



Mythopoeic Society

mythLORE

A Journal of J.R.R. Tolkien, C.S. Lewis,
Charles Williams, and Mythopoeic Literature

Volume 13 | Number 1 | Issue 47, Autumn

Article 11

10-15-1986

An Inklings Bibliography (30)

Joe R. Christopher

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.swosu.edu/mythlore>



Part of the [Children's and Young Adult Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Christopher, Joe R. (1986) "An Inklings Bibliography (30)," *Mythlore: A Journal of J.R.R. Tolkien, C.S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and Mythopoeic Literature*: Vol. 13 : No. 1 , Article 11.

Available at: <https://dc.swosu.edu/mythlore/vol13/iss1/11>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by SWOSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mythlore: A Journal of J.R.R. Tolkien, C.S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and Mythopoeic Literature by an authorized editor of SWOSU Digital Commons. An ADA compliant document is available upon request. For more information, please contact phillip.fitzsimmons@swosu.edu.

An Inklings Bibliography (30)

Abstract

Resuming after a hiatus, a series of bibliographies of primary and secondary works concerning the Inklings.

An Inklings' Bibliography

(30) Compiled by Joe R. Christopher

Aldiss, Brian W. Billion Year Spree: The True History of Science Fiction. (1973) New York: Schocken Books, 1974. [xii] + 339 pp. Index. [Lewis, 3, 88, 106, 119, 196-201, 205, 210, 286, 289n, 305, 307, 320n; Tolkien, 162, 201, 265-269; Williams, 201.]

Aldiss's history of science fiction (recently issued in a revised version as Trillion Year Spree) both cites Lewis as critic or a reader (on William Morris, 3, 88; on E.A. Abbott, 106; on H.G. Wells, 119; on Olaf Stapledon and hypothetically on Hugo Gernsback, 210; generally, 305, 320n) and as a writer of the Ransom Trilogy (196-201, 205, 213n, 286, 289n, 307). Aldiss's summary of Out of the Silent Planet (196-198) contains a lengthy quotation from the Weston-Ransom-Oyarsa conversation in Chapter 20 of the book; Aldiss calls the volume, "one of the most delightful space voyages in literature" (198). Perelandra receives a summary (198-199), a general paragraph on its Miltonic derivation, and such comments as this: "it is undeniable that [Lewis] can sometimes make [non-Christians] squirm with embarrassment, as in the psalm-singing ending" (199). That Hideous Strength is given a brief summary (199-200) and called "remarkable rather than successful" (200). "Jules in That Hideous Strength is a spiteful and personal caricature [of H.G. Wells]. It was hardly Wells' fault that he was a Cockney, or that his legs were short" (213n). (Aldiss, in his defense of Wells, forgets that satire is not a polite debate.) "What remains vital about... the trilogy... is that it tries to answer the Wellsian position in vaguely Wellsian terms. It is not dystopian; it is against the idea of utopia. As such, it represents a genuine minority viewpoint" (200).

Tolkien and Williams are mentioned for their influence on That Hideous Strength (201), but The Lord of the Rings gets an extended later discussion (265-269), including the quotation of night passages from Tolkien and Mervyn Peake to contrast their styles. Aldiss sees Middle-earth as a projection of the social order and scenery of Tolkien's youth, and compares it to the equally artificial world of P.G. Wodehouse: "The counterfeit gold of an Edwardian sunset lights the oeuvre of both men" (266).

Anderson, Poul. Fantasy. New York: A Tom Dorherty Associates Book (TOR Books), distributed by Pinnacle Books, 1981. 334 pp. [Lewis, 327; Tolkien, 160, 273-277.]

Three items are of interest, all non-fiction:

(a) Poul Anderson, "On Thud and Blunder," 159-177 (Tolkien, 160). Anderson writes on popular heroic fantasy, or sword-and-sorcery (he considers the terms synonymous); he comments that heroic fantasy need not be overly simplistic, "as such fine practitioners as de Camp, Leiber, and Tolkien have proven" (160). Note: this essay was previous noted in IB(11) on its first publication.

(b) Poul Anderson, "Fantasy in the Age of

Science," 265-286 (Tolkien, 273-277). (this is the first publication of this essay.) Anderson, writing of The Lord of the Rings, mentions its depths ("the struggle between good and evil both in the outside world and in the human heart, a sense of life as being ultimately tragic and yet infinitely wonderful") as well as its surface in homely details ("the heroes... trudge across long miles,... they crack small jokes or enjoy for a while some rest and peace in a sheltering place"); he finds Tolkien, through his use of homely specifics, to carry more conviction for the reader than E.R. Eddison and James Branch Cabell (273-274). Anderson also contrasts The Lord of the Rings and The Silmarillion on this matter of humble detail, wondering if the "widespread though not absolutely universal demand for basic realism [= homely details] and logical consistency" is not a product of the present scientific age (227).

(c.) Sandra Miesel, "Afterword: An Invitation to Elfland," 317-334 (Lewis, 327). Miesel's essay is a survey of Anderson's fantasies, both the ten stories in this book and his fantasy novels. At one point, in trying to describe Anderson's combination of reason and imagination, Miesel draws a parallel to C.S. Lewis, quoting his "For me reason is the natural organ of truth; but imagination is the organ of meaning." Her quotation continues for another sentence; the source, not given in the essay, is the last paragraph of Lewis's essay "Bluspels and Flalansferes: A Semantic Nightmare."

Green, William H. "The Four-Part Structure of Bilbo's Education." Children's Literature, vol. 8 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980, 133-140.

Green, like several other writers on The Hobbit, sees Bilbo's progress in the book as one of maturation. (Green, however, cites no previous works on the theme, such as Randel Helms' Tolkien's World, Ch. 3, and Jane Chance Nietzsche's Tolkien's Art, Ch. 2.) This thematic understanding is combined with a structural approach, which is the more significant aspect of this essay.

Green sees a four-fold movement: each begins with a leaving of a place of refuge (the Shire, the house of Elrond, Beorn's home, the lake-town) and continues with "want, danger, captivity, and unlikely escape" (133). About the captivities, Green comments, "The dwarves are repeatedly trapped in The Hobbit, twice in bags and three times in tunnels. These accidents presumably symbolize breaks in the maturation process, or, in terms of comparative mythology, absorption into the passive female principle" (136). (Such "mythological" reading, however, is not typical of the essay.) Green stresses an increasing moral ambiguity in the four adventures; for example, the lake-town lacks the grace of Elrond's and Beorn's places, where passages over rivers offer separation from the evils behind (138).

Structurally, Green also makes much of similarities of the opening and closing of the book (134-135) and Bilbo's three separations from the

dwarves (138-139); and he offers a number of interesting suggestions, such as the derivation of Bilbo's name from the Middle English words bil + boie, "sword-boy" (133).

Despite Green's very limited acknowledgment of Tolkien scholarship, the essay is a respectable contribution to Tolkien studies, particularly to the growing consensus about the maturation theme and to the lack of consensus about structure.

Martin, George R.R. The Armageddon Rag. (1983) New York: Pocket Books, 1985. xiv + 402 pp. [Balrog (sometimes "Bal," the name of a dog), 190-191, 254, 260-261, 269, 285, 291, 303-305, 309, 311, 313, 384; "Elf Rock" (a song), 125, 295-296, 341, 379; the Flying Eye (a hot-air balloon with the Eye of Sauron on it), 118, 120, 128, 130-131, 330, 371; Hobbit (the nickname of a singer), 43, 45, 127, 187-188, 276, 287, 291-292, 386, 388; Hot Wind Out of Mordor (record album), 11, 45, 296, 325, 341; Nazgul (the name of a rock group and of a record album), xi, 4-5, 11-13, 22-26, 28-30, 34, 38-43, 45-52, 61, 76, 79, 81-83, 85, 89-90, 109-111, 113, 115, 124-128, 130-131, 147, 149, 163, 174-175, 178-180, 185, 187, 191, 223-226, 232, 234-235, 240-241, 244, 247-248, 252-258, 260, 262-265, 267-269, 273-277, 279-280, 283-284, 286-289, 292, 295-298, 301-302, 306-307, 309, 315, 318, 322-323, 325-328, 333-336, 339, 341, 345, 347, 349-351, 354, 360, 365-366, 368, 370, 374, 378, 380-383, 386, 389, 390-392, 396, 399; Orcs (fan club), 49, 277; Sauron (the nickname of a promoter), 45, 234; general Tolkien references, 11-12, 45, 120, 127, 190, 234, 268, 277, 283, 343, 378.]

Martin's novel is a detective story-cum-supernatural possession fantasy set in the world of rock-'n'-roll; specifically, in a revival of a late '60s and very early '70s rock group, the Nazgul. The use of Tolkien by such a group is made more realistic if one remembers, for example, "Rivendell" on Rush's Flying High (1975) and several Tolkienesque songs, especially "The Necromancer," on Rush's Caress of Steel (also 1975). Martin uses his material and plot framework partly for a nostalgic remembrance of the hardrock and often idealistic youth culture of the '60s, partly for a depiction of what, typically or not so typically, has happened to the idealists, and partly for vivid descriptions of rock concerts. (Among those things which have happened to the one-time rebels seems to be neither hearing loss nor venereal diseases; but, then, this is a fantasy.) The last chapter is sentimental.

Briefly, the Nazgul in this story is an extremely popular rock group which disbanded in 1971 when their lead singer, Patrick Henry Hobbins, nicknamed Hobbit, was gunned down in a concert. This novel begins with the killing of the promoter, nicknamed Sauron bitterly, who owned the rights to the group's name (he is killed stretched out on a Nazgul poster with one of the group's records playing loudly). With his death, his rights seem to dissolve rather than be passed on to his heirs (if any); a new promoter gathers the group together with a young look-alike singer -- the new singer has a dog named Balrog. The song writer of the original group living in New Mexico, has a hot-air balloon with the Eye of Sauron painted on it. A few other Tolkienesque touches occur, but these give the essentials.

"Which side [of the final battle, of Armageddon] are we?" Sandy [the male protagonist] demanded. "Which side are we?"

"That's one you got to work out yourself, friend. This ain't like in Tolkien, is it?" (343)

Schaeffer, Franky. Addicted to Mediocrity: 20th Century Christians and the Arts. Illustrated by Kurt Mitchell. Westchester, Illinois: Crossway Books, 1981. 128 pp. [Lewis and Tolkien, 74.]

Essentially written for Evangelicals, this book attacks some fairly obvious targets: a fondness for simplistic, obvious art; a departmentalization which makes art trivial; particularly, the tendency to judge art on its propagandistic or other effectiveness (Christian utilitarianism). Schaeffer argues that mankind was made in God's image, and God was a Creator -- hence man's creativity comes to him from before the Fall; and that the separation of art (and life) into religious and secular categories is false. At one point Schaeffer mentions Christian artists in various fields whom he believes avoided the wide-spread modern mediocrity, including these writers:

In this century one thinks of C.S. Lewis, of Tolkien, or certain other writers and thinks such as Francis Schaeffer, Solzhenitsyn, Dorothy Sayers and others. (74)

This part of the book is a question-and-answer section, and perhaps the redundancy of other and others can be put down to an oral origin. Francis Schaeffer is Frank Schaeffer's father. The addition of non-romantic British and American writers, such as Graham Greene, would have better made the author's point about the unity of the secular and the religious.

Schweitzer, Darrell (ed.). Exploring Fantasy Worlds: Essays on Fantastic Literature. San Bernardino, California: The Borgo Press (I.O. Evans Studies in the Philosophy and Criticism of Literature, No. 3), 1985. 112 pp. Index. [Lewis, 10; Tolkien, 7*, 24*, 28-30, 50, 98; Williams, 9*; starred pages not in the index.]

Three of the miscellaneous essays in this small book are of interest here:

(a) Michael Moorcock, "Aspects of Fantasy," pp. 7-34 (Lewis, 10; Tolkien, 7, 9, 24, 28-30; Williams, 9). Moorcock's essay originally appeared in four installments in Science Fantasy, issues 61-64, in 1963-1964. Moorcock set out to write a long survey of fantasy, but the magazine was sold and he had to end rather abruptly (Schweitzer, "Introduction," 5). In his opening definition, Moorcock refers to "the well-written extravaganzas of Peake, Tolkien, and others" as one level of modern fantasy (7); however, while consistently accepting Tolkien's style, Moorcock depreciates his work otherwise, ending with this statement:

[The writer] may be an inadequate artist and a good stylist, like Dunsany or Bradbury or Tolkien, but if, as in the case of these, he cannot do more than recapture the wonders and terrors of infancy, he deserves to be regarded as we regard an infant prodigy -- admiration, but not too much serious attention. (30)

Between these statements comes both some analysis of fantasy and something of a historical survey. Charles Williams appears in a list of writers who have used archetypal characters in classical situations (9). Tolkien is mentioned as one of the authors who used fantasy materials in "an imaginary setting" (9). Lewis' "Perelandra trilogy" is one of the examples of authors "exploiting the [fantasy] form" in order to discuss their own ideas about "the nature of Man" (10). Tolkien's Sauron is one of the examples of authors using "the Faceless Man of our dreams, the unknown aspect of ourselves," perhaps even "the 'evil' aspect of ourselves" (24). (Moorcock seems to be thinking of

something like the Jungian Shadow here.) Tolkien has been influenced by Dunsany, Moorcock suggests, having his weaknesses of an "archaic style" and "a nostalgic, highly-colored mood," although Tolkien has some (unnamed) strengths beyond Dunsany (29). (This derivation from Dunsany seems absurd.)

The most extended passage on Tolkien is a comparison of The Lord of the Rings and Mervyn Peake's Titus Groan books (3 paragraphs, 28), which grows out of the assumption that two of the major types of modern fantasy are the Sword and Sorcery tale, developing from the Gothic historical romance, and the Haunted Palace of the Mind story, developing from the Gothic haunted castle story (27). Moorcock's later comment on Tolkien's "picaresque theme" (30) -- meaning a quest theme -- explains what he intends here, as does his description of the Gothic historical romance as "boundless, horizonless, depending on adventure and supernatural marvels for its basic plot ingredients" (27). In his actual comparison of Tolkien and Peake, Moorcock notes their use of "'innocents' as central characters" -- the hobbits in Tolkien; he finds Peake's work superior in its characterization -- specifically in that the characters develop, while Tolkien's do not -- and in its memorable images (28). Despite calling The Lord of the Rings the "outstanding modern" example of the Sword and Sorcery story (28), Moorcock later lists Fritz Leiber's Two Sought Adventure (a Fafhrd and Gray Mouser book) as "the best current" development of the type (31). Whatever the inconsistencies and errors, Moorcock as a major modern fantasy writer is significant, and influential, in his opinions. Note: Moorcock has not changed his opinions in the last twenty years; he writes, in a letter in Niekas, No. 34 (no date; 1986), 44, "... I find C S Lewis morally disgusting and a lousy writer.... I suppose my views on all those horrid Inklings are fairly well known.... I have always felt that there was an unpleasantly rightist undercurrent to [Tolkien's] (and Lewis') books which make them impossible for me to enjoy."

(b) Darrell Schweitzer, "Prithee, Sirrah, What Dost Thou Mean by Archaic Style in Fantasy?" 43-51 (Tolkien, 50). This essay originally appeared in Science Fantasy Review, No. 21, in 1977. Schweitzer writes an interesting essay, using specific passages from various authors -- William Morris, Lord Dunsany, Clark Ashton Smith, William Hope Hodgson -- to illustrate differences in the "archaic" style. Tolkien is mentioned only as a contrast: "The all-time best-seller, The Lord of the Rings, isn't written in a noticeably archaic style" (50).

(c) Paul Spencer, "Cabell: Fantasist of Reality," pp. 97-106 (Tolkien, 98). This essay was not previously printed. Spencer surveys Cabell's fantasies, and Tolkien appears only in two sentences, suggesting, first, that the Cabell revival is due in part to Tolkien's popularity stimulating "interest in literate fantasy," and, second, that "Even more than The Lord of the Rings, Cabell's books demonstrate the power and scope of fantasy as a medium both of entertainment and of profound artistic expression" (98). Spencer stresses the pleasing, not the teaching, side of the traditional formula throughout his discussion of Cabell.

Stableford, Brian. Scientific Romance in Britain [,] 1890-1950. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985. viii + 372 pp. Index. [Barfield, 290; Lewis, 37, 43, 165, 288-299, 309, 312, 330; Tolkien, 289-291, 299; Williams, 179, 291, 296-297.]

Stableford, in an excellent and valuable book, traces the British tradition of the scientific romance, which he contrasts with American science fiction in the

period. He writes:

The origin of the scientific romance was not merely a consolidation of quasi-realistic imaginary voyages, futuristic Utopian fantasies, evolutionary fantasies, and future war stories, with a delicate spice of secular eschatology; it was also a process of discrimination which isolated the speculative fiction which owed its inspiration to the scientific imagination from that which employed a 'supernatural' framework. It also needs to be emphasized that despite a certain amount of protestation to the contrary, this separation was only partially achieved. (38)

Although Stableford does not apply these traditions directly to Lewis, it is obvious that the voyages to Mars and Venus fit the first type, with the Martian society a non-futuristic Utopia; That Hideous Strength has, in its imagery, much of a not-quite-secular eschatology. Lewis also illustrates the failure to separate the scientific romance from a supernatural framework. (The American tradition, not thoroughly investigated, is that of pulp fiction, whether in magazines or paperbacks, aimed at a less educated audience. Essentially, American SF began to become better about 1940, the start of John W. Campbell's Golden Age, near the end of the separate British tradition [324-325].)

Stableford discusses twelve major writers of the scientific romance, divided into three periods: The Pre-war Period -- George Griffith, H.G. Wells, M.P. Shiel, Arthur Conan Doyle, William Hope Hodgson, J.D. Beresford; Between the Wars -- S. Fowler Wright, Olaf Stapledon, Neil Bell, John Bloor; After the Holocaust -- C.S. Lewis, Gerald Heard. As has been known in Lewis studies for a long time, H.G. Wells and Olaf Stapledon provided a background for Lewis to react against; Stableford's survey shows all three in the same tradition. Two figures of importance in the influence on Lewis' fiction also fit into Stapledon's pattern as minor figures -- G.K. Chesterton's fiction is mentioned as a reply to Wells (124-126) and J.B.S. Haldane's essays are discussed (especially, 156-159) -- although Stableford is very general about the essays' influence on Lewis (292). David Lindsay, despite Voyage to Arcturus, receives no real discussion, although he is mentioned twice as an influence on Lewis (291, 298), the second time being described, with John Cowper Powys, as being in the genre of metaphysical fantasy.

The basic discussion of Lewis (288-299) contains a survey of his life and major works, and includes his three short stories that can be considered scientific romances. The only factual error seems to be that Lewis' second marriage ceremony was held in a Church (298) -- it was celebrated by a priest in a hospital. Stableford offers five parallels to Olaf Stapledon's development in his account of Lewis' early beliefs and writings. In general, it is an excellent survey; a comment elsewhere shows that Stableford does not think Christianity can be intellectually acceptable (309), but he is not attacking Christianity in his book. Six of his twelve major authors had fathers who were clerics; the six obviously turned in more secular directions, but Lewis is interesting for his opposite turn. (Stableford lectures in a department of sociology in a British university; his approach, in sections not mentioned here, is sociological, and his attitude is also more of observation than non-analytic judgement. Stableford does not mention that Mark Studdock, in That Hideous Strength, is a sociologist.)

Among the excellencies of the discussion of Lewis is an explanation of why Out of the Silent Planet cannot be regarded as an allegory (292) and an indication of how widespread in the scientific romance

were the ideas of "emergent evolution" which Weston espouses early in *Perelandra* (294). The following section, on Gerald Heard, contains several comparisons with Lewis (309, 312). Elsewhere in the book, Lewis is quoted on the eschatological aspects of the scientific romance (37), is pointed to, with Gerald Heard, for attempting the synthesis of "the scientific and religious world-views" (43), and is mentioned, along with others, for being influenced by the speculative essays of the period between the wars and for producing "spectical [appraisals] of the state of contemporary civilisation, and... its prospects" (165). That is, Lewis belongs to his period.

Lewis' friendships with Barfield, Tolkien, and Williams are noted in the section on Lewis, but little is made of their works; Stableford does indicate that an analogous situation exists between the scientific romance and the metaphysical fantasy in his period of consideration as exists today between science fiction

and the heroic fantasy, the latter flourishing in the wake of Tolkien (299).

Williams, Charles. "At the 'Ye that do truly.'" In The New Oxford Book of Christian Verse, ed. Donald Davie, No. 228 (p. 257). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Williams' poem was included in Lord David Cecil's The Oxford Book of Christian Verse (1940); and in "An Inklings Bibliography (29), "a stress on the lack of copyright for the poem in that volume may have implied that it was original there. But Davie, in reprinting the poem, credits Divorce (1920) as the origin (p. 305), although he also does not give a copyright notice — presumably the volume was uncopyrighted. In his notes, Davie prints the relevant portion of The Book of Common Prayer to illumine this poem (p. 311).

Early Review of Books by J.R.R. Tolkien

Compiled by George H. Thompson

Part VI Tree and Leaf

T&L '64 London: A&U, 1964
T&L '65 Boston: HM, 1965

Anthony, Mother Mary, S.H.C.J. Best Sellers 24 (15 March 1965), 488. [Tolkien's essay on the fairy-story as art form (a 1938 lecture, enlarged) may well be the most important analysis of the function of the poetic imagination since Coleridge.] +

T&L '65

B., V. "More on Fairies". Western Daily Press and Bristol Mirror. 5 June 1964, p. 6. [A brief review, not seen.]

T&L '64

Barrett, William. "Ever-Ever Land". Atlantic Monthly 215 (March 1965), 194-195. [The review gives a sympathetic Christian interpretation to Tolkien's ideas on fairy stories and makes a brief mention of LBN.] +

T&L '65

Bingham, Mary. "From the Perilous Realm". Courier Journal (Louisville, Ky.), 7 March 1965, Section IV, p. 5. [A descriptive appreciation with judicious quotations from OFS. She gives the name "katharsis" to the "piercing glimpse of joy, and hearts desire" that Tolkien finds at the close of the successful fairy tale.] +

T&L '65

Booklist 61 (1 March 1965), 643. [A brief, purely descriptive review.] o

T&L '65

Briggs, K.M. Folklore 75 (Winter 1964), 293-294. [Approaching the book from the point of view of folklore, he argues that classification is a necessity, though Tolkien does not much approve of it. However, stories have been "handed down for the sake of delight and enlargement of spirit," and Tolkien's essay is a timely reminder of this.] +

T&L '64

Brink, Adrian. "Tree and Leaf: J R R Tolkien". Granta (Cambridge), 5 June 1964, pp. 36-37. [A sympathetic, well-informed summary and review. "So Tolkien presents his case and it is a consistent case. Whether it is credible or not is another matter all together, for its author does not ask for rational belief or disbelief. His philosophy is more a way of looking at the world than of thinking of it." LBN is not one of his best works.] +

T&L '64

Choice 3 (May 1966), 204. ["The essay is unique in the fields of folklore and philology." Brief.] +

T&L '65

Christian Century 82 (3 March 1965), 280. ["A sensible 85 page essay on fairy stories precedes a fairy story in this over-priced 112-page book." This is the entire review.] +

T&L '65

Culpan, Norman. "From Sixteen to Upper Sixth: Literature". School Librarian and School Library Review 12 (1 Dec. 1964), 295-296. [A fairly brief, descriptive, sympathetic notice.] +

T&L '64

Dalglish, Alice. "An April Shower to Share". Saturday Review 48 (24 April 1965), 44. [Though not a Hobbit fan, she is favorably impressed by both parts of T&L. "It is required reading for the many who are busily engaged in writing so-called modern fairy tales."] +

T&L '65

Davenport, Guy. "The Persistence of Light". National Review 17 (20 April 1965), 332-334. [This review of T&L is in fact a wide-ranging rhetorical article in praise of Tolkien. The divine vision has often been lost in modern literature but "in Tolkien has been reborn. He has escaped satire and irony on the one side and realism on the other." The theme of the essay on fairy stories is "that the imagination is a metamorphosis of reality rather than an evasion of it," Tolkien's stories are timeless because his creatures represent moral states. The statement that the writing of LOTR was finished before World War II is incorrect. Concerning Tolkien's next work: "It is, I was told this summer in England, 'not a romance but a history'..."] +

T&L '65