxford Church where Lewis Carroll spent a considerable time with the Dean’s daughter Alice Liddell. Carroll lived during the Victorian period, where the British kingdom was ruled by Queen Victoria, and by that time, the literary movement that dominated was Realism. In contrast to most of the Realist authors of that era, like Charles Dickens and the Bronté sisters, Carroll did not focus on reflecting the reality of the social issues and the hardships of the circumstances that Victorians went through, like aristocracy, class-division, and rural migration. In fact, he aimed at writing this fabulous novel using an imaginative plot, surrealistic creatures and an odd style of writing in order to criticize something that is beyond social problems and Victorian lifestyles. He targeted the royal family, and specifically the Queen herself. The most special thing about Carroll’s manner in criticizing royalty is that he did not declare it publically or directly. However he implicitly reduced it into one character in the story “Queen of Hearts”. He also used sarcastic symbolism referring to the real personality of Queen Victoria. In a time when Realism over floated to the surface of the British literature, and prominent authors like James Henry and Mark Twain tried to depict reality with a neutral fashion, and expose society layer by layer, Carroll surpassed them into another level of implicit depiction. Considering the fact that literature at that time was a mere reflection of what people have witnessed, lived, and experienced. It is absolutely safe to say that Carroll used an imaginative story, which seemed to be addressed to the audience of children, as an instrument through which he could convey his sarcastic criticism implicitly.
In this chapter, the sarcastic symbolism that Carroll aimed to use, will be located, examined and compared to real historical facts using the New Historicistist theory, that views literature as an inseparable piece of history, because the author is undeniably influenced by his/her period of time and social conditions. Therefore it serves as an expression to history and an exposure to facts and events that took place long ago. The effectiveness of this theory can be seen when readers are able to view works of literature as parts of history even if they are fictional stories. By understanding that authors are writing about their personal experiences and opinions of the era in which they lived, the reader can obtain greater knowledge of what the era truly resembled.

The very first time the term “Queen” is used in Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland is in chapter XI which is entitled “Who Stole the Tarts!” . It is mentioned that the Queen of Hearts sent a written invitation to the Duchess to play Croquet game with her in the royal palace. “For the Duchess. An invitation from the Queen to play croquet” (Carroll 77). The Queen’s invitations to the Croquet game were to be taken very seriously, especially concerning Croquet, because it was among the most common Victorian traditions and favorable hobbies. This game was first introduced to the British people in the 19th century by the French, and it was addressed to ladies mostly, because at that time women were taught that they are physically incapable or at least this is how they ought to be. That game requires absolutely no skills, no physical efforts and for that matter women of the higher class wear their extravagant gowns and walk into their castle’s gardens were they gently hit wooden balls with a mallet through hoops. This is how most Victorian women used to spend most of their free time. In Carroll’s story, anyone who dares to reject the Red Queen’s request to play that game is to be beheaded right away and this confirms the traits of the horrifying image that Carroll is trying to convey about the Queen.
As soon as the Duchess receives the Queen’s invitation, she flings her baby to Alice saying: “‘Here! you may nurse it a bit, if you like! . . . I must go and get ready to play croquet with the Queen,’ and she hurried out of the room” (Carroll 86). Without showing an ounce of care towards her child, the Duchess abandons everything and rushes to obey the Queen’s request. This event also reflects the idea of terror and fear of the Queen that Carroll aimed to plant in the readers’ minds. Although the Duchess is condemned to death, for handling the Queen physically and slapping her on both sides of her head, “She [the Duchess] is under sentence of execution . . . She boxed the Queen’s ears—” (Carroll 120) that did not keep her from answering the orders of the Queen and rushing to obey her. The author aimed at suggesting that Victorians, despite their fear, are committed and loyal to their Queen, through the behavior of the Duchess.

Carroll insisted to draw a certain image in his readers’ minds about the true nature of their Queen’s character. He kept picturing her as a savage, unforgiving, and the most dominating royalty that ever ruled the throne. In chapter VII, entitled “A Mad Tea Party” the Mad Hatter tells Alice about his story when he was the personal singer and entertainer of the Queen, and how he had to sing during the great concert she threw in the Kingdom. He remembers how the Queen shouted back then, “‘Well, I ’d hardly finished the first verse,’ said the Hatter, when the Queen bawled out ‘He’s murdering the time! Off with his head!’ ” (Carroll 104). He stopped singing at the festival and was accused of murdering “time”, as if time was a person. The Queen of Hearts ordered her soldiers to execute him and ever since that moment, time has stopped at six o’clock and it is forever tea time, which could have been a great thing to the Victorian people because tea parties used to be the most remarkable and enjoyable events that a British person is commonly invited to. They were taken very seriously to the extent that it would seem rude for a person to reject such invitation, or even arrive late for it. Tea was often served during the late afternoon; it
was and still is a common tradition where British people prefer to gather, conversate, and socialize. It was also considered as a great opportunity for the middle class and the higher class to meet and interact with each other. The reference to a tea party in a whole chapter under the name of “A Mad Tea Party” indicates how tea was a matter of great importance during the Victorian age, and how time specialized for it was taken very seriously (Carpenter).

In chapter VIII, entitled “The Queen’s Croquet Ground” Alice walks by three cards, Two, Five and Seven, which function as gardeners in the Queen’s garden. She overhears them talking about how they had mistaken the red rose seeds for the white ones. “why you are painting those roses?” said Alice, and the card holding number Two replied: “. . . Miss, this here ought to have been a red rose-tree, and we put a white one in by mistake, and if the Queen was to find it out, we should all have our heads cut off. . .” (Carroll 114). The Queen and her whole royal entourage; the King of Hearts, the Knave of Hearts, the courtiers, the soldiers and the gardeners are but a pack of talking and walking cards. Every card of the pack is threatened to be beheaded, and their obvious scare of the Queen shows how far her insanity can go. While the cards were whispering to one another about how they are going to adjust the color of the flowers, the Queen comes out to the garden along with her escorts and notices the scene. Without making a single blink, the Queen shouts out her favorite sentence of all: “Off with their heads !” (Carroll 119). She did not even bother to learn about that situation, because for her, executing people is the ultimate solution to every problem. This incident might be Carroll’s manner of suggesting that Queen Victoria assumed full responsibility of the throne at a very young age “At the age of eighteen years old, my Uncle, William IV, died and I became Queen on June 20, 1837. As Queen I was free to do what I wanted, go where I pleased . . .” (qtd. in Fisher 2).
which is the thing that would make any ruler sound foolish, lazy, and incompetent.

After the scene of the guilty cards, the Queen pays attention to Alice, and she asks the Knave of Hearts about the girl’s name, however he replies with a bow and a dull smile. “Idiot!” the Queen shouts at him and decides to interact directly with the girl. “What’s your name, child?” and Alice politely replies “My name is Alice, so please your Majesty,” (Carroll 116). Alice is frightened by the scary attitude of the Queen, but soon she starts calming herself down by thinking to herself “. . . they ’re only a pack of cards, after all. I needn ’t be afraid of them!” (Carroll 116). The Queen takes advantage of the innocent afraid girl and asks her about the gardeners, with a great expectation for an answer; however Alice disappoints her with a rude answer “How should I know? . . . It ’s no business of mine” (Carroll 116). Alice keeps standing there surprised by her own courage while the Queen starts to turn all red and furious, she shouts out very loudly “Off with her head! Off—” everyone stand there in a spooky silence but the King of Hearts, he comes closer to the Queen and asks her in a polite manner and a very low voice “Consider, my dear: she is only a child!” (Carroll 118). Although the King and the Queen of every Kingdom are ought to have equal power of ruling if not the King is superior, in Carroll’s story, the Queen of Hearts is the supreme power and the only ruler of Wonderland. This incident implies on the situation of the Monarch during the Victorian era, when Queen Victoria used to be the upper hand of the kingdom and no other voice is above hers, “Victoria played the dominant role . . . Parliament refused to give him [Prince Albert] any official status in the running of the country. . . ” (Kyi 2) which makes the thought of characterizing Queen Victoria through the character of Queen of Hearts considerable, compatible and very believable. Even her husband Prince Albert could not impose any decisions on her, but rather he was her advisor in time of need.
Queen of Hearts tosses her head away and examines the white roses, and asks the

gardeners “ What have you been doing here ?” (Carroll 118) and number Two answers her

in a shaking voice and a low tone “May it please your Majesty . . . “we were trying—” but

without finishing his answer the Queen screams her favorite sentence of all again “ Off

with their heads !” (Carroll 119) and three soldiers engage to perform the execution. Alice

disagrees with the punishment of the gardeners and thinks it is completely unnecessary.

Instead of beheading the gardeners, she thinks that the problem can be solved if they just

painted the roses red and so she shouts “You shan’t be beheaded !”, grabs the cards and

hides them in a flower pot. The three soldiers wander all around looking for the gardeners

but they could not find them. The Queen yells “Are their heads off ?” (Carroll 119) the

soldiers are so confused and all they care for at this moment is how to satisfy the Queen, so

they reply “Their heads are gone, if it pleases your Majesty !”. The Queen goes on playing

Croquet as if nothing happens, however the oddest thing is that she invites Alice to play

with her, after only few minutes from ordering her execution.

With this incident, Carroll wanted to impose the idea that Queen Victoria does not

give the opportunity to people around her, to explain themselves or express their opinions.

When the first royal child Princess Victoria went ill, the responsible for the royal staff

Baroness Lehzen was the first to blame and to be dismissed “Lehzen [took] 6 months leave

for her health. The arrangement was to become a permanent one” (Kyi 3)

The character of Queen of Hearts does not even listen to what the cards have to say

for themselves; instead she orders the soldiers to execute them right after she notices that

the roses are not red as planned. Another idea conveyed by Carroll is that the verdicts

decided by the Queen are not taken very seriously and neither are the punishments. In

Carroll’s story, the Queen orders the soldiers to execute Alice for being rude, and after few

minutes she invites her to play Croquet with the royal procession. This can only refer to the
author’s attitude towards Queen Victoria’s reigning credibility. As he suggested that she was a severe ruler of a disturbed temper and an obvious impulsive personality, because she throws reckless, thoughtless orders and expects them to be fulfilled. For instance, when she was declared Queen of England and Ireland in June 20th, 1837, “She began exerting her will by exiling her mother . . .” (Queen Victoria), which was a shocking decision to the whole royal entourage.

The game goes on and the players are getting more anxious every minute, the cards run all at once in fear, and no one waits for his turn, every member of the game has his living hedgehogs thrown around with living flamingos. Alice is stunned; she has never seen a Croquet yard like this before, and every once in while the Queen shouts out in a voice as strong as thunder “Off with his head!” or “Off with her head!” (Carroll 122). There is no room for mistakes in playing Croquet with the Queen, or mistaking in anything at all.

The Cheshire Cat appears to Alice and keeps talking to her, when the King notices Alice as if she is talking to herself, he stops for a second and asks her “Who are you talking to?” (Carroll 125), Alice replies “It’s a friend of mine—a Cheshire Cat” (Carroll 125) the King stares at the cat and says “I don’t like the look of it at all . . . however, it may kiss my hand if it likes.” (Carroll 125) but the arrogant Cheshire Cat stares back at the King and says “I’d rather not,” the King turns red and angry at the cat for being rude and for looking at him, because in Wonderland no cat should look at a King. The latter calls the Queen as she passes by, and asks her “My dear! I wish you would have this cat removed!” (Carroll 125) Without even looking around or understanding what the matter is all about, the Queen replies with her favorite sentence “Off with his head!”. Carroll established the described scene in order to convey the idea that the King, despite his royal title, has no power above that of the Queen and that he has to ask her permission to have matters
accomplished, just as compatible as the previous incident when Prince Albert blamed the nursery staff for the sickness of his daughter “Albert blamed the nursery staff appointed by the Baroness” (Kyi 3) but could not accomplish anything about it without the Queen’s permission. Hence Carroll aimed at creating an analogical image to that of Prince Albert by making The King of Hearts unable to decide for himself to whether execute the Cheshire Cat or not, however he resorts to the Queen for solutions.

As Carroll’s story goes on, every creature in Wonderland continues to guide Alice, dictates orders or decides for her. The Queen decides that Alice must meet the Mock Turtle¹, and when Alice asks about this creature, all the Queen has to say about it is that “It’s the thing Mock Turtle Soup is made from” (Carroll 137). As they were walking and talking about it, the Queen glimpses the Gryphon² sleeping, she shouts out loudly “Up, lazy thing! . . . and take this young lady to see the Mock Turtle, and to hear his history. I must go back and see after some executions I have ordered” (Carroll 138) Not having even a little bit of fear from the Queen, the scary creature sits up very slowly and rubs its eyes saying “What fun! . . . It’s all her fancy, that: they never execute nobody, you know. Come on!” (Carroll 139). This incident shows that the executions ordered by the Queen of Hearts are never really performed, and if projected on Queen Victoria, this scene shakes the credibility of her wisdom and competence “It was extremely hard to keep up my royal duties” (qtd. in Fisher 3).

In chapters XI and XII, a trial is organized to convict the guilty for stealing the Queen’s tarts, the King tries to convict the first creature he sets eyes on first, and get over with this trial, however the white rabbit reminds the jury and that they must examine all the witnesses first. Alice is called to be questioned, and she was accused of stealing the Queen’s tarts. When the king tries to examine the evidences the Queen turns purple and, as usually, shouts out “Sentence first—verdict afterwards.” (Carroll 187). To create the
foolish character of a mad queen who rushes to imply sentence first then discusses the verdict later is Carroll’s own manner to refer to the fact that Queen Victoria was of an unstable temper and a remarkable impulsive character. In her article “Victoria, Queen of the Tantrum”, Emma Cowing states that “Victoria had a fierce temper, and because of a misguided belief that she could have inherited the madness of George III, the royal doctor advised her husband not to argue back. Instead, he would lock himself away after she had shouted at him” (Cowing 2).

The symbolism used by Carroll in his story *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* proves that the ruling Queen Victoria is meant to be characterized in the role of Queen of Hearts Queen of Wonderland. Many recognizable things are common between the two, first, the physical aspects; Carroll depicted the Queen as a card along with the pack of cards that are remarkably smaller than the other creatures of Wonderland, whereas Queen Victoria was known to be only of five feet tall, i.e. 1.50 m. (Barrow). Second, Carroll created a character in the story called the Mock Turtle which is the thing mock turtle soup is made from, as the Queen of Hearts describes it, and it has been stated by Christopher Hibbert in the BBC Magazine: Queen Victoria and her Prime Ministers that the turtle soup is one of the things Queen Victoria hates the most in the entire world in addition to insects. Third, Carroll tried to include the idea that babies are neglected and hated in the story, both by the Duchess and the Queen. There is a scene where the Duchess tosses her baby carelessly and the baby crawls away into the woods, and the Queen does not recognize her own children when they are a distance away. Carroll meant for projecting this image as a hint to be reflected on Queen Victoria because she lacked the appropriate enthusiasm for kids, “She hated being pregnant, she had prenatal and postnatal depression. She didn’t breastfeed her children, who she thought were horrible dribbling little things. She was not the least bit maternal. Queen Victoria liked sex, but she didn’t like the result” (Cowing 3).
In some versions based on Carroll’s story, the Queen of Hearts murders the King of Hearts because she is too afraid of his possible betrayal and then betrayed him with the Knave of Hearts. In her journals, Queen Victoria mentions that her husband Prince Albert died suffering from typhoid fever (Fisher 3), and that she mourned his death for the rest of her life. However, in *History extra Magazine*, Ellie Cawthorne states that Queen Victoria engaged in several intimate relationships after her husband’s death, especially with her private servant John Brown which is a sign of unfaithfulness and fake grief. One might assume that if she was not in love with her husband she would not carry nine of his children, however Chris Hastings described her as a “‘needy' and 'domineering' mother who was so sexually obsessed with her husband Prince Albert that she grew to resent their nine children.” (Hastings 1). This explains the enormous number of children she bared while she was married to Prince Albert.

Queen Victoria, Queen of England and Ireland, sat on the throne at the age of eighteen years old. As a young Queen she was expected to be an impulsive foolish ruler, but instead she was notably proud of her position and had no intentions to share it or give up on it. “Victoria’s feelings about her husband’s ambitions were conflicted. On the one hand she adored Albert, recognizing him as her intellectual superior, and encouraging his ideas. But she also had an incredibly strong sense of her own hereditary right. She wanted to share power with Albert, but did not want to give it up completely” (Hodgman 1). Queen Victoria did appreciate Prince Albert’s assistance and Political experience while ruling; however she preferred to keep her power above his. No matter how knowledgeable and experienced he was, compared to the Prime Ministers, the Queen was the one to make the final decisions. In her article “The Marriage”, Anna Kyi argues that “Queen Victoria was reluctant to share any of her powers as Sovereign and she refused to take him into her confidence regarding political matters” (Kyi 3). Carroll targeted her in his story, where he
depicted her as superior to the King of Hearts. Although he carries the label of the King, he is not able to make decisions by his own, but he asks the Queen of Hearts for her opinion, guidance and permission to accomplish matters.

Queen Victoria; lead a very unhappy life when she was of a young age, as described in *History extra Magazine* by Ellie Cawthrone: “As a child, Victoria’s life had been controlled by her overbearing power-hungry mother.” Obviously the Queen’s mother used to be extremely overprotective of her child, and she was not to blame. As a little princess, Victoria was a potential heir to the British throne and she was inevitably in a constant danger, for she, later on, had survived seven assassination attempts (Barrow). The Queen did not have the privilege to enjoy time alone; instead she was forced to follow a system called “Kensington system” established by John Conroy that forced the Queen to share a room with her mother and to never spend a moment without company (Queen Victoria). From that we can deduce that the Queen took advantage of the Queenship to free herself from her mother’s chains, she moved to the Buckingham Palace, which is the official royal residence in London, and “She began exerting her will by exiling her mother to live in distant rooms. She also banned John Conroy the courtier who made her childhood miserable” (BBC Magazine).

Victoria started taking charge of her own life as well as the whole Kingdom all at once. It is completely natural for any person to feel liberated and be impulsive if given such tremendous power at such young age. Carroll took it upon himself to portray this image through his insane character, when she reflects the Queen’s impulsiveness towards leading a life and a whole nation. The Queen of Hearts symbolizes the upper hand and the bigger power of the Wonderland, as she clarifies the inferior position of the King despite the amount of power that is granted to him.
As a result, Carroll, indeed, used his imaginative work of literature as a vessel that contains plenty of sarcastic mockery and criticism towards Queen of Great Britain. In a work that seemed to be mere children’s literature, he succeeded to use the Alice story as a means to implicitly convey his attitudes and opinions towards her which contributed greatly in exposing the historical facts that were held from the public for as long as she lived and after that.

Section Two: *Through the Looking Glass*
Through the Looking Glass is the second part of the Alice story as well as a second opportunity for Lewis Carroll to implicitly mock Queen Victoria and expose the fake portraits she drew and advocated to the people during the years she sat on the British throne. After the first sequel of Alice was written and published in 1865, Carroll spent a considerable time teaching Alice Liddell and her sisters the Chess Game. What it is known about this game is that it has strict rules and obvious logic that must be respected. The Liddell girls experienced hard times trying to learn how to play Chess, so Carroll created a little story for each step of Chess for the purpose of rending the techniques of the game easier to acquire. These little stories are the fragments that, when collected together, formed a continuation of the Alice story. It was entitled “Looking-Glass House” at first but later on Henry Liddell suggested the name “Through the Looking Glass” for it. Right before Carroll sent the manuscript to the Macmillan publishing house, another subtitle was added to the main title “and what Alice found there”. Unlike the first story, the second part is all about how the world is reversed on the other side of the looking glass i.e. the mirror. Brady suggested in his article “The Influence of Lewis Carroll’s Life on His Work 1998” that the creation of a reversed world, where every aspect functions backwards, returns back to Carroll’s left-handedness and the asymmetry he suffered from at the level of his physic. However, Carroll’s imagination this time concentrated on the magic of the mirror, and on how reversed a world would be on the other side of that mirror. He created new creatures for this world, that are even crazier, but he also kept the old ones valid in the story.

Many new characters make first appearances in this sequel like Tweedledum and Tweedledee, who are fat twin boys in school uniforms; they try to help Alice however they disagree on almost every turn. Humpty Dumpty who is very brusque towards Alice, tries to be her voice of reason. There exists a chicken-sized Gnat who travels with Alice in the train and the Fawn who is her campaign in the woods. The characters of the first sequel are
involved like the March Hare, the White Rabbit and the Mad Hatter. However, my main focus remains on the character of the Red Queen. The higher power of Wonderland, who is with projection to the reality of the author, is an obvious characterization of Queen Victoria. In this chapter, with dependence on the New Historicist approach, aspects that define the character of the Red Queen will be extracted and their reflection on the historical reality that is associated with Queen Victoria will be identified.

Starting with the first chapter, entitled “Looking-Glass House”, Alice sits on an armchair and talks to her kitten “Kitty” about how life might be on the other side of the looking glass. She starts wondering about whether the Queen and the other creatures exist in the reversed world or not. Alice wants to reduce the personality of the Red Queen into her little pet so she asks her kitten to imitate the Queen. “Let’s pretend that you’re the Red Queen, Kitty! Do you know, I think if you sat up and folded your arms, you’d look exactly like her.” (Carroll 3). From the words of Alice, certain acts and behaviors like sitting up straight and folding arms together can be deduced as signs of the same property of behavior that Queen Victoria was always known with. Carroll keeps on associating the character of the Red Queen with the proper behavior, and this is one of the major aspects that confirm his characterization of Queen Victoria in his works through the character of the Red Queen, because Queen Victoria used to be referred to as the most esteemed British monarch and the icon of the Victorian propriety concerning the British etiquette (An Icon Of The British Empire: Queen Victoria).

During the first chapter of the story, Alice has the courage to jump into the mirror and accede the world of Wonderland again. The first character she meets on the other side is the Red Queen, who is never pleasant with Alice’s behavior; she keeps insulting her and correcting her behavior “Speak when you're spoken to!” (Carroll 49). The Queen has an infinite respect towards propriety and is in a constant need to control any situation that
occurs in her entourage. The described behavior depicted by Carroll goes back to the real traits of Queen Victoria’s character as she is described by Chris Hastings in his article “Why tyrant Queen Victoria resented her nine ‘ugly, frog-like’ children” published in 2012 as “needy” “insane” and “domestic tyrant” (Hastings 2).

As the story goes on, Alice glimpses a Chess yard inside the fire place that is greatly shaped; she notices that the elements of the game are placed on the board. Unlike the first sequel of story where the Queen and her royal procession are a pack of cards, in the second sequel they are presented in the form of Chess elements. Alice asks the Red Queen for permission to join the game and the Queen hardly agrees, and she insists that Alice can play under only one condition, that she starts playing as a Pawn and keeps playing as one until the end of the game. However Alice’s plan behind playing is that by the end of the game she tends to be the next Queen of the Wonderland. “I done’t [do not] want to be anybody’s prisoner I want to be the queen” (Carroll 42).

Moving on, the Queen decides to move from one square to another, however she orders the King to blow her off to her desired square “‘Blew--me--up,’ panted the Queen…” (Carroll 4) and the King instantly obeys her orders. In order to blow her off, the King makes weird faces trying to collect enough air, “his eyes and his mouth went on getting larger and larger, and rounder and rounder. . .” (Carroll 5). Meanwhile the Queen dislikes the faces he makes and does not hold back from criticizing him, “‘Oh! PLEASE don’t make such faces, my dear!’” shouts the Queen, ignoring that the King is all covered with the ashes of the chimney while he is trying to dust her off and send her to the direction she wants to reach. Describing this scene, Carroll used his creativity to convey a certain image about Queen Victoria and Prince Albert. Where he displays their ruling positions and sarcastically depicts the Prince’s inferiority to the Queen. In her article, “The Marriage of Queen Victoria and Prince Albert”, Anna Kyi maintains that Prince Albert faced several
difficulties trying to find the appropriate gap to fill, and the position he hoped to occupy in the royal family. In her article she stated that every position surrounding the Queen was already occupied. For instance, Prime Minister Melbourne was the Queen’s trusted political advisor, who had provided her with the suitable guidance she required. At the level of her domestic life, the Queen had her private governess Baroness Lehzen, who had covered the home’s managements including the Queen’s expanses and finances, leaving no space for Prince Albert to take control over his family and enjoy the privilege of being the leader, at least of his household and not the whole nation. In a letter he wrote to his relative Prince William Löwenstein in Germany, he explained that “In my home life I am very happy and contented; but the difficulty in filling my place with the proper dignity is that I am only the husband, and not the master of the house” (qtd. in The Marriage). Despite this fact, many scholars like Hibbert and Hastings believe that Prince Albert was of great assistance for the Queen especially during the times she was pregnant.

For that matter, Carroll insisted to paint an image where the King of Hearts does not mind the difficulty of the tasks assigned to him by the Queen, however he is pleased with the advantage of being by her side, assisting her in her time of need, despite his awareness of his inferiority comparing to her powerful position. During their marriage that lasted for 21 years, Queen Victoria found herself obliged to abdicate ruling to her husband in the nine times she was pregnant. Albert was more than pleased to take charge over the nation. In the BBC historical magazine, an essay published in 2014 under the title “Prince Albert (1819-1861)” mentions that in 1861, replacing the Queen, Prince Albert intervened in a diplomatic dispute between Britain and the United States of America and his influence helped greatly in averting war between the two countries. For that, Queen Victoria felt quite comfortable trusting her husband.
Carroll made sure to reflect the same peculiar view about children in both sequels; “‘Throw them away.’ ‘Tie them in knots and send them into the wilderness.’ ‘Roast them well and serve them as appetizers for the main meal.’ . . . it [baby] cries and then it turns into a pig and is left in the woods” (qtd. in Brady). Another example from the second sequel “‘Are you a child or a teetotum?’ . . . 'You'll make me giddy soon, if you go on turning round like that’”(Carroll 27). Some scholars like Brady believe that Carroll’s negative attitude towards children goes back to his own childhood experience. As he suffered from neglect due to the birth of four other siblings before he even turned six years old which led to a loss of attention for himself. Hence this phenomenon is obviously reflected in his writings. Meanwhile, I believe that Carroll tended to reflect some of Queen Victoria’s attitude towards children too, for as long as she lived she never stated that she had passion or empathy towards her children. Considering the number of births she gave, many historians like Simon Perry and Daisy Goodwin suspects the fact of her being fond of children because “Theirs was a “passionate” relationship. Having “nine children is a testament to that” (qtd. in THE ROYALS). However it is not the case, Queen Victoria was never pleased with her pregnancies, as it is mentioned in Anna Kyi’s article “The Marriage of Queen Victoria and Prince Albert”:

I’m really unhappy about it and its spoiling my happiness; I’ve always hated the idea and prayed to God night and day to be left free for at least 6 months, but my prayers have not been answered and I am really most unhappy. I cannot understand how anyone can wish for such a thing, especially at the beginning of a marriage.

(qtd.in The Marriage)

The Queen clarified her desire for liberty in several occasions, and having that unusual number of children was definitely a matter that she did not enjoy. Emma Cowing points out that:
“... the image Queen Victoria liked to portray to her subjects was one of serene domestic bliss, behind closed doors it was a very different story. . . What is less well known is that far from being the doting Mama, Queen Victoria found her babies repulsive, scolded and beat them as they grew older and often resented their presence. . . Forget the domestic goddess: Queen Victoria was a domestic tyrant.”.

Queen Victoria did cared so much about her public image and the thoughts her people may hold about her. Therefore, she tried her best to transmit a loving, caring picture of her with her own husband and children. She aimed at showing the aristocracy and the other lower social classes the perfect family portrait and giving them the simplest idea about the royal life they can relate to, as a way of telling her whole nation that they are ordinary people. Professor Kathryn Hughes, who is a Victorian historian, stated in an interview conducted by BBC History that “Victoria and Albert had terrible rows . . . The royal household was not this chocolate box image of gorgeousness where everybody loved each other.” Hughes also added “It was a place of simmering tensions, huge resentments and extraordinary conniving” (qtd. in Cowing). It is also mentioned in Cowing’s article that the reason for the chaos she put everyone through back in the years she ruled was connected to her own troubled childhood and the frustration caused by the control of her dominating mother. Hence, Carroll often referred to this matter in his writings, especially in *Through the Looking Glass*, “Were you happy in prison, dear child?” (Carroll 39).

In his second sequel, Carroll continued to portray the Queen as a dominant angry ruler who is never satisfied with any given circumstances. She often shouts out “Speak when you're spoken to!” and throws angry comments like “Nonsense!” and “Ridiculous!” (Carroll 50). The character of the Red Queen is a collection of almost every negative aspect; she is dominant, arrogant, loud and impulsive . . . etc and these criteria were not
selected at random. However Carroll was intendedly referring to Queen Victoria because she was known for losing her temper quickly and going into rage crisis. Ridley and Cowing are among many critics who believe that whenever she had a change of heart she became fierce and outrageous. No one dared to argue with her, be around her or even look at her. Jane Ridley states that “There were terrible rows and Albert was terrified by Victoria’s temper tantrums. . . While she stormed around the palace, he was reduced to putting notes under her door” (Ridley 3). In her “Victoria, Queen of the tantrum”, Cowing also states that “. . . she could have inherited the madness of George III, the royal doctor advised her husband not to argue back. Instead, he would lock himself away after she had shouted at him. . .” (Cowing 2).

Queen of England and Ireland lived differently from the picture she painted for herself and her family, especially her relationship with her husband, which was gloriously described. However, it was only a formal idea to satisfy the British people’s curiosity and meet with their expectations. In his writings, Carroll made it very obvious that he tackled these images and criticized them in an attempt to implicitly mock the Queen and her entourage. In *Through the Looking Glass*, the Red King is always belittled comparing to the Red Queen. There were times when Alice hears strange voices, she asks Tweedledee about if there were any lions and tigers around, and he replies that “It's only the Red King snoring” (Carroll 20). Alice bases her assumptions on a higher expectation, thinking that such loud voice might come from a savage animal and Carroll’s intended the usage of the term “only” was for the sake of underestimating the Red King. This served as an indicator that makes Carroll’s story extremely compatible with the historical fact that existed in the royal palace of Windsor. In her book *Queen Victoria: A Biographical Companion*, Helen Rappaport argues that “He [Prince Albert] was greatly preoccupied that his status as husband and future paterfamilias should not be undermined by his technically inferior to
the queen, as her consort rather than King.” (338). The inferiority of the Red King, depicted in the story, has no eligible historical background that is more reliable than the inferiority of Prince Albert considering the Queen’s status.

Moreover, the Queen of Great Britain declared that her relationship with her husband was tremendous; they were the most perfect couple for all Victorians to idealize. In her article “Queen Victoria” Ridley argues that “The marriage between the two first cousins - the young Queen and the clever, handsome German prince - was a love match . . . Paintings and photographs projected an image of a virtuous, devoted young couple surrounded by obedient, fair-haired children.” (Ridley). However the relationship between the two was not as glorious as described in the Queen’s journals “I did fall in love and with the very man my uncle wished me to marry, Prince Albert of Saxe-Coburg-Saafeld . . .” (qtd. in Fisher 2). The Queen was severely controlled as a child, as she had always complained “As a child I was very guarded, maybe too guarded . . . My mother and I shared a room until I became Queen.” (qtd. in Fisher 2). Therefore, as a means to escape her mother’s obsession with her, she took marriage for a refugee to her own self. She maintained that “As Queen I was free to do what I wanted, go where I pleased . . . Albert would never wish to control me. We were married February 10, 1840. . .” (qtd. in Fisher 3). The Queen adored her husband, because he dared not to oppose her very often, instead he was her most trusted advisor and dear friend. Prince Albert offered his permanent help, even though the Queen did not require it at all times, she only needed him to temporarily occupy her position through the times she was pregnant or in labor as she clarified “With the birth of our first child, Victoria, I gave him full power as regent in 1840.” (qtd. in Fisher 3). In addition to that, some critics like Daisy Goodwin believe that Queen Victoria did not really love her husband as a person however she enjoyed the company of an opposite-gender partner as she added “We think of Victoria as a boot-faced old bag, but she
was a young woman who loved dancing, sex and all those things.” (Goodwin 3). The Queen’s enormous reliance on her husband contributed greatly in building an emotional attachment towards him, for their marriage was already planned before, as she declared in her journals “This was an event arranged by my mother and, her brother, Uncle Leopold when I was born.” (qtd. in Fisher 2). For this matter, Carroll created a plot where there exists the character of the Red King however it is entirely not as important as the character of the Red Queen.

After the traumatic death of Prince Albert, Great Britain experienced a long period of sadness and it was centered on the Queen. In her article “The Marriage”, Anna Kyi argues that Queen Victoria entered in a long-lasting grief for the death of her husband and her withdrawal from public appearances was an obvious evidence to that. According to her, Victorians believed that their Queen went ill or insane after that royal tragedy, this gave a glimpse of the extent to which she was dependent on Prince Albert. Despite the previous claims, other critics insist that her glorious love for her husband is but a legend, with which she convinced the public into believing the perfect life royalties were having and relating to it. In her article “Victoria”, Jane Ridley suggested that the Queen’s situation after Prince Albert’s death had two sides; the internal side that the Queen really lived, and the external side that she showed to the public. Ridley added “To her people, the tiny ‘widow of Windsor’ seemed a pathetic, grief-stricken figure. The truth was very different.” (Ridley). Only very rare indicators expose Queen Victoria’s attitude towards the royal death were detected; for she advocated “. . . I had no time to prepare for such an event.” (qtd. in Fisher 3). Therefore, only very few people could actually detect the real situation that existed inside the walls of the palace of Windsor.

Throughout the years, Queen Victoria required the assistance that used to be provided by Prince Albert. For that purpose, Queen Victoria declared: “. . . Princess Alice,
suggested in 1864 that I have a servant named John Brown come to the castle to lead my pony because he could always make me smile. Since then he became ‘indefatigable in his attendance and care’ of me.” (qtd. in Fisher 3). From that day on, Sir John Brown never left the Queen’s side, he was her private advisor concerning political matters and her closest friend concerning domestic life. The Queen and her servant became so much close to the extent that people from inside and outside Windsor suspected the possibility of them being involved in a discrete romantic relationship. This was not an impossible matter for the Queen always advocated the way she feels about him and how much she appreciated his assistance “. . . I simply thought he [John Brown] deserved respect. He was fun, different from any man in my court. He allowed me accept the death of my husband and to move on enough to be tolerably happy again which allowed me to take care of my kingdom.” (qtd. in Fisher 4). The relationship between the two kept growing closer with time, and the Victorians were not very happy about it, they disliked the idea of having Prince Albert replaced. However the Queen seemed not to pay much of attention to the matter, for as long as Brown’s company kept her happy as a woman, and strong as a ruler. When confronted about it, the Queen never confirmed the matter nor denied it, she simply felt the need to say: “. . . if I did have a sexual relationship with John Brown it really does not matter for I am the Sovereign of my kingdom and male rulers have done the same for centuries.” (qtd. in Fisher 4). The public were not convinced that their Queen is still faithful to her deceased husband, and they had their reasons, for the Queen was very expressive concerning her feelings for John Brown. For instance when he died in March 29th, 1883 she confirmed: “. . . I felt as if I had lost Albert again.” (qtd. in Fisher 4). One does not relate one’s death to another’s unless if they were of the same value, and since the Queen went through a similar grief for John Brown, it is safe to believe that he was to her everything Prince Albert was. Moreover, the public was very suspicious of the Queen,
especially after witnessing the ceremonies of John Brown’s funeral that the Queen herself admitted to organizing “I mirrored John’s funeral arrangements with that of Albert’s. . . I included John’s name in the prayer of Remembrance at the service. I also had a plaque erected in the hallowed Royal Mausoleum at Frogmore, I had built for Albert and I.” (qtd. in Fisher 4). Considering the way she treated him, when he was alive, and the way she released him, John Brown meant a lot more to Queen Victoria than just a dear friend and a political advisor.

Furthermore, Victorians were shocked by the unfortunate turn of events of January 22nd, 1901 when the Queen passed away. However, the only thing that could upset the public more than the death of their Queen herself was her after-death demands, in her funeral “a lock of Brown’s hair, his photograph, a pocket handkerchief and several letters exchanged between them were put in to her coffin. Victoria also had Sir James Reid, the doctor she had just before her death, put John Brown’s mother’s wedding ring in the coffin with her. She quite often wore the ring.” (qtd. in Fisher 6). The Queen had the potential to keep her husband’s belongings and demand that they be buried in the same coffin as her body, however she did so with the belongings of her beloved John Brown instead. It is known and very common in the classic ancient English culture that a lock of hair is a symbol for romantic love. Hence, the Victorians were in great confusion wondering why would their Queen have the belongings of a servant buried with her and not her husband’s.

All of the previous historical facts prove that Prince Albert was not of a considerable value, or at least he was not as precious to the Queen as she claims he was, just as Carroll depicted the Red King. His existence is completely optional, his importance is merely as valuable as that of the simplest characters as he also accomplishes no achievements during the story.
Furthermore, ever since Queen Victoria sat on the British throne, she removed and replaced each and every member that she did not believe was effective in her court from the Prime Ministers to the public servants. Growing up, the Queen noticed that there were people who have been taking advantage of her and her mother to become as closer to power as possible for she declared “Sir John Convoy tried to use his relationship with my mother to rise in political power with me for that reason I did not like him” (qtd. in Fisher 2). The Queen also added “I banished Sir John Convoy from my court because he tried to get me to sign a document that would give him my power of Sovereign” (qtd. in Fisher 2).

According to Kyi, in 1841, the Queen felt the need to release Lord Melbourne from the position he occupied as a Prime Minister, and starting a new parliament with a Conservative majority. As well as she had Baroness Lehzen punished and removed due to an accident that occurred in 1842. When Princess Victoria, the first royal child, became sick the Queen blamed the nursery staff that was appointed by Baroness. Some of the decisions could have been taken by Prince Albert or at least recommended by him, however the Queen took charge of everything around her. This is fairly depicted in Carroll’s second sequel of Alice, “I must do it myself, said the Red Queen. . .” (Carroll 53) because every event of the story is created as a step of a chess game, where pawns, rooks, knights and bishops are moved according to the Queen’s will.

At the end of the story, Alice finds a friend, during her journey on the chess board, who promises to help her reach the final square and become the new Queen of Wonderland. As they carry on, Alice discovers a castle with a huge gate marked “Queen Alice”, she enters the castle and sits on bank with a crown on her head. The Red Queen is absolutely not happy with such thing “What do you mean by Queen”? What right have you to call yourself so? You can't be a Queen. . .” (Carroll 49). After that, Alice meets the
annoying twins Tweedledum and Tweedleddee who explain to her that at this point the Red King is sleeping nearby and that she exists only as a fragment of his own dream. Alice becomes confused from the whole matter “. . . let's consider who it was that dreamed it all . . . it MUST have been either me or the Red King. He was part of my dream, of course--but then I was part of his dream, too!” (Carroll 58). Of all the characters in the story, Carroll chose the Red King and made the whole story as a part of his own dream. The fact that Alice’s purpose in this sequel is to become the new Queen of Wonderland, and at the end it turns out that this is the Red King’s dream, means that the latter is the one who seeks to cease the power of the Red Queen and replace her. According to Kyi that was the case concerning Prince Albert

“While Albert agreed to be the Queen’s husband, he was given the title of His Royal Highness. Parliament refused to give him any official status in the running of the country or the British Empire. Much to Albert’s frustration, Queen Victoria was reluctant to share any of her powers as Sovereign and she refused to take him into her confidence regarding political matters.”. (2)

Carroll planned for the story to reflect the notion that Prince Albert was always inferior to Queen Victoria. As he gave the impression that the Prince hoped for a higher estimated position than the one he was granted, by making Alice’s purchase to become the new Queen, the King’s dream that he hopes to achieve.

Successfully, Carroll used the second sequel to expose the reality of the royal history of Queen Victoria that occurred during the years from 1837 to 1901. His literature is nothing like the literature of the time it was produced. When realism was the major dress to all artistic works, Carroll took it upon himself to create a work that was categorized as children’s literature, however it is indeed his only link to reality. An author is never isolated from his environment, and the literature one creates can never avoid reflecting the
reality of the arena and the era during which it was created. Carroll’s works are clever enough to poke, mock and expose implicit historical facts in a comic fashion that was meant for a young audience. They did not drag political attention that could have involved Carroll in any kind of complications, considering that it is highly dangerous and risky to criticize the royalties much less to mock their personalities and life styles.
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Conclusion
Carroll’s sequels of Alice are considered to be as a fabulous story that is one of its kind. In a time where Realism dominated the Victorian ideologies, writings, and life styles, Carroll created the most wonderful and surrealistic story of its time. As soon as his sequels were published, people expected a work that can be only categorized within the works of children’s literature. A story that the only audience it is addressed to is children. However, the Alice story carries an endless amount of deep, implicit meanings that have been analyzed and interpreted in every possible manner.

After examining the two parts of the story and digging deep into Queen Victoria’s life, many ambiguities came into surface. First, Carroll attempted to draw the image of the Queen of Hearts (First sequel)/ the Red Queen (second sequel) as a short, impulsive ruler who goes into seve anger tantrums. Meanwhile, Carroll’s true Queen during the Victorian age was indeed short, impulsive and suffered from anger tantrums. In addition to that, Carroll aimed at giving a negative idea about children, when Queen Victoria really hated children and especially hers. Considering the fact that the time Carroll existed and wrote this magnificent story was the same time Great Britain was ruled by a female ruler, as a result, the insane Queen in Carroll’s story is a mere characterization of the real Queen Victoria. Second, even though there exist a king and a queen in the story, Carroll meant for the queen to be way stronger and more controlling and more powerful than the king. All along the journey, it is the Queen of Hearts/ Red Queen that makes the decisions and call for the orders to be executed at once. The king is just a complementary character that sits beside the queen and agrees to everything she decides, helpless, powerless and thoughtless. Landing these traits on the floors of reality makes perfect sense, since there was no king back at the Victorian age, and Prince Albert did exist however only as assistance to Queen Victoria and not as an equal or superior power. As a result, Prince Albert cannot be thought of as any other character but the character of the King of Hearts/ Red King because of the
compatibility of their positions in their kingdoms and their inferiority compared to the female rulers. Third, in a time where the British literature was but an instrument to reflect the reality of society and to project the circumstances that Victorians experienced, Carroll created what appears to be a tremendously deconstructive work in terms of plot and style, that was used as a shield to cover for the true deep meanings that are implicitly planted between the lines of the story. While the story of Alice was taken but for a children’s bedtime story, Carroll was, like any other Victorian Realist novelist, reflecting the reality he lived and experienced. Even though his way is unique, and the mystery of Alice is the best proof of that, Carroll used his own imaginative, innovative way to implicitly release his opinions about Queen Victoria.

To conclude, it is absolutely safe to say that Carroll was clever enough to use an imaginative story to convey a message concerning his queen. Despite the perfect family portrait that Queen Victoria built about her own character, her marital and family life and advocated it to her people, Carroll is an excellent proof that not all people were deceived by the image their Queen showed.
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Abstract

This research investigates the possible criticism and mockery that Lewis Carroll implemented for Queen Victoria, Queen of Great Britain and Ireland (1837-1901), in his works *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* and *Through the Looking Glass*. With reliance on the New Historicist theory, this dissertation examines the symbolism used by the author and his creation to the fictional character of the Queen of Wonderland. The purpose that leads to the conduction of this research is to discover Carroll’s intentions behind the creation of such sarcastic character, and figure out the hidden meanings he tended to convey about Queen Victoria through a story that is considered as mere children’s literature. Furthermore, several assets of the personality of Queen Victoria’s fictional analogue in the story are explored, analyzed, and compared to the former’s historical real assets, and a considerable resemblance between the two is exposed. Despite the fact that Carroll’s intended criticism of Queen Victoria is implicitly created in a form of a fictional character, that occupies the same royal title as Queen Victoria did, in a surrealistic imaginative literary work, it cannot be denied especially with regard to its compatibility with the historical facts concerning the Queen and its credibility comparing to them. The importance of this research lays in the discovery that Carroll’s work is not a mere collection of children’s stories, however it is a rebellious literary work through which the British empress is indirectly criticized and mocked. Although Carroll’s literary works are categorized as stories for kids, they should not be underestimated for the deep meanings they carry.
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