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An Inklings Bibliography (45)

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.
An Inklings Bibliography (45)

Compiled by Joe R. Christopher and Wayne G. Hammond

Authors and readers are encouraged to send copies and bibliographic references on: J.R.R. Tolkien — Wayne G. Hammond, 30 Talcott Road, Williamstown, MA 01267; C.S. Lewis and Charles Williams — Dr. J.R. Christopher, English Department, Tarleton State University, Stephenville, TX 76402.


Celtic sources or analogues for The Silmarillion include the Irish notion of a paradise overseas (cf. Valinor), Arthurian Avalon (cf. Tol Eressëa with its port Avalon), sacred centers such as Emain Ablach, the Palace of Apple Trees (cf. Telperion and Laurelien), and the Tuatha Da Danann (cf. Tolkien’s Elves). Barnfield finds counterparts for Oss-, Uinen, and Orom- in, respectively, Manannan, Fand, and Cernunnos (the last also known in English folklore as Herne the Hunter, in Irish legend as Fin Mac Cumail, and in Wales as Gwynn ap Nudd). The Halls of Mandos are like the House of Donn, an island in Irish lore on which the dead have their tryst. Tolkien’s “Of Beren and Lúthien” is particularly rich in Celtic inspiration. [WGH]


An eight-sentence biography of Tolkien, with photograph. WGH has not seen the first number in the series of 1000 Makers of the Twentieth Century, in which, he presumes, the criteria for inclusion were revealed; and in perusing only this last of eight weekly numbers, he wonders what the criteria might be that grouped Tolkien with the likes of Elizabeth Taylor, Rudolph Valentino, and Oprah Winfrey. (In alphabetical order Tolkien is placed between General Tojo and Manannan, Fand, and Cernunnos.) Makers presumably means newsmakers. C.S. Lewis was also included in this series, with a biography by Brian Sibley. [WGH]


As the introduction makes clear, Cawthorn compiled this volume by himself after Moorcock did not have time; in light of Moorcock’s well-known antipathy for the Inklings, this explains how books by Tolkien and Williams got into the volume. The format is to list every one of the one-hundred books and to have a short essay (two pages long) on each selection. Actually, some listings have more than one book by the author — usually but not always a series — while at other times an author has several listings.

No. 76 is The Lord of the Rings (161-62). Cawthorn writes a pleasant note (eight paragraphs, with three of them a partial summary). The book’s strength lies in its embracing sweep, a combination of the panoramic view with a wealth of homely detail, ... Over all of the swift-moving narrative hangs the knowledge of history as an unending process. Things must change and pass away, come victory or defeat.

No. 39 is War In Heaven (87-88). Eleven paragraphs, of which eight are given over to summary. Cawthorn suggests an occasional influence from P.G. Wodehouse; and he concludes, “The situation was not new, even then, nor its inevitable outcome. The difference is that Williams was a believer, and it shows.” Admittedly, War in Heaven is an interesting fantasy, but All Hallows’ Eve and Descent Into Hell are usually considered Williams’ best fictions — and they are not mentioned.

The omission of Lewis’ Till We Have Faces seems odd, in light of some of Cawthorn’s selections. Is Moby Dick. (No. 10) a fantasy? Are A Princess of Mars (No. 25) and Tarzan of the Apes (No. 26) fantasies? The former does have a psychic transportation to Mars, but Cawthorn seems to be treating non-realistic as equivalent to fantasy. Burrough’s apes in the latter, for example are his depiction of the missing link, then much discussed — they are pseudo-scientific rather than fantastical.

The various references to the Inklings in the other discussions are usually simply minor comparisons.

The present bibliographer feels tempted to discuss Cawthorn’s selections — why the omission of most of the Arthurian revival of this century, for example? — but the bibliographer had his choices of the hundred best fantasies (for college and libraries and teaching purposes) in Choice several years ago; and the question of taste does not seem worth debating. Cawthorn’s selections are an interesting cross-section of pulp and literary works, at any rate. [JRC]


An anthology of extracts from some of the best writing for children of this century, including most of ch. 2 of The Hobbit (Roast Mutton) and all of ch. 4 of The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe (Turkish Delight). Michael Foreman’s illustrations for these extracts are remarkable only for the (crude) avian and canine decorations on the sledge in his picture of Edmund and the Witch, and for the astoundingly full head of hair on Bilbo in the hands of the Trolls. [WGH]
Fides has developed an interesting framework for his discussion of the relationship between myth and (Christian) fact in most of Lewis’ fantasies. He uses Lewis’ “Myth Became Fact,” as well as an earlier letter to Arthur Greeves, to establish Lewis’ position on the relation of myth to truth, comparing it to standard modern theological positions on the matter (132-37). Then Fiddes discusses the Ransom Trilogy in terms of “Myth after the Incarnation”: he shows how these works refer back to the Christian truth. He faults Lewis’ treatment of the Trinity in terms of his Maleldilian myth, and he finds the Arthurian matter of That Hideous Strength distracting from the Biblical material; but he believes many of the books successful in myth-as-truth terms (137-144). Next, Fiddes discusses the Chronicles of Narnia as “Myth alongside the incarnation”:

The stories are not allegories; it is as if Christ in this world and the great Lion Aslan in Narnia are parallel incarnations of the Logos, resulting in events and patterns of experience which are naturally similar, but by no means identical. (144)

Fiddes finds the lack of a clear Trinitarian statement in the Chronicles less bothersome than in the Ransom Trilogy, for the parallels between Narnia and the Earth need not be exact; but the conclusion of the series — as He spoke He no longer looked to them like a lion” (149) — is faulty because it destroys the parallel, suggesting only one of the forms is the real one. Interestingly, Fiddes notes that none of the humans transplanted to Narnia seem to take the story of Christ with him or her (except for one allusion by Lucy, near the end of Narnia), which is necessary to sustain the parallel. Fiddes also points out a number of successes to the parallel presentation, over the Maleldilian myth (144-49).

Finally, Fiddes discusses Till We Have Faces as “Myth before the incarnation”: for Lewis, the pagan myth should foreshadow, but dimly, the Christian truth to come. This discussion is complicated by the story not only hinting at the Christian story, but also by the development of the Psyche and Cupid myth for the characters. One example of the Christian truth foreshadowed:

...to take a myth in which the expected climax is the restoration of Psyche to Eros, and to re-make its climax as the glorifying of the elder sister, is to startle us. It awakens us to the mysterious possibility of living each other’s life and bearing each other’s pains in the life of God. It looks forward to the incarnation. (15)

On the other hand, not everything works well: “It is not clear, for example, why Eros cannot simply forgive Psyche for her transgression, committed out of love” (154). (Presumably Fiddes is thinking that this hints at a theology in which the sinner must earn his or her salvation, but he does not develop his objection.) There is one minor factual slip in this discussion — Fiddes describes Psyche as naked at the time of the Great Offering (151) — but his basic approach to Till We Have Faces is well done (149-155). [JRC]


The Hobbit contains a sustained pattern of reference to Shakespeare’s A Midsummer Night’s Dream. Both tales are nominally set in distant lands but have English atmosphere and inspiration. Bilbo remarks on the flower-like fireworks the Old Took had on Midsummer’s Eve. Bilbo and the Dwarves are watched over by benevolent, magical figures such as Beorn and Gandalf, as the lovers in A Midsummer Night’s Dream are under the benign and powerful guardianship of Oberon (p. 19). Gandalf’s defeat of the Trolls by imitating their voices recalls the method used by Puck to mislead the quarrelling lovers. Both stories send characters into a dark, magical wood where ordinary folk come into contact with the more-than-natural (fairies, or elves and spiders). The Elves of Rivendell sing in the manner of Titania’s fairy attendants. [WGH]


This volume is a revision and expansion of Arthurian Encyclopedia (1986). According to the preface, the number of entries has gone from 700 to “more than 1,200” (vii); certainly the volume is impressive in its new form. The compilers managed to find minor Arthurian works by a number of significant modern writers (e.g., new in this edition: William Faulkner, John Updike). Of course, the book retains the best of the previous volume, such as a valuable note on Dante’s references to the Arthurian matter. The problems seem to be mainly in the modern period “Theodore Sturgeon” is not the pseudonym of Edward Hamilton Waldo — the relationship is more complex; the comic-book sequence Camelot 3000, by Mike W. Barr and Brian Bolland, is dated from its original twelve-issue form but the more lasting book version (1988) is not noted, despite the inclusion of material appearing in 1990; Maxey Brooke’s “Morte d’Alain” (1952) is cited from a reprint in 1969, but his parallel story “Morte d’Espier” (1955) is missed; despite the 1990 cut off, Diana Paxson’s The White Raven is omitted — surely a significant version of the Tristan story; etc. Probably, with the proliferation of minor entries for short fiction, the editors should gather most together under “Magazine Fiction” (cf. “Television Series” in this volume) in some future edition, with all necessary citations at the end of the entry.

The entry on C.S. Lewis in the first edition was by [jackson] M. [lagorio] and dealt mainly with That Hideous Strength; in this second edition (278-79), it has been nicely revised by [daniel] N[astali] — he has added discussions of Lewis’ early, non-surviving Arthurian “The Quest of Bleheris” and a poem on Merlin and Nimue; he spends a paragraph each on “Launcelot” and Mark vs. Tristram, and he expands the discussion of Arthurian Torso; the discus-
tion of That Hideous Strength is essentially unchanged. It would be nice to add the Arthurian allusion in Lewis’ sonnet “old Poets Remembered,” perhaps to add what some critics have considered the Arthurian motif or tone of Ch. 13, “The Three Sleepers,” in The Voyage of the “Dawn Treader,” perhaps to note Lewis’ quotations from Williams’ Arthurian poems in That Hideous Strength, and to add a paragraph on Lewis as a critic of Malory, Spenser, and other Arthuriana; but this is obviously a satisfactory survey as it stands, much improved from the first edition.

The accompanying bibliography is accurate on primary sources, includes a 1980 essay on Tristiana or Mark vs. Tristan, but has three other secondary sources that are inappropriate. Instead of Charles Moorman’s The Precincts of Felicity, his Arthurian Triptych would discuss the proper topic; A.N. Wilson’s biography is not usable for scholarly purposes, and either George Sayer’s biography or the Authorized Green and Hooper biography (for both) would be preferable; Paul Holmer’s book is one of the poorest surveys of Lewis’ thought available — far better is Gilbert Meilaender’s The Taste for the Other.

The other references to Lewis are minor: some to That Hideous Strength (138, 322, 382) and, in connection to Williams, one to Arthurian Torso (515-16).

The one reference to Tolkien listed in the book’s index is in a passing reference to the Inklings in the basic Williams listing (516). If the bibliographies were listed in the index, then Tolkien would have gotten in for his edition of Sir Gawain and the Green Knight (421). Actually, it would be possible to make a small note on Tolkien for his editing and translating Sir Gawain, for his use of a Middle English poem “Gawain’s Farewell (if memory serves) as a basis for “Bilbo’s Last Song,” and for his unfinished “The Fall of Arthur” — perhaps with a mention of the passage with a few slightly-Arthurian-sounding names in The Silmarillion (cf. Arthad and Urthel, Beren).

The basic discussion of Williams in the first edition was by K.H. G[öller]; this second version has slight revisions by R[aymond] H. T[hompson], particularly an added paragraph on “The Figure of Arthur” and another on “The Advent of Galahad” (the latter, an early poetic sequence, still largely unpublished when the revision was made) (515-517). The basic discussion is good, within the limits of the space, although the transition from the major poetic sequences in War In Heaven should not use the verb “returns” for the novel that preceded those sequences. The primary and secondary bibliographies are acceptable (War in Heaven is misdated); but, since 1990 items are included in the encyclopedia, it seems a pity that the best analysis of Williams’ two mature poetic sequences was not added: Româna A. King Jr.’s The Pattern in the Web. Other references to Williams are to War in Heaven (138); to Talieštin Through Logres and The Region of the Summer Stars (144, 279, 317) and the “The Figure of Arthur” (278).

Several other listings of authors influenced in their Arthorian works by Lewis and/or Williams occur, but they do not note the influences: Sanders Anne Laubenthal, for Excalibur (273); John Heath-Stubbs, for Arthoria (225-26); and Roger Lancelyn Green, for his juvenile retelling of King Arthur and His Knights of the Round Table (257). Alice Mary Hadfield has her second biography of Williams listed in his bibliography, but her juvenile retelling of the Arthurian stories — King Arthur and the Round Table (1953) — is not mentioned; however, it did not, to this bibliographer’s scanning eye, reveal any influence of Williams. Perhaps Green should have been in the main listing for the sake of his sonnet “Logres” (Oxford Magazine, 18 November 1948), which spoke of Williams as Taliessin and Lewis as Merlin.

(Parenthetical note to conclude: Mythopoeic Society members Marion Zimmer Bradley and Persia Wooley are listed in the encyclopedia for their — very different — Arthurian novels; Judith Kollman has one of her Williams essays listed in his bibliography. Mythlore is listed once at least, for the publication of an Arthurian poem by Jane Yolen, when Ruth Berman was poetry editor. The references may not be exhaustive.)


Useful advice for anyone wishing to learn Tolkien’s Elvish languages: read carefully, analyze, apply what you know or can learn about real-world languages. With a bibliography of primary, secondary, and periodical sources. Martsch has also published a series of Elvish lessons in her newsletter Beyond Bree.


This dialogue is not a standard interview, for Walker talks at some length in the piece; instead, as the by-line suggests, it is a conversation. Part of the interest of the dialogue is that Mitchell, an academic philosopher, was Lewis’ successor as president of the Socratic Club at Oxford, serving from Lewis’ move to Cambridge in 1954 until the Club’s cessation about 1970, the latter in a period of a general decline of such undergraduate societies (13). Mitchell was present at the Lewis-G.E.M. Anscombe debate in 1948, but does not remember it being as decisive as later writers have taken it to be; he recounts a later meeting — in the 1960s — at which John Lucas and G.E.M. Anscombe debated the same positions, and which argument he suggests Lucas won. His point is that, while Lewis’ position was “an entirely arguable philosophic thesis,” Lewis himself was not trained to handle the methods of modern philosophy and that it was this realization which led Lewis in other directions than argumentation in his later writings (8-11). Mitchell comments that Lewis was not considered a philosopher during
his lifetime at Oxford because he was not working within the formal limits of the then-contemporary philosophy — rather, he was "a lively independent thinker" (14); "in The Abolition of Man Lewis had a sort of intuitive vision of the kind of argument that in a more philosophically sophisticated way [Alasdair] MacIntyre has marshalled in [later] books" (17). Most of the rest of the discussion deals with changes in modern philosophy and the lack of uniformity of modern moral standards. [JRC]


A retelling of Arthurian tales which sets them in a time later than the events of The Lord of the Rings. Merlin, an old grey wizard, seems to have been Gandalf in a former age, while Nimiane is referred to as elf-queen and remarks that in the Third Age "they called me Galadriel" (p. 82). Mockler refers to Middle Earth (sic), Mordor, Ents (the real rulers of the Forest of Broceliande, p. 110), night-riders (cf. Black Riders), a fellowship (of the Round Table), and a land of stones (cf. Gondor, stone-land). The Lady Luned is turned invisible by a Ring of Power, and Sir Gawain, like Frodo before the gate of Moria, is seized by the leg by snakes in a body of water. Mockler borrows from Tolkien, he implies in his foreword, as Tolkien borrowed from a medley of sagas and legends, ancient, modern and medieval: hobbits from The Wind in the Willows, the Riders of Rohan from French medieval chronicles (here Mockler may be thinking of the fifth-century Rohan Hours manuscript), Gondor from Ethiopian history (the city Gondar?), Gandalf from Merlin, Mordor from Mordred. [WGH]


As Moorcock indicates in his book, he is writing a volume parallel to Lin Carter's Imaginary Worlds (1973), a discussion of what he calls "epic fantasy"; unlike Carter, Moorcock does not mention his own fiction; he also has better taste than Carter (despite his dislike for the Inklings). Moorcock's treatment of heroic fantasy is in terms of an historical background (Ch. 1), the use of landscape (Ch. 2), the protagonists (Ch. 3), wit and humor (Ch. 4), and the Inklings come in his fifth chapter, "Epic Pooh"; according to the introduction, this chapter "was published in pamphlet form by the British Fantasy Society, 1976" (25).

Here is a basic passage, beginning with Tolkien and (as peasants) the hobbits:

Like Chesterton, and other markedly Christian writers who substituted faith for artistic rigour, [Tolkien] sees the petit bourgeoisie, the honest artisans and peasants, as the bulwark against Chaos. These people are always sen-
timentalized in such fiction because, traditionally, they are always the last to complain about any deficiencies in the social status quo. ... In many ways The Lord of the Rings is, if not exactly anti-romantic, an anti-romance. Tolkien, and his fellow "Inklings" (the dons who met in Lewis' Oxford rooms to read their works in progress to one another) had extraordinarily ambiguous attitudes toward Romance (and just about everything else).... I suppose I respond so antipathetically to Lewis and Tolkien because I find [their] consolatory Christianity as distasteful as any other fundamentally misanthropic doctrine. (183-84)

What Moorcock seems to mean by their ambiguous attitudes towards romance is that their protagonists are not adults (he mentions only the Narnian series by Lewis and he treats the hobbits as "quasi-children" on p. 118), and their stories lack irony — at least Tolkien's are so lacking.

I think my own dislike of J.R.R. Tolkien lies primarily in the fact that in all those hundreds of pages, full of high ideals, sinister evil and noble deeds, there is scarcely a hint of irony anywhere. Its tone is one of relentless nursery room sobriety.... (160)

Tolkien is also faulted for being non-inventive about his landscapes (83)

... it is moderation which ruins Tolkien's fantasy and causes it to fail as a genuine romance. The little hills and woods of that Surrey of the mind, the Shire, are "safe", but the wild landscapes everywhere beyond the Shire are "dangerous". Experience of life itself is dangerous. The Lord of the Rings is a pernicious confirmation of the values of a morally bankrupt middle class. (185)

One of the pleasures of Moorcock's book is his inventive-ness in attacking Tolkien (if the reader can distance him- or herself from the matter and admire the manner).

Lewis is also denounced:

According to C.S. Lewis his fantasies for children ... were deliberate works of Christian propaganda. [This is not quite accurate, but it does not affect Moorcock's main argument.] The books are a kind of Religious Tract Society version of the Oz books written by E. Nesbit, but E. Nesbit would rarely have allowed herself Lewis' awful syntax, full of tucked-on clauses, lame qualifications, vague adjectives and unconscious repetitions; neither would she have written down to children as thoroughly as this childless don who remained a devoutly committed bachelor most of his life. Both Baum and Nesbit wrote more vigorously and more carefully.... (189-90)

Moorcock follows this up with quotations from Baum, Nesbit and Lewis. Moorcock indicates that Nesbit had "denser, better writing and a wider vocabulary" (193) than Lewis. "The Cowardly Lion [is] far more attractive character than Aslan" (193). Moorcock finds that Alan "Garner is a better writer than Lewis or Tolkien" (194). And this from Moorcock may be used to sum up Lewis:

Of the children's writers only Lewis and [Richard] Adams are guilty, in my opinion, of producing thoroughly corrupted romanticism — sentimentalized pleas for moderation of aspiration which are at the root of [their] kind of Christianity. In Lewis' case this consolatory, anxiety-stilling "Why try to play Mozart when it's easier to play..."
Rogers and Hammerstein?" attitude extended to his non-fiction, particularly the dreadful but influential Experiment in Criticism. (204)

So much for Lewis! Actually it sees a pity that Moorcock did not approach Lewis through his adult fiction — e.g., Till We Have Faces. At least the charge of a limited vocabulary would not appear.

Moorcock has little to say about Williams, except that he filled his books with his religious ideas (1284) and that he, subtly, "speaks for the middle-class status quo" (204-05). Moorcock sums up the Inklings: "A group of self-congratulatory friends can often ensure that any writing emerging from it remains hasty and unpolished" (205). [JRC]

This entry inspires an editorial invitation for a review or article on this book, especially its comments and opinions on the Inklings. It is rare to encounter a more outspoken opposition to the Inklings. —GG


Tolkien drew upon the archaeological and documentary knowledge of Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire in Collingwood and Myres' Roman Britain and the Anglo-Saxon Settlements (1937), and upon his own knowledge of early Surrey and Middlesex and the idea of residual British (pre-Saxon) populations there, to form the idea of an early kingdom of Greater Middlesex, i.e., the Little Kingdom of Farmer Giles of Ham, in the territory of and some two hundred years before one Frithuwold of Surrey, a sub-king of Mercia. Reynolds surveys the evidence for the extent of Frithuwold's realm and comments on place-names in Farmer Giles. [WGH]


A supplement to the index in Letters (1981), listing the Elvish vocabulary referred to in that book by Tolkien, with an introduction and notes on grammar. Most of the Elvish words are followed by translations by Tolkien or by Santoski. The list is divided into six sections: Quenya, Sindarin, Telerin, Woodland (Silvan) dialect, Common (Primitive) Elvish, and Elvish roots.

Reprinted from Lendarin & Darian 2 (Winter 1981-82), with a few minor and silent emendations. [WGH]


Sellin, the author of The Life and Works of David Lindsay (1981), which had a number of references to Lewis, here writes a comparison and contrast of A Voyage to Arcturus, on the one hand, and Out of the Silent Planet and Perelandra on the other. Sellin quotes several acknowledgements by Lewis of his debt to Lindsay's book (99-100), gives a brief biography of Lindsay (101-102), briefly suggests the content of A Voyage to Arcturus (102-04), quotes Lewis' discussions of Lindsay's method of thematic presentation from "On Stories" (105), and distinguishes between three different types of science fiction — the third being the type of Lindsay and Lewis (106-07). The specific contrasts and comparisons are these: (1) Lewis' emphasis on spiritual states in Perelandra is like an elaboration of any one of Linday's meetings into a whole book (107-08); (2) the space-ship quest becomes, in all three books, "a confrontation of ideologies" — in Out of the Silent Planet, through contrast, as "criticism of our own civilization, of war and strife, of slavery and domination," and in Perelandra, through "a correlation between spatial and physical otherness and moral difference," a confrontation of the three persons and their viewpoints (108-09); (3) "[i]n A Voyage to Arcturus what is attractive is meant to be rejected whereas in Perelandra beauty is positive" (109); (4) "Lewis' fiction draws heavily from Christian mythology" while Lindsay uses Greek and Scandinavian myths (110). This listing drops the details of some of Sellin's developments, and these points are followed by some comparisons of specific passages — including one between A Voyage to Arcturus and "The Dark Tower," which shows no knowledge that Lewis' authorship of the latter has been questioned (110-12). The basic contrasts are two: (1) Out of the Silent Planet and Perelandra depict "unfallen worlds; the books are investigations of goodness .... A Voyage to Arcturus is an investigation of evil"; (2) Lewis' ideology is Christian; Lindsay's is a mixture of Schopenhauer, Plato and the Gnostics" (112-13). (Sellin shows no knowledge of the amount of Platonism in Lewis.) Sellin gives several similarities of dealing with those times, their basic method in these three works being the spiritual journey in an allegorical-cum-mythopoetic mode which they both learned from George MacDonald's Phantastes (114). Overall, a valuable essay. Sellin knows Lindsay better than he knows Lewis — for example, in addition to points mentioned above, he defends Lewis from plagiarism of Lindsay (112, 114), but not in terms of the anti-originality thesis of Lewis' aesthetic theory. Still, the best essay on the topic thus far. [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]

The latter part of Swann’s autobiography, especially ch. 11, makes reference to his opera based on C.S. Lewis’ *Perelandra* and his settings of lyrics by Tolkien the song cycle *The Road Goes Ever On*, Bilbo’s Last Song, and Lúthien Tinúviel. These were written during the phase of Swann’s life where “my music reached out to new and deeper dimensions and where I have gained my greatest satisfaction and fulfillment” (p. 199). *Perelandra* was begun in 1961, in collaboration with librettist David Marsh and Lewis himself. The three discussed their ideas in Oxford pubs, where Lewis expressed further thoughts about the world of Perelandra. Once Lewis wrote some of his own lyrics, but Swann found his style too awkward and his words could not be fitted in. Lewis heard the first performance of the opera, performed by a team of singers with Swann at the piano, but he died before the work could be fully produced. The neglected opera exists today in a piano score and in an orchestral version, in the original three-hour version and in a two-hour, two-act abridgement with some parts put into speech, and in a choral suite of the choicest passages.

In most respects the story of the song cycle *The Road Goes Ever On* is told more fully in the book of that title; but in his autobiography Swann expands upon some points, revealing, for example, that his setting for Tolkien’s Bilbo’s Last Song is based on a Manx tune and also resembles a Cephalonian Greek melody. Swann also remarks on his friendship with Professor and Mrs. Tolkien, who liked the musical stage show *At the Drop of a Hat* Swann performed with Michael Flanders. Tolkien especially liked one of Flanders and Swann song about death, here printed in full. Tolkien’s works had a profound effect on Swann, who believes that the termites of the world will burrow under social injustices (like apartheid) and bring about change: “I reject the crusading armies, the bombers, the threat of nuclear missiles. I prefer the Gypsies, the wandering Jews, the balalaika players, the little people, the hobbits” (pp. 245-6). [WGH]


A book for recording birthdays, decorated with thirteen illustrations by Tolkien for *The Hobbit*, seven colored by H.E. Riddett. Bilbo Woke with the Early Sun in His Eyes and The Hill: Hobbiton-across-the-Water are here titled Bilbo Awoke One Morning and The Hill: Hobbiton-upon-the-Water, and the runic borders on the endsheets are not from *The Hobbit* but from *The Lord of the Rings*. [WGH]


The first separate edition of *The Homecoming of Beorhtnoth Beorhtfort’s Son*, published in a limited impression of 300 copies to commemorate the 1000th anniversary of the Battle of Maldon. The text is reset from *Essays and Studies*, with fifty-three deviations from the earlier text ranging from altered punctuation to omitted words. [WGH]


An engagement calendar with occasional quotations and notes pertinent to *The Hobbit*, *The Lord of the Rings*, and (one instance) *The Father Christmas Letters*, or to Tolkien’s life, and with forty-two decorations or illustrations, or details from the *Hobbit* maps and original binding, by Tolkien. Of these, twelve are full-page illustrations, each placed in the calendar at or near the beginning of a month; four are colored by H.E. Riddett, here not credited. Each calendar spread is contained within a decorative frame (artist not credited). The decorations accompanying 17-19 January, 4-6 December, and 11-13 December are mirror images of the same art as reproduced in *Pictures by J.R.R. Tolkien*. The illustration for September is reproduced with its original title, *Glorund Sets Forth to Seek Turin* (later relettered by Christopher Tolkien as *Glaun un*...). [WGH]


The harp is a recurring element in Tolkien’s mythology, both as a musical instrument and as a heraldic symbol. Wynne and Hostetter cite examples of harps in the earliest version of “The Music of the Ainur,” *The Book of Lost Tales, The Lost Road, The Silmarillion, The Hobbit, and The Lord of the Rings*. In Tolkien’s Elvish languages there is an abundance of words for harp, harpist, harp-music, and related concepts “Qenya sala, salma, salm-,” on which Wynne and Hostetter build a cross-etymological exploration ranging from Qenya through Greek and Latin to Finnish. [WGH]

(Continued on page 39)
Surviving Leaves

This extremely thin volume contains the last scraps from God in the Dock (1970), also published as Undeceptions: Essays on Theology and Ethics (1971); one major essay, "Lilies That Fester," first collected in The World’s Last Night (1959), the only collection of Lewis essays published in his lifetime; and one five page work published for the first time, which Walter Hooper has accompanied by five additional pages of exposition in the Introduction. This work, "Christian Reunion," of which Hooper tells us that "it is written on the back of a few surviving leaves of 'Mere Christianity' broadcast given over the BBC in 1944," and that "when it was discovered after Lewis' death in 1963, it was set aside by his estate," seemsto me to be minor at best, although its interest for Hooper, a recent convert to Roman Catholicism, is understandable. A better view, visible through example, of Lewis' way of addressing fellow Christians who happen to be Roman Catholics, can be found in Lewis' Letters to Don Giovanni Calabria. I note in conclusion that the first page of Christian Reunion (the volume, not the essay) devotes ten lines to telling its readers about C.S. Lewis, followed by ten lines telling them about Walter Hooper.

— Nancy-Lou Patterson

An Inklings Bibliography continued from page 33


Walker presents evidence that the Orthodox have appreciated Lewis' writings (in his second and third paragraphs) and then turns to Lewis' knowledge of Orthodoxy: (1) Lewis' discussion of St. Athanasius in "On the Reading of Old Books"; (2) his use of the ransom theory of the Atonement in The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe, which was a theory "much loved by the early Greek Fathers — especially by St. Gregory of Nyssa"; (3) Lewis' friendship with Nicholas and Militza Zernov at Oxford, which led him to attend one of the summer conferences of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius (an organization which existed to bring Eastern and Western Christians closer together) and to read a paper on "Membership" at one of the Fellowship's Oxford meetings; (4) Lewis' unpublished (and probably no longer existing) paper titled "A Toy, an Icon, and a Work of Art," read at a meeting at St., Gregory's House in Oxford — another result of Lewis' friendship with Nicholas Zernov (probably the paper was a variant of Chapter III, "How the Few and the Many Use Pictures and Music," of An Experiment in Criticism, although Walker does not make the point); and (5) Lewis' description of a Greek Orthodox mass he once attended. Walker ends with the information that Militza Zernov made a cross of white flowers for Lewis' funeral; because W.H. Lewis did not attend—he wanted no flowers — and at the suggestion of the church warden, the cross was put at the foot of the coffin in the church and then on the coffin in the cemetery: a Russian Orthodox gift to mark Lewis' passing. [JRC]


Sys begins with Lewis' core Christian position:

C.S. Lewis ... was not so much interested in speculative theology as in dogmatic theology. ... Everything ... is contained in Scripture and in the definitions of the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian Creeds[,] and Lewis' whole work may be considered as a constant meditation on the central kerygma: 'I believe in God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.' Beyond this we find only explanatory theories, particular theologies which may not or may not help us in our understanding of the 'formula'....(175)
Beyond that, Sys is interested in the “particular flavor” (176) of Lewis’ works. (He does not seem to mean style by this.) The list of Sys’s topics is also not particularly helpful, for his discussions usually contain more than what is announced. For example, he takes up Lewis’ concept of “facthood”: in discussion this turns out to be Lewis’ presentation of God, including paradoxes like “God ... is both intellible and yet absolutely unknowable” (176). After a paragraph on Christian doctrines, Sys returns to God as the ultimate Fact (177-78).

His next major topic is “the church’s expression of her fundamental beliefs” — that is, dogmas (178). The discussion here goes into Lewis’ love of language; his expression of vision, not just reason; his discussions of romantic or like literature which leads beyond personality and art to universal (if sometimes limited) truths — or to myths (178-181) in a similar manner, Sys finds Lewis writing of “tasting ... [the] flavor” of Christian truths — not much concerned with their worded expression as their “eternal flavour of truth” (182-83):

If dogmas may be said to transcend immediate representations [and expressions], it is because they are to some extent ‘points of contact’ between human powers of representation, human awareness of experience, and the vast continent of the supernatural. (183).

At this point Sys investigates Lewis’ use of parallel ideas in The Silver Chair (the signs which Jill must follow) and That Hideous Strength (Ransom’s answers to Merlin’s series of questions) — where the characters have personal experience, not the teaching of the earthly authority, as the basis of the “dogma” they are following (184). “What Lewis obviously dreads is a body of doctrine violently imposed from without and adhered to blindly and fearfully ...” (185) In Pilgrim’s Regress, Lewis depicts “Anglo-Catholicism of a Neo-Scholastic type” as a representative of this danger (185).

The next topic is the Christocentric nature of Lewis’ expression of faith. “The Christian authority is simply Jesus Christ.” It is from this standpoint that we are to understand Lewis’ rather neutral ecclesiology” (186). Finally, Sys discusses Lewis’ writings as missionary work aimed at the modern, rationalistic man (187-89).

Overall, an essay with many good things in it, if often without clear paragraph unity. Some of Sys’s applications — such as that about the signs in The Silver Chair — seems new. [JRC]