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An Inklings Bibliography (44)

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.

This article is available in Mythlore: A Journal of J.R.R. Tolkien, C.S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and Mythopoeic Literature:
https://dc.swosu.edu/mythlore/vol18/iss1/10

Capon, in what seems to be his eighteenth book (146), offers his usual extravagant treatment of Christian theology, although a goodly amount of orthodoxy underlies it. Here he images the Trinity as a Lover, a Beloved, and a Bed (41), for example, based very loosely on a passage by St. Augustine. And his treatment of the titular love — for an example of his earthly comments — spends more time on love affairs and adultery than on marriage. However, there are parallels even to C.S. Lewis; for example, Capon’s discussion of romance includes a historical statement about courtly love (113), although he does not use that term, and his conclusion shifts from the image of the lovers’ bed to that of the dance (171-72, 175). But these and other, more remote parallels may be the result of chance, not influence. (Incidentally, Capon’s “the old phrase, ‘Deus ludens’” [47] may or may not refer to an old idea, but the Latin surely should be *Deus lusor*.)

Capon’s two references to Williams are straightforward statements of influence:

... if God’s all-but-total way of managing the universe is simply chance... then luck is just as holy as miracle because it’s just as much God’s way of doing business...

... And you don’t even have to single out good luck for the accolade: as Charles Williams was fond of saying, “All luck is holy” — for the simple reason that all luck, good or bad, is God’s chosen métier. (39)

And, again, “All luck — as I have said, following Charles Williams — is holy” (118). Capon repeats this idea of holy luck a number of times in the book — it is one of his main theses (e.g., 137, 139, 140, 152) — but does not mention Williams again. Actually, Williams’ phrase seems to have been, “ALL luck is good luck” or “All luck is good,” as shown in this passage from the beginning speech by Mary in *The Death of Good Fortune*:

... for now

my lord my Son has made this clear —

that all luck is good luck. And I,

I struck by seven words, witness too

that all substance is love, all luck good.

........................................

all chance is heavenly, all luck good.

“All luck is good” is repeated several more times in the play. [JRC]


An associational item. In *The Great Divorce*, George MacDonald tells Lewis that the idea of the *Refrigerium* can be found in Prudentius and in Jeremy Taylor. Cook has translated section five of Prudentius’ *Liber Cathermerinon* into free verse. One stanza contains the idea:

Even the noxious spirits
crowded into Hell
often have a holiday
from punishment
on the night
when the holy god
returned
from the swamp of Achereon
to the world
above. (31)

This translation is preceded by a brief essay which gives some background on Prudentius —”Aurelius Prudentius and Spanish Mystical Poetry,” also by Cook (18-21). At one point Cook quotes from Roy Campbell’s translation of “Living Flame of Love” by St. John of the Cross in order to illustrate a similarity of idea of Prudentius (21). [JRC]


Christopher, for the “average reader” of Lewis, surveys the biographies (first section) and bibliographies (second section). In that first section, he considers W.H. Lewis’ biographic contributions, Green and Hooper’s *C.S. Lewis: A Biography* (1974), Sayers’ *Jack: C.S. Lewis and His Times* (1988), and Griffin’s *Clive Staples Lewis: A Dramatic Life* (1986). He mentions Wilson’s *C.S. Lewis: A Biography* (1990) as then forthcoming, and passes over two lesser biographies. He also considers two pictorial biographies and passes over a third, and discusses three partial bibliographies.

In the second section, he discusses the basic primary bibliography — Hooper’s “A Bibliography of the Writings of C.S. Lewis: Revised and Enlarged” (1979) — and its

Dorsett, then Curator of the Wade Collection, writes a brief essay about the library collections of C.S. Lewis primary and secondary materials — in the first place, the Wade Collection at Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois; in second, the Bodleian Library, Oxford. Smaller collections of primary materials are mentioned at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, and the University of Texas, Austin. Surprisingly, Dorsett does not mention the secondary material (correspondence to Hooper) in the Walter M. Hooper Papers in the Southern Historical Collection and Manuscripts Department, Wilson Library, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill (which included, for example, an unpublished sonnet by Roger Lancelyn Green about C.S. Lewis). Essentially, a brief, factual note. [JRC]


King, Author of The Pattern in the Web: The Mythic Poetry of Charles Williams (1990), discusses Williams’ use of Merlin in *Taliessin through Logres and The Region of the Summer Stars*. “What is Merlin’s function in the myth?” (65). King essentially answers this in three sections: “Williams’ interpretation of the myth” (65) on pp. 65-68; “the kind of imaginative universe in which Merlin is placed” (69) on pp. 70-76; and “the function [Merlin] is intended to perform” (69) on pp. 70-76.

The first section lightly traces Williams’ interest in the Arthurian matter from his early commonplace books; through his early Arthurian poems, the two books mentioned above, and *War in Heaven*; to “The Figure of Arthur.” The stress here is on the quest for the Grail as properly being, not for the few as in Malory and Tennyson, “but for all” (68).

The second section gives the geography as presented in Williams’ mature Arthurian poems and briefly discusses the fall of man (the Dolorous blow) and the redemption of the kingdom (potentially, in Galahad).

The third section is the most complex, being the actual discussion of Merlin. Merlin, King says, is a symbol for time, being young “because time has the capacity to be continually renewed” (73). In many ways, Merlin and Taliessin are complementary figures: Taliessin gives expression to Merlin’s “mode of thought” (a simplified summary of p. 72) — although at other times they more nearly balance each other, as polarities, than simply one expresses the other, Merlin from the perspective of eternity and Taliessin, of this world (also 72). Merlin and his sister, Bresin (in Williams’ handling), are responsible for the establishment of the Kingdom of Logres (mainly Merlin’s work) and the engendering and nurturing of Galahad; when “Galahad comes to the Castle and assumes the Perilous Seat,... Merlin’s task is completed” (74). With the appearance of the Grail and the subsequent Quest, eternity, rather than time, is concerned. In Williams’ version, Nimue, who presides over Brocéliande, is Merlin’s mother (69).

This is a good essay, as would be expected from King. There are several typos, which are not his fault, but he does slip in placing *War In Heaven* between the two books of significant Arthurian poems (66). [JRC]


Kreeft writes a lively, engaged treatment of Lewis’ ideas about history:

I extract twelve major principles about history from Lewis: five could be called a philosophy of history, four a description of history, and three a psychology of history. Thus I apply these twelve principles to the issues of the future of humankind on this planet, and draw a single conclusion from them. Finally, from this conclusion I derive a number of immediately practical applications for our present lives. (199-91)

He thus sums up Lewis’ “Philosophy of history”:

Five historical principles, then: skepticism about the philosophy of history; denial of historicism and its belief in the malleability of human nature; denial of progressivism and universal evolution; denial of chronological snobbery; and denial of Enlightenment optimism and modern relativism and liberalism because of their denial of the reality of sin. (199)

The four-fold description of history:

...the pre-modern world, especially medieval Christendom; the Renaissance, or the Great Divide between the classical and modern [actually, Lewis put the Great Divide later, during the nineteenth century]; the modern world; and the future. (199)

And the three-fold psychology of history: (1) “Presupposing the Tao, the doctrine of objective value, this principle states that whenever one of two values is really greater than another, prior to another, if man upsets this hierarchy he loses both values” (204); (2) “The second psychological
principle is ... the demon of collectivism, of mob psychology, of mass consciousness. The dark side of the comfortable conformism is the death-wish" (205-206); (3) the "third and final psychological principle is ... Sehnsucht, 'Joy,' the 'inconsolable longing,' Augustine's 'restless heart'" (206). Kreeft applies these concepts to the modern age and reaches a modest conclusion: "to anyone who is concerned with peace and with the life and survival of our civilization, here is a summary of what I have learnt from C.S. Lewis, what I think he would say today if he had only a single paragraph" (212). Unlike most of such puttings-in-Lewis-mouth of thoughts, Kreeft's conclusion is Biblical enough and sane enough to be by Lewis. But the main interest of this essay to the scholarly student of Lewis is the summary of Lewis' understanding of history. [JRC]


Patrick offers a highly interesting essay on Lewis' Idealism (the term is used in its philosophical sense). The first part of the essay traces Lewis' philosophical development from atheism to theism, essentially a condensed version of material in Patrick's The Magdalen Metaphysics. This part has some nice summaries of aspects of Lewis' thought — e.g.,

Just as Lewis' defense of truth involved the proposition 'Either truth or meaninglessness,' his defense of moral values was developed from the axiom 'Either values as they are in the broad human tradition, and have been discovered by every generation, or amorality.' (163)

But the essential part as Lewis reaches philosophical maturity is his Idealistic position, broadly in the tradition of Plato, "Origen, the Cambridge Platonists, idealists of the twenty-centurty school of Bradley, and monists like Bergson" (164); elsewhere are mentioned the Gnostics and Clement of Alexandria (166) and Berkeley (173). In this tradition, "Creation is an allegory.... Creation exists as degrees of incarnation of the divine substance" (164). Patrick argues that Lewis, in his philosophical and theological essays (not in his fiction), tends to neglect the physical nature of things: for example, Lewis is more inclined to argue that Jesus is God that to understand the implications of Jesus' manhood (169). (That Lewis imaged the divine as physical and the physical world as a dream — although Patrick does not make the point — supports this.)

Sometimes Patrick is arguing a Roman Catholic agenda:

...it is probable that [Lewis] considered the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption theoretically inconsequential ... on which [judgement] he surely knew he differed from the Fathers.... (168)

Actually, Lewis probably considered them non-Biblical and therefore not part of the essential Christian faith (perhaps more strongly, as simply not true); this may be what Patrick means by inconsequential, but his language avoids the essential issue. As to some other points, there are other possibilities than Patrick considers:

That Lewis frequently ignored the existence of a created order in which created goodness is perfected by grace occasionally caused strained conclusions. His strange argument that marriage might be of two kinds, Christian and non-Christian, since the indissolubility of marriage is not rooted in nature but in grace and gospel, reflects this lingering doubt that every supernatural mystery reflects the perfection of a good commanded at creation and established within it. (168)

It is certainly true that Lewis does not seem to believe in many doctrines or dogmas (or mysteries) as "commanded at creation," but may not his position about two types of marriage derive from his understanding of Natural Law? Essentially, Lewis believes that Natural Law is shown by the teachings of the great, traditional moral leaders through history. The essential question is how many non-Christian teachers denied divorces to their students and followers.

These arguments with Patrick are not meant to say his essay is poor; rather, he asks some basic questions about Lewis' philosophical-cum-theological position, and his basic argument about Lewis' philosophic tradition and its implications is destined to be important in one branch of Lewis studies. [JRC]


Schakel, the author of Reading with the Heart: The Way into Narnia (1979), here offers an approach to the Chronicles in terms of Lewis' essay "On Stories." He gives a convenient summary near the end of his essay:

For children and adults who, unlike the predragonized Eustace, are open to romance and myth, the Chronicles of Narnia appeal in various ways, at various levels: there is the appeal of suspense and suspensefulness in the narratives, the appeal of the 'atmosphere' of the Narnian world, and the appeal of the mythic dimensions of the stories. They appeal also because the children realize that, fantasy and 'other-world' though they may be, they are fundamentally life like. (130)

As he did in his book, Schakel denies Christian-reductionistic readings; and, as was his book, this is an excellent (if brief) introduction to the artistry of the Chronicles. [JRC]


A survey of dragons in literature from Lang's Red Fairy Book (1890) to "stretching the time limit" Naomi Mitchison's Travel Light (1952). The first part of the essay concerns dragons in Tolkien's fiction and poetry. A previously unpublished remark by Tolkien, crossed through in a 1938 manuscript lecture on dragons, appears on p. 59. [WGH]