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An Inklings Bibliography (40)

Abstract
For entries 34–41 in this series, Hammond reviews Tolkien titles, Christopher reviews the Lewis material, and Hargis reviews Williams and the other Inklings.

It is unfortunate that Arbuckle or her editor three times refers to *That Hidden Strength* in stead of *That Hideous Strength* (in the title, in the first sentence, and in the second paragraph; the other four references is in the essay, two of them in the latter part of the first paragraph, get the title correct, as do those in the notes and the bibliography). The slip creates a suggestion of poor scholarship; and, since Arbuckle's thesis seems unlikely, the suggestion of poor scholarship is certainly not true so far as citations of most major discussions of *That Hideous Strength* through the early 1980s are concerned.)

Arbuckle's subtitle gives her basic thesis: she is arguing that Merlin stands for the Holy Grail in Lewis' romance. "Merlin ... represents both the Grail in all its myth of abundance and sacrament as well as personifying Lewis' conception of the ultimate Order of the universe" (81). She argues this with parallels between Merlin and the Grail, the evidence for the latter usually cited for one or more of three scholarly sources on the Grail legend. For example, she takes Jane Studdoick as being parallel to Perceval (95), visiting St. Anne's as the Grail Castle (82); she is affronted by the emphasis on marital hierarchy there on her first visit, as Perceval failed to ask the proper question (84); etc. Merlin as the Grail chooses his/its own master (90), predicts the future (90, 91), distinguishes between good and evil (90, 91-91) — all three traits are said of the Grail in Jesse Weston's *The Quest of the Holy Grail*; etc.

Overall, the central thesis of this essay seems strained; but there certainly are some interesting arguments along the way. For example, Arbuckle suggests that the severed head of Alcasan is parallel to the head of Bran in Celtic myth, which has had influences on the Grail legend (she might have cited, but did not, the Welsh version of "Peregr non"). Suggesting it here "represents an antithetical-Grail Lord" (89). In a similar reversal, "Fairy" Hardcastle "is the evil fee [+ fay or fairy] who deludes the wife or lover of the Grail Knight and then holds her captive; only that the captive lover has changed, becoming the husband in this version (88) — thus, the nickname "Fairy" works at two levels. The essay, therefore, has interest for scholars, even if they do not accept its full argument. [JRC]


A Tolkien Thesaurus is not a thesaurus in the usual sense of the term, but a concordance to roughly 15,000 "active words" in *The Lord of the Rings*. These words are listed alphabetically together with brief passages in which the words appear in Tolkien's text, and volume and page reference to both the hardcover edition and the Ballantine paperback edition of *The Lord of the Rings*. The words were selected in general on the basis of "memorability." "Most articles, conjunctions, prepositions, common articles, and auxiliary verb forms, along with the most common words of size, number, color, and direction" are omitted (p. [v]). All proper nouns are included except for the names of "ubiquitous characters" such as Frodo and Gandalf, for which only the "most important" passages are cited. Related word forms, e.g. "awake + awaken, awakened, awakening, awoke," "Anduin + Great River, River of Anduin, etc." are grouped together and the variant forms cross-referenced. The compiler has attempted completeness and has come very near the mark, but there are some unintended omissions.

When Garland agreed to publish *A Tolkien Thesaurus* they asked for many changes in its introduction and deleted much explanatory matter. The author privately printed his original, extensive introduction as a booklet and made it available on request from the Marquette University Archives. The booklet describes Blackwelder's intended audience, the criteria on which he based his word selection, his policies with regard to alphabetization and spelling, and other points of style and rationale. Also included are a selected list of "unusual" words (e.g. "ghylls, rede", phrases (e.g. "a tight belt and a light tooth"), and passages (e.g. "Many great trees grew there, planted long ago, falling into untended age amid a riot of careless descendants") in *The Lord of the Rings*.

Illustrations by ten artists of fantasy lands — Middle-earth, Maple White Land, Sangri-La, Gormenghast, Mars (chiefly Burroughs’ and Bradbury’s Mars; C.S. Lewis’ Malacandra is noted but not illustrated), Hyborea, Atlantis, Melnibone, Earthsea, the Land and Urtih, with critical essays and a general introduction by Edwards and Holdstock. Tolkien is the author most referred to in the introduction, and the chapter on Middle-earth is first in the book. This chapter includes five illustrations by Paul Monteagle, three of them in color, for The Lord of the Rings: the Company of the Rings crossing the Bridge of Khazad-dûm while Gandalf defies the Balrog, which is visible only as a winged shadow; Rivendell at night, with two apparently winged, slant-eyed, pointy-eared Elves (or are they weird statues?) above a gateway; flooded Isengard after the Ents’ conquest; the Dead Marshes, with corpses floating on the surface; and the Teeth of Mordor, bristling with spikes and with windows like angry faces.

The essay on Tolkien is largely negative in its criticism. Tolkien “slides around” the fact that Gandalf knew of the Ring’s power yet left it in Bilbo’s possession for some sixty years. The Rings is destroyed only by “a piece of luck.” The Lord of the Rings is “morally bankrupt, small-minded, conservative and not even very memorable” (p. 20), say the authors, supported by quoted criticism of Tolkien by Fritz Leiber and Michael Moorcock. The Authors imply that the book is best read by adolescents, and they claim that “even devoted Tolkien fans find that on subsequent readings the spell begins to fade” (p. 20) The Lord of the Rings nevertheless “manages to transcend its weaknesses and rise above its critics” (p. 22). The Silmarillion is regarded by Edwards and Holdstock as Tolkien’s “background research,” useful to read only if “our interest in his creation [The Lord of the Rings] becomes of academic intensity” (p. 22).


Though she is well known as the illustrator of popular works by C.S. Lewis and J.R.R. Tolkien, and was the winner of the Kate Greenaway Medal in 1968 and runner-up for the Medal in 1973, Pauline Baynes feels the loneliness of her profession. She works on her own, at home, spiritually if not physically isolated. She is sensitive about her work and unsure of its quality. “When you’ve finished the job,” she remarks, “no one eulogizes: nobody says, ‘This is the best work we’ve seen in our lives’. All you get from the publisher is ‘That’s fine. Send in your account.’” When she finished the original of the Middle-earth poster map she took it to J.R.R. Tolkien before it was printed. “He just gave it a backward glance and said ‘Ah yes, there they all are. Now Fritz [Baynes’s husband] what will you have to drink...’”

The article is illustrated with a drawing by Pauline Baynes for The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe and with a photograph of the artist. [WGH] Helms, Randel “All Tales Need Not Come True” Studies in the Literary Imagination (special issue: “The Inklings,” ed. Raymond Carter Sutherland), 14:2 (Fall 1981), 31-45

A very good essay contrasting the literary implications of the attitudes toward the Bible of Lewis and Tolkien. Helms argues that Tolkien’s religious and aesthetic approach meant that he could find parallels to the Bible in other literature, including valid Christian revelation in that other literature. Lewis, on the other hand, thought in either/or categories: the Bible had all valid revelation, and was a non-aesthetic basis of judgement of the truth or validity of other literature. Helms ties these attitudes to the Catholic and and the Evangelical Protestant for Tolkien and Lewis respectively — for the former, the basis of faith is the Church and the Sacraments, not the Bible primarily; for the later, the Bible. Helms uses “Mythopoeia,” “Beowulf: The Monsters and the Critics,” and “On Fairy-Stories” as the primary supporting texts for Tolkien; “Christianity and Literature” and “The Literary Impact of the Authorized Version,” for Lewis. Although Helms mentions several literary works, the most extended examples are Perelandra (the use of the human form of Venus because of the Incarnation on earth) and The Silmarillion (a different explanation for death than that in the Bible). At least one qualification to Helm’s argument about Lewis can be suggested: Dante’s Divine Comedy is nearly as pervasive an influence as the Bible, but by Helm’s argument it should not have had any authority for Lewis. [JRC]


Ten full-color illustrations for The Lord of the Rings and two for The Silmarillion, with facing calendar pages:


February, The Dark Tower: a Nazgûl upon a dragon-like beast flies toward Barad-dûr under a darkening sky.

March, Sam and Shelob: Sam lungs with his sword at the great spider standing over Frodo.

April, Galadriel: a portrait in Pre-Raphaelite style of the Elf-queen by her mirror, painted as if within a frame decorated with Art Nouveau vines and leaves.

May, Gandalf: the wizard strides in the rain through a grassy field.

June, At the Ford: Frodo, upon Asfaloth, raises his sword to defy the Black Riders, who are being engulfed by Elrond’s flood. Howe departs from Tolkien’s text, in which Frodo’s sword “broke and fell from his shaking hand” before the Riders were engulfed. Howe also places trees on the western edge of the Ford though Tolkien described a “long flat mile” of apparently tree-less land on that side of the river.

July, Old Man Willow: a hobbit (Sam, if Howe is following the text) peers around a gnarled, Rackhamesque tree as Frodo lies pinned beneath a root.
August, Turambar and Glorund: the elf-warrior plunges his sword into the dragon as the beast belches fire. The latter name is given as in The Book of Lost Tales (elsewhere Glarung).

September, Éowyn and Nazgûl: Éowyn raises her sword to strike the Nazgûl-Lord’s winged steed.

October, In Mordor: Frodo and Sam, in disguise, are caught amid marching Orcs.

November, Glorfindel and the Balrog: a giant black, bat-winged creature with horns and a streaming mane slashes a sword at the Elf-warrior on a pinnacle of rock.

December, Minas Tirith: a detail of the city painted in the style of Maxfield Parrish.


The “exchange” of the title consists of two letters from each writer. (1) Jones complains of the Use of Lewis for the purpose of religious rigidity, says that Lewis was “a brilliant but severely limited human being”—particularly in areas dealing with women—and briefly praises Till We Have Faces. (2) Fuller agrees about Lewis’ followers, expanding the charge beyond that of rigidity; mentions several valuable depictions of women in Lewis’ fiction, with the final praise saved for Orual; describes the type of joy he finds in Lewis; and says the “Lewis the storyteller” is the best aspect of Lewis to read. (3) Jones, while accepting Fuller’s dispraise of Lewis’ disciples, still makes several points against Lewis (e.g., “he was unfair with regard to anything new”) and Williams, and briefly discusses Lewis’ theological context of Anglicanism. (4) Fuller defends Williams and Lewis as persons, both in terms of complexity, and sums up Lewis as a “fallible, mildly eccentric, warm, learned, imaginative Catholic Christian spokesman”; Catholic in this context is loaded, since Jones was upset in both letters by the evangelicals’ celebration of Lewis.


An index to names of people, places, and things, and to words in Tolkien’s invented languages and in Old English, which appear in The Hobbit, The Lord of the Rings, The Silmarillion, Unfinished Tales, the History of Middle-earth series through The Shaping of Middle-earth, The Road Goes Ever on, The Letters of J.R.R. Tolkien, and The Monsters and the Critics and Other Essays. These eight to nine hundred names, etc. are “the most significant... in the Middle-earth volumes,” in Hyde’s estimation. Citations to works and pages (in hardcover editions) follow each word. For a reason not explained by the compiler, page references are not always given in straightforward numerical order, lowest to highest number, but in mixed sequence.

Kincaid, Paul “The Imperfect Echo: An Interview with Guy Gavriel Kay.” Vector (journal of the British Science Fiction Association April-May 1987): 7-10 [Tolkien] Guy Gavriel Kay comments chiefly on his Fionavar Tapestry but also on his assistance of Christopher Tolkien in editing The Silmarillion for publication. Kay and Mrs. Christopher Tolkien are from Winnipeg, their families knew each other, and he had met Christopher a number of times before J.R.R. Tolkien passed away. Kay was hired as a “younger associate rather than another fully-fledged academic of [Christopher’s] own standing,” to balance the editing team (p. 7). Kay feels he also provided an “external viewpoint.” He assisted Christopher from October 1974 until the summer of 1975. The editing “went remarkably amably, very smoothly, I think as much as anything else because we were both so intensely involved” (p. 7).

Kay also remarks (p. 9) on the influence of The Lord of the Rings on subsequent fantasy novels. Majestic as Tolkien’s book is, “there is a great deal of room for maneuvering within the structures and parameters of high fantasy.” The “repository” of myths and folk tales “can be worked with so many different ways that I really do think that there’s lots and lots of room for writers to work with those primal myths, as much as Tolkien did himself, and come to a different destination.”


Miller challenges Ruth Noel in general as a scholar (Noel does not have “an educational background sufficient to cope with Tolkien’s immense erudition” [p. 139]) and in particular for finding, in her Mythology of Middle-earth, parallels between Gandalf and Malory’s Merlin. “These two wizards,” wrote Noel, “were both powerful, prophetic, inscrutable, and suddenly, unexpectedly human. Each had the responsibility for the fortunes of a nation and its future king; each had a dramatic sense of suspense and a childlike love of concocting surprises.” Noel also notes that Gandalf and Merlin both has “obscure beginnings and mysterious endings,” and both were supposedly immortal (quoted by Miller, pp. 122-123). Miller argues that Gandalf is not particularly prophetic, his foretellings “are more in the nature of premonition or prediction, rather than sibylline or delphic utterance” (p. 126). It is Elrond, she points out, not Gandalf, who has responsibility for bringing up the future king Aragorn (but Noel makes clear that in the passage quoted she is referring specifically to Gandalf as Aragorn’s counselor in the “Last Debate”). The Lord of the Rings is not about “the fortunes of a nation” but about “the cosmic struggle between Good and Evil” (p. 127) in which Gandalf assists the peoples of Middle-earth against Sauron. (Here Miller misses the point that the “fortunes of Gondor, and by extension the “nation” of Men to come, are indeed at stake, and Gandalf is “responsible” for them according to the purpose of the Istari in
Middle-earth.) Miller misinterprets Noel’s use of “human” in pointing out that Gandalf is not human but a Maia.

Miller then proceeds to compare Gandalf to Odin, a parallel which Noel also remarks, and here Noel “is certainly correct.... If the character of Gandalf is indeed indebted to medieval literature, it is to Odin and the Norse that the debt is owed — not to Merlin and the Celts — and even here the relationship cannot be pressed too hard” (pp. 128, 129). Gandalf and Odin both bear many names; they are both associated with totemic animals, horses and eagles in particular; they are both runemasters and are skilled in magic; and they both endure death and are resurrected with powers greater than they had before. Miller thinks it likely “that Christ’s passion was uppermost in Tolkien’s mind when he conceived of Gandalf’s great struggle in the mines of Moria, but perhaps Odin’s Story was also present” (p. 132). Gandalf also physically resembles Odin. Tolkien may have “deliberately distributed the attributes of Odin over several characters, with Saruman, Gandalf’s treacherous double, and Sauron perhaps embodying Odin’s darker side as ‘the promoter of strife and the source of evil’ ... as Gandalf might exemplify him as his most benevolent” (p. 130). Miller concludes this line of argument with the curious statement that “Tolkien did incorporate some traits of both Merlin and Odin (and most particularly Odin) in his characterization of Gandalf” (p. 132), after she earlier took pains to dissociate Gandalf and Merlin except as fellow ‘members of the class Wizard’ (p. 123).

But “neither medieval wizard can be considered a principal source” of Gandalf or of his order (p. 132). Tolkien looked instead, as is made clear in his letters, to the Judeo-Christian concept of the angel. He may have looked in the Book of Tobit at the archangel Raphael, who assumes human form to assist Tobias. Tolkien also drew upon the archetypal pattern of the mage, from the magus-legend as it developed in ancient Persia (or earlier). Gandalf fits eight of the ten features of this pattern as set out in The Myth of the Magus by E.M. Butler: a supernatural or mysterious origin, temptations (“impatience, leading to the desire to force others to their own good ends,” Tolkien quoted by Miller, p. 135), wanderings, a magical contest, (Gandalf versus Saruman in The Two Towers, or in a larger sense, Gandalf versus Sauron), a trial or persecution (Gandalf imprisoned by Saruman), an violent death, a resurrection, and a solemn farewell.

Niven, Larry, and Jerry Pournelle. Footfall. New York: Ballantine Books (A Del Rey Book), 1985 [Lewis, 88, 335.] A science-fiction novel, detailing an invasion of the earth by elephant-like aliens. When the alien ship has been sighted, one of the characters listens briefly to a television interview program with a number of Christian leaders discussing the theological implications of the ship: the Episcopal bishop of California says, “And of course C.S. Lewis played with aliens” (intelлектually played with the idea of aliens” might be clearer), and again,

Lewis points out that the existence of intelligent aliens impacts Christianity only if we assume they are in need of redemption, that redemption must come in the same manner as it was delivered to humanity, and that it has been denied them. (88)

The first of these statements seems to be based on the first two volumes of the Ransom Trilogy, and the second or either “Will We Lose God in Outer Space?” or “The Seeing Eye.”

The later passage comes in a discussion of morality. One character says, “But nobody really knows what right and wrong are,” and another character replies, “Sure they do. C.S. Lewis saw that well enough. Most of us know what’s the right thing, at least most of the time. The problem is we don’t do it” (335). The allusion seems to be to the opening of Mere Christianity. (The bibliographer thanks The Very Reverend Donne E. Puckle of Chippewa Falls, Wisconsin, for a note about the second paragraph.)

[N.B. THIS IS A COMPANION TO THE KINCAID ENTRY]


At “Conspiracy ’87” Kay spoke (at much greater length than in his Vector interview) of his assistance of Christopher Tolkien in editing The Silmarillion for publication. Christopher had already arranged his father’s papers in a preliminary order. Kay joined him in Oxford on 21 October 1974. The first two chapters of the book had been drafted by Christopher in an “academic style” later used for the History of Middle-earth, each with the latest version of the text concerned, variant readings from earlier versions, and editorial notes. Kay felt that since J.R.R. Tolkien considered himself primarily a storyteller, the text would be better presented as a continuous narrative. The section “of the Coming of the Elves” was so successfully edited in this form that the straightforward narrative approach was adopted for the entire book.

As the editing progressed, “Kay would proceed one chapter ahead of Christopher Tolkien, proposing solutions to various textual problems and the like. The later would then go over the result critically and change it as he thought fit, and then type the initial draft of the chapter” (p. 17). Later the two men would engage in “intense dialogue” to reach the final form of the chapter. In this way the first draft of The Silmarillion was completed by 1 February 1975. Kay went home to Canada in June 1975. During those months of labor, Kay came to look upon the barn in which he and Christopher Tolkien worked “as an island, a sanctuary of light amidst the darkness.” The two “felt like medieval monks. It was a labour of love for both of them, a time of rigorous mental discipline” (p. 17).

Kay also spoke of his attempt to meet J.R.R. Tolkien in the summer of 1973. He called on Tolkien at Merton College, Oxford, sent in by the porter a letter of introduction and a personal note, and received in return a message from Tolkien that he was not well and was not seeing visitors. Kay regrets not having kept Tolkien’s note; but Tolkien kept the letters Kay sent in to him, and later they
were found by their author in Tolkien’s correspondence files.


Pittinger, who once negatively critiqued Lewis in The Christian Century and who was answered by Zhim, here reconsiders the debate, and still holds his negative positions. He praises some of Lewis’ books — A Grief Observed (14), The Four Loves, The Abolition of Man (18), The Chronicles of Narnia, and The Screwtape Letters (19) — but finds Miracles (15), The Problem of Pain (15-16), and Mere Christianity (16) lacking. The first of these apologetic works is “not only unconvincing but seriously offensive,” mainly because it takes the miracles literally (15). The Problem of Pain has flaws in its discussion of animal suffering and its exercise understanding of God (15). Mere Christianity is weak in its discussion of the Trinity and flawed in its understanding of the incarnation (16). Pittinger indicates that his “conceptuality [of Christianity] is Whiteheadian ‘process thought’ as developed by Charles Hartshore” (16) and that he prefers the phrase “history became myth” to Lewis’ “myth became history” (17). (Lewis’ actual phrase, in one of his essays titles, was “Myth Became Fact”; however, Pittinger is not distorting Lewis’ essential idea here.) Pittinger concludes, “Yet all the time his purpose was admirable” (19).


Reminiscences of the Inklings by their former students are always interesting, and this memoir of the poet Philip Larkin by a fellow student of St. John’s College, Oxford, during 1941-42, has a few caustic tidbits. (a) “It was a fairly safe assumption among the few of us reading English that if you skipped a particularly stressful performance by J.R. Tolkien [sic] at the Taylorian and went off instead to Taphouse in Commarket, or Acotts or Drawa Hall in the High, you might well run into Philip or perhaps Kingsley Amis...,” looking for jazz records (83). (b) “Like me, Philip seemed never to tire of Kingsley’s ‘story without words’, a marvellous display of improvisation and mimicry that featured the furtive placing of a powerful bomb — its detonation could be wonderfully prolonged — among a crowd of hearties drinking at a table. And for an encore we would be pole-axed by the Chicago gangster film starring a shrill, arm-waving Lord David Cecil as the gang leader threatening a squealer, a role usually assigned to C. S. Lewis” (85). [David Bratman, via JRC]


Shippey begins his paper with a twentieth-century example of “reconstruction,” Tolkien’s Riders of Rohan in The Lord of the Rings and the element emnet in the Rohan place-names Eastemnet and Westemnet. The Riders of Rohan are based on the Anglo-Saxons, except in their fascination with horses which the Anglo-Saxons lacked. Emnet is Old English for “level ground” or “plain” and survives only in the Norfolk place-name Emneth; Modern English has no native word to express the concept of “steppe” or “prairie,” “because the thing itself is unknown in a small and densely-wooded island.” But “if ... the Anglo-Saxons had been familiar with the [Rohan-like] plains of North-West Europe (instead of emigrating to England), they would have called them ‘emnets’; and if they had to use ‘emnet’ as an everyday word for a familiar landscape, it is only reasonable to assume that their attitude to horses would have been much more receptive!” (p. 53). In Appendix A to The Lord of the Rings Tolkien includes several names from the Riders’ ancestry which are derived from Old English but from Gothic. “It is as if Tolkien had remembered, in his broodings on words, that ‘horse-folk’ par excellence, the equitatus Gothorum , the cavalry of the Goths,” a people closely akin to the ancient English. The Riders, Shippey concludes, are what the English might have been like if they had turned east instead of west, “with their English names and Gothic history, their English word for Gothic landscape, their highly un-English adaptation to grasslands and horses” (p. 54).

Shippey examines the Riders, and Tolkien’s use of philology, in more detail, but emnet is less, in his Road to Middle-earth (1982). In the present essay he refers to scholarship by Christopher Tolkien, especially his Saga of King Heidrek the Wise (1960). [WGH]

Reprint of the 1977 edition published by Harry N. Abrams with illustrations from the Rankin-Bass animated film of *The Hobbit*. The present edition is reduced in size by ten to twenty percent and is printed on a lighter, glossier paper. The fold-out plates of the original edition are here printed as double double-page spreads. The Galadhrindust-jacket combines on its upper cover the images printed on the Abrams binding with the picture of Smaug printed on the Abrams acetate jacket. On the lower Galadhrindust-jacket is printed the illustration of Smaug from p. (155); the "invisible" figure of Bilbo is here truly unseen, behind a Universal Price Code panel. The jacket blurb is unchanged from the Abrams jacket: it still proclaims the book to be "the first fully illustrated, deluxe edition" of *The Hobbit* and that (a very doubtful assertion) "Tolkien himself would certainly have been delighted" with the illustrations. [WGH]

**Tolkien, J.R.R.** *The Hobbit, or There and Back Again.* "Revised Edition." N. Y.: Ballantine books, 1988. xiii + 305 pp. New paperback "50th anniversary" edition, reset, though the impression numbering continues ("Twenty-third Printing: September 1988"). The text appears to be unchanged from previous Ballantine impressions. An error on p. 16, line 9, *We are not for met* together" has been carried into the new typesetting. *Thror's Map and Wilderland* are reproduced as usual.

The cover illustration by Michael Herring depicts Bilbo and Gollum in Gollum's cave. Bilbo is plump and middle-aged, wears a full-sleeved shirt, tunic, trousers, and cloak, and holds a short sword. Gollum is fangtoothed, pointy-eared, and glassy eyed. The illustration is framed in an archway, a design feature common to the late 1988 Ballantine Tolkien covers.

Two bindings have been seen: (1) with "J.R.R. TOLKIEN" on the upper cover stamped in gilt, and (2) with "J.R.R. TOLKIEN" in white on the upper cover, and, at lower left of the upper cover, parallel with the price line, a blue rule and "SPECIAL BOOK CLUB EDITION" in white. The first version has been sold separately and in a boxed set with *The Lord of the Rings*. The second version, despite its "book club" label, has been sold in bookstores as a regular mass market paperback. [WGH]


Twenty bound color postcards of illustration by Tolkien (*color added by H.E. Riddet): The Hill: Hobbiton-across-the-water, The Trolls*, Rivendell, The Misty Mountains looking West from the Eryie towards Goblin Gate*, Bilbo Woke with the Early Sun in His Eyes, Beorn's Hall*, The Elvenkings's Gate*, Bilbo Comes to the Huts of the Raft-elves, The Front Gate*, Conversation with Smaug, Old Man Willow, Moria Gate, Fragment from the Book of Marzabul, The Forest of Lothlorien in Spring, Barad-dûr, Tanquetil, Gondolin and the Vale of Tumladen*, Tol Sirion*, Beleg Finds Guidor in Taur-nu-Fuin (i.e. Fangorn Forest), and heraldic devices of Lúthien Tinúviel and Beren. With a biographical note and notes on the illustrations, in German. [WGH]

**Notes**

3. It was Collingwood who drew Tolkien into the Lydney 'dig' as a helper in interpreting the Nodon's inscription.
5. In all of these abbreviations, *Arch* = 'Archaeological.' As survey maps show, a Roman road ran along the spine of the Mendip Hills, some of it being the base of the modern B3134 road. It has been thought to have some link with the mines of the Roman period. See Gough, p. 46.
6. This is about 4-5 miles from the possible 'entrance' in the west under Sandford Hill and could well be said to be near the line of the imagined thoroughfare through the mines, if one were passing from the 'top' of the range to the 'bottom' (or southern end).
7. One may well imagine that in the creation of the Balrog there comes in some measure of Bram Stoker's 'The Lair of the White Worm' (1911), pp. 40-42. See Appendix.
9. It is, perhaps, the argentiferous aspect of the ore that gave Tolkien the idea of the prized metal, *mithril*, also called 'Moria-silver, or true silver.'
11. In *The Fellowship of the Ring*, Gandalf observes that: 'It cannot be less than forty miles.' (p. 332)
13. H.M. Scarth wrote on the coins found at East Harptree in 1888, while H. St. George Gray published his report on those on Sanford Hill in 1924.
14. See *The Return of the King* (1955), p. 415; and *The Fellowship of the Ring* (1954), p. 331, where we are told by Gandalf: 'The Dwarves have a name which they do not tell.' (p. 331).

Please ask your University, College, and Public Libraries to subscribe