

EVELYN WAUGH STUDIES

Vol. 47, No. 3

Winter 2016

CONTENTS

[Guy's Deleted Nippers, Part I:](#)

[The Unending Story of the Ending of *Unconditional Surrender*](#)

2

Jeffrey A. Manley

NEWS

Guy's Deleted Nippers—Part I: The Unending Story of the Ending of *Unconditional Surrender*

Jeffrey A. Manley

Introduction

Evelyn Waugh had a habit of changing his texts, even after publication. Few of his works of fiction as originally published escaped subsequent alteration at some point. Sometimes these changes were merely corrections or small edits in wording with no impact on the meaning. In others, there were substantive modifications, even years after publication, as in the case of *Brideshead Revisited* which was revised several times after its first appearance in 1944 in a limited edition. What motivated these changes varied from case to case. Sometimes it was perfectionism on the part of Waugh the draftsman, and in others revisions may have occurred to Waugh as he reread the text, or thought matters over, or may have been suggested to him by friends or readers.

In the case of *Unconditional Surrender*, the final volume of Waugh's war trilogy, it was a combination of all of the above and then some. The ink was scarcely dry on the first printing before Waugh began tinkering, in the first instance in response to comments from some fellow novelists who had received advance copies. These led him to change the ending, but he also made several other smaller edits throughout the book, some substantive, some stylistic. He later made further alterations in response to reader suggestions.

The problem in this case was exacerbated by several factors not present in earlier revisions. To begin with, the publishers in both the UK and US were inconsistent in their acceptance of Waugh's changes and both failed to note the first set of changes in the copyright descriptions of second printings, even though these implicated, *inter alia*, the ending of the book. Perhaps this explains why the original paperback publishers failed to include the changes, and Penguin never did. Then, Waugh himself undertook a substantial revision of all three volumes to produce a recension issued as a single volume entitled *Sword of Honour*. It included some but not all of his previous revisions, in addition to which he made others. He intended this volume to be his "final version" of the books. It was published shortly before his death, but then, contrary to Waugh's apparent expectations, the recension went out of print as the individual volumes continued to be republished. Readers and publishers preferred the individual volumes, which were themselves inconsistent in their treatment of Waugh's edits.

Shortly before Waugh's death, he had intervened personally through his agents in connection with two translators and with a BBC TV adaptation to assure that the most current edited version was used. After his death, several scholars noticed the variations in the war trilogy and recension and described them in scholarly periodicals or bibliographies. But there seems to have been no one in a position of control over subsequent publication who was made

aware of these academic studies. Nor, it seems, did Waugh leave any detailed instructions to his literary estate or agents regarding what form the future publication of the war trilogy should take—individual volumes or recension.

The confusion caused by the variations in the war trilogy is perhaps unique in Waugh's *oeuvre*. The purpose of this paper is to attempt to explain how the problem developed over the last years of Waugh's life and then to trace the legacy of confusion that spread and multiplied among publishers, readers and commentators to the present day. Had Waugh lived a few more years, there can be little doubt that he would have assured that matters were systematically brought under control. He was very much a hands-on manager of his works and would surely have continued to intervene with the publishers until some form of uniformity had been achieved. But his unexpected death at an early age, while he was still in control of decisions regarding the publication of his works, left a lingering problem that continues to this day. Nonetheless, an opportunity presents itself to resolve the inconsistencies among the various editions of *Unconditional Surrender* (and indeed between those editions and *Sword of Honour*), so that future scholars (and interested readers) will be fully aware of the variations, as well as the final version Waugh had preferred.

1. The Deletion

At the conclusion of *Unconditional Surrender* (hereafter "US"), Waugh added an Epilogue bringing the story up to the time when the first volume was written. This was 1951, the year of the *Festival of Britain*. The update includes the news of Guy's marriage after the war to Domenica Plessington. That marriage is revealed in a discussion between Guy and his brother-in-law Arthur Box-Bender at Bellamy's Club. As Guy is about to leave for another engagement, Box-Bender asks, "Domenica all right, *and the children?*" (310) to which Guy answers, "Yes" (310). Guy then moves on. Elderberry,¹ an acquaintance of Box-Bender who had overheard the conversation, recalls having learned about Guy's remarriage after the death of his wife Virginia in a wartime bombing, and asks for more details. Box-Bender responds:

The first sensible thing he's ever done. Domenica Plessington, Eloise's girl. Eloise looked after the baby [Trimmer's bastard son] while Guy was abroad. Domenica got very fond of it. Marriage was the obvious thing. I think Eloise deserves some credit in arranging it. *Now they've two boys of their own. When Domenica isn't having babies she manages the home farm at Broome. They've settled in the agent's house. They aren't at all badly off.* (321; emphasis added)

¹ This friend of Box-Bender, who lurks around Bellamy's, was introduced in *Officers and Gentlemen* but his name was there spelled Elderbury.

Evelyn Waugh Studies 4

The book was published in October 1961. Nancy Mitford wrote Waugh two letters about the book that same month, liking it so much she couldn't wait until she had finished it to comment. On 22 October, having by then reached the end, she wrote, "I'm so glad about the happy ending. I expect they'll like Trimmer's kid far better than their own." Waugh replied tersely, "Only Box-Bender thought the ending happy" (*NMEW*, 440). Waugh also received a letter from Anthony Powell dated 20 October 1961 in which Powell said that he

was aggrieved that Crouchback achieved comparative happiness at the end. I liked him pursuing his *via dolorosa* to the grave. Of course, Trimmer's son will no doubt grow up and cause trouble. Is there any hope of a future book about him? (*Evelyn Waugh Papers*, British Library, Manuscripts, Add. 81068)

That two of his friends, both novelists, had misinterpreted his intentions in giving Guy offspring with Domenica seems to have distressed Waugh. He responded to Powell on 30 October 1961:

I am disconcerted that I have given the impression of a 'happy ending.' This was far from my intention. The mistake was allowing Guy legitimate offspring. They shall be deleted from any subsequent edition. I thought it more ironical that there should be real heirs of the Blessed Gervase Crouchback dispossessed by Trimmer but I plainly failed to make that clear. So no nippers for Guy and Domenica in Penguin. (*Letters*, 579)²

Waugh marked up a copy of the first C&H printing with edits which, *inter alia*, eliminated Guy's two legitimate offspring. On the front flyleaf he wrote "Errata noted before publication, October 1961." In red ink, he instructed: "to be returned, please, to Combe Florey House, Taunton," and later added, "Also errata noted by readers 1962."³ This seemed to settle matters and to ensure that future editions would reflect the altered ending.

² Gene Phillips, in *Evelyn Waugh's Officers, Gentlemen and Rogues* (1975), reported a different explanation for the changed ending based on a discussion he had with Laura Waugh. She explained to him that Waugh deleted Guy's own children from the epilogue "because he wanted to reinforce the fact that Guy had married Domenica as an act of generosity to provide a home for her and for Virginia's child" (137). This was written, however, before publication in 1980 of Waugh's own more detailed explanation in his letter to Anthony Powell relating to the additional layer of irony.

³ The October 1961 errata would reflect the comments of Anthony Powell and Nancy Mitford about the unintentionally happy ending, as well as other points that Powell had questioned. One of these was whether Uncle Peregrine's housekeeper Mrs. Corner was related to Chatty Corner who appeared earlier in the story. Apparently not, as Waugh, in the mark-up, changed her name throughout to Mrs. Warner. That change was picked up by C&H but not by Little, Brown. The later reader errata dated 1962 would have been added after the book had been returned from the printer. More about this in Part II.

Evelyn Waugh Studies 5

The second and most subsequent printings of both the U.K. and U.S. hardback editions changed the discussion between Box-Bender and Elderberry to read as follows:

A marriage was the obvious thing. I think Domenica deserves some credit in arranging it. *No children of their own, but that's not always a disadvantage.* Domenica manages the home farm at Broome. They've settled in the agent's house. They aren't at all badly off. Angela's Uncle Peregrine left his little bit to the child. Wasn't such a very little bit either. (311; emphasis added)

Apparently sometime later, Waugh also marked up another copy of the first printing in specially bound black leather and gold-covered page edges with the family crest embossed on the covers. This would appear to be the copy intended to be saved in the family collection. It has a slightly different version of the change:

A marriage was the obvious thing. I think Domenica deserves some credit in arranging it. Domenica manages the home farm at Broome. They've settled in the agent's house. They aren't at all badly off. Angela's Uncle Peregrine left his little bit to the *boy*. Wasn't such a very little bit either. *A pity they've no children of their own.* (311; emphasis added)

This copy contains an additional edit, as discussed in Part II, on the etymology and pronunciation of "homosexual," which Waugh also added later to the original mark-up apparently based on reader comments. Why Waugh made these particular edits in the specially bound family copy of the book is a bit hard to explain. Most likely, it would seem, might be his desire to record in the "official" family edition the changes in the first printing that he deemed most important. There is no date to indicate when he made the changes in this copy.

There were, in addition to Guy's children, fifteen other revisions noted in the copy sent to the publishers.⁴ While C&H made these other changes in their second printing, the Little, Brown edition appears to contain only three. I will return to these "orphaned" edits later, in Part II, but for now will focus on the deletion of Guy's children.

Waugh wrote Randolph Churchill on 28 August 1962: "The second edition of *Unconditional Surrender* has an important change. The hero has no children of his own" ("Evelyn Waugh: Letters and Postcards to Randolph Churchill." *Encounter*, July 1968, 12). This would suggest that Waugh took care to check a copy of the second printing (which he refers to as the "second edition") to ensure that at least the changed ending had been inserted.

⁴ See R. M. Davis, *Evelyn Waugh, Writer* (1981), 318 (n.27) and 323. As noted by Prof. Davis, both of these marked up copies are contained in the Evelyn Waugh Collection at the University of Texas.

2. Revisions Undisclosed

These second printings are labeled as such but do not specially indicate that they have been “revised” or otherwise modified from the first printing in any material way.⁵ The C&H version is described as “*Second Impression 1961*” and Little, Brown described its version simply as “*Second Printing*” with no date of issuance aside from the copyright date of 1961. In making his edits, moreover, Waugh created another problem by overlooking the discussion on the preceding page between Guy and Box-Bender in which the latter asks after Domenica “*and the children.*” So, an anomaly was created, and this was not eliminated in subsequent printings of the individual volumes (R.M. Davis, *et al.*, *A Bibliography of Evelyn Waugh* [1986], 23).

This anomaly was resolved by Waugh, however, in his modifications to what became the recension of the three novels entitled simply *Sword of Honour*. This was published in 1965 (U.K.) and 1966 (U.S.), shortly before Waugh’s death. In that version, Box-Bender asks Guy: “Domenica all right, *and the boy?*” And Box-Bender then explains to Elderberry a few lines later, “Domenica manages the home farm at Broome. They’ve settled in the agent’s house. *Pity they haven’t any children of their own. They aren’t at all badly off*” (706; emphasis added). This created a second variant ending.

At least one reviewer of *SoH* noticed the change in the ending. In the *TLS* (17 March 1966) the reviewer, J.W.M. Willett, described the only “major” change to the story

being effected by a tiny amendment on the last page of the book. In ‘Unconditional Surrender’ Guy and his new (Catholic) wife had ‘two boys of their own’ as well as the cuckoo planted by Trimmer. This has been cut...The happy, lucky ending is for some reason no longer acceptable. Mr. Waugh’s picture of divine providence has been seriously altered. (*CH*, 477)

Willett was apparently unaware of the earlier changes made by Waugh in volume 3.⁶

⁵ Cf., *Brideshead Revisited*, where Waugh also made revisions to the first printing. These were published by Chapman & Hall in what was described as “Revised Edition 1945,” which was effectively the 2nd Printing. According to R. M. Davis, they consisted of “about a dozen variants from the first edition.” Evelyn Waugh, *Writer* (1981), 177-78. These emendations in *Brideshead* were not made by Little, Brown until 2012. Unlike the *Brideshead* revisions, the edits to US involved a major change to the story—i.e., the ending. And yet, no “revisions” to US were indicated by either C&H or Little, Brown in their description of their second printings.

⁶ John William Mills Willett (1917-2002) was, according to his obituary, an assistant editor of the *TLS* at the time. A few days before his unsigned *TLS* review was issued, The Times printed his signed retrospective review of *D&F* (*CH*, 92-94). He later established a reputation as an expert on the life and works of Bertolt Brecht (*Guardian*, 22 August 2002).

After Waugh's death, however, these various changes were noticed by literary scholars. In 1970, Winnifred Bogaards published an article in the *Evelyn Waugh Newsletter*, 4.2 (Autumn 1970), about the existence of the three variant versions. Robert Murray Davis, as noted above, discussed the various versions in *Evelyn Waugh, Writer* (1981; 322-23), *A Catalogue of the Evelyn Waugh Collection* (1981; 22-23), and the 1986 *Bibliography of Evelyn Waugh* (23-24). But no one at the book publishers seemed to take any notice.

Waugh died in the belief that the recension was, as described on its title page, his "final version" of the novels and that readers would understand without ambiguity that Guy and Domenica had no children except for Trimmer's bastard son.⁷ But that was not to be the case. For some reason, the recension seems to have been unpopular with readers (and publishers). It was reprinted a few times in hardback by both U.S. and U.K. publishers, but for many years there was no paperback edition in either the U.K. or U.S.

Contrary to Waugh's expectations and, indeed, his description in *SoH*, the individual volumes of the three separate novels were for more than three decades the primary source for the reader. The first paperback edition of the *Sword of Honour* recension was published by Penguin only in 1999. According to Angus Calder, who wrote the introduction to that Penguin edition, in the late 1990s the publishers had difficulty locating a copy of the C&H 1965 first edition of *SoH*. Even the British Library, the National Library of Scotland and the Waugh family were unable to produce one. In the end, Penguin used a photocopy of the 1983 Methuen hardback reprint, that company having taken over C&H in the meantime.⁸

Calder attributed the lack of sales for the recension at least in part to Waugh's death shortly after publication, leaving the book without Waugh's considerable promotional skills. In 1967, the year after his death, the BBC broadcast a three-part TV series based on the trilogy. Had Waugh lived, there would surely have been interviews and articles about the program and the book featuring his participation. That could have been the occasion for the launch of a paperback edition of the recension with a TV tie-in. Given Waugh's support for and involvement with the writers of the adaptation, he would likely have been willing or even eager to write or speak to promote both the program and the underlying book. But none of that happened, and the sales of the recension were apparently deemed insufficient to warrant a concerted promotional effort or a paperback reprint prior to 1999.

3. What the Public Reads

⁷ It is described on the dustwrapper and title page as "A Final Version" indicating that perhaps in the case of a Waugh novel, there could never be "the" definitive "final version" as long as he remained alive to change it.

⁸ Calder (1942-2008) wrote widely about WWII, with a particular focus on the home front.

Meanwhile, a whole generation of readers was primarily dependent upon the three original individual volumes of the war trilogy. Penguin had republished these simultaneously in paperback in 1964. They also produced a boxed set of the individual paperbacks. The boxed set was marketed as *The Sword of Honour Trilogy*. In the U.S., a paperback edition of the third volume was published in 1965 by the Delta imprint of Dell Books.⁹ Neither the Penguin nor the Delta paperback version, however, reflected Waugh's changes to the ending or the other edits he made in volume 3.

Indeed, to this day, the Penguin edition of the individual *Unconditional Surrender* volume still in print and for sale on Amazon.co.uk carries the original ending in which Domenica and Guy have two boys of their own. The Delta version was not long kept in print, and when the individual novels were reprinted in paperback by Little, Brown in 1979, the revised ending was used as it had appeared in the second printing of their hardback edition. This paperback version continued to be on offer in the U.S. until 2012, but the anomalous reference to "children" on one page in conjunction with "none of their own" on the next was not corrected.

In 2012 Little, Brown republished most of Waugh's fiction in a uniform edition (both hardback and paperback). This included the first U.S. paperback edition of the *Sword of Honour* recension. In an apparent attempt to reduce some of the confusion relating to these books, Little, Brown also changed the U.S. title of volume 3 of the war trilogy (originally published as *The End of the Battle*) to coincide with Waugh's own original title, *Unconditional Surrender*. The title had initially been modified when Little, Brown expressed concern about confusion with contemporaneous U.S. publication of another book entitled *Unconditional Surrender*.¹⁰ When asked to suggest an acceptable alternative, Waugh offered several titles, starting with *Chivalry* and *Conventional Weapons*, whichever "will help the poor reviewers to understand better...That's really all that matters."¹¹ When these didn't suit, he sent in another list (with tongue even more firmly in cheek): "'Depth and Shoals of Honour,' 'Shoals of Honour,' 'Peace without Honour.' 'Honour comes a pilgrim grey.' 'Guy Crouchback.' 'The End of the Battle.' 'Peace.' 'The Sword.' 'Quixote in Modern Dress.' Or if he prefers it 'Uncle Tom's Cabin and the Seven Dwarves.'" And in a footnote, "'It was a Famous Victory'" (*Letters*, 565).

⁹ In 1961, Dell had published a paperback edition combining *Men at War* and *Officers and Gentlemen* in a single volume in its Laurel imprint.

¹⁰ This conflict apparently related to *Unconditional Surrender: The Impact of the Casablanca Policy upon WWII*. This was written by Anne Armstrong and published in 1961 by Rutgers University Press.

¹¹ *Conventional Weapons* was the working title Waugh originally used for this volume, but he graciously changed that to avoid a conflict in the U.K. with a contemporary novel being written by Jocelyn Brooke. See Stannard. *The Later Years*, 476, n.116.

Little, Brown's new uniform edition of 2012 was reset and unfortunately, with no explanation, *Unconditional Surrender* reverted to the original ending ("two boys of their own" [307]), leaving Little, Brown in the same position as Penguin with two different endings in print at the same time.¹² The 2012 Little, Brown edition also included for the first time a "Readers Guide" following the text. Among the materials contained in that guide (7-8) is the letter from Waugh to Anthony Powell explaining his intention to change the ending. The editors or proofreaders (to the extent such positions still exist) failed to notice the discrepancy between their text and the guide. At least between 1979 and 2012, however, there was no current Little, Brown version in circulation containing a reference to "two boys of their own."¹³

In the U.K., on the other hand, confusion reigned. In 1984, Penguin decided to issue a single volume edition of the three novels. This was published during the post-*Brideshead* Waugh boom and was entitled, confusingly, *The Sword of Honour Trilogy*, as in the case of the earlier Penguin paperback boxed set of the three individual volumes. This was not, however, Waugh's 1965 recension but a compendium of the three separate novels in the textual versions that Penguin had been selling individually or as a boxed set since 1964. On the copyright page, there are references to those three original editions. There is no introduction or other explanatory material, however, to distinguish this publication from the recension, entitled more simply "*Sword of Honour*," that Waugh had intended to be his "final version" of the novels. Nor is there any reference to Waugh's changes to the ending of volume 3 that had been incorporated into subsequent printings of the C&H hardback editions. This 3-in-1 version continued to offer the original ending of volume 3 with two children of their own for Guy and Domenica, as did Penguin's separate edition of volume 3.

As noted previously, in 1999 Penguin finally decided to publish a paperback edition of the recension, and its 3-in-1 version seems to have been allowed to fall out of print. The 1999 paperback edition, entitled simply *Sword of Honour*, included an introduction by Angus Calder in which the changes in the ending in the *SoH* recension are noted. Calder was unaware,

¹² According to Alexander Waugh (comments at a 2015 University of Leicester conference), Little, Brown used the Penguin editions of Waugh's novels to reset their own 2012 editions. That is consistent with the typo on p. 173 of the 2012 Little, Brown *Unconditional Surrender* ("with a shadow" rather than "without a shadow") that occurs in the Penguin reset version (136). See fn. 22, *infra*.

¹³ In another case U.S. readers were not so fortunate. It involved *Officers and Gentlemen*, where Davis mentions a last-minute change in the typescript that failed to reach the U.S. in time for its inclusion in the first U.S. printing (*Evelyn Waugh, Writer*, 278, n.23). This revision was substantive, although it doesn't change the story, only the emphasis: it had Julia Stich wave in the air the envelope containing the dead British soldier's ID tag that Guy had brought back from Crete and then drop it into a wastepaper basket, unseen by Guy. The change did not appear in Little, Brown's U.S. hardback or paperback reprints of its original edition of *O&G* nor the U.S. paperback edition published by Dell in 1961. It does appear in the current Little, Brown editions (hardback and paperback) that were published in the 2012 uniform edition. This would be consistent with Little, Brown's use of the Penguin edition for their reset text in 2012, as noted in the preceding footnote.

however, of the changes made in the original hardback version of volume 3. He asserts, erroneously, that when Penguin published the original paperback versions of the individual novels in 1964, “Waugh had made no changes” (*SoH*, Penguin, 1999, reprinted 2001, xviii). In addition, the separate Penguin edition of volume 3 remained in print with the original ending (“two boys of their own” [240]). In 2011 when Penguin republished a complete run of Waugh’s books in hardback, it chose not to republish each individual volume of the war trilogy but only the *SoH* recension. There was no occasion therefore to address changes to the ending of volume 3.

The 3-in-1 version, however, lived on in the form of a new Everyman’s Library hardback edition that had meanwhile been published in 1994 in both the U.K. and U.S. The Everyman edition was, like the earlier Penguin 3-in-1 version, called *The Sword of Honour Trilogy*. This version contained an introduction by Prof. Frank Kermode who discussed at some length Waugh’s change in the ending. Kermode, however, like Calder writing a few years later, seemed to think the change was effected by Waugh only in 1965 when he made the edits for the *SoH* recension. Like so many others, he was unaware that Waugh had changed the original 1961 single-volume version.¹⁴

After citing Waugh’s correspondence with Nancy Mitford (but not the more detailed exchange with Anthony Powell), Kermode goes on to hypothesize that Waugh’s new ending was “perhaps due to his thinking that it was more characteristic of the modern world that Trimmer’s child rather than a true child of Guy Crouchback should be the heir of Broome...” (xxix). That’s not far off Waugh’s own description of his motives for the change in his letter to Powell, of which Kermode seems to have been unaware (or at least doesn’t mention). Despite the fact that Kermode deems this to have been one of Waugh’s “more important revisions,” he goes on to confess, parenthetically, that in the Everyman edition the deleted children “have been put back by another hand” (xxix). Given all the changes that had occurred (or had failed to occur) up to that point, it is hard to know what he means by this remark, but one interpretation would be that someone among the Everyman publishers and editors proposed to use or footnote the revised ending while someone else (perhaps Kermode) preferred the original ending and made the decision to retain it in an unannotated format.

The Everyman 3-in-1 version was also sold in the U.S. in Knopf’s Borzoi imprint. Little, Brown at the time was marketing only the individual volumes in paperback, but with the revised ending of volume 3. There was no paperback version of the recension published in the U.S. until 2012 when, as noted previously, Little, Brown brought out an edition under its Back Bay Books imprint.

¹⁴ See also Robert Hickson, “Sloth, Disillusionment, and the Higher Clarity,” *Apropos*, 9 Dec. 2013, 29-31. Prof. Hickson, like Calder and Kermode, compares the endings of the 1961 first printing and the *SoH* recension but does not mention Waugh’s change in the second printing.

Further confusing matters in the U.K. was a 1990 subscription version of the trilogy published by The Folio Society. They issued the individual hardbound volumes in an illustrated boxed set that they marketed collectively as *Sword of Honour*. Like the Penguin individual volume 3, that of The Folio Society contained the ending in which Guy and Domenica have two children of their own. An introduction by Mark Amory, editor of Waugh's letters, is included in volume 1 (*Men at Arms*). It makes no mention of the changed ending in either the second C&H printing of volume 3 or the *SoH* recension.¹⁵ In his opening summary Amory refers to the book's conclusion in which "the hero is finally dismissed in a wry parody of a happy ending" (ix). He should have at least been curious about that "happy" ending because his volume of Waugh's letters includes the one Waugh wrote to Powell (quoted above) in which he promised to change the ending to leave Guy and Domenica with "no nippers" of their own.

Waugh's biographers (and critics) are inconsistent in their treatment of the variant endings. Christopher Sykes, writing in 1975, doesn't seem to have been aware of the different endings in either volume 3 or the *SoH* recension. He considered *US* Waugh's "best book" but describes the conclusion as follows:

Virginia was killed by a flying bomb in the war and Guy has married a suitable Catholic girl *and begotten children of his own*, though he is faithfully bringing up Trimmer's heir as his own...The attempt to depict Guy in his new found-found happiness as a jolly good fellow is wholly unsuccessful. (568-69; emphasis added).

Thus, while agreeing with Waugh that the original "happy" ending is unsuccessful, Sykes seems unaware that Waugh had changed it.

Professor Stannard (*The Later Years*, 1992) does not discuss the changed ending of either *US* or *SoH*, perhaps wisely in view of the fact Waugh and his publishers couldn't make their minds up as to how the story should end.¹⁶ Selina Hastings notes Waugh's stated intention to delete Guy's own children in his letter to Powell but says "the deletion was not made" (596) citing the 1964 Penguin edition of *US* but not mentioning later editions of the hardback and the *SoH* recension.¹⁷ Both Patey (353) and Wilson (155) mention the changed ending in later

¹⁵ Although both "*Unconditional Surrender* (1961)" and "*Sword of Honour* (1965)" are listed on the copyright page of The Folio Society edition, the title page does not mention *Sword of Honour*. The text is from the individual volume first printing and does not reflect the changes in either the second printing or the recension.

¹⁶ Stannard: *The Later Years*, pp. 289, 441-43) describes the inserted passages from the short story "Compassion" spun into the tale of Guy and the Jewish refugees as effectively the novel's end or a "coda" to the entire trilogy and mentions the Epilogue only insofar as it provides a satirical description of the Festival of Britain.

¹⁷ Hastings cites (629) the 1964 Penguin edition of *US* as her textual source.

editions.¹⁸ The most recent biography, *Evelyn Waugh: A Life Revisited* (London, July 2016), by Philip Eade, does not address the changed ending, but Eade states that he was writing about Waugh's life and decided to include little mention of his works.

The lack of consistency among the published editions of Waugh's works, as well as to some extent his biographers, has had a tendency to confuse readers and scholars throughout the period since *US* first appeared. For example, in the late 1960s (after the publication of *SoH*), Joseph Mattingly berates two critics for failing to realize Guy's own children had been deleted. Those critics (Bernard Bergonzi and James Carens) wrote before publication of *SoH* so could have known about the deletion only if they had read the 1961 second printings. But then, as Professor Davis pointed out in a rebuttal, Mattingly himself was unaware of that earlier change and erroneously thought that Waugh had always intended that Guy would lack any offspring of his own. Mattingly assumed that in *SoH* Waugh was merely correcting an earlier printing error rather than implementing a change to the ending from what was originally written and intended.¹⁹

Iain Gale, in 1990, wrote an often useful guide to Waugh's works, *Waugh's World*, containing page references to characters and other topics in Penguin editions of Waugh's novels. At the time he compiled his guide, there was no Penguin or other paperback edition of the *Sword of Honour* recension. Gale's guide fails to reflect the change in the ending of volume 3 as well as the change of Mrs. Corner to Mrs. Warner. An earlier reference guide (*A Waugh Companion*, 1988) by Prof. Paul Doyle (founding editor of the *EWNS* and a contributor to the 1986 bibliography) reflects the changed ending in both the recension and the subsequent hardback printings of volume 3.

More recently, a critic warned readers in the *Cambridge Companion to English Novelists* (2009) of the conflicting versions of the ending among editions then current, not himself aware of which was definitive. And another scholar correctly refers to Waugh's intention to change the Epilogue to remove Guy's two children, without apparently realizing that Waugh had in fact delivered on that intention (or at least tried to do so).²⁰ Professor Davis advised scholars to learn

¹⁸ As noted previously, Professors Davis and Bogaards both discussed the variant endings in some detail in critical studies of Waugh's works, as distinguished from biographies. Jeffrey Heath in *The Picturesque Prison* (London, 1982, 216) also gets it right, citing Bogaards (*Idem*, 313, n.30).

¹⁹ *English Language Notes* 6 (Mar. 1969) 200-01, and 7 (Dec. 1969), 127-29. Davis's "gotcha" appeared in print before Bogaards' *EWNS* article in 1970; he may have been first off the mark in announcing this discovery in print.

²⁰ Michael Brennan, *Evelyn Waugh: Fictions, Faith and Family* (2013), 130; the bibliography of this well-researched and annotated study indicates reliance upon the 1964 Penguin edition of *US* that, as noted previously, has not to this day reflected the changed ending. See also Marcel DeCoste, *The Vocations of Evelyn Waugh* (2015), 153 and 157, where the original 1961 C&H edition is cited, crediting Guy with two children of his own.

three lessons from this state of affairs: (1) never assume consistency between different editions of Waugh's novels; (2) Waugh was capable of altering not only details but important elements of the story; and (3) study of the textual history of Waugh's novels was not only essential but almost certain to be rewarding.²¹

4. Who's to Blame?

Blame for this fifty-year state of confusion would seem to be shared by the publishers, Waugh's agents and even Waugh himself. The marked-up copy Waugh sent out was apparently transmitted to his U.K. publishers sometime in late 1961. Somehow, those revisions were also communicated to Little, Brown in the U.S. They both published "Second Printings" with the changes on the final page deleting the two children of Guy and Domenica. As noted in Part II, for some unexplained reason, the two publishers were inconsistent in their treatment of Waugh's other contemporaneous changes. And why they both failed to indicate that their Second Printings were "Revised" is equally inexplicable.

Waugh had a standing arrangement with Penguin since 1936 to publish paperback reprints of his fiction. There is correspondence in the University of Texas *A.D. Peters Collection* indicating the understanding that all three of the war trilogy novels would be published by Penguin under the terms of that previous agreement, but when, in what order, and in what format is not discussed.²² C&H (or possibly A. D. Peters) would probably have been responsible for sending a copy to Penguin who would have reset it for their paperback format. It is most likely at that stage that an error was committed. Without knowing or seeing any evidence that the second C&H printing was revised, someone may have sent a copy of the first printing to Penguin by mistake. How the same mistake was made in the U.S. begins to strain one's credulity regarding coincidences in the book publication industry, but the copy sent to Dell, presumably by

²¹ *English Language Notes* 7, *supra*.

²² The Penguin agreement would probably have been with C&H, not Waugh. C&H would have owned U.K. publication rights and agreed to allow Penguin to market paperback reprints in stipulated territories consistent with C&H's own rights. The royalties would have been paid by Penguin to C&H, which had a separate agreement with Waugh to share them.

Little, Brown or Waugh's U.S. agent, must have also been the unrevised first printing.²³ The Dell version was, in any event, reset for U.S. paperback publication without the revised ending.²⁴

By the 1960s Waugh had enjoyed a long and happy relationship with Penguin. He used Penguin as his U.K. paperback reprint publisher beginning in 1937, with their publication of *D&F*. They reprinted four additional novels before and during the war. In 1951, they added five more at one time, for a total of ten, all of which they seem to have kept in print. In the early 1960s they added *Helena* and *Pinfold*. Penguin continued to publish Waugh's fiction up to and after his death, and in 2011, in an ambitious undertaking previously noted, published virtually his entire lifetime output of books, both fiction and nonfiction, in a uniform hardback edition.

While Waugh can be heard in his correspondence with his agent to whinge about his primary publishers, Chapman & Hall, Duckworth and Little, Brown, there seems to be little or no complaint about Penguin concerning either royalty payments or product quality.²⁵ Indeed, in one case Waugh complained that Penguin had made a large royalty payment too soon and asked that it be taken back and paid later for tax reasons. If the Peters correspondence is anything to go by, Waugh must have left relations with Penguin largely up to the Peters agency and C&H (or Duckworth). He seems not to have proofed Penguin reprints. Thus, while there are several references in the Peters files to returning proofs to C&H and Little, Brown, I don't find any references to Penguin proofs (at least in the years I reviewed which were those when Penguin publication of Waugh's work was most prolific: 1936-38 and 1950-51). It would appear that

²³ It seems unlikely that the Dell version was reset from the Penguin edition. The Penguin edition also had the aforementioned typo on p. 136 (unrelated to Waugh's edits) where Virginia is described as laughing "with a shadow of ridicule" whereas the correct text as reflected in other editions is "without a shadow of ridicule." See Ann Hitt, "Virginia Troy and a Textual Discrepancy," *EWNS*, 25.1 (Spring 1991). The Dell edition (170) correctly uses "without." Waugh caught that typo when using the Penguin copy to prepare the *SoH* recension, but subsequent Penguin editions of *US* remained uncorrected.

²⁴ There is correspondence in the *A.D. Peters Collection* at UT dated November 1963 regarding the agreement for the paperback reprint edition by Dell. Although this came a year following a warning by ADP (at Waugh's urging) to French and Italian translators to use the revised text (see Part II), there was no such warning to Little, Brown to assure that Dell used the later version (nor is there any record of written communications between ADP and Waugh regarding conclusion of this agreement).

²⁵ There is a considerable volume of correspondence in the University of Texas *A.D. Peters Collection* regarding the 1951 Penguin "10 by Waugh" project. The Penguin contract was with C&H (or Duckworth in the case of *When the Going Was Good*). Waugh himself seems to have had little direct contact with Penguin. The correspondence in 1949-1951 mainly relates to Waugh's dissatisfaction with the 50/50 split of the paperback royalties between him and his original publishers. The dispute did not involve Penguin directly, who didn't really care who got the royalties it paid, but was between Waugh and his original publishers. The correspondence indicates that Waugh's agents were unable in this earlier period to increase his share of the Penguin royalties. There is no mention of the issue in the later correspondence regarding the paperback reprints of the war trilogy volumes.

Waugh trusted Penguin and its professional proofreaders to check their reset pages against the hardback editions.

Why neither hardback publisher, upon incorporating these changes, indicated a revision on the copyright page is also peculiar. If only to protect the copyright to the revision, it would seem prudent practice to indicate that a revised edition was being published and file a copy with the copyright depository. But a copyright submission would obviously cost something; moreover, the additional protection gained would be limited to the new material and therefore perhaps considered not worth the additional cost. Even if no additional copyright protection were deemed necessary, however, a revision notice on the copyright page would seem good publishing practice if only to avoid the sort of confusion that arose in this very case.

After the individual Penguin volumes of the war trilogy had appeared in May 1964, Waugh finally addressed the matter of the ending again when he made the edits for the recension. He used a set of the Penguin paperbacks with the covers torn off as his “copy text, [and] corrections, deletions and a few additions were made in red ink” (*Evelyn Waugh, Writer*, 326). Those marked-up editions are also archived at the University of Texas. Waugh made his edits on the same printed Penguin page that erroneously contained the children he had intended to delete from that very edition, as he had remarked to Anthony Powell three years previously.

It must have been at this time that Waugh first noticed that Penguin had not included the revised ending. His agents were in this period negotiating with the BBC over TV rights to film the War Trilogy. Waugh supported the project but urged the BBC to use the recension (referred to as the “revised version”) he was then preparing as the basis for the script. The BBC in turn was willing to do so but wanted to start work immediately and asked where and when it could obtain a copy of the “revised version.” This correspondence took place in July and August 1964 at the same time Waugh was still working on the recension that was published over a year later. The agents, in a letter to the BBC dated 23 July 1964, made it clear that “Mr. Waugh’s point is that [the BBC] must use the ending of the latest edition of *Unconditional Surrender* and not the first single volume published by C&H and *also by Penguin*” (emphasis added).²⁶

As noted in Part II, the BBC scriptwriters clearly got the message and somehow managed to find the correctly revised version of the book. But, in the process of negotiating with the

²⁶ BBC Written Archive Centre, File # T48/582/1 (Waugh, Evelyn). This correspondence also refers to attempts by the BBC personnel to meet with Waugh later in 1964 to discuss his “changes and cuts” and explain how the script would be developed. Ric Cooper has written that Waugh met with his father Giles Cooper, the BBC scriptwriter, along with the director Donald McWhinnie at the Dorchester Hotel in early 1966. In the course of the meeting, which was a bit awkward to begin with, Cooper and Waugh discovered that they had both been to Lancing, although Cooper was 15 years younger than Waugh. “Drinks appeared and an increasingly jolly session ensued, until it was time to leave.” (“War of the Roses,” *Evelyn Waugh Studies*, 42.3, 6).

BBC, it seems not to have occurred to Waugh that Penguin themselves should also have been notified separately about the need to revise the ending. He may have decided that it wasn't worth the bother to correct the single volume of the Penguin edition, which was already in print, assuming that it would soon be overtaken and replaced by his "final version" in the recension. As mentioned hitherto, this turned out not to be the case. In any event, if the nickel ever dropped on notifying Penguin, I am unable to find where it landed.

Waugh was sufficiently concerned about the variant versions in circulation prior to the 1964 Penguin publication that he had also written to A. D. Peters as early as February 1962 warning them to make certain that copies with the "small but important changes" were provided to translators working on the book. The A. D. Peters Collection at the University of Texas contains two contemporaneous letters to French and Italian translators fulfilling Waugh's directive and forwarding the latest text, described as slightly revised. This was, no doubt, the C&H Second Impression.²⁷

By 1964, Waugh was not as intellectually acute as he had been earlier in his career. This is evident to anyone viewing his two BBC interviews in 1960 and 1964. In the latter program, the signs of ageing are much more evident. On the other hand, in this same period, he managed to see the first volume of his autobiography into print and was capable of making coherent and sometimes complex edits in the texts of the three war novels to produce the final recension. In any event, Waugh had what may have been the last best chance to correct the Penguin individual edition of volume 3 and has left no record of having made any attempt to do so.²⁸ It is quite possible that Waugh thought he had made a sufficient effort to implement the change when he inserted it in the *SoH* recension that he intended to be his final version of the trilogy.

In any event, Waugh's active interventions with the translations and TV adaptations give a fairly solid indication that further interventions to put things right would have occurred if he had lived. One problem was that he died so suddenly and unexpectedly that he had no opportunity to brief his literary executor on areas of potential concern such as the confusion over changes to the war trilogy's ending. His heirs were not aware of the problem to the extent that

²⁷ A.D. Peters & Co. were more directly involved in negotiations with foreign publishers than with Penguin, perhaps because the C&H contract may have conferred exclusivity only to publication in the U.K. and overseas British colonial possessions.

²⁸ The University of Texas A. D. Peters Collection ends in 1963, and consequently any correspondence Waugh may have had about the matter through his agents after that date would be unavailable in that archive. The Penguin archive at the University of Bristol maintains correspondence records of individual Penguin titles that first appeared during the period including 1964 as well as correspondence with individual authors. Upon inquiry, they reported that their relevant files contained no correspondence relating to a change in the ending of volume 3 (emails from Hannah Lowery, University of Bristol, dated 7-8 August 2014.)

Waugh himself was. He may have reasonably expected that the *SoH* recension would override Penguin's failure, of which he was fully aware, to incorporate the new ending in volume 3.

To whatever extent the problem may have been due to Waugh's unexpected death, however, the original fault must lie with whoever at C&H and Little, Brown supervised the production of the second printings and failed to indicate that they were revised editions. With no notice of such revisions on the copyright page, personnel at either the agent's or publisher's not directly involved with the 1961 edits had no way of knowing whether it made any difference which version was sent to Penguin or Dell. That may excuse Penguin in the first instance, but as time went on they surely became aware of their error.

Little, Brown somehow avoided the error when they published their own paperback version in 1979, after Dell's went out of print. They appear to have used the plates from their own second printing of their hardback version for the paperback. So, although U.S. readers had no inexpensive paperback reprint edition of the *SoH* recension (with the changed ending) until 2012, they did have the corrected ending in the individual edition of volume 3 twenty years earlier than their British counterparts.²⁹ Readers in Britain had to wait until 1999 for a paperback version of *SoH* reflecting the deleted nippers. And even today, British readers relying on the Penguin edition of volume 3 conclude their reading with the impression that Guy and Domenica lived happily ever after with Trimmer's bastard son and "two boys of their own."

Notes

(1) Part II of this essay will appear in the next issue of *EWS* and will deal with the legacy of confusion caused by Waugh's efforts to change the ending and make other edits to *Unconditional Surrender*.

(2) A shorter version of this paper (Parts I and II) was presented on 24 April 2015 at a conference at the University of Leicester: *Evelyn Waugh and His Circle: Reading and Editing the Complete Works*.

²⁹ As noted previously, in 2012, when Little, Brown reset the pages of volume 3 for a new edition, they used the Penguin version as their text and therefore began selling the original ending in the U.S. for the first time since 1979.

Works Cited: Part I

- Amory, Mark, ed. *Letters of Evelyn Waugh*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1980.
- . "Introduction." *Sword of Honour*. 3 vols. London: Folio, 1990. i-xvii.
- Calder, Angus. "Introduction." *Sword of Honour*. London: Penguin, 1999. vii-xxviii.
- Cooper, Ric. "War of the Roses." *Evelyn Waugh Studies*. 42.3 (2012): 6.
- Davis, Robert Murray. *A Catalogue of the Evelyn Waugh Collection at the Humanities Research Center*. Troy, NY: Whitston, 1981. Item A29.d, 22.
- . *Evelyn Waugh, Writer*. Norman, OK: Pilgrim, 1981.
- Hastings, Selina. *Evelyn Waugh: A Biography*. London: Sinclair Stevenson, 1994.
- Kermode, Frank. "Introduction." *Sword of Honour Trilogy*. London: Campbell/Everyman, 1994. xi-xxxiv.
- Mosley, Charlotte, ed. *Letters of Nancy Mitford and Evelyn Waugh*. London: Hodder, 1996.
- Peters, A. D. "Letter to Michael Bakewell." 23 July 1964. BBC Written Archive Centre: File # T48/582/1 (Waugh, Evelyn).
- Phillips, Gene. *Evelyn Waugh's Officers, Gentlemen and Rogues*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1977.
- Powell, Anthony. "Letter to EW." 20 October 1961. *Evelyn Waugh Papers*. British Library: Manuscripts, Add. 81068.
- Sykes, Christopher. *Evelyn Waugh: A Biography*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977.
- Waugh, Evelyn. *The End of the Battle*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1961.
- . "Letter to A D Peters & Co." c. 18 February 1962. *A D Peters Collection*, Harry Ransom Center, U of Texas.
- . "Letter to Randolph Churchill." 28 August 1962. "Evelyn Waugh: Letters and Post Cards to Randolph Churchill." *Encounter*. July 1968. 3-19.
- . *Sword of Honour*. London: C&H, 1965.
- . *Unconditional Surrender*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1964.

---. ---. Leather binding. *Evelyn Waugh Collection*. Austin: Harry Ransom Center, U of Texas, London, 1961.

---. ---. London: C&H, 1961.

---. ---. Second Impression. London: C&H, 1961.

Willett, J.W.M. "Review of *Sword of Honour*. *TLS*. 17 March 1965. Reprinted in Stannard, Martin, ed. *Evelyn Waugh: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge, 1984. 476-80.

NEWS

John H. Wilson Jr. Evelyn Waugh Undergraduate Essay Contest

Submissions are still welcome for the John H. Wilson Jr. Evelyn Waugh Undergraduate Essay Contest. Essays (normally limited to 20 pages or 5000 words) are invited on any aspect of Waugh's life or work and will be judged by the *Evelyn Waugh Studies* editorial board. The winning essay will be published in the journal, and the author will receive a prize of \$500. Deadline: 31 December 2017. Email submissions to jpitcher@bennington.edu or Patrick.Query@usma.edu

Conference at The Huntington Library

A gentle reminder that this symposium, co-sponsored by The Huntington, The Evelyn Waugh Society, and *The Complete Works of Evelyn Waugh* project, is on May 5th and 6th:
<http://www.huntington.org/evelynwaugh/>

***Decline and Fall* on Acorn TV in May**

Lauren Wynne, the Publicity Assistant Assistant for Acorn TV, kindly informed the editors that updates will be shared on their Facebook <https://www.facebook.com/OfficialAcornTV/> and Twitter <https://twitter.com/AcornTV>> pages.

Tenancy of The Abingdon Arms

<http://jobs.bighospitality.co.uk/job/1262062/the-abingdon-arms-beckley-oxford-tenancy-opportunity/>