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An Inklings Bibliography (43)

Abstract
Entries 42–59 in this series are written by Hammond (Tolkien material) and Christopher (Lewis and other material). See Hammond, Wayne G., for one later entry in this series.
The choices are in part responsible, and his reorientations towards genuine selfhood” (p. 24).


(6) “Supplement f?r 1985-1986 till En Tolkienbibliografi med tillägg och rättelser för tidigare år” = “Supplement for 1985-1986 to A Tolkien Bibliography, with Additions and Corrections for Earlier Years” by Åke Bertenstam, pp. 160-275. In Swedish and English. The third supplement to Bertenstam’s bibliography of works by and about Tolkien. Its arrangement is here more elaborate, with new sections M and N listing Tolkien-related periodicals (e.g. Mythlore and Mythprint) and reviews of these periodicals. [WGH]
Tolkien's fiction is characterized by “doubleness” or “con­
governor of his entourage] that ultimately reinforce an
civilized English with the far more willful Nordic” (p. 52).

Beowulf, for all his emphasis on Nordic independence, on
changing berserker, a wide-ranging enemy of goblins and
“where you and your kind belong” (pp. 57, 58). [WGH]

Tolkien's ideal
in a different ink. [JRC]

Thomas compares Eddison's and Tolkien's uses of the
term Middle earth, applies words and ideas from Tolkien's
"On Fairy-Stories," and quotes Tolkien's remark that Ed­
dison was "the greatest and most convincing writer of
'invented worlds' though his nomenclature [is] slipshod
and often inept." Winter notes that Eddison's Worm and
Tolkien's Lord of the Rings are inevitably compared, though
"apart from their narrative ambition and epic sweep" they
have little in common (p. xii). C.S. Lewis is mentioned in
passing.

Ellison, John A. "The 'Why,' and the 'How': Reflec­
tions on 'Leaf by Niggle.'" Leaves from the Tree: J.R.R.
23-32.
The subjects of "Leaf by Niggle," writes Ellison, are "skill,
craftsmanship, technique; the essentials of bringing any
large artwork to completion, be it painting, building, sym­
phony, or The Lord of the Rings" (p. 24). He examines
Tolkien's working method, which was to begin on a small
or close scale "as with an individual word' and work out­
ward to a larger form" an invented language or an imagi­
ary world. But Tolkien found it difficult to reconcile a
larger vision with its fragmentary details. Ellison explores
the implications of "Leaf by Niggle," the story of a man
who could paint leaves better than he could paint trees, in
relation to Tolkien's struggles in writing The Lord of the
Rings and The Silmarillion.

Farrell, Frances. "Kindred Spirits: GKC & CSL." In
a column called "Chesterton Close-Up." Midwest Chesterton
A familiar essay on the topic of similarities of ideas be­
tween Chesterton and Lewis. Farrell offers some general­
ized examples:

admiration for George McDonald [sic]; objections to
pacifism; translating jargon into words of one syllable;
dislike of literary moralizing; enjoyment of stormy
weather; respect for tradition; belief in the possibilities of
miracles; love of fairy tales and mythology; the impor­
tance of religious dogma, especially the doctrine of
Original Sin.

Fulk includes in this anthology of Beowulf criticism, pp. 14-44, Tolkien's 1936 essay "Beowulf: The Monsters and the Critics," and in his preface defends it against current criticism that it "has become the object of mindless veneration, is over-anthologized, hopelessly retrograde, and much too long, and so can safely be set aside now to make way for more important matters" (p. xi). Tolkien's "explanation of the poem's larger structure . . . has never been bettured," his methodology "remains a model for emulation," and his view of the Beowulf poet as "an artist of an antiquarian bent" is still influential though "a major obstacle to dating the poem." Nor have "the monsters" become superfluous, though that issue is "not as pressing as it was in 1936" (p. xii-xiii). Several of the writers included in this anthology refer to Tolkien's essay, pro and con.

[HGW]

Horne, Brian. "A Peculiar Debt: the Influence of Charles Williams on C.S. Lewis." *A Christian for All Christians: Essays in Honour of C.S. Lewis*. Ed. Andrew Walker and James Patrick. London: Hodder and Stoughton (A C.S. Lewis Centre Book), 1990. 83-97, 229-231nn. [Coghill 84-85, 88-89, 96; Dyson 84; W.H. Lewis 84; Tolkien 84-85;](The third, fourth, fifth and final items need some qualifications to precisely fit Lewis; the faulty parallelism of the third item is in the original.) Farrell closes with anecdotes containing Lewis's and Chesterton's replies in debates with persons who raised difficulties about knowledge of what exists. [JRC]


The Oxfordshire Tolkien knew was marked by a growing population, expanded housing, and new roads and aerodromes. "The heart has gone out of the Little Kingdom," Tolkien wrote despairingly in 1945, referring to Oxfordshire by the name he used for it in *Farmer Giles of Ham*. But later his attitude softened. *Smith of Wootton Major* "heralded a new creative strand for the Little Kingdom" (p. 42). Lewis notes that there are several Woottons in and around Oxfordshire, and a village named Nokes (like Nokes, a character in *Smith*) on the edge of Otmoor. [WGH]


One of the best essays on its topic — although its topic, despite its title, is more the spiritual parallelism of Chesterton and Lewis than the influence of the former on the latter. Mackey begins with the non-religious upbringing of Chesterton and the influence of George MacDonald's *The Princess and the Goblin* on Chesterton's spiritual development; Mackey does not develop Lewis's atheistic, or antitheistic, period to the same extent, but does show the influence of MacDonald's *Phantastes* on Lewis's parallel development. Mackey quotes the basic passage about Lewis first reading Chesterton, but goes on to point to their parallel social attitudes, particularly their trust of the common person (Lewis's "Willing Slaves of the Welfare State" is quoted). Mackey suggests some parallel personality
Noonan invented the phrase “a thousand points of light,” but it became the source of controversy — about its source. She lists three suggested sources, and then a clear duplication:

Five months after the speech, in January, the “Inside the Beltway” section of the Washington Times said … that the great C.S. Lewis had used the phrase “a thousand points of light” in one of his science-fiction books, which did surprise me. I haven’t read it, but I assume the Times was right because it cited the page number of a specific edition, a show of confidence that suggests the writer had the book in his hands as he wrote. People ask me now if that’s where it came from. I say no … (324)

Two approximate phrases and another exact duplication are found subsequently: the second exact phrasing is from a turn-of-the-century engineer writing about electricity in a city (325).


In 1987-88 English calligrapher Jackson executed a commission to write out the Ring verse from The Lord of the Rings. In doing so he made at least one preliminary sketch and twelve variations. All of these are described, and three illustrated, in the catalogue of a show of Jackson’s work at the Minneapolis Institute of Arts, 16 August-16 October 1988. The three illustrated variations are vigorously modern in style, and very different from one another. [WGH]


Patrick discusses Lewis’s importance, identifying him with other men of the 1930s who felt they lived in a period of “intellectual and spiritual barbarism” and comparing him to Boethius “who, like Lewis, lived in a barbarian time, gathering up the wisdom of the past for Christ, and presenting it in ways that made it live beyond the failure of his civilisation.” Only in his final paragraph does Patrick tie his praise of Lewis to the purpose of the book he is introducing. [JRC]


Despite some loss of organization at the end, Purtill offers a very good reply to those writers who have said that Lewis lost his Christian faith: John Beversluis in C.S. Lewis and the Search for Rational Religion (1985) and “Beyond the Double Boltsed Door” (1985); the British TV movie on Lewis’s life, Shadowlands (1985); and, in a different way, Humphrey Carpenter in The Inklings (1978). (Purtill does not mention the stage version of Shadowlands, which no doubt post-dates his essay.)

Beversluis has said — and the movie more indirectly suggested — that Lewis’s faith was shattered by the death
of Joy Davidman, and thus his earlier arguments for a rational Christianity were proved worthless. Purtill replies by distinguishing — on the basis of an extended passage from *Mere Christianity* — between reason and faith on the one hand and imagination and emotion on the other. Purtill does not deny that Lewis’s emotions were greatly upset by Davidman’s death and that his imagination — as reported in *A Grief Observed* — was morbid for a while; but Purtill points to the conclusion of *A Grief Observed*, to Lewis’s letters in the period between Davidman’s death and his own, to the essay “On Obstinance in Belief,” and to a passage on the resurrection in *Letters to Malcolm: Chiefly on Prayer*, for evidence that Lewis had not lost his faith. (The latter two are cited later in the essay than the basic discussion of this point.)

Second, Purtill generally considers Beversluis’s arguments that Lewis’s arguments for Christianity are flawed. He quotes a review he wrote of Beversluis’s book, finding the book seriously flawed, but more effectively he quotes a review by Thomas V. Morris, a philosopher at Notre Dame University who thinks Lewis is a better writer than philosopher; Morris also finds Beversluis lacking, particularly in tone and in depth of consideration. Within the space limits of Purtill’s essay, this is quite effective. (Outside of the particular line of argument being pursued by Purtill is a very interesting statement by Morris: he refers to Lewis’s argument for the divinity of Christ as given in *Mere Christianity*, saying it is “sometimes known as the Lewis Trilemma” [42]; if it is famous enough to be known by such a verbal shorthand, then it obviously has been very effective. Certainly, Morris shows that Beversluis’s treatment of it is inadequate.)

Third, Purtill turns to Lewis’s debate with Elizabeth Anscombe over part of his argument in *Miracles*. He discusses the background of the debate is some detail and quotes various persons: George Sayer, in *Jack*, and Carpenter, in *The Inklings*, suggest that Lewis felt he was decisively defeated in the debate and was emotionally upset — and perhaps even, according to Carpenter, giving up reason as a guide (Carpenter quotes others about Lewis’s reaction; Sayer quotes Lewis directly); Anscombe, in her *Collected Philosophical Papers*, Vol. 2, downplays emotional reactions, not having noticed any upset in Lewis at the time or at a subsequent social meeting, and discusses his revision of the third chapter of *Miracles*. But Purtill denies (quite correctly) that this episode has anything to do with a loss of faith generally or a lack of trust in reason as an aid to faith specifically; it was over precision of argument and the changes of the period in how philosophy was carried on. It is at this point that “On Obstinance in Belief” is cited, to back up the point about Lewis’s continued trust in reason — although the discussion immediately afterwards returns to Beversluis, and so broadens — or perhaps digresses — to the general topic of the essay.

Fourth, Purtill considers briefly “whether the case for rational religion depends on... Lewis’s success in defending it.” Purtill spends four paragraphs here, saying there are other defenders of this cause — so the logical answer is no — but Lewis’s writing abilities make his defense particularly important, and thus Purtill has thought it worthwhile to discuss the claims of Beversluis, the movie, and Carpenter.

Purtill announced the fourth topic to be his “final” one, but next he turns, “[f]inally,” to conjectures as to why some have spread “untruths about Lewis.” He suggests three reasons: spiritual envy, dislike for rationality being claimed for faith, and dislike for conservative Christianity. Purtill also draws some morals for his reader at the end of the essay.


A brief discussion of the manuscript versions of *Farmer Giles of Ham* with casual but insightful remarks on the story. Rateliff notes that “the tale is structured around the Oxford academic calendar” (p. 47), and that it is a Christmas tale as well as (at least in part) a parody of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*.


Reynolds describes a “Dutch doll” since Tolkien’s character Tom Bombadil initially was derived from one. Some of Bombadil’s Dutch doll-ness is apparent in *The Lord of the Rings*, in his apple-red face, thick brown hair, and distinctive clothes. The article includes a photograph of a Dutch doll in the Museum of London dressed very like Tom Bombadil.


This volume has the two titular works by Williams, together with additional matter by Hadfield. "Outlines of Romantic Theology" was written in 1924; this is its first publication. It is complete except, as Hadfield notes, for some missing quotations at one point, which Williams never supplied. "Religion and Love in Dante" was published as a pamphlet in 1941 in Britain and as a book in 1976 in the United States (the latter — Norwood, Pennsylvania: Norwood Editions — is not listed in the bibliography at the end of this volume). Hadfield provides an "Introduction: the Writing of "Outlines of Romantic Theology"" (vii-xiv) to the earlier work, and a "Sequel" (74-88) between the two works; her accounts are primarily but not exclusively biographical. She also footnotes the first work by Williams, doing an excellent job with Biblical references and those to the Book of Common Prayer; she does not identify a quotation from Coventry Patmore (36) or an allusion to a novel by G.K. Chesterton (39), but does identify many of the other references. In addition, as indicated above, there is a checklist, "Principal Works of Charles Williams" (112-13).

"Outlines of Romantic Theology," written after Williams had married Florence Conway in 1917 and very shortly before he fell in love with Phyllis Jones (after which Williams probably would not have written it this way), is a discussion of "marriage" (romantic love) as being, in some sense, Christ. Although Williams adds some necessary qualifications to this statement in Chapter II, "The Principles," his comparison of marital love to the life of Jesus (Chapter III, "The New Testament in Romantic Theology") and to the celebration of the Eucharist (Chapter IV, "The Mass in Romantic Theology") illustrates the basic similarity.

Of the other four chapters in this treatise, the most important is Chapter VI (the number, no doubt by accident, is omitted), "Doctors and Documents." Williams discusses the Biblical "Song of Songs" (at the end of the chapter), Dante, Sir Thomas Mallory, John Donne (with Robert Herrick and Thomas Carew), and Coventry Patmore. Although Dante and Mallory are the bases of later non-fiction by Williams, probably Patmore is the most important at this point in Williams's development — some of Williams's early poems are in Patmore's tradition. Indeed, as the present bibliographer has suggested in a brief review of this book elsewhere, "Outlines of Romantic Theology" is likely to have been Williams's attempt to replace the *Sponsa Dei* which Patmore wrote and then destroyed.

"Religion and Love in Dante: the Theology of Romantic Love" can be considered as either a special approach to the romantic theology of the previous work or as a forerunner to *The Figure of Beatrice*, which followed it by two years — or, of course, as both. Williams surveys *La Vita Nuova* and the *Commedia* in terms of romantic love, treating, for example, the sins of the *Inferno* generally, and sometimes specifically, as distortions of romantic love. One of the oddities of Williams's emphasis is that he never clearly indicates that Paolo and Francesca were adulterers, while discussing them once and mentioning them several times more; they become for him an example of romantic love gone wrong, not of vows violated: their sin "is a too great indulgence, a too long lingering in permitted delight, a lawless concentration on each other" (100) — perhaps "lawless" is meant to suggest their breaking of vows, *The Purgatorio* Williams implies at the end is the process of becoming "adult in love" (106). "The whole of the *Paradiso* is, as might be expected, greatly beyond our common knowledge. Not until many more lovers have set themselves to follow that Way will it become known and (as far as it ever can) common" (107). Mainly, Williams, discusses the *Paradiso* as an in-godding process, which is also an in-loving.

The importance of this book is "Outlines of Romantic

Yates argues that Tolkien did not decide to write a poem in the form of a Breton lay, then cast about for a subject; rather, he wanted to write a version of the “Clerk Colvill” story (about a young man and a water-nymph), was intrigued by the translations he found of the analogous Breton “Lord Nann” ballad in F.J. Child’s Ballads, and used them as the source for his poem “The Lay of Aotrou and Itroun,” which he wrote in the octosyllabic form of a Breton lay. Yates shows how Tolkien reshaped the versions of “Lord Nann,” in particular “Lord Nann and the Corrigan” in a collection by Hersart de la Villemarqu’], to suit his own ends.

[WGH]