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An Inklings Bibliography (39)

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.
AN INKLINGS BIBLIOGRAPHY (39)

Compiled by Joe R. Christopher, Wayne G. Hammond & Pat Allen Hargis

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, 1151 N. State St., Elgin, IL 60120.


Tolkien used non-pagan elements of Mithraism to form the theological background of The Lord of the Rings: a pre-Christian mythology out of which a modern Christian world could arise. The War of the Ring reflects the struggle between Ahriman (Evil) and Ahura Mazda (Good); the Elven-rings are related to the rings of the priests of Mithras; Sauron and Gandalf are "mutations of Mazean gods, demons, and angels" (pp. 195-96). [WGH]


A biography of the man (1825-1910) who began the Early English Text Society, among many other projects. Tolkien is listed in a group of thirteen "distinguished ... scholars" who have worked on the E.E.T.S. (154). Although Benzie does not note it, the volume Tolkien edited for the series was Ancrene Wisse: The English Text of the Ancrene Riwle, intro. by N. R. Ker (Early English Text Society, Original Series, No. 249), published by the Oxford University Press, 1962. [JRC]


Burton discusses Chesterton and Lewis in relation to their ages, predictably, finding more direct involvement with his time on Chesterton's part. (Even there Burton is very selective in the few aspects he mentions.) Burton quotes two passages, from different essays, out of God in the Dock and four passages from Lewis out of William Griffin's Citire Staples Lewis: A Dramatic Life, establishing that Lewis did not involve himself in social causes. Burton discusses Lewis' private charities, showing that "in his personal stewardship of time, money, and energy he is consistently generous." (Lewis' description of the Christian society in Mere Christianity would have enriched Burton's discussion, and there are other works by Lewis which could be added; but for Burton's non-scholarly, didactic purposes, his citations are enough.) Finally, Burton draws three morals for others from the examples of Chesterton and Lewis.


Dorsett, after an introduction on others who have touched on his topic, surveys most of the reasons for Lewis' effectiveness as an evangelist. Essentially, Dorsett gives eight reasons: (1) Lewis was a convert, and so knew and understood the non-Christian world; (2) Lewis was skilled enough to write in simple, clear English — Dorsett passes over this point quickly, since others have discussed it; (3) Lewis' own spirituality, manifested in his devotional life. The later is subdivided into three areas: (a) his well-disciplined prayer life, running perhaps an hour to hour and a half per day, subdivided into regular corporate prayer, regular use of a spiritual director, at least occasional prayer with other laymen, regular private prayer, and common requests for others' intercessory prayers — Dorsett also gives some of the results of Lewis' prayer life; (b) Lewis' "radical action to remove obstacles that caused him to sin," such as giving away the royalties from his books; (c) his obedience to God's commands, such as regular Communions and answering all letters from his fans. Dorsett then continues with the main reasons for Lewis' effectiveness; (4) "his courage to be honest" about spiritual doubts and to answer the real problems of faith; (5) his two themes of reason and Sehnsucht, which reach two different audiences; (6) his assumption that the real truth in any field is compatible with the Christian truth, which removes a "fearful attitude that too much knowledge will overturn one's faith" — Dorsett is quoting a dissertation in the preceding clause; (7) "his focus on the essentials of the faith that unite [Christians] rather than on the tangents that divide"; and (8) his evangelistic emphasis in most of his books, fiction as well as non-fiction, rather than just a few. (The last point can be debated, despite the passage from Lewis that Dorsett quotes to support it.) [JRC]


Fowler begins with an account of being a graduate student at Oxford University in the 1950s, with C.S. Lewis his tutor.
The debate begun that day in Magdalen, as we watched the distant clash of antlers, has been carried on ever since as an agon between the critic and the writer in me (1-2). The debate was over a "conflict between academic and imaginative writing" (1), Lewis not feeling a conflict. After his opening paragraph, Fowler creates a dialogue between Writer and Critic, but does no refer to Lewis again. [JRC]


Gibson, the author of one of the best books on Lewis' fiction in C.S. Lewis: Spinner of Tales, here considers "four concepts" found in the book: "the nature of the occult [used in the sense of "the world of supernatural evil"], the nature of sin, the nature of grace, and the nature of the universe [used in the sense of "a series of principles of God’s creation"] (126). In each of the first three cases, Gibson considers what Lewis has said about the topic in his non-fiction and other fiction, and then how it is shown in Perelandra; in the fourth, there are a few citations from non-fiction.

The "nature of the occult" covers pp. 126-130, with the significant emphasis on the demonic possession of Weston and other awareness of demonic presences in Perelandra on pp. 129-130. The "nature of sin," pp. 130-33, with several applications to Perelandra: the nature of sin explained by Ransom to Tidinril (130-31); Weston’s egotism, megalomania, and reduction of God to pantheism (313); the results of sin shown in the Un-man (131-32); and the three-fold temptation of Tidinril to different types of sin (132-33). The "nature of grace," pp. 133-36, is treated partly in the application of Gift Love, Need Love, and Appreciative Love (from The Four Loves) to Perelandra (134) and partly in terms of "the grace which binds each to us in a web of vicarious debt" (135), shown in Tor’s unmerited reward of Oyara-ship to Venus (135). Finally, "the nature of the universe" (136-38) is discussed with evidence from the Great Dance: "the principles of God’s creation" (136) are that it is "eternal, unique, unequal, central, needful...superfluous [and] incomprehensible" (138). [JRC]


Half biographical sketch, half commentary on The Lord of the Rings and escapist literature. Often grossly inaccurate. Reviewed in Mythlore 51. [WGH]


Hooper, in a paper very much shaped for being read aloud, discusses three false images of Lewis (the second part of his title): C.S. Lewis the Misogynist (38-40), the Fundamentalist and /or Evangelist (40-43), the Doubter (43-50). The latter refers to Lewis’ supposed loss of faith at the time of his wife’s death, as argued in an essay and a book by John Beversluis. Hooper indicates what is wrong with these images of Lewis, although his anecdotal paper is not attempting a full, balanced portrait of Lewis as the first half of his title might suggest. One example of Hooper’s casual organization will suffice. In his discussion of Lewis the Doubter, he includes the movie Shadowlands as indicating the same impression of Lewis as losing his faith; but Hooper includes with it some material about Claire Bloom, the Joy Davidman of the film—an anecdote he remembers from Davidman’s now lost 1952-1955 diary, two conversations with Bloom—which have no discernable connection with the topic of Lewis’ purported loss of faith. No doubt this was a successful talk at the 1987 Conference to Celebrate the Achievement of G.K. Chesterton and C.S. Lewis, but it is not Hooper’s best work as a printed essay. Note: in light of the questions about Hooper’s veracity raised by Kathryn Lindskoog’s The C.S. Lewis Hoax, it is enough to note here, first, that Hooper retells at least one of his earlier anecdotes of his summer with Lewis and adds another fairly long anecdote to the collection (there are at least three other short anecdotes); second, Hooper does, finally, date his first meeting with Lewis — 7 June 1963 — which is far after the Easter Hooper suggested in 1975. No doubt others will find other points of this sort to comment on. [JRC]


Howard’s essay is lively and filled with good points, as is to be expected from Howard, but it has one curious slip and one curious omission. He spends two paragraphs on the Christian non-fiction, two on the literary and lexical studies, and one on the poetry at the first of the paper, to get them out of the way (89-92); and then he turns to the fiction. The curious slip is that he says the dreamer in The Great Divorce sees “a great and noble lady being drawn in a chariot” (98); Sarah Smith comes walking — Howard has confused her with Beatrice. The curious omission is that the title of Till We Have Faces is not mentioned; Howard does mention Orual for two sentences (96) and Glome in a list (93), so he must not be banishing that volume from Lewis’ works — however, nothing here indicates that he finds the volume especially good or likely to be lasting. (In The Achievement of C.S. Lewis Howard wrote well on the book, using it for his climactic chapter.) Howard’s ap-
proach to the Chronicles of Narnia and the Ransom Trilogy, mainly, are through their use of terror and the sublime. He points to the images of damnation in the two series as examples of terror (93-95), as well as images of the "Terrible Good" i.e., God (95-96). The appearances of the elders are a transitional example, combining terror and the sublime (96-97). Howard's examples of the sublime in Lewis are, first, the plenitude of his fictive creation (7); second, the epiphanies where the high spiritual qualities of certain human characters are revealed (98); and, third, the spiritual scenes such as the Creation of Narnia and the Great Dance in Perelandra (98-99).


Kilby notes mythic qualities in The Lord of the Rings with reference to Cosmos and History by Mircea Eliade, and argues that The Lord of the Rings is essentially a Christian narrative though not simply Christian allegory.

With a summary in German. [WHG]


Kreeft sets up Lewis' argument from Sehnsucht for the existence of God and/or Heaven in terms of a formal categorical syllogism:

Major premise: "every natural or innate desire in us be-speaks a corresponding real object than can satisfy the desire."

Minor premise: "there exists in us a desire which nothing in time, nothing on earth, no creature, can satisfy."

Conclusion: "there exists something outside of time, earth, and creatures which can satisfy this desire" (250)

His essays is divided into four parts, the first of which sets up the syllogism and comments on each of its three steps. The minor premise refers to Sehnsucht. The second division quotes and discusses the three works by Lewis which establish this argument most clearly — Surprised by Joy in an autobiographical way (three passages are quoted) Mere Christianity in a "practical-pastoral" way (the argument is given but is only claimed to be a "probable" explanation of Sehnsucht); and in the 1943 introduction to The Pilgrim's Regress in a logical way (in which the conclusion is set up as something that "must exist").

The third section is the least satisfactory in this generally good (and certainly valuable) essay; the problems are caused, in part, by a type of rhetorical playing to the audience, which leads to disgressions and sometimes meaningless flourishes. (An example of the later is Kreeft's anthesis of "love is blind" and "God is love," in which he ends up denying the former statement, but this is trivial playing with words; instead, one should set up "erōs is blind" and "God is agape" — the two statements do not intersect.) Kreeft sets out to "trace historically four strands of influence (experiential, historical, epistemological, and practical) which feed into the modern form of the argument." The first of these, the experiential/psychological, has both negative and positive forms. The negative is "the emptiness, vanity, and wretchedness of [non-religious] human life." Kreeft uses Ecclesiastes, and Pascal's comment on Ecclesiastes, to establish this perspective. (Here, as often in this essay, Kreeft is no doubt limited by his space; a full discussion would have to answer Camus' assertion at the end of The Myth of Sisyphus that Sisyphus is happy.) The positive form is the human desire for God shown, for example, in Plato's ladder of love in the Symposium, where the lover is not satisfied with limited, material loves.

The second of these strands, "the philosophical tradition of thought about a historical origin for our misery and displacement," turns out to be a discussion of the Fall as described in Genesis 3. Kreeft accepts it as historical, evidently, not as myth solely. Later, in the discussion of the third strand, Kreeft notes that Jung's theory of the Collective Unconscious may be used "as a substitute for, or supplement to, the historical explanation of Eden."

The third, epistemological strand is based on "Plato's doctrine of Amanuensis" — that is, a human being has the ability, however flawed at times, to recognize a new truth — moral, mathematical, or of whatever kind — when he or she comes upon it. Kreeft divides the explanations of the phenomena into two categories — those that try, in one way or another, to explain it away, and those that accept it. He subdivides the latter into "the ontological, as in Augustine's theory of Divine Illumination, [and] the psychological, and in Jung's theory of the Collective Unconscious." Lewis accepts the former, Kreeft, says. The latter can be used as a supplement to or substitute for the ontological, although Kreeft dismisses the latter, the substitute, but not from an argument — simply because he has accepted the Christian position (of Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Chesterton, and Lewis). And he parallels the Christian position with Plato's "epistemology of a priori knowledge."

The fourth strand of influence of Lewis' argument is the practical/pastoral. Basically, Kreeft is considering where the ability to recognize new truth resides. By this point, he seems to be limiting this recognition to religious truth, to the finding of God. Kreeft identifies three terms here, which he assumes to mean the same thing, for the source of the ability: the heart, in Biblical usage; the will, in Augustine's Confessions; and desire, in Lewis' argument. He points to passages in Pascal and Augustine, and to anecdotes about Martin Buber, which presuppose "the same heart-desire for [supernatural] happiness that Lewis' argument presupposes."

Having shown that Lewis' argument pulls together elements of earlier thought, Kreeft in the fourth section of his paper turns to "five objections that have been made (or
could be made) against the Lewisian syllogism. Kreeft sets up and answers two versions of an objection to the minor premise; he quotes from John Beversluis's C.S. Lewis and the Search for Rational Religion three objections to the major premise and one also from Beversluis based on Lewis' own reactions to God at the time of his return to Christianity, which says that Lewis did not live up to his argument of desiring God. The most interesting part of this section comes from Kreeft's answers to Beversluis, particularly the first of them, in which he labels Beversluis's approach "positivism, or at least empiricism," indicating that "the classical empiricists and the logical positivists objected to all deductive reasoning," for they denied the truth of all generalizations (major premises) that were not backed up with a survey of all instances falling under them—a demand that wiped out the purpose of syllogism. Kreeft argues in terms of Plato and Augustine in reply.

Perhaps, in Kreeft's own terms, the argument in this section that most needs support is his description of nature (based on "every natural, innate desire has a real object") as "meaningful, teleological, full of design and purpose." An assumption of a God-created universe no doubt lies behind this; and, of course, in defending the Lewisian syllogism, that is assuming what needs to be proved—at the very least, Kreeft needs to cite his tradition here. He is working from a previous paragraph's discussion of Aristotle's formal causality, but nature is such an ambiguous term that few are going to agree on its "essence" (Kreeft's term for the cause in the Aristotelian discussion).

Kreeft concludes with a brief contrast and comparison of the argument from desire with Anselm's "ontological argument" for the existence of God.


Analysis, chiefly of the music of "The Road Goes Ever On," and to a lesser extent of its words and of the relation of the song to the rest of the Road Goes Ever On cycle. [WGH]


Linguistic-philosophical discussion of Tolkien's use of poetry in Elvish (or Orcish) in The Lord of the Rings, and of readers' interactions with that poetry.

With a summary in German. [WGH]


Lake shows that, while the 1945 and 1946 publications were presumably set from identical typescripts, the Macmillian edition preserves more of Lewis' original, both in capitalizations and paragraphing. Presumably (although this is not precisely the way Lake expresses it), an editor at Bodley Head queried more of the material than the Macmillian editor did, and so Lewis agreed to bring more of the London edition into accordance with modern style. There are also several corrections of the text in the London edition for style and content. (Lake gives a chart of the thirty-four differences between the two hardcovers that he has located, ignoring accidental errors, pp. 54-55.)

The abridged Pan edition is not studied by Lake for what Lewis cut when shortening his material from the Bodley Head version, but for textual variations. He finds eight differences from the hardcovers—corrections of errors, one further modernization of paragraphing, and one sentence that Lewis added.

The two modern paperback editions both derive, oddly enough, from the original New York edition. Lake cites, in general, without a chart, the accidental errors of the texts as proof of this.

"One point is now clear: [while "no text is badly corrupt,"] there is no simple perfect text of That Hideous Strength! [The Bodley Head edition] on the whole is the best; but it needs to be corrected from [the Macmillan edition] and [the abridged Pan editions]" (554). [JRC]


An interesting essay, in part because it finds some specific similarities between Chesterton and Lewis unlike the usually listed ones. First, Leigh points out that Lewis first read Chesterton about the time he accepted moral obligations, and he first read The Everlasting Man about the time of his conversion to theism. He pushes these later in his essay as partial influence for each step.

Second, Leigh points to a parallel career of the two men's attempts to tell of their conversion: (a) in allegorical works, The Man Who Was Thursday (1908) and The Pilgrim's Regress (1935)—although, despite Leigh, The Man Who Was Thursday seems more symbolic than allegorical; (b) in argumentative essays, Orthodoxy (1908) and a series of works beginning with The Problem of Pain (1940); and (c) in memoirs, The Autobiography of G.K. Chesterton (1936) and Surprised by Joy (1955).

Third, the intellectual pattern of both Orthodoxy and Surprised by Joy is "a circular romance narrative in which the author arrives where he started, only to recognize the place for the first time" (293). Actually, despite Leigh, this is the pattern of The Pilgrim's Regress, not Surprised by Joy;
the latter has a return pattern, but it is not circular in imagery. But Leigh does point to some other similarities between the two books: for example, that both essentially start from images—a toy theater and a toy garden—which capture much of the meaning of the authors’ lives.

Fourth, Leigh traces how friends helped each man toward conversion and how books did, also—although Chesterton and Lewis contrast greatly in the type of books that helped.

Fifth, Leigh traces, according to a modern theory of conversions, several different “aspects or levels of conversion”: “moral, affective, intellectual, and religious—acceptances of goodness, love, objectivity, and faith (300). Leigh suggests another, more fundamental level—imaginative: “the discovery and transformation of one’s innermost intentional symbols so as to be led beyond oneself and be driven to search for ultimate meaning throughout a lifetime” (300); he is thinking of the theater and the garden. At any rate, in what follows he gives details of Lewis’ conversions at the imaginative, moral, intellectual, and religious levels—more Lewis than Chesterton, because Lewis is clearer about them in his writings.

Sixth, Leigh makes a distinction between holiness and wholeness. He sees Chesterton and Lewis as not having emotional conversions (this concept may be identical to the affective conversions mentioned above), and thus both men had “to struggle, as most humans do, with disagreeable and even bizarre emotional patterns” (303). Leigh is not trying to debunk them in this, but simply to indicate their psychological situations in relation to conversion.


Morse finds parallels between *The Lord of the Rings* and the Aenid in setting, theme, narrative sequence, and characterization. He describes the “soup” from which Tolkien drew his story as made from Nordic or Germanic myths, flavored with Christianity and classical epic, “the distilled traditions of the European literary heritage (p. [45]). The languages, geography, and politics of *The Lord of the Rings* remind Morse of the Latin League and the Roman Empire. [WGH]
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In his story of the Stone of Erech and of the oath-breakers in *The Lord of the Rings* Tolkien explored “the proto-history of the people of Erech, originally Uruk,” and quietly speculated about “the Christian lore which became part of the cult of the famed Black Stone of Ka’ba” (p. 116). Ryan remarks in passing, but significantly, that “all the stories of Middle-earth may, in a general sense, be seen as ‘speculative philosophy’ or exploration and ponderings as to the ‘lost legends’ of the Indo-European background” (p. 116).

With a summary in German. [WGH]


The Vegetation of Middle-earth of *The Lord of the Rings* is
divided into (1) "ordinary" plants, identifiable as present-day European flora, associated with Hobbits, Breelander, and other "ordinary" folk, (2) plants of Númenórean, Eressëan, or Valinorean origin, with no present-day variety, associated with the Elves and higher" Men of Gondor and Rohan, and (3) athelas alone, associated with Aragorn.

Sculp is concerned in part with errors in plant names in the Dutch translations in The Lord of the Rings by Schuchart.

With a summary in German. [WGH]


Overview of works by C.S. Lewis, Charles Williams, J.R.R. Tolkien, and George MacDonald, and of works about these authors, published in Italian.

With a summary in German. [WGH]


First paperback edition of the selected letters, photographically reprinted (reduced) from the 1981 hardcover edition.


Revised version of a biographical and critical essay and bibliography first published in 1978. The Hobbit and The Lord of the Rings are summarized, Farmer Giles of Ham, Smith of Wooton Major, The Father Christmas Letters, Mr. Bliss, and The History of Middle-earth noted, Tolkien's influence on adult fantasy authors briefly discussed. The Bibliography includes Tolkien's fiction and many of his scholarly works.

With a summary in German. [WGH]


The prose of The Lord of the Rings is often poetic. Tolkien used "lyrical implication" to give his text expression beyond its meaning on the surface. Zgorzelski finds parallels to the later parts of The Lord of the Rings (though not sources) in "The Waste Land" and "Marina" by T.S. Eliot. Tolkien's lyrical expression "is rooted in imagist and symbolist poetic choices and techniques" (p. 105)

With a summary in German. [WGH]

LETTERS, (continued from page 33)
predictions of J.R.R. Tolkien than with the real world development of Welsh and Finnish. He chose and embodied the sounds (and in some cases, the grammatical structure) of Finnish and Welsh in his own created languages, and then provided a Secondary World rationale as to why they were related. He did not use any real world linguistic scheme to relate his Middle-earth languages, except where his rationale involved general philological rules.

With regard to the phonological and grammatical divergence between Quenya and Sindarin within Tolkien's creation, I can only say that the separation between the two dialects follow consistent linguistic patterns. A perusal of the extent volumes of The History of Middle-earth reveals that Sindarin is the Elven language of the Great Lands, Middle-earth as we say; Quenya is preserved in Westerme, Tol Eressea and environs. The vast amounts of time and great distances separating the two languages, together with the differing cultural developments, give credence to Tolkien's historical development. The Elves are immortal, yes, but they are not immutable. Considering the language changes in England during the 300 year period following the Norman Conquest in 1066, we ought to be awestruck that there is such a residual similarity between Quenya and Sindarin at all after thousands of years of divergence. That in and of itself is illustrative of the basic difference between Men and Elves as far as their respective longevities are concerned, in Tolkien's cosmology.

There is no question that language to the Elves was an art. In fact, Tolkien conceives the Elves as a racial personification of Art (see Letters, pp. 176, 236). I postulated years ago in Mythlore that one of the primary differences between Quenya and Sindarin was that the former was significantly more polysemous than the latter. Native Quenya speakers enjoyed an ease in Westerme, that is difficult for us to comprehend; it was almost Millennial. The Grey-elves, however, were in a constant battle for survival (by comparison) against the onslaughts of Morgoth and his minions; there wasn't a great deal of time (again, by comparison) for musing on the intricacies of linguistic innuendo. I think that is reflected in the languages, in conception and in development.

---
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