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Abstract
Companion to her study of Tolkien’s use of the Andrew Lang fairy tale collections (in #99/100) with a piece on how Lewis used them as well, but tended to look favorably on and use more modern fantasy sources than Tolkien.
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C. S. Lewis, like his friend J.R.R. Tolkien, loved fairy tales, and in many ways they both chose to model much of their work on fairy tales. But they used fairy tales in different ways and had different ideas of what a typical fairy tale was. Tolkien, in his essay “On Fairy-Stories,” first delivered as an Andrew Lang lecture in 1938, argued that fairy tales were not particularly for child-readers but were rather originally intended—and still equally appropriate—for adult audiences. He took folk-tales as his chief examples in the essay, citing especially examples from the folk-tales retold in Andrew Lang’s “color” Fairy Books, although he also included examples from modern fairy tales. (Lang’s influence on Tolkien was discussed in my article, “Tolkien as Child of The Green Fairy Book.”)

Lewis took a rather different approach in “On Three Ways of Writing for Children,” originally a speech the Library Association in 1952, and reprinted posthumously in Of Other Worlds. Unlike Tolkien, who used folk-tales as his chief examples of fairy tales, and used many motifs in his own work that he would have met in childhood as a reader of folk-tales in Lang (e.g., benevolent magic-workers both women and men, dragons, dwarfs), Lewis thought first of modern writers such as E. Nesbit and Kenneth Grahame, and where his work uses motifs that probably come from Lang, the stories used tend to be re-tellings of modern, individually-authored stories, not folktales. In 1952, Lewis was halfway through his “Narnia” series. (The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe had appeared in 1950, Prince Caspian in 1951, and The Voyage of the “Dawn Treader” in 1952.) In this article, he quickly dismissed two of the ways promised in the title, ways that he didn’t use himself: writing for the market (or what is stereotyped as marketable), and writing for an individual child. He focused on a third way: “writing a children’s story because a children’s story is the best art-form for something you have to say.” He focused, in particular, on the kind of children’s story he most enjoyed, “the fantasy or (in a loose sense of that word) the fairy tale” (“On Three Ways” 23).
Lewis cited Tolkien as his authority to point out that fairy tales were not necessarily for child-readers ("On Three Ways" 26-27), but he was, nevertheless, interested in the fairy tale as a genre that he felt was likely to interest child-readers. In describing what he meant by fairy tales, Lewis made general references to folk-tales—"dwarfs and giants and talking beasts and witches" (25) and "wicked kings and beheadings, battles and dungeons, giants and dragons" (31), but his primary specific example was a modern story, Kenneth Grahame's *The Wind in the Willows*, which Lewis chose to cite because an important part of the appeal of fairy tales, he felt, was

[B]eings other than human which yet behave, in varying degrees, humanly [...] [provide] an admirable hieroglyphic which conveys psychology, types of character, more briefly than novelistic presentation and to readers whom novelistic presentation could not reach. [Grahame’s Badger is an] extraordinary amalgam of high rank, coarse manners, gruffness, shyness, and goodness. The child who has once met Mr Badger has ever afterwards, in its bones, a knowledge of humanity and of English social history which it could not get in any other way. (25)

Tolkien, by contrast, considered *The Wind in the Willows* a Beast-Fable, and not a fairy tale ("On Fairy-Stories" [OFS] 36n2).

In 1956, when the complete Narnia series had appeared, Lewis reflected for the “Children’s Book Section” of the New York *Times Book Review* on how “Sometimes Fairy Stories May Say Best What’s To Be Said.” This brief essay did not include direct reference to specific fairy tales, although he included a tacit reference to what is evidently a specific story in his description of his feeling that the fairy tale form might allow him to write about religious themes in a way that would not be obviously religious and so would let him avoid the unfortunate effect obviously religious writing can have on readers by seeming to demand a religious response as a duty and thus not allowing the readers to form their responses freely. “Could one not thus steal past these watchful dragons?” ("Sometimes Fairy Stories" 38), he asked. (This striking phrase was borrowed by Walter Hooper for the title of his study of Lewis, *Past Watchful Dragons.*) ¹

The brief phrase sounds as if it could refer to almost any story with dragons, whether in myth/folklore or in modern fantasy. There are many stories of heroes who get past dragons. But Lewis’s phrasing makes two odd changes. He had begun the passage by talking about wanting to “steal past a certain inhibition.” In shifting from this single literal feeling to a plurality of metaphorical dragons, he has changed both the logic of his metaphor and the

¹ Editor’s note: As well as for an essay collection edited by Amy H. Sturgis and published by The Mythopoeic Press in 2007.
nature of the metaphorical obstacle. In nearly all stories of heroes who sneak past dragons, the hero confronts one dragon, not several. (Also, getting past safely usually calls not just for getting past it but for killing it.) For instance, in an Estonian folktale, “The Dragon of the North” (collected/retold by Friedrich Reinhold Kreutzwald and included in *The Yellow Fairy Book*), the hero uses a magic ring to make himself invisible so that he can get close enough to the dragon to kill it; in *The Volsunga Saga* (included in abridged form in *The Red Fairy Book* as “The Story of Sigurd”), Sigurd does not try to get past the dragon to get to the treasure, but rather waits beneath a cliff for the dragon to go past him, and from there attacks the dragon’s soft belly and so kills him. Jason, in Greek mythology, does not kill the dragon guarding the Golden Fleece, but puts it to sleep with a drug supplied to him by the sorceress Medea.

It could be argued that the change to a plurality of dragons reflects a plurality of feelings. Lewis does, after all, describes the inhibition as having two causes, the resistance to being told what one ought to feel, and the reverence which “itself did harm” by sounding as if it “were associated with lowered voices; almost as if it were something medical” (“Sometimes Fairy Stories” 36). But the feeling of inhibition itself is singular. Confusing the single feeling he wants to steal past with the causes of the feeling to come up with an image of stealing past multiple dragons seems a carelessness not typical of Lewis. Since the shift to the plural does not quite fit the psychological state being described, and does not reflect the majority of stories employing watchful dragons, it sounds as if it must be influenced by an actual, less typical, story or stories Lewis had in mind in coming up with the metaphor.

Lang’s collections could have been the source. Of the many dragon stories scattered through his fairy tale books, two involve getting past plural watchful dragons, and neither is a folktale. Both are modern. In Mme. d’Aulnoy’s “The Story of Pretty Goldilocks,” from the end of the seventeenth century, in *The Blue Fairy Book*, the hero does not manage to get past the pair of watchful dragons himself. An owl that he has befriended flies over the dragons’ heads to get a little water from the Fountain of Beauty for him. H.J. Ford’s illustration of the scene (203) shows the owl winging back out of the cavern over the mighty, but not very clever-looking dragons. In “The Invisible Prince” (in *The Yellow Fairy Book*), the prince, searching for his princess, uses his power of invisibility to go past “two huge dragons guarding the gate of a wood” (84). Unusually, Lang did not indicate the story’s origin, but it is “Le Prince Invisible” by Louise Cavelier Levesque, an eighteenth-century writer. Its literary origin is detectable in the plot, which includes such erudite, non-folklore-like characters as Prince Gnome, the ruler of the element of earth (and his brothers, the princes of Air, Sea, and Flame), and the allegorical Fairy Despair, who casts rejected lovers into a labyrinth, where they wander until they die. References to Lang
scattered through Lewis’s letters show that he was generally familiar with Lang as a folklorist; although the Color Fairy Books did not stand out for him as they did for Tolkien, and are not specifically mentioned, it seems obvious that his familiarity with Lang’s work would have included them.

Another tacit reference in “Sometimes Fairy Stories May Say Best What’s To Be Said” was to a still more modern fairy tale, in Lewis’s description of the mental images that gave rise to Narnia in his imagination: “a faun carrying an umbrella, a queen on a sledge, a magnificent lion” (36). Fauns are from Roman mythology, and a faun with an umbrella is original to Lewis. Magnificent lions have many possible sources (e.g., the Biblical Lion of Judah, the medieval king of the beasts of the Bestiaries, or the companion of Princess Una in Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene*.) But the “queen on a sledge” obviously grew out of Hans Christian Andersen’s “The Snow Queen,” from the nineteenth century. In this article, although loyally repeating Tolkien’s point that fairy tales are not necessarily for children, Lewis continued, all the same, to consider fairy tales as something particularly likely to appeal to children. He offered a possible solution to this paradox, arguing that sophisticated adults are more fashion-conscious than children, and thus more fashion-ridden. Thus, Lewis felt, in an age when realistic fiction is particularly prized by critics, adult readers expect it to be what they, too, should prize, and they consequently under-value fairy tales, leaving only children to be able to appreciate non-realistic modes of story-telling. He repeated this argument in a brief article two years later, “On Juvenile Tastes.”

Tolkien cited Lang’s collections of folktales extensively in “On Fairy-Stories,” and not just because the first version of the essay was an Andrew Lang lecture. He knew the Color Fairy Books well, and they came to mind quickly for him. Born in 1892, he had identified himself in the essay as “born at about the same time as *The Green Fairy Book*” (OFS 54). He cited modern examples as well, but the folktales were uppermost in his thoughts about fairy tales. Unlike Tolkien, Lewis was more inclined to think of fairy tales in terms of modern fantasy stories for children, citing writers like E. Nesbit and Kenneth Grahame. In his autobiography, *Surprised by Joy*, it is not surprising to find this tribute to E. Nesbit in his comments on his favorite books as a child:

Much better than either of these [Arthur Conan Doyle’s *Sir Nigel* or Mark Twain’s *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur’s Court*] was E. Nesbit’s trilogy, *Five Children and It, The Phoenix and the Wishing Carpet* [*The Phoenix and the Carpet*—he was evidently listing the titles from memory], and *The Amulet* [*The Story of the Amulet*]. The last did most for me. It first opened my eyes to antiquity, the ‘dark backward and abysm of time.’ I can still re-read it with delight. (17)
He added also as influences stories from Norse mythology (as he glimpsed it in the poetry of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow), Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* and the anthropomorphic animals of Beatrix Potter’s books, especially her *Squirrel Nutkin*, and of Sir John Tenniel’s political cartoons in *Punch*, but folktales as such do not figure in the list. Lewis’s preference for modern fairy tales over folktales is reflected in the contents of Douglas A. Anderson’s pair of anthologies, *Tales Before Tolkien* and *Tales Before Narnia*; he included one story that is a direct re-telling of folk material in *Tales Before Tolkien*, “The Story of Sigurd” (Lang’s abridgement for *The Red Fairy Book* of William Morris’s translation of *The Volsunga Saga*), but none in *Tales Before Narnia*.

Lewis Carroll’s two *Alice* books (which Tenniel illustrated), perhaps surprisingly, considering the importance in them of anthropomorphic animals, do not figure in Lewis’s list, either. Joe R. Christopher, in an article comparing and contrasting Carroll and Lewis, found two examples of passages in the Narnia books that reflect passages in the “Alice” books, but was more struck by the differences between the two writers, commenting,

> [T]he Looking-glass Country, on the one hand, and Narnia, on the other—despite some superficial resemblances, such as talking animals—are radically different in their tones. The Red King and Father Time are not handled in the same ways—the one is an intellectual puzzle; the other is a mystery, an archetypal mystery—Saturn and an angel. (13)

C.S. Lewis did appreciate the other Lewis, as can be seen in his occasional references to him, but Carroll was less important to C.S. than more romantic writers like Nesbit.

Lewis made only minor use of Lang’s collections, and of the folktales in them. However, the literary story from Lang of “The Invisible Prince,” besides its watchful dragons, may have influenced Lewis slightly in his portrayal of gnomes. Although “gnomes” have become such familiar figures in modern fantasy-writing as to seem obviously folkloric, they are not; they were invented by a Renaissance writer, Paracelsus, elaborating the ancient Greek idea of the four elements of earth, air, fire, and water, into spirits who inhabit and personify each element. In his 1946 poem, “The True Nature of Gnomes,” Lewis described Paracelsus’ gnomes and told how

> Beguiled with pictures, I fancied in my childhood
>  Subterranean rivers beside glimmering wharfs,
>  Hammers upon anvils, pattering and yammering,
>  Torches and tunnels, the cities of the dwarfs[.]
H.J. Ford’s striking illustration of Prince Gnome as he “Learns the Name of his Rival at the Golden Fountain” (Yellow 89) may have contributed to Lewis’s image of the gnomes’ “sinewy bodies” (Poems 9). Prince Gnome is a human-sized being, not the dwarf-size more commonly associated with gnomes, and implied by Lewis’s reference to “the cities of the dwarfs.” Lewis followed most scholars in assuming that Paracelsus’s gnomes were based in part on the dwarfs of folklore. He commented in his discussion of Paracelsus’s elementals, in his chapter on “The Longaevi” in The Discarded Image: An Introduction to Medieval and Renaissance Literature, that “The Gnomes are closer to the Dwarfs of *märchen*”(135), and the dwarf-sized gnomes of his poem re-appeared as the Earthmen-gnomes of The Silver Chair, living far below-ground.

For the Narnia stories, Lewis made dwarfs and gnomes two distinct species: the gnomes live far underground and dread the open air, while the dwarfs may live in caves (as in Prince Caspian) and “the caverns of the earth” (where their capitol is, according to the “March for Dwarfs,” Poems 6-7), but they have no difficulty with life in buildings above-ground (as in The Horse and His Boy). Terms of address for a Narnian dwarf such as “Son of Earth” and “Earthman,” however, show the connection between dwarfs and the earth-gnomes that Lewis still felt. Dwarfs as such were common in many sources. Examples in Lang included “The Yellow Dwarf” in The Blue Fairy Book, another literary story by Mme. d’Aulnoye; and the Grimms’s folktales of “Snow-White and Rose-Red” and “The Three Dwarfs” in The Red Fairy Book. The smithying dwarfs of Norse and Germanic mythology were also familiar to Lewis. Gnomes, however, not found in folklore and not yet as common in the modern fairy tales of Lewis’s childhood as they have become since, were less familiar. Lewis does not seem to have known L. Frank Baum’s work, and so would not have known the Nomes of Baum’s Ozma of Oz (1907) and later Oz books. He would probably have known the Grimms’s “Das Erd-männeken,” usually translated as “The Gnome.” He may also have identified as gnomes some dwarf/gnome-size characters not labeled as such in Lang’s collections, such as “Rumpelstiltskin” (from the Grimms, included in The Blue Fairy Book), or “The Underground Workers” (an Estonian folktale in The Violet Fairy Book), especially the Workers as illustrated by Ford, with their hammers and anvils at the forge (220). And certainly he would have known that George MacDonald, one of his favorite writers, had explained in The Princess and the Goblin (1871) that the beings living in the subterranean caverns under the Princess’s castle were called gnomes by some, and kobolds or goblins by others. Arthur Hughes’s initial illustration of the goblins, with their mining tools and their torches, in front of the entrance to their “tunnels,” must also have contributed to Lewis’s childhood image of gnomes. Thus, although his idea of gnomes drew on sources both literary and folkloric, literary sources such as Levesque and MacDonald were probably somewhat more important.
E. Nesbit’s influence on the Narnia books is especially clear in her use in many of her stories of groups of siblings as protagonists, instead of the single youth or maiden, or, sometimes, a boy-and-girl pair typical of both the folk fairy tales and of the modern fairy tale before Nesbit (e.g., Hansel and Gretel, or George MacDonald’s The Princess and Curdie). The use of a Nesbit-style group of children, as with Lewis’s Pevensies, makes possible various kinds of conflict and interaction in a kind of social comedy that before Nesbit was more likely to appear in realistic fiction (e.g., Louisa May Alcott’s Little Women), and, without her influence, was not as likely to be joined to the mythic, romantic sweep of the abysses of time that both Lewis and Tolkien loved. Sometimes Lewis even borrowed bits of Nesbit as specific as the tyrannical Queen of Babylon, vainly trying to conquer modern London in The Story of the Amulet, who became the tyrannical Empress Jadis, vainly trying to conquer modern London in The Magician’s Nephew. Joe R. Christopher, in his dissertation, The Romances of Clive Staples Lewis, pointed out that, in addition to making Jadis resemble Nesbit’s Queen of Babylon, Lewis underscored Nesbit’s influence on Narnia by announcing at the start of The Magician’s Nephew that it took place when “Mr. Sherlock Holmes was still living in Baker Street and the Bastables were looking for treasure in the Lewisham Road” (qtd. in Christopher 196). Lewis loved, as Tolkien on the whole did not, a mixture of satiric and social comedy in a fairy tale. Already, when he had only just begun work on The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe, he spoke to Chad Walsh of his intention “of completing a children’s book which he has begun ‘in the tradition of E. Nesbit’” (Walsh 10). Laura Miller, in The Magician’s Book: A Skeptic’s Adventures in Narnia, briefly mentions the influence of Nesbit’s narrative voice on Lewis’s, and in “On E. Nesbit and her influence on The Chronicles of Narnia,” one of the “Outtakes” from the book on her website, Miller discusses in more detail Lewis’s borrowing of this “narrator’s voice: companionable, confiding, occasionally ironic, and conversational in a tone that hovers between big sister and eccentric uncle.”

In 1962, with the Narnia series completed, Lewis returned once more to a consideration of the appeal of fairy tales, in the chapter already mentioned, on “The Longævi,” in his book on the Medieval worldview, The Discarded Image. (The book’s publication date was 1964, but it came out after Lewis’s death; the book’s preface is dated July 1962.) By the learned term of Longævi, he explained, what he basically meant was “Fairies,” but he wanted to include related figures, such as fauns and nymphs, or mermaids, and, besides, he felt that the word was “tarnished by pantomime” (123). The material in the book grew out of his entire academic career as a specialist in Medieval and Renaissance Literature, but the experience of writing modern fairy tales of his own in the Narnia books must to some extent have influenced his ideas of the similarity of the appeal of fairies and of such related figures as fauns, nymphs, dryads, and mermaids. Bearing in mind
his choice of *The Wind in the Willows* as his chief example of a fairy tale in “On Three Ways of Writing for Children,” the Narnian Talking Beasts should probably be included as well in the list of intelligent non-humans with an appeal akin to the appeal of fairies.

Lewis felt some doubt about the appropriateness of devoting an entire chapter to the topic:

> Whether they are important enough to justify this arrangement [of a chapter to themselves] is another question. In a sense, if I may risk the oxymoron, their unimportance is their importance. They are marginal, fugitive creatures. They are perhaps the only creatures to whom the [Medieval] Model does not assign, as it were, an official status. Herein lies their imaginative value. They soften the classic severity of the huge design. They intrude a welcome hint of wildness and uncertainty into a universe that is in danger of being a little too self-explanatory, too luminous. (122)

Miller, in *The Magician’s Book*, quotes from the end of the preceding chapter of *The Discarded Image*:

> If [the medieval cosmos] has an aesthetic fault, it is perhaps, for us who have known romanticism, a shade too ordered. For all its vast spaces it might in the end afflict us with a kind of claustrophobia. Is there nowhere any vagueness? No undiscovered byways? No twilight? Can we never get really out of doors? (*Discarded Image* 121, qtd. in *Magician’s Book* [MB] 270-271)

She considers that the claustrophobia Lewis sometimes felt in looking at the medieval cosmos was just what she had felt in looking at the Narnia books she had loved as a child when as an adolescent she found out that they had a Christian agenda—that “the road that had once seemed to lead to free and open country had in reality doubled back to Church.” She was accordingly delighted to find “Lewis himself writing wistfully of a third road, like the bonny road that leads to Elfland” (*MB* 271). She adds that Lewis shared my attraction to ‘twilight’ and ‘undiscovered byways,’ wayward forces that eluded the moral polarities of the great monotheistic religions born in the Middle East. But to admit such things into his picture of the world would undermine the very quality that made that picture so comforting: its comprehensive, celestial harmony. Fairies, neither angels nor men, neither good nor evil, have no place in God’s plan. That is the real source of their appeal and their threat, and the reason why fundamentalists object to witches, wizards, and other occult elements in children’s books. It’s not that these figures allure readers to Satanism, but that they introduce the possibility that God and Satan are not your only
options. Whether or not you believe in fairies, they stand for that choice, for the third road. (MB 276)

This delight in getting outside rigid systems of thought, of getting outside the limitations of our own human perspective to imagine other ways of thought, other ways of being, was, Tolkien said, one of the profound delights of the fairy tale: “On this desire [the desire to converse with other living things], as ancient as the Fall, is largely founded the talking of beasts and creatures in fairy-tales, and especially the magical understanding of their proper speech” (OFS 73). Here, in spite of Tolkien's feeling elsewhere in “On Fairy-Stories” that Beast-Fables were not the same genre as fairy tales, he and Lewis were in agreement about the appeal of Talking Animals as attractive in a way similar to the attraction of the non-human, yet human-shaped Fairies. Lewis's use in the science-fictional context of Out of the Silent Planet of three different species of Martian aliens shows yet another form of this appeal: the different species of intelligent Martians have not only for Ransom, the human protagonist, but for each other the appeal of being talking animals.

Lewis's enjoyment of Talking Animals ran through his whole life. In boyhood, he and his older brother, W.H. Lewis, made up Boxen, an amalgamation of the older boy's imagined India and the younger's Animal-Land. Lewis's poems, written over several decades and collected and edited posthumously in Poems by Walter Hooper in 1965, included many outspoken beasts, such as “The Dragon Speaks” from 1933, “What the Bird Said Early in the Year” from 1938, the horses about to inherit the Earth and acquire speech in “On a Picture by Chirico,” from 1949; as well as a general defense of the practice in “Impenitence,” from 1953, in which Lewis argued that “the man-like beasts of the earthy stories” were naturally fitted for use as “Masks for Man,” concluding with his favorite, The Wind in the Willows, paired with Lewis Carroll's “The Hunting of the Snark”:

    here’s a
    Health to Toad Hall, here’s to the Beaver doing
    Sums with the Butcher!

Lewis and Tolkien were different in important ways in their interest in fairy tales—different in whether they expected fairy tales to be associated with stories for children or not, different in thinking Beast-Fables generally and The Wind in the Willows, in particular, as part of the same genre as fairy tales or not, and different in thinking first of folktales or of modern fantasy stories in choosing typical examples of fairy tales. But they were alike in their delight in fairy tales as a way of getting outside the limits of ourselves, to imagine other ways of thought, and other ways of being.
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