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Abstract
For entries 34–41 in this series, Hammond reviews Tolkien titles, Christopher reviews the Lewis material, and Hargis reviews Williams and the other Inklings.
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 — Dr. J.R. Christopher, English Department, Tarleton State University, Stephenville, TX 76402; Charles Williams and the other Inklings — Pat Allen Hargis, Judson College, 1115 N. State St., Elgin, IL 60120.


Brooks recalls thirty-nine years of publishing by Houghton Mifflin Co., whose main office is 2 Park Street, Boston. Three pages of his reminiscences concern The Hobbit and The Lord of the Rings. Though the managing editor at Houghton Mifflin was not impressed with The Hobbit, which had been routinely submitted in proof by Allen and Unwin, and the children's librarian at the Boston Public Library gave an unfavorable opinion, Paul Brooks liked the story and recommended its publication. The quality of The Lord of the Rings was recognized by editor Anne Barnett, from whose report Brooks quotes: "Who will read 423 pages about an unfinished journey undertaken by mythical creatures with confusing names? Probably no one, but I still say it is wonderful ..." (p. 107) [WGH]


In Middle-earth Tolkien created idealized landscapes in the pastoral tradition of Arcadia, the forest of Arden, and Walden Pond. In his depiction of the Shire at the beginning of The Lord of the Rings Tolkien most powerfully evokes the pastoral appeal (p. 150). Burger describes at length the pastoral aspects of the Shire and, more briefly, those of Tom Bombadil's home, Rivendell, Lórien and Fangorn forest. [WGH]

Cutsinger, James S. The Form of Transformed Vision: Coleridge and the Knowledge of God. Foreword by Owen Barfield. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1987. Barfield sets the context for this book (relative to Coleridge studies in general) and recommends it highly because it takes seriously not only what Coleridge thought, but how he thought. [PAH]


Derrick's lecture was the keynote address at a 1987 Conference to Celebrate the Achievement of G.K. Chesterton and C.S. Lewis, In Seattle, Washington. As such, it is a largely informal reminiscence with some critical points. Derrick mentions being tutored by Lewis at Oxford and attending meetings of the Inklings with him as well as having other conversations (4-5). He briefly discusses Chesterton's influence on Lewis (5-6) and makes his own comparison and contrast of the two (6-7 et seq.); he indi-
Dunsire, Brin. “Of Ham, and What Became of It.”
Amon Hen (bulletin of the Tolkien Society) 98 (July 1989): [14]-17
Dunsire explores the geography of Framer Giles of Ham and compares the fictional Ham with present-day Thame in Oxfordshire. He includes a map of “The Little Kingdom and Its Environs.”


Though Tolkien denied that he wrote The Lord of the Rings to reflect real events, he was not unaware of what was happening in the world, in Stalinist Russia and Nazi Germany. Like everyone else he was influenced by his contemporaries and by the emotions of wartime, and The Lord of the Rings naturally reflects these influences. Ellison suggests analogies between Tolkien’s book and contemporary history.


Honig is concerned with the presentation of women and girls in Victorian children’s fantasy; among the authors considered, six receive most of the discussion and George MacDonald is one of the six — and he is the one who is tied to the references to the Inklings. “[J.R.R. Tolkien, Charles Williams, C.S. Lewis, and W.H. Auden were all directly influenced by the works of George MacDonald.]” Honig writes, and Lewis is quoted from George MacDonald: An

Anthology about considering MacDonald his master (92). Later, the phrase about “my master” is quoted once again (86), and the influence of MacDonald on Tolkien and Williams is attributed to “The Golden Key, as well as MacDonald’s other fantasies” (87), on the basis of Jonathan Cott’s Beyond the Looking Glass (138, n. 20). In short, there is little significance of Honig’s references to the Inklings. [JRC]
spiritual encounter in prayer, and a rejection of causality (about the latter Houston manages to misunderstand, or ignore, what Pascal and Lewis meant by the term). [JRC]


Kollmann explores Williams’ use of allusion, noting that the appropriation and alteration of significant moments in the poetic tradition play an important role in how Williams expresses his own version of a grand unity. [PAH]


Lindskoog’s book is a pleasantly written encouragement for would-be writers. Most of the references to Lewis and the other Inklings are of a minor nature — sometimes anecdotes, sometimes citations as authorities, sometimes listed as admired writers — and undocumented by footnotes. For example, the first reference to Lewis also involves W. H. Lewis (who is not in the index):

When C.S. Lewis’s brother Warren wrote one of his superb books about French history, C.S. Lewis discovered that Warren had spelled “diary” as “dairy” all the way through the manuscript, and told him so.

Warren responded loftily, “I use simplified spelling.”

This anecdote occurs in a discussion of spelling as a writing skill; as indicated, there is no source given. These references could be hunted down; but, since the primary purpose of the book is not a discussion of the Inklings, it is not worth the effort.

However, three matters are worth noting for students of Lewis. First, Lindskoog reprints from the “Lewis Family Papers” (W.H. Lewis’ unpublished anthology) a mock sermon on the text of “Old Mother Hubbard,” written by Flora Hamilton Lewis — C.S. Lewis’ mother — composed, Lindskoog says, seven years before C.S. Lewis’ birth, which would date it in 1891. The mock sermon appears complete on pp. 127-28, 136-37.

Second, in a chapter of accounts by various writers of their practices, etc., under the title of “Another Tolstoy,” Charles Wrong spends five paragraphs out of the eighteen in his note recounting anecdotes from his meetings with Lewis, as a tutee in political science, in a one-time interview Wrong was doing in order to write an article, and in a chance meeting at the Oxford train station (anecdotes 238-39; article 238-242).

Third, Chapter 10 is entitled “C.S. Lewis’s Free Advice to Hopeful Writer (243-264). It has a drawing by Patrick Wynne of Lewis, based on a photograph of Lewis lighting his pipe (243). In this chapter Lindskoog first recounts her one visit to Lewis (243-244) and then in six sections gives Lewis’ advice on writing from his letters to various correspondents. Some of these materials, although not brought together before in this form, are from obvious sources: “Practice, Practice, Practice” (245-49) is from the letter to Arthur Greeves, They Stand Together; “Seeing One’s Mistakes” (251-53) is from Letters to Children, with a few citations from Letters of C.S. Lewis (the letter is oddly called Collected Letters in the endnotes); and “As One Rhymster to Another” (253-54) is from Letters to an American Lady. The other sections are the ones which are most interesting; they consist of paraphrases, largely, of mostly unpublished letters. “The Best Words in the Best Order” (249-250) covers three (?) letters to Leo Baker, three to A.K. Hamilton, and one (in 1929) to J.R.R. Tolkien (the later account is very generalized, and it probably refers to Lewis’ note about reading “The Cost of Beren and Luthien,” called “The Lay of Leithian” in Lays of Beleriand.” “Simplify! Simplify!” (254-57) consists of entirely unpublished letters, for which Lindskoog gives the dates: these refer to letter to J.B. Phillips of 3 August 1943 and 3 January 1944; of a letter to Miss H.C. Calkins of 29 March 1949; of two letters to Katharine Farrer, 10 June 1952 and 3 February 1954; of a letter to Mrs. Donnelly, 14 August 1954; of two letters to Father Milward, 2 February 1955 and 7 March 1960; and of single letters of Mrs. Johnson, 3 February 1955; I.O. Evans, 2 September 1956; Jane Douglas, 19 April 1958; and Owen Barfield, 29 March 1962. The final section, “Raised in Print,” discusses a series of at least fourteen letters to Sister Penelope, an Anglican nun; at least one of these — an 1963 letter — appears in Letters of C.S. Lewis; there is also in this section a summary of a 1960 letter to E.T. Dell. Several of the letters to Sister Penelope are interesting for the student of Lewis’ writings; Lindskoog points to a partial origin of the name Penesthesia used in the Chronicles of Narnia (261) and tells of Lewis’ decision, in 1955, to use a literary agent (259). [JRC]


Farmer Giles of Ham, with its mock history and trivialized monsters and hero, is Tolkien’s lighthearted reply to the critics of Beowulf he had dealt with more seriously in his 1936 British Academy lecture. [WGH]


McKinley describes Tolkien’s life as a scholar and the writing of The Hobbit and The Lord of the Rings, then critically examines Tolkien’s fiction, The Lord of the Rings in particular. She dislikes Sam Gamgee and finds Tom Bombadil embarrassing. Most of Tolkien’s poetry, she feels, is little more than doggerel. Tolkien was “far from being a great prose stylist” (p. 565), his characters chat in clichés, some of his characters grow too heroic and thus difficult
to deal with, he did not "have an easy time with his occasional anxious attempts at humor" (p. 565), the tale has virtually no women of any species" (p. 566). Nevertheless "The Lord of the Rings rises above its failures, its blind spots, its ineptness, its cliches" (p. 566). McKinley lauds Tolkien's skill in inventing names and geographies and cultures, his feeling for landscape, his vigorously original characters such as the Ents and Gollum, and "the force of the telling of the tale" (p. 566).

She has "never really warmed up to The Hobbit," however (p. 569). She discusses this earlier work cursorily and gives a brief overview of Tolkien's other fiction. For her The Lord of the Rings is "the center of Tolkien's work for the average, unphilological reader" (p. 570). A "selected bibliography," partly inaccurate and inconsistent is appended.


Nasmith presents his views on how hobbits should be drawn, and on what other characters in The Lord of the Rings look like in his artist's eye. Cf. more general comments by Nasmith, on his illustrations and career, in an interview by Alex Lewis, Amon Hen (bulletin of the Tolkien Society) 98 (July 1989): 21-24. [WGH]

Schimer, Rudolph. "C.S. Lewis" (one of two "Valedictory Poems") G.K. Chesterton and C.S. Lewis: The Riddle of Joy. Ed. Michael Macdonald and Andrew A. Tadie. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989. xi. [Bibliographic note: said to be reprinted from Speeches at the Stake, but no publication or copyright information is given; perhaps the source was a privately-printed chapbook.]

The poem consists of forty lines of blank verse, written in the first person, presumably in the persona of Lewis — although the style (completely) and the imagery (almost completely) are not Lewisian. The speaker is in fire, possible from the Speeches at the Stake context, but mainly a Purgatorial flame (not a Dantean purging of lust); his meditation is mainly on Heaven and Hell. Overall, not a very strong poem, and the Lewisian connection does not do much for it.


A summary of the writing and publication of Farmer Giles of Ham from its origin probably in the late 1920s and its first edition in 1949.


Of twenty-five primary academic works by Tolkien, fifteen are virtually never referred to by scholars, and three are almost totally neglected. The remaining seven works have fared better, and three of these — "Ancrene Wisse and Hali Meithad," "Beowulf: The Monsters and the Critics," and "The Homecoming of Beorhtnoth" — "rocked the collective jaw of academe right back on its spine" (p. 19).

Shippey explains why these essays succeeded and continue to succeed, and why he disagrees with two of them.

[WGH]