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Abstract

A series of bibliographies of primary and secondary works concerning the Inklings.

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/vol11/iss1/8
This Bibliography is an annotated checklist covering both primary and secondary materials on J.R.R. Tolkien, C.S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and the other Inklings. Authors and readers are encouraged to send off prints or bibliographic references to the compiler:

Dr. J.R. Christopher, English Department,
Tarleton State University, Stephenville, Texas 76402


Poul Anderson and Gordon R. Dickson have written a series of stories about the Hokas--Earthman's Burden (short story collection, 1957), Star Prince Charlie (novel, 1975), and this volume of four stories. The Hokas are short, highly intelligent but imitative, bear-like aliens whose planet has been reached by earthlings; as the Hokas learn about various earth fiction or history, they imitate it. The beginning of "The Napoleon Crime" has some references to some Hokas along with his parents, the name has not been adopted as a complete substitute; presumably it is simply a nickname, typical of his ambience.

The reason for the name from Tolkien is not made clear: his real name is Paul Frederick (p. 305), but since he gets along with his parents, the name has not been adopted as a complete substitute; presumably it is simply a nickname, typical of his ambience.

The protagonist sees Frodo as an elf: "an elvish creature . . . a wild thing; she could almost see the shadow of antlers on his brow" (p. 83); "he looked like a very tall elf" (p. 302). Since Bradley, as author of Men, Halflings and Hero Worship (chapbook version, 1973) and The Rivendell Suite (copyright 1969; one version in The Middle-earth Songbook, 1976), knows the difference between elves and hobbits quite well, the cross association in the novel is the protagonist's; perhaps it is also meant to suggest a contrast between Frodo's appearance and his inner nature, revealed by the nickname. The protagonist at one point asks, ... what is that absurd thing he calls himself, something out of Tolkien--Bilbo Baggins?" (p. 361). Absurd is characterization; the word shows his snobbishness.

An associational reference for this checklist is tied to an attempted swindle by a fake occultist. The antagonist comments on the antiquity of the "gypsy switch": "And it's been written up dozens of times--Gresham exposed it in his novel Nightmare Alley" (p. 309). This refers to William Lindsay Gresham, Joy Davidman's first husband.


In the "Introduction: Of Sand and Stars" (pp. ix-xiv) to this collection of short stories, Clarke, in a discussion of SF pulp magazines, writes:

No less a critic than C.S. Lewis has described the ravenous addiction that these magazines inspired; the same phenomenon has led me to call science fiction the only genuine consciousness-expanding drug. [p. xi.]

This is presumably a reference to Surprised by Joy, Ch. 2, where Lewis describes his reading during his early schooling, with reference by name only to H.G. Wells:

"The idea of other planets exercised upon me then a peculiar, heady attraction, which was quite different from any other of my literary interests. ... This was something coarser and stronger. This interest, when the fit was upon me, was ravenous, like a lust. This particular coarse strength I have come to accept as a mark that the interest which has it is psychological, not spiritual; behind such a fierce tang there lurks, I suspect, a psychoanalytical explanation.

The use of ravenous in both passages suggests the origin. However, Lewis's autobiographical passage itself does not refer to the American SF, although Lewis certainly read some of it. And Clarke, who know Lewis and exchanged letters with him, may have some private statement in mind.


Clerihews are a type of light verse, consisting of four lines of prose rhythms and irregularity in length, rhyming in couplets; typically, the first line consists of, or ends with, a proper, historical name, and the content is an ahistorical assertion about that person. On p. 22, one such verse, by Robin Skelton, begins, "William Cobbett / Never discovered a hobbit!" On p. 133, another, by Tess van Sommers, about an Australian, begins, "Heilpamm (Sir Robert) / Is not a hobbit!"—unfortunately, the latter, in its third"
line, asserts "A hobbit is a species of fairy," which is certainly ahistorical in Middle-earth terms but probably was not intended as such. The other clerihew of interest, by Joanne Hill, is quoted entirely:

J.R.R. Tolkien

Was not, on the whole, keen
On trolls made of plastic,
But he thought gnomes were fantastic.

Probably the best comparison for Tollkien is not Lewis' "Cecil, but to an earlier member of his family."


"Many great Christian writers of the past, including John Milton and C. S. Lewis, have not only assumed some cosmic hierarchy but have portrayed it as a divine ordering of the universe, full of majesty and beauty" (p. 12). Finger argues that the citation and modification of Psalm 8:1, 3-8, in Hebrews 2:5-8, upsets the idea of hierarchy as a static concept.


Greenwood surveys Leavis' career and critical works, accounting for him as having (praise) a "sober prose style" (p. 32), critical of The Interpretation of Dreams, and concludes, "Barfield is entirely innocent of Freudian ideas, and to judge by his general attitude he would be most unwilling to seek allies in that quarter. We meet, therefore, two quite different approaches to poetic language arriving at virtually the same standpoint. And this is striking." What Hough is suggesting is that a type of preconscious unity to images and language underlies much poetry.


Krauthammer begins by quoting Lewis from "Dangers of National Repentance" (1940), although the source is not given. "But Lewis is too pessimistic. There are authentic expressions of national contrition. And these are as moving as those rare poems. Krauthammer then goes (p. 18). Krauthammer then goes (p. 20), "I think Mr. Lewis had the right point."


Kroober is mainly concerned with such tendencies as specialization in American academia, so the Inklings are not mentioned, except rhetorically. "Understanding our discipline . . . requires that we resist the distractions of fantasy battles between Tolkien-shaped theoretical creatures . . . " (p. 335).

Note: this issue of PLMA is part of the Modern Language Association's celebration of its centennial. Except for this one metaphor, the Inklings are not referred to; much of this is simply the natural American bias of an American organization concerned with its history. But Geoffrey H. Hartman's "The Culture of Criticism" (pp. 371-397) lists 204 critical works in his bibliography, several of them British,

Reflections on a Literary Revolution, instead of Studies in, as on the title page.

A collection of eight essays (several of them originally addressed), of which only two are directly pertinent to the Inklings. (a) "Reflections on a Literary Revolution" (pp. 3-82)—probably the cause of the confusion over the subtitle—discusses the development, characteristics, and limited influence of Imagism (used in an extended way), and mentions Lewis several times. The two references are to Lewis' "De Descriptione Temporum" (pp. 42-43).

Tolkien's use of the change in poetry to be one indication of a rift in culture between the early nineteenth century and the early twentieth century is mentioned, and the second time Hough goes on to cite Lewis' references and allusions to Lewis do not, however, mean that Hough rejects modern poetry and James Joyce's fiction in the way that Lewis does; rather, for example, he calls The Waste Land "an idiosyncratic encyclopedic success" and Pound's Cantos "an idiosyncratic encyclopedic failure" (p. 70). Whether or not Hough is right, he both understands and discriminates among modern works in a way Lewis did not.

(b) "Psychoanalysis and Literary Interpretation" (pp. 108-130) is a discussion of what Freudian theory and practice has contributed to literary criticism. Section V of the essay (pp. 128-129) compares Barfield's theory in Poetic Diction to the critical section of The Interpretation of Dreams, and concludes, "Barfield is entirely innocent of Freudian ideas, and to judge by his general attitude he would be most unwilling to seek allies in that quarter. We meet, therefore, two quite different approaches to poetic language arriving at virtually the same standpoint. And this is striking." What Hough is suggesting is that a type of preconscious unity to images and language underlies much poetry.
without including Cecil, Lewis, Tolkien, or Williams. Hartmanbriefly discusses criticism without jargon, historical criticism, or the debate over Milton's Satan (all on p. 386), suggesting the first is out of fashion; the second, simplistic; and the third to be properly decided in favor of. That Milton has, unconsciously, identified with Satan for the first two books of Paradise Lost. Given these biases, one does not wonder that the Inklings are not mentioned.


A collection of four essays, most of which first appeared in Leavis' journal Scrutiny. Those involving the Inklings are these:

(a) "Gerard Manley Hopkins," pp. 44-58 [Cecil, 51]. In a discussion of Hopkins' simplicity and "riming audacities," Leavis writes, "To say this, of course, is not to endorse Lord David Cecil's view that Hopkins is difficult because of his difficult way of saying simple things. It is relevant, but hardly necessary, to remark that for Hopkins his use of words is not a matter of saying things with them; he is preoccupied with what seems to him the poetic use of them, and that is a matter of making them do and be." No source is given for Cecil's views; probably the reference is to his introduction (p. xxxi) to The Oxford Book of Christian Verse (first ed.).

(b) "Johnson and Augustanism," pp. 97-115 [Lewis, 97]. In the opening paragraph of this essay, Leavis deprecates much of the approach to Dr. Johnson in England, writing, "these are too good reason for expecting that a new book on Johnson by one of the academic custodians of the humanities will exhibit the kind of literary accomplishment that goes with an admiration for the prose of (say) Miss Dorothy Sayers, the brilliance of Mr. G.S. Lewis, and the art of Lytton Strachey. This is of course not dismissed without further consideration. (Not listed in Christopher and Otsling.)

(c) "The Logic of Christian Discrimination," pp. 248-254 [Williams, 249, 252-253]. Leavis begins, "I have already had reason for concluding that Christian Discrimination is decidedly a bad thing." His object of attack is Poetry and Personal Responsibility by Brother George Every [Glenn, III-B-43]. In a paragraph quoted from Every on p. 249, used to show that he has no knowledge of the difference between the works he jumbles together, Every moves from E.M. Forster, at the first of the paragraph, to Charles Williams, at the end. "I can see no reason for being interested in Charles Williams" (p. 252). "The passages of Williams' verse quoted by Every seem simply to confuse the fact that, however sound his poet's orthodoxy, he hadn't begun to be a poet" (p. 252). "Having taken the tip and looked at [Williams'] introduction to the 'World Classics! Milton] I am obliged to report that I find it merely and generally interesting and sometimes even amusing, but I find it extremely difficult to believe that this is the work of a man who had nothing critically relevant to say" (p. 253). ". . . if you approach as a literary critic . . . or if you approach merely with ordinary sensitiveness and good sense, you can hardly fail to see that Williams' preoccupation with the 'horror of evil' is evidence of an arrest at the schoolboy (and -girl) stage rather than of spiritual maturity, and that his dealings in 'myth,' mystery, the occult, and the supernatural belong essentially to the ethos of the thriller. This, of course, is his spiritual edifying to promote the opposite of spiritual health" (p. 253). Probably spiritually/ly in this last quotation means psychologically/ly each time. [Glenn does not list this essay.]

(d) "The Progress of Poetry," pp. 293-298 [Cecil, 297]. A trivial reference to Cecil, contained in a quotation from John Hayward's Prose Literature since 1939, which Leavis is attacking.


A history and discussion of the Church of England and, in a limited way, the Anglican Communion. Perhaps Neil has an unconscious bias toward clergymen, for he manages to mention J.B. Phillips' translation of the New Testament in his discussion of the twentieth century (p. 404), while not mentioning Lewis, Williams, Dorothy L. Sayers—or T.S. Eliot. Lewis does get into the bibliography for A Preface to "Paradise Lost", as a help to understanding seventeenth-century thought. (p. 450).


An amateur-detective novel in which Dade Cooley, a San Francisco attorney, journeys to France to help, and then to investigate the murder of, Kate Mulvaney, who was on a barge with her relatives, vacationing on the canals there. At one point, questions arise concerning "several college-age boys and girls" (p. 57) who are playing Dungeon and Dragons (or at least they have a Dungeon Master, according to the novel). As Cooley stands listening to them before they pause, two of the characters go downstairs. The latter is strong enough to break in a door at the bottom of the stairs (p. 58). No direct reference to Tolkien appears, but the popularity of his characters, and their influence on Dungeon and Dragons, seems implied by the use of these two types.


"An Evening in Tavrobel" consists of two stanzas, of eight and twelve lines respectively, rhymed (with the exception of one ABBA quatrain) in couplets. The lines are iambic tercets with a pentameter for the close. The poem describes a late May day (stanza one) and night (stanza two) with minute fairies, here called "spirits." (1.7). There is no explanation of the name in the title.

"The Lonely Isle" has two stanzas, of twelve and thirteen lines respectively, rhyming ABABCCDEDEFFGHGHIJKKL. The last line is a tetrameter, but the rest (all basically iambic) vary between pentameters and hexameters. The poem is a description of the island with white rock coastline (cliffs?), with white birds flying above it; in the second stanza, children, fairies, a citadel, and an inland bell-tower are mentioned as on the island. This may be an early account of Eressea.

"The Princess Nf" consists of six quatrains, with lines varying from dimeters to tetrameters (or possibly only trimeters, beginning with anapests instead of amphimacets); the rhyme scheme, repeated in pattern for the second twelve lines, is AABBCCDDEEFFE. Two of the lines of this poem are close enough to lines in "Princess Mee" in The Adventures of Tom Bombadil to remove any doubt that this is the source of the later poem, but the whole business in "Princess Mee" of the reflection is not in this earlier version; this is just an iambic pentameter. [The Princess Nf is not in the collection, but there is a letter of 27 September 1983, reports that these poems were first located by John Ratecliff and Doug Anderson in their bibliographic work; this was reported in AmOn Hen: The Bulletin of the Tolkien Society, No. 34 (August 1978), 19. However, it is worth repeating since the poems are not listed in West's Tolkien Criticism (rev., 1981).


A collection of seven essays by J.R.R. Tolkien, all but one of them originally addresses and all but two previously published.

(a) Christopher Tolkien, "Foreword," pp. 1-4. Christopher Tolkien briefly surveys the sources of the essays and explains his editing procedures.

(b) J.R.R. Tolkien, "Beowulf: The Monsters and the Critics," pp. 5-46. Given as a lecture in 1936 and published in the Proceedings of the British Academy with that date, this essay is usually considered seminal in Beowulf studies, for discussing the poem as art rather than philology or Germanic legendary history (in background details particularly). The essay has been available in the United States in two anthologies of Beowulf criticism (West, rev., 1-35), but this is its first collection in a volume by
Tolkien—as is true of all of these essays except for "On Fairy-Stories."

(c) "On Translating Beowulf," pp. 49-71. Originally appeared as "Prefatory Remarks on Prose Translation of Beowulf" to the 1939 edition of J.R.R. Tolkien's "The Hobbit." Tolkien quotes two other versions of "Oilima Markirya," the only one in Sindarin, "Dir avosaith a gwaew hinar," with a prose translation. In the notes to this essay, Tolkien quotes two other versions of "Oilima Markirya," with a verse translation, "The Last Ark;" "Nienquine," with a prose translation; "Erendel," with a prose translation and a verse paraphrase titled "Erendel at the Helm;" and an untitled poem, the only one in Sindarin, "Dir avosaith a gwaew hinar," with a prose translation. In the notes to this essay, Tolkien quotes two other versions of "Oilima Markirya," the earliest and the last, with a glossary for the latter, and another translation with the same title, "The Last Ark." In the "Foreword," Christopher Tolkien refers to "Oilima Markirya" as "one of the major pieces of Quenya" (p. 4).

(b) "Valedictory Address to the University of Oxford," pp. 224-240. The address was given in 1959. Tolkien's purpose is a discussion of the temptation and (first) confession of Sir Gawain, mainly the third section of the poem. Unlike some critics, he takes the confession as valid and discusses the poem in terms of its morality. A multitude of minor points could be mentioned from the poem: for example, the first endnote gives a linguistic argument for pentangle being widely used in Middle English; this presumably explains the bald statement from the paper: for example, the first endnote gives a linguistic argument for pentangle being widely used in Middle English; this presumably explains the bald statement that he did not take this opportunity to quote in footnotes the materials omitted or revised in 1947 from the 1939 address as printed in 1964; but what is unfortunate is that he did not take this opportunity to quote in footnotes the materials omitted or revised in 1964 from the 1947 version in Essays Presented to Charles Williams, ed. C.S. Lewis—"I came into more regular contact with other fans while I was in the RAF, stationed close enough to London to travel down on the tube to the evening performances of the London SF Circle. . . . Its ancestry dates back to before WWI. . . . And the visitor's book—the Circle's sole concession to formality, maintained by our doyen Frank Edward Arnold—contains such remarkable names as those of Marie Stopes and C.S. Lewis" (pp. 323-324). The occasion is not given by Brunner, but since the London SF Circle is—according to his account—mainly social, presumably Lewis was invited as a guest. This is not the occasion when Lewis, seconded by Tolkien, debated with C. S. Lewis; that was in an Oxford pub at a meeting of the British Interplanetary Society (mentioned by Clark in The View from Serendip).

(e) "Leigh Brackett," pp. 361, 370-383 [Tolkien, 382]; published in Luna Monthly, No. 61 (1976); conducted, September 1973-June 1974. Walker seems to have asked at least two of the women he interviewed whether men were action-oriented in their fiction and women place-oriented. In the interview with Anne McCaffrey (p. 257), where the questions are given, half of this pair appears. Leigh Brackett replies to both of the terms, beginning on p. 379, although in her case the questions do not appear, and she concludes, "Tolkien . . . was immensely aware of 'place.' So was Eddison."


This seems to be a photographically reproduced edition of the Oxford University Press editions of the two books—that is, The Region of the Summer Stars is from the 1950 reset edition, not the first edition in 1944. As such, it does not vary greatly from the earlier Oxford University Press cloth edition of the books and the two editions have the separate pagination of the earlier books. The Brewer edition differs in these respects: it has a new title page, with a title for the whole volume (Oxford listed the two titles, as in Brewer's subtitle); it has a new copyright page and has dropped the separate copyright pages of the two books; it has used the half-title page of each book as the title page and dropped the Oxford title pages; it has dropped the Roman numerals on the prefatory material with the Region of the Summer Stars (presumably because the omission of the title page and the copyright page fouled up the numbers); it is softcover rather than hard. Neither edition has Lynton Lamb's endpaper map (of a female nude superimposed on Europe) from the first edition of Taliesin through Logres. The main utility of this edition is that the occasional page numbers in Arthurian Torso by Williams and Lewis match it, unlike the combined edition with new

Whitman, an Episcopal priest being published by a Catholic press, offers an approach to psychological wholeness through the images of fairy tales. His "Introduction" (pp. 5-8) is indebted to "On Fairy Stories" for its terms of discussion. The first section of his book discusses a series of familiar, brief tales — "Jack and the Beanstalk", "The Emperor's Clothes", "Rumpelstiltskin", "Snow White", and five others — in psychological terms and Biblical parallels. A particularly Jungian analysis is offered of "Hansel and Gretel"; an undocumented parallel to "The Cobbler and the Taller*. A piece of the creation account in the Taller* is given in a discussion of evil, based on the stepmother in "Snow White" (p. 32).

The second section is a consideration of The *Lord of the Rings*. It begins with a summary (pp. 55-57) which unfortunately states that "Gandalf falls into a dark abyss in a battle with a Nazgul — a dreadful spirit of the underworld" (p. 57), although the later discussion of the episode is in terms of the Balrog (pp. 70-71). The chapter titles on the Tolkien work indicate the basic approach: "The Quest or Inner Journey" (pp. 58-65), "The Use of Power" (pp. 66-72), "The Choosing of the Kingdom" (pp. 73-80). In the first, W. H. Auden's "The Quest Hero" is quoted about the six characteristics of the quest story (p. 59), but typical of this variety of popular book is the fact that the essay is not identified and its sources are not given. Whitman gives on to give five characteristics of the Christian spiritual quest, which are not (it turns out) identical with Auden's; both Tolkienese and Biblical illustrations are given. The second of these chapters is mainly a discussion of the Ring as a symbol of power, with the need to give it up — self-sacrifice — emphasized. "There is a strange aspect to the Ring Tale which is different from the New Testament, and it is that the destruction of the One Ring causes the other rings to diminish" (pp. 71-72).

That is, in Whitman's terms, survival in the nuclear age may mean the whole civilization may regress. (Tolkien, of course, was not symbolizing the atom bomb, but he did not rule out applications. Whitman makes the application without comment on Tolkien's intentions.) The third of these chapters is about Frodo choosing to be Ring-bearer, but it has the highest percentage of Christian, non-Tolkienese materials in it. A curious passage is one in which Whitman calls the tentacles of the Watcher in the Water "snakes" (p. 74); perhaps he is just trying to not complicate his text, which includes Whitman's reference to the tentacles in the same terms.

The third section has a brief introduction (not a summary this time) and three chapters on the "main" characters of *Wardrobe*: "How Eustace was Changed" (pp. 90-94), on the "Wagon Island episode "The Voyage of the Dawn Treader"; and "On Being Taken In and Taken Out" (pp. 95-98), on the Dwarfs in *The Last Battle*. The applications are mainly the obvious Christian ones.

The final section is about the persons reading the book writing their own fairy tales (with some final guidance in interpretation from a spiritual counsellor); the goal is not art but personal self-understanding. In the stories (three are quoted) are used like the dreams in Freudian analysis, but approach is Jungian. "On Fairy-Stories" is cited at the first (p. 101). The final chapter is a consideration of Biblical parables and episodes in the terms of the book; as with the rest of the section, except for that first page, Lewis and Tolkien are not mentioned.

---

**LETTERS continued from page 44**

We mortals generally find no better use for it than to be humorous (punning and such). Once in a while one of our poets will describe a verse that we have play in order to deepen the semantic layering of a poem and occasionally a prose writer will do the same (again, Joyce). The "lay High Elf (if I may use such an outrageous oxymoron) as well as the linguistic possibilities of an utterance (or written passage) and, in fact, delights in discovering those nuances. The nuances need not be related etymologically any more than they need be related in real world language. In fact, I would suspect that the juxtaposed etymologies themselves could just as well provide the kind of semantic "parallax" that the High Elves enjoyed.

I would like to make one observation about your etymological hypothesis which I think might help you understand how I arrive at my speculations. You postulate a Common Elvish verb, "gwam-en(t)" which yields "omentie" in Quenya. That may very well be the case; it certainly is permissible phonetically (the "n"-"nt" alteration). The problem is that there is no example in the entire corpus, of "-ment" for "-men("region") except in those cases like "Hyarmentir" and "kementari" where the "t" is ob­ thrivously a part of the following morpheme. That there might be an elemental overlap, there is no question. If that is the case, then my "tie road" would be totally consistent. If "tie" does not wash, then the corpus evidence makes "omentie" odd-man out. Not a very elegant description in light of the published material. If we then insist that "men" is the admissible form, then we end up with a gratuitous "t" which for some reason (phonological or otherwise), has intruded. (Perhaps it escaped from the parenthesis in my "au(t)" (Slap my mouth!))

"-lva: You correctly describe the difference between "-lva" and "-lma" as Jim Allen does in his Introduction to Elvish. To say, however, that a "dual" is something other than a kind of pronoun is to make an assertion that flies in the face of the most respected historical descriptions of Old English and other languages with similar pronominal structures. The function of "-lva" is, indeed, that of "a first person dual pronoun." I confess that at the time that I wrote the article, I chose not to make an issue of the "inclusive" and "exclusive" aspects. I thought that I had raised enough issues by then as it was. That does not make my statement an "inaccurate" one. I admit that I think that I am merely mincing words, may I provide you with an example from English. "Polygamy" does not refer exclusively to a man having more than one wife; it refers to a spouse having more than one spouse regardless of gender. "Polygyny" refers to a man having more than one wife. "Polyandry" refers to a woman having more than one husband. If you will promise never to refer to the "polygamous" Mormons, except in "polygynous" terms, I will promise never to omit the "inclusive-exclusive" aspects of the "first-person dual pronoun."