



Mythopoeic Society

mythLORE

A Journal of J.R.R. Tolkien, C.S. Lewis,
Charles Williams, and Mythopoeic Literature

Volume 11
Number 1

Article 12

Summer 7-15-1984

Letters

Melanie A. Rawls

Sarah Beach

Darrell Schweitzer

Susan Owens

Jessica Yates

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.swosu.edu/mythlore>



Part of the [Children's and Young Adult Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rawls, Melanie A.; Beach, Sarah; Schweitzer, Darrell; Owens, Susan; Yates, Jessica; and Wynne, Patrick (1984) "Letters," *Mythlore: A Journal of J.R.R. Tolkien, C.S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and Mythopoeic Literature*: Vol. 11: No. 1, Article 12.

Available at: <https://dc.swosu.edu/mythlore/vol11/iss1/12>

This Letter is brought to you for free and open access by the Mythopoeic Society at SWOSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mythlore: A Journal of J.R.R. Tolkien, C.S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and Mythopoeic Literature by an authorized editor of SWOSU Digital Commons. An ADA compliant document is available upon request. For more information, please contact phillip.fitzsimmons@swosu.edu.

To join the Mythopoeic Society go to:
<http://www.mythsoc.org/join.htm>

SWOSUTM

Online Summer Seminar 2023

August 5-6, 2023: Fantasy Goes to Hell: Depictions of Hell in Modern Fantasy Texts

<https://mythsoc.org/oms/oms-2023.htm>



Letters

Authors

Melanie A. Rawls, Sarah Beach, Darrell Schweitzer, Susan Owens, Jessica Yates, and Patrick Wynne



LETTERS

Melanie A. Rawls

Thomasville, GA

I enjoyed Mythlore 36 (it bears more than one reading). John Schimanski's drawing (p. 12) of mountains adrift in mist I found peculiarly evocative of Middle-earth. I am particularly enjoying Edith Crowe's "The Many Faces of Heroism in Tolkien" as well as her fine drawing, and Karl Schorr's "The Nature of Dreams in The Lord of the Rings." Schorr points out that almost all of Frodo's dreams have the wind blowing through them; I immediately thought of Manwe, Lord of Airs, and of how the past of Middle-earth "blows" through its present.

Most of all, I am enjoying the poetry. "October Hymn" by Karl E. Russa arrived just in time to help celebrate the blue, bright silver and restless gold which is October (though here in deep south Georgia, October proper, with attendant bright weather, has an annoying habit of arriving as late as mid-November).

Alice P. Kenney's "The Toad-Sister," however, does just what good fantasy should do: it takes an unexpected perspective and opens a new or different way of seeing. How different to see the selfish shrewish Ugly Sister of the fairy tale as something other than a foil for the heroine; or to have expressed the pain beneath the meanness, or have hinted a chance for change or love in her pitiful life. Thanks, Ms. Kenney, for the Toad-Sister's tale. It needed telling.

Sarah Beach

Austin, TX

Although Christine Barkley's article "Donaldson as Heir to Tolkien" is well-written, there are a few things to which I take exception.

At one point she mentions "Frodo's recognition of his own lust for power at the Cracks of Doom." However, there is not much indication in The Lord of the Rings that Frodo's failure is a "lust for power." He has become possessed by the Ring and no longer has the will to destroy it. He has exercised power twice in confronting Gollum, but that is not the same as lusting for power.

In the section of her outline dealing with difference in the perception of heroism in the two authors, she indicates that in Tolkien "heroism" is "to do and endure and sneak past evil." In spite of the fact that there are several instances of "sneaking past evil" in LotR, confrontation of evil is a very important fact: Frodo's withstanding the attack of the Ringwraiths at Weathertop, his confrontation with Boromir, Gandalf's with Saruman and later Denethor, Frodo's confrontations with Gollum, Merry and Pippin's with Grishnakh, the scouring of the Shire. There is no sneaking in these instances. Tolkien's characters look directly into the face of evil and confront it. But they don't do it prematurely, when forcing the

confrontation would bring them capture and defeat. Thus, Frodo "sneaks past" Minas Morgul.

I question the statement that Tolkien considers the destruction of power as the way to deal with it. "Power" is a handy label to tag on the issue (and it is indeed the focus in Donaldson -- Covenant does not want the power he is told he possesses). But the One Ring was made for the sole purpose of domination, not "power." There are several figures in LotR who possess "power" but do not seek to destroy the power they possess: Gandalf, Elrond, Galadriel. They are perfectly aware that their power is likely to be diminished by the destruction of the One Ring, but they consider that loss to be worth the destruction of the instrument of domination.

I feel that Barkley's contention that the issues of WWII affected the writing of LotR overlooks the fact that throughout history people have feared "being dominated and controlled by a group of people calling themselves the Master Race and claiming superiority," the reaction of the ancient Israelites to the Egyptian pharaohs, the Chinese reaction to their Manchu conquerors, the eventual reaction of the Central American Indians to the conquistadors. Such a feeling is nothing new and shouldn't in a literary work be considered as a reaction to specific historical events, unless so stated. It certainly shouldn't be applied to LotR when Tolkien himself has said that such was not the case.

On another matter, if I might be allowed, I'd like to make some comments on behalf of my fellow Mythlore artists. When I was at Mythcon last year, I was gratified by the number of compliments made to me concerning my artwork. When I first began doing pieces for Mythlore, praise had a definite inspirational effect on me. But I've been one of the lucky ones. I'd like to remind the readers that artwork is as much a performance medium as theater is, and the performers occasionally need the nourishment of applause, either generally directed (in the letter column) or personally directed (in a personal letter to the artist). One likes to know whether anyone even looked at the thing, let alone liked it. I suspect that some artists may get discouraged by the lack of comment (favorable or otherwise). To those of my fellows who are currently submitting artwork I say "Don't stop." To those who used to send in work but got discouraged I say "Come back." To those who are feeling timid about submitting work I say "Try it." And especially, to Edith Crowe, the Art Editor, for her early friendly responses, and to Glen Goodknight for his on-going encouragement and criticism, I express my heart-felt thanks.

Darrell Schweitzer

Stratford, PA 19087

There's a grotesque typo in my poem "The Official Response" in the 38th Mythlore. The word "throughout"



has somehow become shortened to "thought." This must leave the reader wondering. "Through"? "Throat"? "Thought"? I also note a punctuation error. The second stanza should not close with quotation marks, as it does in the printed version.

As for Christine Barkley's thesis that Stephen Donaldson should be reckoned Tolkien's chief heir, my main response is that Tolkien deserves better. It is true that Donaldson has some storytelling ability, and an undoubted ability at subcreation, but, while Tolkien's prose ranges from serviceable to extraordinarily vivid and poetic, Donaldson's is low-level pulp. He would have been a conspicuously crude stylist in *Thrilling Wonder Stories* in 1940. It's very hard to read more than a page of his prose without finding something to wince at. He also has his own clichés. British fans, who take Donaldson far less seriously than we do, have invented a game called "Clench." To play, a bunch of people open Donaldson books at random and read as far as they can before finding the word "clench." The person who lasts the longest wins. At least jokingly, the all-time record has been reported to be a page and a half.

No, Donaldson is only an epic writer for the style-deaf. If someone is to be considered an heir to Tolkien, he or she should not only share many of the characteristics of Tolkien, but write as well as Tolkien, or nearly so. My own choice would be Ursula Le Guin. Her *Earthsea* trilogy isn't as massive as Tolkien or Donaldson, but I don't think great literature comes by the pound. Stylistically, she is to Donaldson what a finely polished gem is to unquarried rock.

Susan Owens

St. Paul, MN

To comment on both Mr. Kondratiev's and Mr. Speth's letters in *Mythlore* 38, I would like to begin with Mr. Kondratiev's point that Lewis's reasons for not going "all the way" to Rome, and his reasons for not doing so are a perfectly legitimate area of biographical inquiry. I agree, to some extent. Once

an author is deceased, biographers often go far in investigating and providing hypothetical answers to personal matters in an author's life, which for various compelling reasons would not be attempted while their subject is alive. But while Mr. Kondratiev is correct as far as he goes, let us also respect the fact that Lewis, out of prudence and charity, persistently preferred not to give his reasons, except in personal correspondence, and then rarely. Surely he was a catholic (small 'c'), as was pointed out, and the reasons he did not become RC, as guarded as they were, have been carefully ferreted out in Mr. Derrick's book; a book which frustratingly fails to take these same reasons seriously. It is this fact, rather than Mr. Kondratiev's well-taken point, that boggles the mind, and moved me to ask in my previous letter "why berate the man?", which Derrick does. This goes beyond biographical inquiry into a bizarre debate with a deceased man.

It would be easy to fall into the assumption that Lewis's early exposure to Ulsterism was the main and abiding reason he did not "go all the way." We may consider it endlessly, but it cannot be proven. Lewis was a total non-believer for a long period of his life. His exposure to catholic and ecumenical thought was considerable in his adult life. A man of recognized rigorous intellectual honesty would have dealt with the question of Rome with the same internal honesty that he approached all other philosophical and religious issues. To jump to the easy presumption of Ulster prejudice does a disservice to both the personal integrity of Lewis and the reasoned treatment of issues. A close friend (Tolkien) may have said it in some passing circumstance that we do not fully understand, but we know from Tolkien's biography and published letters that he did have lapses of surprisingly uncharitable remarks, was extremely sensitive about his own Roman Catholicism, and could be amazingly crotchety and close-minded at times.

In response to Mr. Speth's letter, his remarks in both his review in *Mythlore* 36 and his letter that one sees little of the C. of E. in Lewis's writing is certainly not offensive to me. Even if recognized as such, it is a non-sequitur in relation to his attitude toward the Church of Rome. Some professing Christians are primarily focused on the structure and services of their own denomination or church in their religious thought, while others focus more directly on Christ. Lewis was firmly in the second group.

Mr. Speth seems to reveal a very curious prejudice in the last paragraph of his letter, as well as in his previous review, where he equates his imaginary Lewis Industry with academia. Non-academic writers appear exempt from his "caustic and withering" remarks. Not only is this unjust, it flies in the face of some of the very best books written in Lewis. Not being an academic, and do not have direct experience with the "odious" publish or perish pressures they contend with--does Mr. Speth?--I cannot accept this insult to so many important books on Lewis, nor that nearly all books on Lewis that would better have been left unwritten were written by academics under the gun. Far from it. Such an implied sweeping generalization is even more unbelievable than unjust.

I gladly note Mr. Speth's agreement that there may be valid criticisms of Derrick's book, and that "Lewis contributed much toward a healing process." I do join Mr. Speth in his suggestion to "think of more cheerful things, like the prospect of rereading Lewis himself." Amen.

Jessica Yates

London, England

On the article on Mythlore 35--"Historical Motivations for the Siege of Minas Tirith," by Jefferson P. Swycaffer:

While it is perfectly plausible that before describing the Siege of Minas Tirith, Tolkien would have researched several accounts of medieval sieges in order to get his background and strategy more realistic, I don't accept that the Siege of Minas Tirith is primarily modelled on the Siege of Constantinople in the "conscious and deliberate" way Swycaffer alleges.

Though the example of the superbombard cannon is a good parallel to Grond, other elements could derive from other sieges. Swycaffer has to admit that Constantinople was captured, and Minas Tirith was saved. There is another famous siege, again of a Christian city by Turkish forces, in which the city was saved--the Siege of Vienna, 1683. In an article published in the Proceedings of the Indiana Academy of the Social Sciences, 1977, George W. Geib argues for the most likely parallel to the Siege of Minas Tirith. ('The Horns of the North: Historical Origins of J.R.R. Tolkien's Trilogy'). A few points: Vienna stands on a river (not the sea); the relief comes via Polish cavalry; Vienna was surrounded by ring-shaped walls; the relieving army travelled through a southern forest; the Turks were led by the Sultan's vizier (not the Sultan himself). Geib does not insist that this siege is the only and true historical parallel, but suggests that it made a contribution.

In a letter in Mythlore 35, Sandra Miesel reminds us of yet another confrontation, the Battle of Chalon. As she said in her pamphlet Myth, Symbol and Religion: The Lord of the Rings:

"The Riders of Rohan provide Gondor's margin of victory . . . just as the Visigothic cavalry did for Rome at Chalon. . . . in A.D. 452. . . . Aged King Theoden of Rohan falls at the Pelennor Fields just as the elderly Visigothic king Theodoric I did at Chalon."

Moreover, T.A. Shippey, in The Road to Middle-earth, also makes this parallel (probably independently of Miesel):

"On a larger scale the Battle of the Pelennor Fields closely follows the account, in Jordanes' Gothic History, of the Battle of the Catalaunian Plains, in which also the civilization of the West was preserved from the 'Easterlings', and in which the Gothic king Theodoric was trampled by his own victorious cavalry with much the same mixture of grief and glory as Tolkien's Theoden." (ch. 1, p. 12)

(The invaders were led by none other than Attila the Hun!) So here is another candidate, not exactly a siege, but with the important parallel of the death of the leader of the cavalry.

It is strange that Swycaffer nowhere indicates, regarding the siege of Constantinople, that the Turks were in the wrong. Naturally the laws of war dictate that a rising empire must try to crush a dying empire--but moral law should condemn the aggressor.

I am glad that correspondents in Mythlore 36 spoke out against Swycaffer's extraordinary statement

(especially in such a journal as ours) that "No culture is significantly better than another." I'd like to take this point further, as I don't believe this statement ought to stand without supporting evidence.

Possibly what Swycaffer means, is that the pros and cons of each culture should be carefully considered before declaring that culture A (in this case, medieval Christendom) is overall superior to culture B (the invading Turks). But even so it is the duty of a moral being in a democracy to denounce the evil aspects, both of his own culture, and any other culture. Let's take a few examples in which our culture, i.e. 20th C. Anglo-American, might seem to be superior, but in fact to an objective viewer such as E.T. might seem equal or even inferior to other cultures.

A primitive tribe in the South Seas sends its teenage males to fight to the death with other teenage males in neighboring villages. The winner must bring back his victim's head in evidence. How barbaric! Yet do we care any better for the young who fail to get through our educational system? Our street gangs, football hooligans and dope addicts are evidence that our society is not perfect.

A culture of the ancient world sacrificed young children to placate its gods. How barbaric! But our culture takes random toll of young children to be sacrificed to the Motor-Car, and poisoned by nuclear radiation.

The main social organization which opposes our own, imprisonments and tortures intellectuals, journalists, non-violent patriots and religious adherents. Yet it presumably has a high degree of internal security, with little street crime or drug addiction. It might be argued that life for the very poorest in a so-called socialist state is better than life for the very poorest in the USA or UK, and their dependent Third World countries.

Perhaps this is how Swycaffer would justify his statement about no culture being superior to another. On the other hand, as the correspondents in ML 36 pointed out, some features of a society may be so evil that nothing else can mitigate them. I am reminded of Ursula Le Guin's short story, "The Ones who walk away from Omelas," which could be applied both to transatlantic Western society, and to the socialist bloc. In both, the good life of many is bought at the price of the misery of others.

Finally there are some comments of Swycaffer's I cannot endorse. When he says, "The Turks were not orcs. No humans are," he should have gone back to Tolkien's Letters, e.g. L. 78 p. 90.:

"There are no genuine Uruks...(though I fear it must be admitted that there are human creatures that seem irredeemably short of a special miracle, and that there are probably abnormally many of such creatures in Deutschland and Nippon - but certainly these unhappy countries have no monopoly: I have met them, or thought so, in England's green and pleasant land)."

Humans may not be orcs, but they can certainly behave like them, and orcs behavior must be opposed, even if it is committed by "our" soldiers, policemen, prison guards etc. If one Turkish soldier raped a

woman prisoner or killed a baby, then for those moments he was an orc, despite Swycaffer's pleading otherwise.

Swycaffer's remarks about the youth of Gondor who revive orkish fashions are incomprehensible: "This the context of the siege." Tolkien did not approve of the orc-cults, but sadly prophesied what has in fact come true, the resurgence of fascism in the modern West. Swycaffer implies that this development in Gondor was a Good Thing, but Tolkien didn't think so. The youths were not aping the orcs in a misguided mood of reconciliation--"They weren't as bad as all that"--the youths were taking an unhealthy interest in the orkish "pleasures" of torture, rape and massacre, forgetting the ideals of the War of the Ring.

It cannot be said too strongly that orcs do not represent a race. They represent the violent aspect of human nature--an aspect to be acknowledged and combated--not to be accepted and enjoyed. Anyone can be an orc for a while, but the temptations are greater if one belongs to some sort of organized gang, either of criminals or even law-enforcers. It is not the being "barefoot and ... undisciplined," Mr. Swycaffer, that makes one an orc - it is the superior strength, anonymity, and lack of moral toughness which may betray a soldier, policeman or prison guard into taking advantage of the powerless.

Comments on Benjamin Urrutia's review of The Return of the Jedi:

When I reviewed The Return of the Jedi for Amn Hen (issue 63) I concentrated on the parallels with The Return of the King, of which I held the title to be only one among many. The following comments are based on my review.

As Mr. Urrutia rightly says, the climax of both constructs of physical battle and spiritual conflict running parallel. In both sagas there are in fact two "physical" battles on the earthly plane. In The Return of the King, the battle of the Pelennor Fields precedes by several weeks the battle before the Gate of Mordor. However, Lucas goes one better by making the two physical battles (in space and on the planet Endor) simultaneous and interdependent.

Lando cannot blow up the Death Star until Han Solo has destroyed the ray which shields the Star. But unless Luke wins his psychic struggle, the Emperor will blow up the planet Endor; and will also escape to build more Death Stars and continue his evil rule.

So also the conflicts in Tolkien are interdependent. The army marches to Mordor to draw Sauron's attention away from Frodo and Sam, but it cannot defeat Sauron until the Ring has been destroyed.

Further parallels are noted in the roles of the main characters. Aragorn is an epic hero, leads the army in battle, and wins the princess. Sam fulfills these functions on a less glamorous level. Frodo becomes a mystic hero, fights on a spiritual plane, withdraws from earthly life and never marries. Just so, Han is a counterpart to Aragorn, Luke to Frodo--but it is Luke who bears the magic sword.

Princess Leia resembles Arwen and Eowyn, as she fights in battle, is wounded in the arm, and marries the hero. Like Eowyn, she is attracted to two men, first Luke and then Han Solo, and after Evil has been destroyed she has a scene with Han when she reassures

him that she loves him. Far more comical than the corresponding scene in RotK when Eowyn discovers her love for Faramir!

The opening events of book and film are very similar. Sam rescues Frodo (actually, at the beginning of Book 6) who was previously paralyzed by Shelob. Luke and Leia rescue Solo from Jabba the Hutt--Solo has also been paralyzed to near-death by a freeze-ray!

Gandalf, the wizard adviser, having returned from the dead, takes a more active role than Obi-wan, who remains on the astral plane and can only be seen by Luke. Whereas Frodo and Sam go to Mordor with Gandalf's blessing, Luke goes to confront the Emperor on his own initiative. There is no parallel to the brother-sister motif (unless you look at The Silmarillion).

Finally, it is the role of Darth Vader who provides the most interesting variation on Tolkien's theme. All through the Star Wars epic, Vader has appeared as the counterpart of the Lord of the Nagul, right-hand man of the Evil Lord, the Emperor/Sauron. But suddenly and marvelously, he turns to Good, and becomes, instead, Gollum's counterpart. Whereas Gollum fell with the Ring, Darth Vader throws the Emperor down, and is saved to rejoin Obi-wan on the astral plane.

This now leads me to comment on the three articles on Gollum in ML 37: "Silent Commands?," "A Critical Approach to Fantasy," and "Gollum: a Misunderstood Hero." Firstly, I strongly disagree with Hall that Frodo ordered Gollum to "hurl himself and the Ring into the fire." If Frodo had used the Ring to command Gollum, he would have become corrupt like Sauron, and beyond redemption.

I preferred Stoddard's interpretation, but disagree with the term "arbitrary ... damnation" and the phrase "unmerited ... and accidental death." Callaway's article is flawed by lack of attention to detail. He says "Without The Silmarillion one would not know that Sauron is a "servant" of Melkor" - but Strider told the hobbits this on Weathertop. It would also have been better to quote from Tolkien's letter to Robert Murray, S.J., citing the actual letter, no. 142, pp. 171-2, rather than the excerpt given in Kilby.

Callaway's conclusion, that Gollum "consciously" takes the Ring from Frodo and deliberately destroys it, is also wrong.

Let's go back to Return of the King. Tolkien writes: "he stepped too far, toppled, wavered for a moment on the brink, and then with a shriek he fell." This doesn't read as if Gollum deliberately jumped over the edge. My reading of this has become more and more certain: that Eru reached out and "nudged" Gollum over. Then we read in the Letters (192 p. 253) that indeed "The Other Power then took over" i.e. Eru Himself.

Where Stoddard goes wrong is to equate death with damnation. Many of the leading characters in LotR die a death recorded in the Appendices--but they are not damned, and indeed Aragorn and Arwen have to meet after death. In Letter 181 p. 234 Tolkien says that he would not inquire "Into the ultimate judgement upon Gollum" for this was up to God to decide. We are all sinful, and must not anticipate judgement.

But now, back to *Return of the Jedi*, and seeing that one good deed redeems so much evil, perhaps Gollum too was saved, after much purgation, to meet Frodo and Sam in the hobbit's heaven, purified by his fiery fall. His inadvertently heroic deed in saving the world should have counted in his favor. Darth Vader was saved--and Gollum as well.

Patrick Wynne

Fosston, MN.

There are several points in Paul Nolan Hyde's column with which I disagree. To begin with, I don't understand why he finds it necessary to give *utvinyenes* the elaborate translation 'I have just now found it.' There is no reason to assume that Tolkien's own translation, 'I have found it,' is vague or inaccurate. Mr. Hyde is reading subtle nuances of meaning into this simple phrase that aren't there. I'm reminded of Tolkien's puzzled reply in *Letters* (pg. 424) to a reader who asked if *Pedo mellon a minno* 'Say friend and enter' really meant 'Speak as a friend,' i.e. in a friendly voice: "I do not know why you are not satisfied with G(andalf)'s own interpretation."

I also disagree with the etymologies Mr. Hyde attributes to certain words:

aure 'sunlight, day' -- Mr. Hyde states that this word is a compound of *aut* 'to pass' and *ure* 'heat' and literally means 'passing heat.' I find this highly unlikely. It may be convenient to enclose the *t* in *aut* in parentheses and thus imply that it is somehow 'optional,' but it is not justifiable phonetically. Consonants do not vanish so easily and without reason in Quenya compound words. In the *Silmariillion* Appendix (pg. 458 paperback) Christopher Tolkien states that *aure* is indeed related to the element *ur* 'heat, be hot,' the Elves considering day as the time of the sun's heat. I see no reason to look much further than that, other than to note that the word *aure* 'sunlight,' derived from the root *AS-*, is closely related to *aure* or perhaps even a variant form of it.

lûme 'hour' -- Mr. Hyde states that 'lûme, of course, is glossed as 'darkness'', evidently equating it with *lûme* 'dusk.' I don't think this is the case, any more than English *bug* is equivalent in meaning to *hog* (and personally, I'd rather receive the former than the latter). Again, why is he not satisfied with Tolkien's translation 'hour'? *lûme* resembles *lûme* 'dusk' and *lumbule* 'heavy shadow,' but it's *lûva* 'bow,' and perhaps refer to the arched movements of celestial bodies as a means of telling time.

omentie 'meeting' -- Again, Tolkien's simple translation, 'meeting,' is rejected in favor of a more elaborate and unlikely one, 'region of the voice road.' *Oma* can immediately be discounted as the initial element, since it contains a long *o* while that in *omentie* is short. In *Letters* (pg. 282) Tolkien mentions the Common Elvish prefix *gwa-* 'collection of -,' which became *o-* in Quenya and *go-* in Sindarin. This prefix is seen in Quenya *olasë*, Sindarin *golas* 'collection of leaves, foliage,' and also in Sindarin *gobel* 'enclosure, town' (as in *Rhosgobel* 'Russet Town,' and in lenited form in *Amon Obel* 'Hill of the Enclosure,' the reference being to *Ephele Brandir*, probably derived from a Common Elvish word *gwa-pel* 'a collection of fences.' I would hypothesize a Common Elvish verb *gwa-men-* or *gwa-ment-* 'to collect ways, join paths, meet,' which in Quenya yielded the gerund *omentie* 'a meeting' (-*ie* is a gerundial suffix in Quenya; see *Unfinished Tales*, pg. 317, note 43) and in Sindarin yielded the adjective *govamen* 'met.' The second element in *gwa-ment-* is, of course, *men* 'way.'



Mr. Hyde is inaccurate in stating that *-lva* is "a first dual pronoun". To be exact, it is the first person plural possessive pronoun, inclusive, i.e. the person being spoken to is included: 'ours, yours and mine.' Quenya also has an exclusive version, *-lma*, in which the person being spoken to is not included: 'ours (but not yours).' The dual is a different thing altogether, referring to things in twos or in natural pairs and indicated by final *-t* or *-u*: *ciryat* 'two ships'; *Aldu* 'The Two Trees.'

I also note that throughout Mr. Hyde's column and elsewhere in *Mythlore* the long vowels in Elvish words are not indicated. In non-linguistic articles in which Elvish names are used merely to denote characters and places this is not important; however, in a column such as Mr. Hyde's where Elvish names and words are considered as things of interest in themselves, apart from the people and places they identify, marking the length of long vowels is essential. A lot can hinge on the length of a single vowel; note my comment on *oma* and *omentie* above.

[Reply by Philology Editor: Paul Nolan Hyde]

I appreciate your candor and lucidity about your views. I try to be as clear as I can, as well, and I take it as a compliment when someone returns in kind. I realize that this stance is a vulnerable one; it makes for an easy target as one can clearly see what he is shooting at. You have been frank and gentle with me; it is only fitting that I should respond in like manner.

First, a couple of observations and then some detailed responses.

1) I am a "curious *mëmken*" linguistically. It is not enough for me to know that the word "lord," for instance, functions as a noun, both proper and common. Nor does it suffice to semantically isolate it in a binary fashion (although I find that sort of thing fun). Nor am I satisfied when I have discovered all of the syntactical implications and nuance changes caused by word order and phrasal orientation (as tedious and fruitless a task as that might be). I scramble after its essence. Why is the word the way

it is? What closing synapse initiated the whole business and what has happened since. Believe it or not, the most fascinating thing about the word "lord" for me is that it has formed from the Anglo-Saxon "hlaf-weard," "the guardian of the loaf (of bread)." Knowing that little tidbit does something for my comprehension and usage of "lord"; it is the taproot of its meaning, the soul of its usage. So, if I dig around a little, looking for the "kennings" in JRRT's stuff, it is merely a reflection of my mind set. I simply want to know the "whys" of the language (impossible I know) and not just the "whats."

2) I am also afflicted with a disease (pronounced "dis-ease"), the major symptom of which is a compulsion to find pattern and consistency wherever they exist. My basic philosophy of life is founded on the principle that there is order in all things good, even though it is sometimes difficult to perceive. In conjunction with that, I feel that Tolkien was of a similar sentiment and, consciously or unconsciously, injects that philosophical precept into every aspect of Middle-earth. I suspect that it is this undergirding that first attracted me to his works. My training in Historical and Descriptive Linguistics has reinforced this posture. The net result is that I feel the necessity to somehow account for similarities, differences, loose ends, extra morphological elements (and so forth), in an holistic analysis and appraisal of the languages of Middle-earth. The inherent danger is, of course, that without all of the possible corpus in hand, conclusions about the functions of the languages will always be tentative at best. The struggle for description, then, will be eternal so long as Christopher publishes the linguistic material piecemeal. Nonetheless, Descriptive Linguistics demands that an exacting, detailed, accounting be made for all material, so far as it at present stands. As a matter of note, I had the opportunity to spend some time with the Appendix to *The Book of Lost Tales*. I extracted over 1600 new morphological elements from those few pages. This is to say nothing of what my "word-crunching" computer programs will turn up once I am able to apply them to the new material. This is to say even less about what remains in the text of the new volume itself by way of invented language passages which were not treated in the Appendix. It is going to be a long year. I guess what I am trying to say (in an all-too-Melvillean way) is that we all do the best we can under the circumstances, but my bent requires as much pattern and postulation as will account for what exists. I realize that irritates some folks; I have precisely the same reaction when someone wants to take a finely written piece of prose apart. "Why not just enjoy it, and let it go at that?" Dis-ease, compulsion, "und so weiter."

I think that these two general reasons explain, at least in part, why I find it necessary to go into such detail with words like "utuviyenes." Not to do it would be to gloss over details and loose ends, Tolkien, by the way, is *The Master* of subtle nuance. In fact, I believe that he is without parallel. Have you ever asked yourself why he spells his first name JHON on the title page of *The Lord of the Rings* (the Elven script)? Stupidity? A lapse? I don't think so. I believe that he is saying something about himself (with a simple metathesis) that only a perusal of the OED, his works, together with his letters and interviews can reveal. May I suggest that he is better at the cloaked nuance than is James Joyce? He is, you know. In addition, if the text translations are the sum and bonum of clarity and precision, why

does he give us the material in *The Road Goes Ever On*? Why all of the other explanations in the *Letters*? Why all of the carefully worded disclaimers about the translations in the narratives? If Tolkien ever lamented anything it was that he did not give enough on and in the languages.

With regard to your quote from Tolkien's letter: Tolkien's correspondent gave a "translation" that was not only wide of the mark syntactically and morphologically, but didn't fit the narrative either. Now to the etymologies:

aure: I apologize for not making it clear that the "au(t)=-ure" combination is for me a historical connection rather than a contemporary compound. You are quite correct to point out that the dropping of consonants is a difficult matter phonetically, but in this particular instance it is not as far-fetched as might be thought at first blush. It should be remembered that the articulatory points for the "r" in "ure" and the "t" in "aut" is precisely at the same point in the mouth; at the back of the teeth. The "r" here is not a retroflex like it would be in American English pronunciation. If the Quenya pronunciation follows real-world articulatory rules (which I believe that it does to some measure), the intervocalic "r" is actually a flap rather than the expected trill. Flapped "r" and "t" are extremely close phonetically, the only real difference (I say this guardedly) being the difference in voicing (in fact, some phonetic alphabets mark the flapped "r" into a kind of "d"). Intervocally, the "t" would pick up that voicing under real world articulatory rules. What we would have then are two overlapped morphological elements, "aut" and "ure," easily coalescing into "aure." Speculative? Assuredly! But linguistically sound and not without comparable examples in the languages.

lume: you stated that I evidently equated "lome" and "lume." Actually, in all sincerity, I did not. I simply processed the entire corpus of linguistic material for the sequence "LUM" and found an almost absolute consistency of that sequence being used equally for "darkness, shadow" and as "hour." I then simply tried to explain to myself how the same sequence might develop two apparently different (but related) meanings; hence the speculation. You might like to know that the Appendix to *The Book of Lost Tales* vindicates your theory that "lume" derives from apparently the same root as "luva." The root is "LUVU," but (interestingly enough) all of the glosses are of the "wood, lower, dark lowering cloud, dark weather, overcast, cloud foul weather" variety (p. 259). If "luva" "bow" is from "LUVU" (which would not surprise me), the semantic divergence is at least as interesting as the "lume" "hour" one.

omente; I'm going to give the field to you on this one, not only because I am a good sport, but because I believe that you are right...for the most part. In saying, however, I still cling tenaciously to my first interpretation, not out of stubbornness, but merely to make one other point clear (then I'll have a thought or two on your interpretation). One of the oddities about Quenya is that it is unbelievably polysemous in comparison to Sindarin. I have a paper appearing in this year's edition of the *Proceedings of the Missouri Philological Association (PMPA)* which makes this point quite clear. I would be glad to send you off a copy as soon as I get mine. Without going into lot of detail, I would simply state that Tolkien conceived of Quenya speakers of possessing that rare talent of "word play" developed to near perfection.

continued on page 63

pagination issued by Eerdmans in 1974, and, of course, it is good to have the poems currently in print.

Whitman, Allen. Fairy Tales and the Kingdom of God. With a Foreword by Morton Kelsey. Pecan, New Mexico: Dove Publications, 1983. [viii] + 132 pp. [Lewis, (iv), 2, 4, 25-26, 32, 78, 83-90, 131-132]; Tolkien, (iv), 2, 4-8, 55-57, 59-79, 79-80, 83, 101, 107, 131n.] Paper, \$4.95.

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", "Rumplestiltskin", "Snow White", and five others -- in psychological terms and Biblical parallels. A particularly Jungian analysis is offered of "Hansel and Gretel"; another, using John A. Sanford's Christianized Jungianism of The Kingdom Within, of "The Cobbler and the Tailor". A piece of the creation account in The Magician's Nephew is used to illustrate divine naming (Aslan's song) in a discussion of Rumplestiltskin's name (pp. 25-26); an undocumented reference to Lewis on attitudes about the devil (it seems to be a very free paraphrase of the 1961 preface to The Screwtape Letters) 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 says 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 source is not given. Whitman goes on to give five characteristics of the Christian spiritual quest, which are not (it turns out) identical with Auden's; both Tolkien-esque and Biblical illustrations are given. The second of these chapters is mainly a discussion of the One 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 of 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-Tolkien, material 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 Sam's reference to the tentacles in the same terms.

The third section has a brief introduction (not a summary this time) and three chapters: the Chronicles of Narnia: "Breaking the Witch's Spell" (pp. 85-89), on Edmund's betrayal and Aslan's sacrifice in The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe; "How Eustace was Changed" (pp. 90-94), on the Dragon Island episode in The Voyage of the Dawn Treader; and "On Being Taken In and Taken Out" (pp. 95-98), on the Dwarf 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 psychological self-understanding. 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 on interpretation 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 seriously use homophonic 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) perceives all of 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 in any 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, "gwa-men" or "gwa-ment" which yields "ommentie" 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 "Hyarmentie" and "kementari" where the "t" is obviously 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 "ommentie" 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 "aut(t)" (Slap my mouth!))

-Iva: You correctly describe the difference between "-Iva" and "-Ima" as Jim Allen does in his Introduction to Elvish. To say, however, that a "dual" is something other than a kind of pronoun, to make an assertion that flies in the face of the most respected historical descriptions that we have on Old English and other languages with similar pronominal structures. The function of "-Iva" 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, merely "imprecise." Lest you 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."