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

An essay discussing Toynbee's terms archaism and futurism, as used in A Study of History and as taken "to be reacting against or destructive of the contemporary ethos within which they exist" (199-200). "Contemporary return to origins' movements have existed in parallel with, and have often drawn sustaining imaginative impetus from, a proliferation of Middle Earth [sic] fantasies, including regression as far back as to the Pliocene" (200). When Bailey turns to futurism, in his sense, he also discusses the aliens in SF and he does not return, substantially, to archaism and its dangers.


"The highlight of the Fall was in another league entirely: the stage production of an adaptation of Tolkien's Lord of the Rings by the Canadian Theatre Sans Fil -- performed by a combination of live actors and rod-and-cable puppets. The same group did a stage version of The Hobbit at the Olympic Arts Festival in Los Angeles in 1984. Advance reviews were somewhat mixed, but intriguing, so I decided to take a chance. The first few minutes were not promising -- Hobbits are, by their very nature, cutey, and Bilbo's 111th birthday party threatened to dissolve into Disneyfied at any moment. But once the quest was begun, the Fellowship prepared to spend their first night in the forest -- and almost subliminal electronic humming filled the theater, accompanied by ominous snorts and heavy breathing; then the Dark Rider appeared -- a cloaked figure mounted on a gigantic, sleek black horse with a white skull for a head, eyes glowing like red coals, clouds of vapor coming from its nostrils. I'm sure I wasn't the only one in the audience to turn to instant goosebumps. From that moment I was captivated, watching Tolkien's world come to life before my eyes. I was scarcely conscious of the black-clad puppeteers scurrying around in the background. The puppets were real: the elves, pretternaturally tall and thin and beautiful and non-human; Treebeard the Ent, a marvellous twenty-foot-tall talking tree; the gigantic Shelob the spider; and the Balrog, deserving of all the Lovecraftian adjectives such as 'aquamous' and 'rugose,' entering from the back of the auditorium and oozing its way down the aisle, snuffing at the audience, and finally climbing over the orchestra pit and onto the stage for its battle to the death with Gandalf the wizard. There was Saruman and his minion Wormtongue, comic and evil at the same time; the full-scale battle of Minas Tirith, with rival war machines trundling onto the stage and disgorging what seemed like hordes of warriors; and at the climax, slimy Gollum biting off Frodo's finger with the One Ring, and falling into the fires of Mount Doom. Brilliant puppetry, costuming, sound effects, music, black light and lasers -- the gobseumbers are back, just from the memory. I'd love to see it again."


Bryant writes a brief history of riddles in world literature (although missing altogether those by Emily Dickinson) and then collects 709 examples, almost all in verse or translated from verse into prose. In his history of the form, he mentions the competition between Bilbo Baggins and Gollum in The Hobbit, Ch. 5, quoting "This thing all things devours" (77-78); in his collection, Bryant quotes the seven verse riddles from The Hobbit but not the one in prose (186-187) and gives their answers (204).

Christopher, Joe R. C.S. Lewis. Boston: Twayne Publishers, A Division of G.K. Hall (Twayne English Authors Series, No. 442), 1987. [xvi] + 150 pp. [Inklings generally, ix, xiv, 1, 4, 6, 29, 60, 62, 64, 105, 120; Barfield, xiii, 2, 3, 5, 12, 25, 30, 42, 67, 72, 76, 103, 132 n. 8; Bennett, 29; Dyson, xiv, 5, 6, 13, 29, 114; Fox, 76; Hardie, 25; Havard, 64; W. H. Lewis, xiv, 2, 5-6, 16, 25, 39, 66; Tolkien, xiii, xiv, 2, 4-6, 13, 23-24, 29-30, 37, 42, 60, 81, 909, 977, 103, 105, 119-120; Williams, xiv, 2, 6, 20, 29, 66, 41-42, 43, 60, 62, 64, 67, 76, 84, 87-88, 90, 100-103, 105, 108, 123-124, 125.]

Christopher offers a study of Lewis' book-length prose works, arranged by genre into chapters and then chronologically within the chapters. Following the Twayne format, he also has a chronology of Lewis' life, a biographical introduction (which Christopher turns mainly into a discussion of Lewis' sensibilities), a conclusion on Lewis' artistic importance, a primary checklist, and an annotated secondary checklist (which Christopher limits almost entirely to full-length books on Lewis). One of the virtues of Christopher's book is that he avoided the required summaries of content and plots (which, for example, ate up much space in Margaret Patterson Hannay's C.S. Lewis in a similar series), turning them into plot and organization analyses. Christopher has emphasized Lewis' artistry and self-revelatory aspects in his books (despite what Lewis' The Personal Heresy says about the latter) and seems largely unconcerned with Lewis' Christian message; an example of the latter is his psychological reading of Till We Have Faces, with only scant mention of the religious level. Christopher also emphasizes between allusions, Lewis' male chauvinism, his sadism, and his references to his friends. Some of these should make the book controversial in a minor way, appropriately enough since Lewis also did controversial things in his scholarly books. Sometimes Christopher simply seems eccentric, as in his attack on the lack of organization in Letters to Malcolm when he could have just as easily praised its epistolary verisimilitude; sometimes he misses the obvious, as when
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Bryant quotes the seven verse riddles from The Hobbit but not the one in prose (186-187) and gives their answers (204).
he fails to mention D.E. Myers' brilliant reading of the Narnian Chronicles in their order of publication, "The Complete Anglican: Spiritual Style in the Chronicles of Narnia"; and sometimes he is simply wrong, as when he complains about the lack of organization in The Great Divorce — Marsha Ann Daigle in her dissertation, "Dante's Divine Comedy and the Fiction of C.S. Lewis," has shown it is based on Dante's Purgatorio with George MacDonald's discussion of free will coming between two groups of five Ghosts each, just as Virgil's discussion of free will occurs on the Fourth Cornice of Mount Purgatory, the middle one of the seven. Whatever his book's flaws and despite his biographical emphases, Christopher's basic concern with aesthetics and his attempted appeal to a general audience are obviously intended to prove valuable in a long-range defense of Lewis as a writer.

Christopher, Joe R. "The Natural Law Tradition of C.S. Lewis." The Ring Bearer. 4:1 (Fall/March 1986), 11-16.

The first of Christopher's essays covers much of the same ideas as his discussion of "Right and Wrong as a Clue to the Meaning of the Universe" and The Abolition of Man in his book, C.S. Lewis, published about a year later; but the latter part of the essay is of interest, for there Christopher goes on to consider the relationship to Lewis' belief in Natural Law to his belief in Christianity. Christopher shows that earlier Christian writers tended to say that God created Natural Law -- these come from Lewis' citations of them in English Literature in the Sixteenth Century and Studies in Words -- but Lewis said Natural Law simply was God, seen from a particular perspective ("is not the Tao the Word Himself?") Lewis writes to Clyde S. Kilby. Probably Christopher's sense of audience explains the difference in the two writings: C.S. Lewis was written for a general audience; "The Natural Law Tradition of C.S. Lewis," as is indicated by a note (16), was originally read at a divisional meeting of the Conference on Christianity and Literature.


This article is essentially the chapter on the Chronicles of Narnia from Daigle's dissertation, "Dante's Divine Comedy and The Fiction of C.S. Lewis," although the first section has been shortened and some minor revisions made later. Daigle's second section argues that Dante's Commedia and Lewis' Chronicles are both Biblically based works in the sense of using the typological approach, in which the Biblical salvation history is reshaped in a new literal level. In the third section, she traces allusions to the Inferno in The Silver Chair and to the Purgatorio and Paradiso in The Voyage of the "Dawn Treader." The second section is complementary to Charles A. Rutter's "C.S. Lewis' Narnia and the 'Grand Design,'" which argued the Biblical parallels as a generic, not a typological, approach; the third section is excellent in showing Lewis' indebtedness to Dante's poem, both in specific allusions and in structure (the cave journey in The Silver Chair, the journey to Utter East [Heaven, more or less] in The Voyage of the "Dawn Treader"). Daigle's notes cite the two earlier studies of Dantean imagery in the Chronicles, both at the time of her publication unpublished.


After a chapter on Lewis' literary theory, Daigle surveys Dantean literary devices and plot imitations in The Pilgrim's Regress, The Space Trilogy, The Screwtape Letters, The Great Divorce, and "The Narnian Chronicles." Daigle misses the Dantean imagery at the end of Till We Have Faces, but otherwise she provides the fullest and best treatment of Lewis' Dantean borrowings in his available. The discussions of both The Pilgrim's Regress and the Ransom Trilogy involve extended comparisons of the journeys of Dante—the-character and John in the former and Ransom in the latter, among other matters. Parallels are drawn between Screwtape's Hell and the Inferno. The discussion of The Great Divorce is elaborate, as might be expected. In addition to the more obvious parallels, daigle discusses the structure of Lewis' book, finding the same 5 + 5 structure of meetings (including one non-meeting) that Evan K. Gibson found in C.S. Lewis, Spinner of Tales; but Daigle correctly identifies the content relationship: "the first five are illustrations of sinful attitudes, while the next five episodes are illustrations of disordered love" (164). She also points to Lewis' last two episodes (the young man with the lizard and Sarah Smith) as being parallel to Dante's reaching the level of purification of lust on Mount Purgatory and then entering the Garden of Eden. The chapter on the Chronicles of Narnia has been separately published as "Dante's Divine Comedy and Lewis' Narnia Chronicles."


Dale's book is a pleasant but curious work. It was written, she says (xi), out of a decision to publish some chalk drawings by Chesterton -- presumably the color sketches on pp. ii, 11, 77, 117. (The color drawing on the dust jacket is not in the book, and it may be one of this group.) There are also thirty-three black-and-white sketches and one holograph ms. reproduced. What is odd is that there is no index to the art in the book and no causal explanations of most of the sketches (perhaps no explanations are available). Dale writes a short biography of Chesterton, "The Man Who was Chesterton," in eight chapters, and a general survey of his art, "The Artist and the Lunatics," in one. Dale repeats, although enlarging, her controversial thesis from The Outline of Sanity (1982) that Chesterton became a Roman Catholic as a matter of discipline when taking on the editorship of his dead brother's The New Witness (58; also, 59-61). But in general her biography is not likely to cause as much controversy as her earlier one, and the book seems aimed at a general (perhaps largely library) audience.

Lewis is used as an authority once in this book. Dale paraphrases his statement that there is, in her words, "a Kafkaesque quality" to The Man Who was Thursday (33). The source, not given, seems to be the penultimate paragraph of Lewis' essay "Period Criticism" (1946). The second reference to Lewis is in a list of later writers who were influenced, to a greater or lesser degree, by Chesterton: Dorothy L. Sayers, Lewis, T.S. Eliot, W.H. Auden, Evelyn Waugh, and Graham Greene (61).


This boxed edition is of interest as the least available of the English-language editions of The Hobbit which have been illustrated by someone other than Tolkien himself. It was preceded by the edition illustrated with the stills from the animated cartoon
version of The Hobbit by Arthur Rankin, Jr., and Jules Bass (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1977; New York: Ballantine Books, 1978) and followed by the edition with Michael Hague's illustrations (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1984). Fraser uses black-and-white drawings, heavily stylized (particularly with concentric patterns on stones). He has two full-page drawings (of the eagle-rescue of ch. 8 as the frontispiece; of the gathering for adventure on the Lone Mountain of ch. 17 on p. 9, just before the beginning of ch. 1). Additionally, Fraser has a drawing covering approximately the top one-third of each page that begins a chapter. Most of the drawings are original with Fraser, but his headpiece to ch. 3 is a night-time version of Tolkien's "Rivendell," with the foreground tree removed and no clouds around the far mountains; his headpiece to ch. 19 is based on Tolkien's "The Hill: Hobbiton-across-the-Water," with different clouds in the sky, slight differences in the buildings, and the addition of the small figures of Gandalf and Bilbo just across the foreground bridge. Tolkien's "Thor's Map" and Christopher Tolkien's "Wilderland" are reproduced in this edition as they are in at least the third edition from George Allen and Unwin, as the front and back endpapers.


An amusing essay written from the point of view of O'Brien, a character in 1984, but discussing the actual 1984 world. "Bear in mind that we still face danger as long as it is possible to reach the general public with any clear and accurate exposition of either real science or real religion.... Yet we cannot overly suppress reference to science or religion in SF. What, then, Comrades, is our solution? It is to head off those authors who have any real grasp of these areas, and to encourage those who do not, but think that they have. [New paragraph.] We can safely claim to have made real headway on this latter task. Any SF bookshop today is packed with novels out of Tolkien via Ursula Le Guin, novels which duplicate the length of the former's work without its style, and the trappings of the latter's work without its understanding. The fact that this mishmash of ancient magic, eldrich wizards, towering heroes, and liberated heroines is passed off as science fiction is already a triumph for us; the incitement in the young that religion is something on a part with Royal Queen jelly is an added bonus" (118).


"Orwell uses the anticipation [the fictional excerpt from Emanuel Goldstein's Theory and Practice of Oligarchic Collectivism, read by Winston Smith in 1984] to deny political possibility. Politically, his position now resembles that of a conservative, like C.S. Lewis, who, in The Abolition of Man (1947), was arguing that the scientific-technological renaissance is only a way of granting further power to those already holding too much power and a way of depriving the future of its full range of options" (145). The comparison, even in the context of Huntington's reading of the Goldstein excerpt, seems strained.


Valerie M. Lagorio, in her two-paragraph note on Lewis (336-337), gives a brief, very simplified Arthurian summary of That Hideous Strength, "Although Lewis' That Hideous Strength is unabashedly reactionary with regard to scientific progress, empiricism, and atheism, his investing of human worth and hope in the Pendragon and Logres is in the mainstream of Arthurian moral realism." In one sentence at the end of the note, she mentions Arthurian Torsos. Lagorio shows no knowledge of Lewis' unfinished poem "Launcelot" (Narrative Poems). Presumably minor allusions (e.g., those motifs in Chapters XIII and XIV of The Voyage of the Dawn Treader) and certainly Lewis' Arthurian criticism other than that on Williams — mainly on Mallory and Spenser — are not significant enough for this volume. Oddly, in Lagorio's four-item bibliography after her English literature discussion of Lewis (336-337) on Lewis instead of, for example, a biography, and she lists Charles Moorman's The Precincts of Peculiarity instead of his more appropriate Arthurian Triptych. (The latter, for whatever reason, is likewise not listed after the notes on T.S. Eliot and Charles Williams.)

The other references to Lewis are uneven. Raymond T. Thompson, in the fiction section of "English and American Arthurian Literature (Modern)," does an elaborate division of fantasy into low and high, and the latter term into didactic, mythopoetic, heroic, and ironic. In mythopoetic fantasy, the struggle between Good and Evil is waged directly between supernatural powers, and it usually takes place in a contemporary setting. Thus, Charles Williams relates a powerful story of spiritual conflict in a disbelieving world as competing parties search for the Holy Grail in War in Heaven (1930); and C.S. Lewis condemns the dehumanizing aspects of scientific progress in That Hideous Strength (1945). The protagonists of these novels develop a deep understanding of life, but only at the cost of personal loss and suffering" (156). Muriel A. Whiting, in her discussion of Arthur Machen says that "Machen uses the theory of perichoresis to explain the reappearance of the Grail in modern times, an idea adopted by Charles Williams and C.S. Lewis" (349). Her reference is to Machen's novels The Great Return and The Secret Glory: perichoresis is close to Williams' emphasis on co-inherence, but the similarity of Machen's books to Williams' War in Heaven needs development. Lewis, of course, did not write a modern Grail story (unless one takes the glass of wine Mr. Fisher-King drinks in Ch. 7, Sec. 2, of That Hideous Strength as a parallel). J[eremy] J.[workman], in "Medievalism," quotes Lewis on humanism vs. The Faerie Queen (370): the source, not given, is English Literature in the Sixteenth Century. "New Learning and New Ignorance" (19). Workman also lists Williams as one of the four poets in whose twentieth-century works the Arthurian matter achieved "large-scale treatments" (380). Beverly Taylor, in "Return, Legends of Arthur's," comments about That Hideous Strength. "Arthur himself never returns; however, various Arthurian figures appear throughout the work, and finally both Merlin and Mr. Fisher-King...like Arthur go to another sphere" (451). The text of the romance suggests that Merlin died in Edgestow (Ch. 17, Sec. 2). In his discussion of Charles Williams (see below), K[arin] R. G[urttler] mentions Lewis' editing of Arthurian Torsos (630; in the bibliography, 633); Gurttler also has a general comparison of the Inklings, "In many respects, [Williams'] tenor of
thanked to views shared by his old [sic] Oxford companions, C.S. Lewis and J.R.R. Tolkien, particularly in a tendency toward elements of fantasy and the supernatural" (633).

Gurttler gives a good survey of Williams' main contributions to Arthurian matters in a three-and-a-quarter-page note, although he makes no mention of Williams' Arthurian poetry in the two books, "Taliesin through Logres and The Region of the Summer Stars." These early poems are listed and discussed in Charles Moorman's 1981 essay "The Structures of Charles Williams' Arthurian Poetry," a study which might well have been included in Gurttler's bibliography. Gurttler's understanding of the two books, as separate cycles, is much like that advanced in Glen Cavaliere's "Charles Williams: Poet of Theology" (in Gurttler's bibliography), but his brief reading of some poems in the sequence(s) seems more indebted to Lewis' 'Williams and the Arthuriad' than to Cavaliere. Gurttler concludes this part of his discussion, "Williams has widened the dimensions of the Arthurian story, reminding us of Milton and his representation of the Fall. Heaven and earth are united in a new mystical empire, which is not the less real because it never existed.... His Arthuriad is not a stylized portrait of a utopian phantastikon but a universally valid representation of the modern human situation" (633). A short paragraph, next to the last in the note, generalizes about War in Heaven.

The short references to William are less bothersome than those on Lewis. Raymond H. T. Thompson, in "English and American Arthurian Literature (Modern)," in addition to the mention of War in Heaven cited above, comments about Williams' poems: "the compositions of T.S. Eliot, Edwin Arlington Robinson, and Charles Williams represent the greatest achievements in Arthurian literature during the first half of the twentieth century.... Charles Williams' unfinished Arthurian cycle... explores the mystical significance of the Grail story. The downfall of Arthur's kingdom results from spiritual failure; an egotistical self-love that breeds disorder" (170). [Richard] F. O'Gorman, in "Grail (Graal)," in his last paragraph, mentions Williams, along with four other nineteenth and twentieth century authors, as a modern example of a writer thematically concerned with the Grail (260). Raymond H. T. Thompson, in a brief note on Taliesin, comments, "Taliesin was ignored outside of Welsh tradition until discovered by modern writers, most notably Charles Williams" (540).

J.A.W. Bennett and Tolkien are listed in bibliographies for books they edited, Essays on Malory (357) and, with E.G.V. Gordon, Sir Gawain and the Green Knight (511), respectively.


One of MacLeod's humorous Professor Peter Shandy mysteries, but this one involving a fantasy/dream sequence in Wales for most of the book. Three American agricultural professors end up in a fairy-tale, with a giant (an enchanted warrior) appearing in the second chapter. An allusion to Lewis appears in the third chapter, when one of the professors explains what he thinks has happened: "When my children were small, we maintained the homely old custom of reading aloud.... [The postman of his sister, who supplied them with books] was for British authors who wrote about children falling down rabbit holes or stepping into wardrobes and finding themselves henceforth involved with adventures of a nature which... seemed to be fantastical.... Now I realize they must have been mere vignettes of local history. That public house [from which they vanished] evidently functions in a manner somewhat akin to a wardrobe or a rabbit hole. We may perhaps consider ourselves fortunate to have encountered Sir Torchyl [the giant] instead of a well-dressed rabbit or a talking lion" (25). Later allusions to children's literature appear, but none to Narnia.

Post, Jonathan V. "'Gentry Errantry: For the 25th Birthday of NASA/With Apologies to Errantry' by J.R.R. Tolkien." Star/Sword Poetry Chapbook. No. 1 (1984), 4-5. (The chapbook series is, or was, edited by Scott E. Green.)

The imitation of Tolkien's poem is clear in this first stanza:

A spacecraft has a passenger
or else unmanned, like Mariner,
interplanetary messenger,
<ins>a Pioneer, a Voyager[.]</ins>

The poem consists of ten stanzas, varying in number of lines, all lines centered by computer (as here), often with fairly rough metrics; but there are no specific references to Tolkien within the poem itself.


Pringle selects the best SF novels of the post-World War II years —1949 until one of 1984. No one in the field would agree with all of his selections; but his concern is with artistry and other values, not with time-passing entertainment, so his choices are of interest; he briefly explains each selection in a two-page note on each work.

Obviously, Pringle's period does not include that of the Ransom Trilogy, but Lewis is mentioned twice. The first time is in the discussion of George Orwell's 1984 as part of "a whole tradition of 'post-Wellsian' fiction," which includes a number of minor authors and "more enduring writers like Olaf Stapledon, Aldous Huxley and C.S. Lewis" (22). The second time is in a discussion of Arthur C. Clarke's Childhood's End —it gained praise from C.S. Lewis... for its deft blend of hard science and religious mysticism" (56). This probably refers to the letter which Lewis wrote to Clarke after reading the book and which was later used in some publicity (with Lewis' permission).

The two references to Tolkien are of less significance. The first appears in the "Author's Introduction"; as part of a definition of SF, Pringle excludes "the Supernatural Horror Story and the Heroic Fantasy.... By heroic fantasy I mean such works as J.R.R. Tolkien's The Lord of the Rings..." (11). In the discussion of William Gibson's Neuromancer, Pringle complains, "All too many of the contemporary SF writers deal in the sub-creation of never-never worlds, lands akin to L. Frank Baum's Oz of Tolkien's Middle-Earth [sic] which it would be pleasant to escape to" (220). This distorts Tolkien's over-all creation, but it reflects a common reaction to his rural imagery.


This small art book was published on the fortieth anniversary of the first publication of The Hobbit, as Lin Carter's introduction, "There and Back Again," about children's books, mentions twice (10, 13). The format is a series of reproductions of Wenzel's draw-
ings illustrating *The Hobbit*, some in color, some not, usually on recto pages; Carter gives a brief summary, on the opposing verso pages, of the action of the story. Sometimes, no doubt due to the difficulty of placing the color printing, the story gets disjointed. For example, the double-page color print, "Thorin Finds a Lock for his Key," depicting the finding of the entrance on Lonely Mountain (44-45, with Carter's text on 43), is placed between "Spiders and Swords in Mirkwood" (40; text 40) and "Strange Cargo for River Running" (47; text, 46). Carter's text is often simplistic; for "Moon Mysteries at Rivendell," a picture with Elrond holding up the map to the window, Carter only mentions that Bilbo, Gandalf, and the dwarves had "a friendly host to describe the way to the Lonely Mountain where the treasure lay concealed" (21; text, 20). But the interest of the book is in the drawings: Wenzel has a two-page map of the action (6-7), eight single-page color prints (17, 21, 24, 29, 33, 41, 48, 52), ten single-page black-and-white drawings (19, 23, 27, 31, 39, 46, 51, 55, 57, 59), three double-page color drawings, the third being the same as the wrap-around cover of the book (36-37, 44-45, 60-61), and several smaller black-and-white drawings, one repeated (1 and 15; 3; 34; 42; 62 [the latter a self-portrait]). A biographical sketch by Charles M. Collins of Centaur Books mentions that Wenzel had been a comic book artist, as well as a children’s book illustrator and advertising lay-out person (63); the drawings suggest a sophisticated comic-book artist, with an extremely good colorer. Gollum (27) is drawn in a pure comic-book style; but the other drawings are not so obvious in their tradition and Wenzel’s declared influences, including Arthur Rackham (63), have an influence. One complaint is that Wenzel is not consistent about the size of Bilbo’s head in comparison to his body; in some of the drawings, Bilbo looks like a human dwarf.

Quenti Lambardillion, continued from page 43

The seeming scribal errors might be attributed to the haste with which Tolkien dashed off the post card or it might simply reflect his overall attitude toward the runic system, inside and outside of Middle-Earth. It did not "appear" elegant, nor was it in its use.

The last question which ought to be asked in a study like this is "How much does Tolkien borrow from the runic systems of the Germanic languages?" Table 3 answers that question.

Table 3

Tolkien’s Use and Invention of Runes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rune</th>
<th>A.S.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
<th>Toll.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
<th>O. Nor.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'wen'</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Toll.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'rad'</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>'calc'</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rev. 1 Toll.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>invent. Toll.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>'ving'</td>
<td>Toll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rev. 2 Toll.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>'os'</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>'vnr'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'gear'</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>invent. Toll.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>invent. Toll.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'hoer'</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>rev.</td>
<td>24 Toll.</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rev. 6 Go.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>'ear'</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>'haegel'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'lagr'</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>'peorth'</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'wesh'</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>variant A.S.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>invent Toll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'tyr'</td>
<td>Nor.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>invent. Toll.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>'ur'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rev. 9 Go.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>'nyd'</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>invent. Toll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'tir'</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>'var'</td>
<td>Nor.</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'naud'</td>
<td>O. Nor.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>'naw'</td>
<td>O. Nor.</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invent. Toll.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>rev. 38 Toll.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>invent. Toll.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'arv'</td>
<td>O. Nor.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>'kv'</td>
<td>Gold. Horn.</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invent. Toll.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>'zfyw'</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>'arv'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'yr'</td>
<td>O. Nor.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>'gar'</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'kann'</td>
<td>O. Nor.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>'man'</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'feyh'</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>'iaw'</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invent. Toll.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>'sige'</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of those runes which have "Toll." after them are either completely or partially invented characters. "Rev." means that a legitimate runic symbol has been reversed by Tolkien to take on a different value. Those runes with "(A.S.)" after them are Anglo-Saxon runes. Those with "(Nor.)" are Northern Runes. "(O.Nor.)" means that the rune is from Old Norse. "(Gold.Horn.)" and "(Gold.Brac.)" refer to famous artifacts found in Norse burial mounds which were engraved with runes. "(Go.)" refers to Gothic runes.

Even though there seems to have been an excessive amount of borrowing from these runic alphabets, to criticize Tolkien without considering what he has done with them would be unfair. Tolkien has recreated the runic system so that it seems to many to be more believable than the original; his world has given them new life.

NOTES


SUBMISSIONS

Mythlore actively seeks submissions of articles, art, letters of comment, poetry, reviews and other relevant material. See page 2 for the addresses of the appropriate editor when making submissions.

All written submissions, including articles, columns, letters, poetry and reviews must be in one of two forms:

1. Type-written submissions must be double-spaced. Two copies should be submitted, including the original.

2. IBM compatible formatted 5 1/4" floppy disk. The files should be straight ASCII files unless the material has been written using "Word Perfect" (4.0, or more recent, preferred) or "Volkswriter" (3.0 preferred). Most material produced on a Commodore 64 (using a 1541 disk-drive) is also acceptable. In addition, we have the capacity to receive articles electronically by modem. Please contact Paul Nolan Hyde (see page 2 for address) for further information regarding this possibility.

These forms of submission saves Mythlore time and money and in effect represents a much-appreciated contribution to the Society, and is strongly encouraged whenever possible.

The preferred style of articles is the MLA Handbook, except that short citations such as ibid., op. cit., and author and page number, can be incorporated in parentheses in the text. Any additional questions concerning submissions should be addressed to the Editor.