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Abstract
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Beach evaluates the various knights who speak poems in Williams’ Arthurian poems, both some of the early poems and those in the two late volumes. (Beach wrote this before David Llewellyn Dodds’ collection that includes a number of the previously unpublished early and late poems.) He finds eight such poet-knights: Bors (two poems, both from Taliessin through Logres), Galahad (one poem, early), Lamoracke (two poems, one early, one from Taliessin), Modred (one poem, from The Region of the Summer Stars), Palomides (five poems, two early, three from Taliessin), Percival (three poems, two early, one from Taliessin), Taliessin (thirty poems, six early, seventeen from Taliessin, seven from Region), and Tristram (one poem, early). Beach lists these by title in his appendix (180-81)—although it must be added that one may disagree with some placements: for example, Beach lists "Prelude" from Taliessin as a Taliessin poem; but there is no first-person to it, and the poem may be taken as an authorial statement just as easily—or more easily.

Beach is concerned with how well the narrators function as "the poet-chronicler in King Arthur’s court" (173). Since, obviously, most of these speakers are not trying to so function, Beach ends up some some successes (predominately Taliessin), some failures. Perhaps the tradition of the dramatic monologue would have been a better approach, although Beach is flexible enough to do some comments along that line—for example, here is part of his comment on Tristram:

Tristram . . . fails as an artist because he overestimates his abilities . . . . In "Tristram’s Song of Iseult," the knight demonstrates his nature by composing a poetic dissection of the queen’s naked body, which is gradually revealed "ceremonially" but also "with an intense unceremonious mirth" during a night of lovemaking. Tristram attempts to turn his love into high art, and in doing so, takes credit for the beauty thus presented . . . . [Of the partial line "O my great song, O proud and gay!"] Proud is Tristram indeed, and this pride blinds him to the flaws of his own artistic construction. He mixes his metaphors . . . . Unfortunately for Tristram, his restless refrain of "The dawn must come and I be ridden away!" undermines the poem, for it reveals his lack of dedication to the artistic task . . . . (174)

Although a critic might quibble about some details, this analysis works well, for Tristram’s claim is to have written a great poem. In a similar manner, Beach has some interesting and valuable comments to make on the other lyrics—but not usually this detailed (particularly on the more difficult lyrics), and usually dealing with them in relation to the speaker, as here, or to the society. [JRC]


The Hobbit as issued by Ballantine Books has a curious publishing history, marked by changes in covers as well as (unannounced) revisions of the text. Blackwelder points out that the only way to pinpoint these changes is to collect as many copies of the edition as possible and chart the differences. He also notes some peculiarities of publication and the fact that some apparent duplicates actually contain variations. Part of Blackwelder’s elaborate Hobbit chart is reproduced. [WGH]


As stated on its copyright page, some of the material in this book originally appeared in David Day’s A Tolkien Bestiary and/or his Tolkien: An Illustrated Encyclopedia. The present text is from the Encyclopedia, the illustrations chiefly from the Bestiary. The Companion—not to be confused with the 1976 book of the same name by J.E.A. Tyler—includes an introduction, chronology, A-Z dictionary, index of sources, and main index. Unfortunately, there has been no improvement in the text, which critics are now showing to be seriously flawed. [WGH]


One aspect of The Lord of the Rings which connects it with epic tradition is its representation of the world having declined from a remote Golden Age. Visions of paradise
(or demi-paradise) in Tom Bombadil’s house, Lothlórien, Rivendell, and the Shire are contrasted with the world as it is, emphasizing a feeling of loss. But Tolkien went further, and combined the myth of the Golden Age with the Atlantis legend (in the story of Númenor), and these with Judeo-Christian myth “by emphasizing what the downfall of Númenor,” like “the expulsion from Eden or the dispersal of races after Babel,” “cost all future generations of humankind” (p. 96). Huttar notes parallels between Tolkien and Classical authors, and with Donne, Vaughan, and Milton, in their approach to the idea of a Golden Age.

[WGH]


A collection of essays, including:

- “An Accidental Masterpiece” by Annemarie van Ewyck, pp. 5-14, which describes *The Lord of the Rings* as an interweaving of light from the Silmarils and the Hobbits, both derived from Tolkien’s mind and heart.


- “The Picture of Boromir in *The Lord of the Rings*” by Jan van Breda, pp. 23-31. The author discusses Tolkien’s balanced depiction of negative and positive qualities in Boromir.

- “The True Myth” by Anja Boerma, pp. 33-40. Boerma looks at Christianity as the core of Tolkien’s conviction, and his influence on C.S. Lewis’s conversion to Christianity. On p. 40 is a poem entitled “The True Myth.”

And finally, “Military Action during the War of the Ring” by Sjoerd van der Weide, pp. 41-51, an outline of eighteen military engagements and minor actions in Tolkien’s work.

[WGH]


Patterson’s essay on Williams’ essays is preceded by checklists on Williams’ books, the books he edited and contributed to, and his uncollected essays in periodicals (316-18). In general, these checklists are well done, catching, for example, the 1978 American edition of *Religion and Love in Dante*, which most lists do not. But there is one slip, which shows a hand besides that of Patterson in their making: *Scorpion Reef* (New York: Macmillan, 1953) is listed as one of Williams’ novels, but it is a mystery by the American author Charles Williams instead. The essay and checklists are accompanied by five photographs of Williams (in one, standing beside William Butler Yeats) and two pictures of (very plain) title pages of Williams’ books. Patterson’s essay gives some evaluation of secondary sources near the end, and a selected secondary checklist follows.

Patterson’s essay is not among her best work, probably because of word limits to the essay. At any rate, she uses a chronological, biographical approach and mentions briefly or discusses more fully thirty-four essays or pamphlets, ten introductions to books, two dialogues, one interview, and two reprinted excerpts from a book of criticism. Of course, major long works appear in the biographical narrative; but, for example, *The Figure of Beatrice* appears only in a subordinate phrase as developing the ideas of the pamphlet *Religion and Love in Dante*. The longest discussion is of “The Ostentation in Poetry,” the introductory chapter of *Reason and Beauty in the Poetic Mind* (perhaps here considered an introduction simply), whose ideas Patterson ties back to Coleridge and forward to F.W. Bateson and Robert Beum. Combining this introductory essay with the introduction to *The New Book of English Verse*, Patterson concludes, “Consciousness of abstraction [from the former] and consciousness of consciousness [from the latter] are the twin foci of twentieth-century criticism, and Williams contributed to the development of both concepts” (321). This emphasis on ideas and, often, on how they related to Williams’ period is typical of this essay. (An influence on C.S. Lewis, through different works, is several times suggested, which may be considered as part of the relationship to the period.) Patterson often quotes aphorisms or other brief passages, but does not discuss Williams as an artist in the essay form. As a guide to Williams’ short essays and related writings, this essay is satisfactory; but it seems almost too compact for a reader who does not know Williams, it does not deal with Williams’ artistry, and it lacks space enough, despite what it does along this line, to really evaluate Williams’ importance in the period—in the Milton controversy, for example—or more universally.

[JRC]


Tolkien’s Númenor is a “unique compromise between Antiquity and Modernity,” “a modern Utopia that echoes the myth of the Golden Age and that of the Lost Paradise”

A brief discussion of four Dutch artists who produced illustrations for Tolkien's works: Walt de Rijk, Cees Kelfkens, Bart van Erkel, Cor Blok, and Capucine Mazille. Rossenberg concentrates on Blok, describing the technique he developed, a combination of silkpaper and gouache which gives an impression of ancient murals or miniatures, first used in his "Barbarussian Art" and later in his Lord of the Rings paintings. Rossenberg also describes Blok's meeting with Tolkien and the latter's appreciation of Blok's art.

[WGH]


Tolkien wrote out in formal tengwar three versions of the letter sent by King Elessar to Samwise which features in the unpublished epilogue to The Lord of the Rings held in the Marquette University Archives. Two of these versions are reproduced and discussed in Sauron Defeated; the other is reproduced on the cover of Vinyar Tengwar 29, which also contains an article by Smith analyzing all the Sindarin and English versions of the letter.

[WGH]


An adaptation of Tolkien's book for only six actors, though since the version has twenty-three characters, a small cast is possible only with much doubling. A larger cast may be used if available. This is a very good adaptation, with much of Tolkien's dialogue and the essence of the story intact. Most of the characters of the book are retained except for the Dwarves, which are reduced to Thorin alone. The Battle of Five Armies necessarily becomes a one-sentence comment by Bilbo to the audience. All told, Taylor's version is more faithful to Tolkien's original than the Patricia Gray adaptation often performed, which omits Bard, has Thorin kill Smaug, changes the Elvenking to a Queen, etc.

[WGH]


Tolley finds parallels between Tolkien's "Mythopoeia" and Alexander Pope's "Essay on Criticism." Both poems "emphasize that while man’s mind or nature is faulty, it still possesses the original correctness of vision as given by God or Nature" (p. 223). Tolkien’s use of disgraced echoes Pope, and Tolkien develops some of Pope’s images: for example, the image of light, in Pope used to extol Nature, in Tolkien to spell out the glory of Man.

Some of the main themes of Pope's Essay on Man, if not their treatment, are also common to "Mythopoeia." For Pope, the "proper study of Mankind is Man"; for Tolkien, "since man is in the image of God, it is proper for him to study everything" (p. 224). Pope extols Science; for Tolkien, Man is not essentially scientific, but creative. One of the recurring images in the Essay on Man is a maze, a puzzle to be solved by investigation; Tolkien in "Mythopoeia" uses the image of a loom "on which tapestries with fine and varied pictures are made" (p. 224). Pope does not
discuss the Fall, the Incarnation, or Redemption in the Essay on Man; Tolkien, on the other hand, in “Mythopoeia” is explicitly theist and implicitly Christian.

The Essay on Man may have suggested itself to Tolkien as another poem on the nature of Man dedicated to a friend, as “Mythopoeia” was directed to C.S. Lewis; but Pope, like Tolkien a Catholic and a poet, failed to offer a Catholic view of Man the maker. Tolkien therefore stepped into the breach. Tolley also refers to Sidney’s Apology for Poetic, another work concerned with creativity, Man, and Nature, and to Barfield’s Poetic Diction as illuminated by Verlyn Flieger in her Splittered Light. [WGH]


vande Kemp begins with a brief background of the Inklings (with one minor inaccuracy) and a brief overview of Williams’ novels, with synopses of Descent into Hell and All Hallows’ Eve (283-86). It is only at that point the author can begin her examination of Williams’ “relational theories . . . in the context of family theory” (283). Her section “Relational Theology and Family Dynamics,” the rest of the essay except for the conclusion, contains eight subsections. “The City of God” (286) calls Williams a Christian Platonist, and says that his “hypothesis of marriage and the family is developed within [the] context of the City of God [battling Infram].” Perhaps she identifies Williams’ archetypal City too easily with the Church, but what she says has its validity. “Outic Relatedness and Co-inherence” (286-88) is more interesting: the author identifies (“much in common”) the human aspects of co-inherence with the existential concept of “outic relatedness.” She cites the father-mother-child relationship as analyzed by both Williams and I. Boszormenyi-Nagy, but then points out that Williams takes his concept into areas that existentials and contextualists describe as “functional”—e.g., divorce. She supports Williams on the “intergenerational dynamics of marriage and divorce.” The next paragraph and a half is spent in discussing Wentworth in Descent into Hell and several characters in All Hallows’ Eve without citation of family authorities—probably she assumes the parallel to functional and dysfunctional social groups is obvious. She ends the subsection with a citation of R. D. Laing to show “[t]he relevance of co-inherence to object-relational family theory.” The next, short subsection, “Selfishness or Charity? Rejunctive [v]ersus Disjunctive Acts” (288), identifies “[r]elational ethics[. . .]” . . . trustworthy relatedness (rejunctive acts) and . . . moves [noun] away from relatedness (disjunctive acts)” with Williams “[a]cts of love[,] or charity[,] and [a]cts against love[,] or selfishness.” An example is given from All Hallows’ Eve.

The next subsection—“Balancing the Ledger: The Practice of Substituted Love” (288-290)—discusses Substitution and Exchange. (vande Kemp considers these as separate concepts—“the doctrine of substitution and the way of exchange”—calling them “[t]hese doctrines.”) Along with examples from the last two novels, some fairly extended, the author writes of Substitution and Exchange as offering “a possibility for balancing the intergenerational ledger of relationships”; she finds Williams’ emphasis on “living from others” as reflecting “the contextual theorists’ focus on the existential indebtedness of both consanguine and committed relationships.” She also identifies “sin” as “relational stagnation.” The fifth subsection—“Forgiveness and Rejunction” (290-91)—uses examples entirely from All Hallows’ Eve: Lady Wallingford shows the disjunctive tendency, not rejunctive at all; Williams’ three types of relationships of forgiveness are not only illustrated from the novel but commented on within the author’s field: “. . . Williams warns against pettiness in our keeping of relational ledgers”; “[i]n individualistically oriented theory, Betty’s ‘forgetting in love’ would have been sufficient. However, forgiveness is a relational act . . .” The short sixth subsection—“Legacy and Co-inherence” (292)—is mainly a series of quotation from Descent into Hell, but it is introduced with this comment, “there is perhaps no better illustration of family legacy in literature than Williams’ description of Pauline Anstruther.”

The equally short seventh subsection—“Mystification and Disqualification” (292)—illustrates the two terms of the subsection’s title, one term from each volume; neither term is defined (since vande Kemp’s audience knows them). The final subsection—“Collusion and Pseudo-Self” (292-93)—uses the first term of its title a number of time and the second not at all. For example, the collusion of Simon Leclerc and Lady Wallingford “was a far cry from mutuality”; Wentworth “chose simply to relate to an incarnation of his own wishes—an extreme case of relational collusion.” vande Kemp concludes that Charles Williams’ “theory of interpersonal relationships . . . includes all of the dimensions of relational ethics as articulated by contextual fam-
ily therapists" (293). Although an essay for a general audience would need to define the field's jargon more than this essay does, this is a valuable discussion for, in a way opposite to the author's intention, the insights of the contextual students tend to validate the psychology underlying the fantasy in Williams' fiction. (The compiler thanks Bruce Leonard for supplying him with a copy of this essay.)


Weeks has written one of the poorest books on Williams that has been published. The first chapter and the opening of the second are a disaster, although the discussions of the novels in the later second and third chapters are somewhat better. His basic thesis is that Williams used the seven "sentences" or "statements" (Williams' terms, from a letter—Weeks calls them steps) establishing the Companions of Coinhence as the basic themes of his seven novels, one statement per novel in the order as given and as written. (That Williams drew up the sentences in 1939 and wrote *Shadows of Ecstasy* in 1925 evidently has no significance.) Further, Weeks does not actually use the statements but their supporting texts for his support. For example, here is the first statement:

1. The Order has no constitution except in its members. As it was said: Others he saved, himself he cannot save. (8)

Thus, Weeks searches *Shadows of Ecstasy* for some use of "Others he saved; himself he cannot save." All he can come up with is a possible negative use:

Consider one obviously does not save any character in a religious sense. He merely sets the example of what not to do for any other individual who might come under his influence. Ironically, by setting a bad example, Consider one might inadvertently save others. (25-26, stress added)

Thus the first step in his thesis is not proved. With such a text as "Am I my brother's keeper?" (8) for the second step, Weeks is able to find both positive and negative examples in *War in Heaven* (33, 35-36, 38); but there is hardly a piece of serious fiction that could not be used to illustrate such a text. The discussions of the other five novels do not add any convincing support to the thesis, despite the sixth statement using "double man" and a *dopplegänger* appearing in the sixth novel. (Perhaps this is why Weeks spends most of his fifth chapter, "Conclusions," in between brief summations of his thesis, discussing Williams as an Existentialist; there is some validity to that argument.)

In addition to this, Weeks is sometimes simply factually wrong on matters. For example, he says Williams was admitted to University College, Oxford, as a scholarship student (6), presumably confusing Williams with Lewis; he explains that Dorothy L. Sayers was a member of the Inklings, as indicated "by her presence at their meetings" (15n). Further, there is much about Williams' thought he simply misunderstands:

According to Williams, man accepts or rejects salvation and the Godhead by either affirming or rejecting "images."

[Characters in *War in Heaven* are now seen as either their brother's keepers or not, depending, of course, upon their affirmation or negation of images. . . . (38)]

(Weeks ends that last sentence "as the paths of Coinhence dictate," but the meaning of the clause is not at all clear; perhaps he is suggesting that Co-inherence has something to do with predestination.) So much for the Way of Negation.

It follows that Weeks' discussion of "This also is Thou; neither is this Thou" (quoted on p. 19) is nonsense. He does not see that it has to do with the affirming or negating of images. He explains that the first statement means "Man-kind is also Godhead"—that is, "Man is able to live within Godhead as Godhead exists in mankind." The second statement—"neither is mankind Godhead"—"represent[s] the history of the church" (This is not developed.)

The simple reversal assures the primacy of the religious dogma that we are cast in God's image and not the reverse. (19)

Later, Weeks explains a second meaning to the two statements:

The motto may be read also as a movement. That is, as the pilgrim moves towards Coinhence and Unity [the first statement], he becomes the opposite and cannot achieve mystical unity with Godhead. (49n)

Weeks surveys the criticism of Williams' novels in his fourth chapter—missing, for example, Charles Moorman's *The Precincts of Felicity* and, for some reason, omitting doctoral dissertations—but obviously he did not understand some of the critics' comments about the two mystical paths. More specifically, in the third chapter when he is following an article by Judith J. Kollman, he describes the two paths correctly (53); but he does not see what he says at this point contradicts his statements in the previous chapter. Not all of the book is as confused as the discussions quoted above, but it would be regrettable if any beginning student of Williams consulted Weeks.

A. J. Montesi's "Introduction" (ix-xi) raises the question of why Williams' reputation has flourished and says that Weeks' book answers much of the question. Note: since Weeks is said in a biographical note to have received his doctorate from St. Louis University, since Montesi and two others are thanked by Weeks in his "Acknowledgements"

Contents by Williams: (1) *Taliessin through Logres* (19-93); (2) *The Region of the Summer Stars* (95-145); (3) twenty-four of the forty-nine poems in the early sequence "The Advent of Galahad," not previously collected as a series and in part previously unpublished (163-251); (4) "Intermediate poems," being four poems written between poems of "The Advent of Galahad" and those of *Taliessin through Logres* (253-261); (5) "Poems after Taliessin through Logres," being one published poem and six substantial fragments (275-291).

Contents by others: (1) Lynton Lamb, a map of the Empire (a nude woman sketched over an outline map of Europe), which was on the endpapers of *Taliessin through Logres* (ii-iii and 306-07); (2) David Lewellyn Dodds, "General Introduction" (1-3), "Select Bibliography" (14-15), "Introduction to Uncollected and Unpublished Poems" (149-150), "Introduction to The Advent of Galahad" (sic, italics) and Intermediate Poems" (151-161), "Introduction to Poems after Taliessin through Logres" (265-277), and "Sources and Acknowledgements" (299-302). Dodds gives an excellent historical background to Williams' writing of his Arthurian poems and discusses their ideas. Considering this a popular volume, Dodds promises "Scholarly editions of Williams' unpublished Arthurian works will follow" (150)—possibly he means the full "Advent of Galahad" cycle. At any rate, until these later editions appear, this volume is the basic collection of Williams' Arthurian poetry. [JRC]


*Vinyar Tengwar* continues its detailed examination of Tolkien's manuscripts from a linguistic point of view. The present article is a close examination of the earliest extant chart of Quenya noun declensions, written on the back of a page from a late draft of "Beowulf and the Critics," the essay from which "Beowulf: The Monsters and the Critics" was derived. The chart, previously unpublished, is here transcribed and accompanied by a lengthy analysis. [WGH]