



Mythopoeic Society

mythLORE

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

Volume 20
Number 4

Article 3

Winter 1-15-1995

An Interview with Owen Barfield

Astrid Diener

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



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

Recommended Citation

Diener, Astrid (1995) "An Interview with Owen Barfield," *Mythlore: A Journal of J.R.R. Tolkien, C.S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and Mythopoeic Literature*: Vol. 20: No. 4, Article 3.

Available at: <https://dc.swosu.edu/mythlore/vol20/iss4/3>

This Article 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 MidSummer Seminar 2025
More Perilous and Fair: Women and Gender in Mythopoeic Fantasy
August 2-5, 2024

Via Zoom and Discord

<https://www.mythsoc.org/oms/oms-04.htm>



An Interview with Owen Barfield

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

AN INTERVIEW WITH OWEN BARFIELD

POETIC DICTION — BETWEEN CONCEPTION AND PUBLICATION

CONDUCTED 25 MARCH 1994 AND EDITED BY ASTRID DIENER

Introduction

Poetic *Diction* was first published by Faber and Faber in 1928. But its origins lie as far back as 1921, or early 1922, when Owen Barfield chose the language of poetry as a subject for his B.Litt. thesis at Oxford. By reflecting on the language of the poetry of the past, and the “felt change of consciousness” experienced by the reader of the present, he arrived at the larger theory of an “evolution of consciousness”. His thought was inspired simultaneously by Romantic poetry and philosophy, and the latter provided him with a starting point for his enquiries. But, as he records in the 1972 afterword to *Poetic Diction*, he had no model supporting his theory before he became acquainted with Anthroposophy and the works of Rudolf Steiner (which are largely concerned with the concept of an evolution of consciousness).¹

This suggests a long period of transition from the actual conception of his thoughts to their coming into shape and their final publication as *Poetic Diction*. In the interview printed below I had the opportunity of asking Mr Barfield about those beginnings of *Poetic Diction*. I asked him about the various influences that helped him to put his thoughts into shape: specifically about the first reactions to his new ideas, about the general intellectual climate of the time and his own reactions to it, and more generally about the role of Anthroposophy in the development of his thought.

Owen Barfield is a contemporary of C.S. Lewis and T.S. Eliot — in some ways two very contrasting literary figures in twentieth century English literature. While C.S. Lewis was, since his undergraduate days, a close friend of Barfield's, T.S. Eliot became the publisher of *Poetic Diction* and other works of his. Among the questions I posed were, finally, those concerning his relation to Lewis and Eliot. He once remarked (in relation to C.S. Lewis, but it applies equally to himself): “A good deal could be said about the absolute necessity of humour, as an available ingredient to any really deep thinker, as distinct from either a merely rapid or a merely solemn one”. I am most grateful for the humour and the patience he displayed in answering, with great generosity, all those many questions of mine.

I would also like to express special thanks to my supervisor, Professor A. D. Nuttall (New College, Oxford) — for his enthusiastic support of, and his invaluable advice on, the present interview.

The Interview

Astrid Diener: You stress very much that your ideas, with your turning towards Romanticism, were so much against the stream that, in a way it seems, if one thinks

of you at this time, that you were rather an ‘isolated’ figure in the way you were thinking. It would therefore be interesting to learn from you about the reaction of your friends and surroundings when you communicated your new ideas about poetry to them.

Owen Barfield: I communicated most of them to C.S. Lewis. And he was — I wouldn't call him quite a Romanticist, but he had this love of literature, and certainly of the Romantic poets, as much as I did. And he had a very powerful imagination. But I wasn't really in touch with the contemporary literary people much. I just felt the impulse to put down what poetry meant to me, and therefore what it could mean to other people, I suppose.

Diener: Your ideas about poetry seem so strikingly new at the time that I wonder how easy or difficult it actually was for you to put them into shape, and to communicate them.

Barfield: I tried to put down what I was thinking. And, as I say, what I thought about poetry, particularly lyric poetry of the recent past, even more particularly Romantic poetry, was not what was being said by the literary circles of the time particularly. So, I just wasn't interested in them ... I didn't care for T.S. Eliot's poetry at all. I think that is really all I can say ... My family — they weren't by any means philistines, but they weren't specially interested in poetry. So, I had no particular audience or literary companionship there ... It just happened, really [laughs].

Diener: You say you were discussing your ideas with C.S. Lewis. I take it that one of the things you were discussing was the importance of imagination and whether it could be a vehicle for truth, or whether it was simply a desirable pleasure of the human soul ...²

Barfield: Yes. Sorry for interrupting you, but there I could go a little further in answering your previous question ... Imagination as a vehicle for truth: I was very much struck, as I began to get fond of poetry, with the fact that it wasn't just enjoying the poetry at the time, but, also, it did enlarge or deepen my experience of the world around me, especially the natural world, of course. And that aspect of poetry reading didn't seem to be attracting any attention, particularly, from anyone else.

Diener: And it seems that it also didn't quite attract C.S. Lewis's attention in the same way as it attracted yours.

Barfield: I think that's not quite true; he had a great love of nature. There was very much poetry he knew by

heart, far more than I did [laughs]. And he would certainly very often come up with appropriate quotations if we went out for a walk or anything; and if he was struck by anything he would be more likely to cap it with a quotation from English poetry, or even both Latin and Greek poetry, than I would. He didn't theorize about it. That's the difference. He didn't want to theorize about imagination — he loved it.

Diener: And this theory about poetry as a means of cognition seems to be something on which you and Lewis actually disagreed.

Barfield: Very much so. Yes. He didn't like the idea of having any concrete relation between imagination and knowledge: Knowledge was a job for science. He was, philosophically, really a materialist — in the kind of deepened form where it was called Subjective Idealism. When it came to actual detailed knowledge of any sort, that was a job for scientists. He accepted the materialist assumption of nineteenth and twentieth century science. I think somebody put it (it was a man, who wrote about history) who said all history was history of thought; he said that couldn't be applied to nature because nature has no inside. And Lewis would certainly have agreed with it — that nature had "no inside". But I think that's something where I convinced him a bit (or he said so in things he wrote) — that it had an inside in a similar sense to what individual human beings have: they have their inside of the body and their inside of the mind.

Diener: Once asked about C.S. Lewis's relationship to imagination you said "he was in love with it ... But I wanted to marry it" ...³

O.B: Yes [laughs].

Diener: This remark tells something about two different concepts of life, and about two different ways of wanting to lead one's own life.

Barfield: Oh yes, quite.

Diener: And recently, when I reread your book on Lewis, your idea of 'wanting to marry imagination', of bringing it into everyday life, as it were (which differs so much from Lewis' approach), struck me as having a parallel with a little book by Virginia Woolf called *A Room of One's Own*, published only a year after your book *Poetic Diction*.⁴

Barfield: I'm not very sure I've read that. It was very much talked about at the time, I remember. She didn't theorize about imagination exactly, did she?

I refer to his remark where he compares Lewis's attempt to keep imagination apart from everyday life with the Victorians' attitude towards women,⁵ and point out to him that this is exactly what Virginia Woolf reacted against (though not in a very theoretical way): the insulation of women, as well as of imagination. And I ask him how closely related he feels to any

such thoughts as those of Virginia Woolf.

Barfield: I never read much of Virginia Woolf. I read *To the Lighthouse*, and one or two other things. I think I thought she was a bit of a dilettante, but I did her quite wrong. I didn't really read enough of her to justify or form any opinion, I think. I associated her with the Bloomsbury Group. Also, I tended rather to shun books just because they were very popular then [laughs]. And I knew that the people whose books were popular had quite different ideas about life than I had [laughs].

Diener: It's only when comparing what Virginia Woolf says with what you say (I'm not very sure how close the relation is) — it seems there was 'something in the air', which was picked up by different people independently, by Virginia Woolf, or by yourself, or having been long developed by Rudolf Steiner in Germany, for instance.

Barfield: Also by the German *Naturphilosophen*. And they were brought to England by Coleridge, of course. Coleridge meant a lot to me.

Diener: When were you actually acquainted with Steiner's writings? — One finds oneself confronted with lots of conflicting dates: Some people say in 1922 ...

Barfield: Have you got the book *Romanticism Comes of Age?* Didn't I tell there in the introduction? — 1922, some time around there.

Diener: Yes, you say there: "a year or two" before you published *History in English Words*.⁶

Barfield: Yes, while I was composing it. It took me a long time, not just the writing, but the collecting of material, all the different words and so forth. I spent a lot of time in the library of the British Museum, just looking at the *Oxford English Dictionary* to see how words had changed their meaning. I think I mentioned Steiner in the introduction to *Poetic Diction*, didn't I? I had come across him while I was writing it.⁷

Diener: Well, I remember you saying in the introduction that, at the time, you were not acquainted with Steiner's writings on the same subject, and that you'd find it quite improper to 'father upon him' many of the views on poetry you held.⁸

Barfield: Oh yes.

Diener: So, at one point your own ideas ran into those of Steiner. But when exactly did Steiner come in?

Barfield: I gave a lecture on myself once in the Anthroposophical Society, which was reprinted as *Owen Barfield And the Origin of Language*.⁹ What I mentioned there was rather curious, really. The essence of Steiner's teachings, as you will know (you've read a fair amount of Steiner?), is the evolution of human consciousness, the kind of pictorial consciousness in earlier times. I in

a way, came to the same conclusion on my own before I heard of Steiner, but in terms of language rather, of human beings' experience of language and of nature. In effect, you could say that I came to the conclusion that human beings in earlier stages of evolution had what you might call a pictorial consciousness. Steiner, of course, taught that too. He called it sometimes "atavistic clairvoyance". It was rather curious that I was taken by his whole metaphysics, but for a long time they were more or less parallel — his thought of "atavistic clairvoyance" and mine of "original participation", as I called it later. And I didn't connect them. I remember, quite late, after I'd been reading Steiner off and on for a year or two, suddenly saying to myself, this "atavistic clairvoyance" he is talking about is what I am talking about. For a time they went on side by side.

Diener: That would mean your thoughts were already fully developed before you actually came across Steiner. Would you say then that Steiner was confirming your own views?

Barfield: Confirming them and also strengthening and setting them in a true context, somehow. And also his whole teaching, the detailed account of the evolution of consciousness, the spiritual hierarchies and so forth ... I think I put it once that he began where I left off. All I had done was to establish, in a hostile intellectual atmosphere, that there was such a thing as the evolution of consciousness from a more pictorial, more living, if you like, form or quality to our own. He assumes that, to start with, and builds on that this terrific edifice. But, of course, I got a lot from Coleridge. Coleridge was very enlightening for me, with his concept of polarity.

Diener: Well, once you put it that Rudolf Steiner's thought is really Romanticism come of age.¹⁰

Barfield: Yes, I put it in that way. That, I should have thought, you ought to be able to appreciate because, in a sense, the German *Naturphilosophen* were predecessors of Anthroposophy, weren't they?

Diener: Yes, and considering the fact that I as a German will be able to appreciate this root of Anthroposophy in German Philosophy, I would like to ask you, as a witness of the time, and as one of the first Anthroposophists in England, what impact it made, and what it meant to you, as an Englishman, when it first came to England.

Barfield: Reading Steiner and reading the translations,¹¹ or the writings of the very few English Anthroposophists were two very different things, because there were very few English Anthroposophists, and they weren't, for the most part, particularly philosophically educated people. And in those days there was rather a strong flavour of the old Theosophical Society among a good many members. I didn't have a lot of contact with the English Anthroposophists. But there something personal comes in because my wife, whom I married just about the same time when I discovered

Rudolf Steiner, disliked Anthroposophy intensely.

Diener: What, if you allow me to ask, were her main reasons for disliking Anthroposophy?

Barfield: Well, she was a member of the High Anglican Church. And it just wasn't her line, that whole business of self-knowledge and so forth. She was particularly horrified by the teachings of the two Jesus boys.¹² She felt it was a kind of sacrilege ..., or nonsense or something. But I don't want to go into all that, it was a tragedy. It really spoilt our married life, although we had a happy one, in many ways.

Diener: Your own initial reactions to Anthroposophy seem a little ambiguous — you once said that, when you first attended talks about Anthroposophy, you were impressed and full of doubts.¹³ What was it in particular that made you feel doubtful about Anthroposophy?

Barfield: The doubts were the fact that it started with assumptions totally contrary to the assumptions we had arrived at in the intellectual and social atmosphere we had been brought up in. The doubts were the kind of doubts of any ordinary scientist, or any person who accepts materialistic science as the only true account of the nature of the world. We took for granted the kind of thing that the sciences were saying about the origin of the world and so forth, just as all the people around us did. And here was Steiner, quietly saying exactly the opposite to a great deal of it. Naturally we felt doubtful. But it became more and more convincing. It was a far more rational explanation of the nature of the world than the kind you get from the sort of *Weltanschauung* that is either assumed or specifically taught nowadays in schools.

Diener: The specific stress on the examination of self-consciousness, the examination of thought and the turning inward to imagination for a better understanding of reality — would this have been one of the things that would have aroused doubts initially?

Barfield: Yes, in a sense, because that lay at the beginning of the divergence from contemporary assumptions, that you take thinking seriously — not only thought, but the activity of thinking. I was tremendously impressed, of course, by his [sc. Steiner's] philosophical books: *The Philosophy of Freedom*, or, as it was then called in English translation, *The Philosophy of Spiritual Activity, and Truth and Science*. They really convinced me finally, I think, that in spite of its being contrary to everything that was being taught around me, it was the truth.

Diener: The impulse of examining self-consciousness, seems, at that very time, to have been considered as something coming specifically from Germany.

Barfield: Oh yes, I agree.

Diener: And sometimes one finds in England some kind of an aversion to it. Let me, for instance, read to you a remark by Harold Nicolson (where he quotes the German diplomat Albrecht Bernstorff's manual for German students going up to Oxford): "The egocentric German habit of constantly relating the universe to themselves and themselves to the universe is a morbid habit 'which may lead us to disaster'. It does not produce individualism, it produces only self-consciousness; and in so doing it diminishes the sense of personal responsibility and tempts the young German to surrender in despair to something outside himself — 'to the State or to a Party'."¹⁴

Barfield: Yes, of course, that is a valid criticism of one of the effects of the emphasis on self-consciousness. Well, it comes down to Hegel, doesn't it, really? — Hegel's "deification of the state". That is the dark side of it, as I see it. But that doesn't mean that one should ignore the bright side. I'm not putting it very skillfully, I'm afraid.

Diener: C.S. Lewis, as you say in your book about him, had a fear of drifting into the dark side, the irrational, and refused the idea of examining his own consciousness. Was his criticism fruitful to you in the sense that it would sharpen your awareness of this dark side?

Barfield: It was only fruitful in the sense that, in order to fight with him, I had to go into the best way of expressing, defending, what I thought. His reaction to Anthroposophy was a tragedy, in a way. It was very much affected by the fact that in an earlier period of his life he had a time when he was rather attracted to occultism in the bad sense, which some Theosophists went in for, I think. And he had this rather phoney attraction for it. And he reacted very strongly against it. He mixed up all this in his mind. For he thought it was all trying to come back again in Anthroposophy.

Next, I hark back to what he said earlier about the beginnings of his dispute with C.S. Lewis, and then I go on to ask him specifically about how it led to the so-called "Great War" controversy between Lewis and himself, and he asks:

Barfield: Have you read the book about the "Great War"?¹⁵

Diener: By Lionel Adey? — Yes. Adey says that the "Great War" began with Lewis's disappointment by your interest in Rudolf Steiner and that he began to try to dissuade you from Anthroposophy.¹⁶

Barfield: Yes.

Diener: But what you said about the development of your thought before your acquaintance with Anthroposophy makes me think that the "Great War" controversy was perhaps not really *only* about Anthroposophy but about the thoughts you had been arguing about before that. Would that be true?

Barfield: I'm not quite sure what you said — that the

difference between us didn't arise out of the fact that I was interested in Anthroposophy, but it was there before that altogether? I think that's true. On the other hand ... have you read his book *The Allegory of Love?* — in the introduction there he recommends my method not only in theory but in practice.¹⁷ He didn't quite carry out that. It was a muddle in a way, of course, but the efforts to clear up the muddle were what produced the "Great War".

Diener: So, your "Great War" was, in a way, about Anthroposophy as well as finding your individual positions ...

Barfield: It is so, yes ...

Diener: ... which had developed beforehand ...

Barfield: And also one learnt a lot from him. I owe quite a lot to Lewis. He forced me to think my position out responsibly and fully, to defend it against his. And he was certainly a more strenuous thinker than I was in the sphere of abstract thought, equipped with the quick mind he had. I owe a tremendous lot to him. I think he says in *Surprised by Joy* that he thought that I influenced him more than he influenced me.¹⁸ It may be true that I influenced him more, but I think I learnt more from him than he learnt from me, really [laughs].

Diener: Would this very strenuous way of arguing with Lewis have been something that couldn't be found so easily within the Anthroposophical movement?

Barfield: Yes, I think there are books by Steiner, and books by his followers, and so forth. It's certainly all there, but it's one thing to have it in a book, and another thing to have someone you're constantly arguing with. It forces the pace a bit, you might say.

Diener: Something else again, also connected with Lewis. He reacted very strongly against the poetry of T.S. Eliot. In almost every single book he has some attack on Eliot, whereas Eliot didn't seem to pay much attention to Lewis at all ...

Barfield: Later on they were all right. They collaborated in a translation of the Psalms.¹⁹ What happened to it, and whether it was published, I don't know.

Diener: But in those early days they seem to begin on almost opposite ends.

Barfield: Yes. Well, of course Lewis had a big change, on what he called, his conversion. And he was in sympathy with the later Eliot of the *Four Quartets*, and so forth. In a way he couldn't be when he himself was not a Christian, or even a Theist. (And Eliot, of course, had his own view.)

We talk a little about Eliot, and I return to the differences between the early Eliot and the early Lewis, and his particular relation with Eliot.

Diener: In contrast to Lewis, Eliot approached his own way of looking at things by examining self-consciousness.

Now, in *Poetic Diction* you say that Eliot's poetry, in a way, mirrors the twentieth century despair of the isolated individual, the "patient etherized upon the table."²⁰...

Barfield: Oh, do I? ... In the introduction to one of the later editions — yes.

Diener: It's very interesting, though, that, in his poetry he is very much concerned with examining the self, and with self-consciousness.

Barfield: Yes, indeed.

Diener: That correlates a little with some of your own interests in the exploration of self-consciousness, in a way. What was your exact relation to Eliot? Of course, he was your publisher of *Poetic Diction* at Faber and Faber's, wasn't he?

Barfield: Yes. Well, you already pointed out that I wrote some disparaging remarks about his poetry in *Poetic Diction*, didn't I? But he published one of the earliest — not articles — sketches, that I wrote, in the *Criterion*. It's in there²¹ ... My literary connection with T.S. Eliot is described quite fully in the introduction there, and also the things he published in the *Criterion* ... He was impressed by my book *Saving the Appearances* very much.²² It was through him that I was introduced to the American publishers, the Wesleyan University press, who published most of my books. And it is only in America where they have had any real impact. Practically all my publicity is American. No-one cares twopence about my writings in England, or hardly anybody does, a very very small circle. But in restricted circles, in different parts of America they're read and discussed, and even movements are started, and so forth. This is partly through Eliot, I think.

Diener: Unfortunately, I haven't read the *Barfield Sampler* yet. But would you perhaps be prepared now to say a little more about how you got to know T.S. Eliot, and what it was, at the time, that interested him in your *Poetic Diction*?

Barfield: I don't know whether he was interested ... He must have been fairly interested in *Poetic Diction*. But it was later on, after I had had some contact with him, in contributions he published in his periodical *Criterion*. One he accepted, one he refused. He wanted something more like the one I had written before, that was very pessimistic.²³ The introduction to the *Barfield Sampler* quotes a letter of mine where I said that I was rather tired of the kind of literature that does nothing but point out ironically all the disintegration and decay that was going on.²⁴ We had a kind of correspondential, as it were, relation — between editor and contributor, in a small way. I suppose he read *Poetic Diction*. I don't remember him ever commenting on that, but he certainly did comment frequently on *Saving the Appearances*. I think there's some quotation on one of the editions: He talks about "strange highways of

thought", or something like that.

Diener: So would you say it was a literary exchange, or friendship between you and Eliot?

Barfield: No, I wouldn't go as far as that, no. There was a time when he and a few other young or youngish literary aspirants used to meet for lunch somewhere in the West End. That was much later, after I had gone into law, and was practising as a solicitor. And I did attend one or two of those luncheons. I can't remember the names of the other people, young poets — except that Richard Aldington was one of them; but it was too difficult, and long, a journey, and I had to go back to my office then. I never really was in touch with the literary cliques at all, or with Eliot personally.

Here the interview ends.

Notes

1. See *Poetic Diction: A Study in Meaning*, reprint (Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1987), pp. 212 f.
2. This, and most of my other remarks about C.S. Lewis refer to the book *Owen Barfield on C.S. Lewis*, ed. by G.B. Tennison (Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1989). It contains texts by Owen Barfield adapted from their original form as lectures or portions of books, and three interviews.
3. See interview of 1984 with George Tennison, reprinted in *Owen Barfield on C.S. Lewis*, p. 137.

**MYTHLORE
ART PORTFOLIO**

Over the years *Mythlore* has published a considerable amount of highly praised mythopoetic artwork. Few people are inclined to cut their issues of *Mythlore* in order to frame these pieces for their walls. Therefore, *Mythlore* has begun a series of portfolios reproducing various pieces on quality paper suitable for framing. A limited number of portfolios are now being offered containing copies signed and numbered by the artists.

Signed portfolios are \$25.00 / Unsigned portfolios are \$15.00
Included in the first portfolio are the following pieces:

"Meditation of Mordred"
(Williams) by Sarah Beach (from *Mythlore* 39)

"Trothlight on Cerin Amroth"
(Tolkien) by Paula DiSante (from *Mythlore* 45)

"The Mistress of the Silver Moon"
(MacDonald) by Nancy-Lou Patterson (from *Mythlore* 21)

"Till We Have Faces"
(Lewis) by Patrick Wynne (from *Mythlore* 39)

Each Portfolio comes in a folder with Patrick Wynne's "Triskelion" (from *Mythlore* 35) printed on the cover. The artwork is reproduced on 9" x 12" sheets, and is suitable for framing. Please specify whether you want a signed or unsigned portfolio. Write to: *Mythlore* Orders Dept., 1008 N. Monterey St., Alhambra, CA 91801.

4. *A Room of One's Own* is based on two lectures Virginia Woolf delivered in 1928 to two women colleges in Cambridge, and was published in 1929.
5. See Owen Barfield on C.S. Lewis, p. 98.
6. See introduction to *Romanticism Comes of Age* (Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1986), p. 12. *History in English Words* was first published in 1926 by Methuen and Co., London.
7. This suggests that Barfield developed an interest in Anthroposophy some time between 1922 and 1924. First signs of his growing interest can be detected in an entry in Lewis's journal dated 7 July 1923 where Lewis says: "I was very much disappointed to hear that both Harwood [i.e. a common friend of Barfield's and Lewis's] and Barfield were impressed by him [sic: Steiner]." *All My Road Before Me, The Diary of C.S. Lewis, 1922-1927*, ed. by Walter Hooper, Foreword by Owen Barfield (London: Fount, 1993), p. 254.
8. "[...] yet it would, it seems, be impossible in a Preface to convey half my own sense of indebtedness without appearing, quite improperly, to father upon him many of the views on poetry which I have expressed — whereas I can scarcely recollect anything he has said or written on that subject at all, nor am I yet acquainted with his lectures on Language." The 1927 preface of the first edition, reprint (Middletown Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1987) p. 12.
9. The lecture was given in June 1976 at Rudolf Steiner House, London, and printed in *Towards*, 1,2 (June 1978) and *Towards* 1,3 (December 1978), and is available separately in George Publications, New York, no date.
10. See introduction to *Romanticism Comes of Age*, p. 14.
11. Barfield did not learn German until 1929.
12. Steiner was not so much interested in Jesus as an 'ordinary' human being (as it was the case in nineteenth-century historical research), but in his 'extraordinariness'. In his explorations he came to the conclusion that there must have been two Jesus boys, the one being the incarnation of Zarathustra, the other having had no previous incarnation, but having a special relation to Buddha; at the age of twelve the former died, and his spirit entered the body of the latter who by his baptism at the age of thirty took on his 'Christ nature', living on earth, as an embodiment of the divine, until his crucifixion. See, for example, Rudolf Steiner's 1909 lecture *Das Lukas-Evangelium* (Dornach: Rudolf Steiner Verlag, 6th edition, 1968), and his 1910 lecture *Das Matthäus-Evangelium* (Dornach: Rudolf Steiner Verlag, 4th edition, 1959). And for Barfield's own comment on this teaching and its evolutionary significance see his book *Unancestral Voice* (London: Faber and Faber, 1965, and Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan Univ. Press, 1965).
13. See Elmar Schenkel, "Interview with Owen Barfield", September 1991, *Inklings Jahrbuch für Literatur und Ästhetik* 11 (1993), p. 25. Barfield relates here his first acquaintance with Anthroposophy through his friend A.C. Harwood, and says they attended these talks, which were organized by George Kaufmann in London, in "1922 or 1923."
14. See Harold Nicolson, "Albrecht Bernstorff" (10 August 1945), in *Comments 1944-1948*, (London: Constable & Co., 1948), p. 110. This particular passage comprises two perspectives on self-consciousness: the German and the English, the pre-First World War view of Bernstorff's manual (1912) and the post-Second World War view in Nicolson's commentary on Bernstorff.
15. The book Barfield refers to is Lionel Adey, C.S. Lewis's "Great War" with Owen Barfield (Victoria, British Columbia: Univ. of Victoria Press, 1978).
16. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
17. The *Allegory of Love* is dedicated "To Owen Barfield, wisest and best of my unofficial teachers", and in the introduction, which Barfield quotes, Lewis writes: "Above all, the friend to whom I have dedicated the book, has taught me not to patronize the past, and has trained me to see the present itself as a 'period'. I desire for myself no higher function than to be one of the instruments whereby his theory and practice in such matters may become more widely effective." *The Allegory of Love: A Study in Medieval Tradition* (London: Oxford University Press, 1935), p. viii.
18. In *Surprised by Joy* Lewis describes their friendship and how it began during their undergraduate days, and he characterizes Barfield as a kind of "anti-self", "the man who disagrees with you about everything": "Actually (though it never seems so at the time) you modify one another's thought [...]. But I think that he changed me a good deal more than I him." *Surprised by Joy: The Shape of my Early Life* (London: Fount, 1977), p. 161.
19. This was in the mid or late 1950s, as Humphrey Carpenter records it, who also mentions that in 1959 they met privately, "an event which the pre-war Lewis would have declined to be in every respect impossible." *The Inklings, C.S. Lewis, J.R.R. Tolkien, Charles Williams and their Friends* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1981), p. 246. The translation of the Psalms was first published in 1961, the complete edition appeared in 1963 and is still used in its amended version as *The Revised Psalter, The amended text as approved by the Consociations of Canterbury and York in October 1963 with a view to legislation for its permissive use* (London: S.P.C.K., 1964).
20. See the 1951 preface to the second edition, reprint (Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1973), p.36: "they [sic: the modern poets] have presented us with the human spirit as bewidered observer, or as agonized patient, compassionate in Hardy, humbled or repentant in Eliot, but always the observer, always the patient, helpless to alter anything but his own pin-pointed subjective emotion".
21. Here he points out a book to me: *A Barfield Sampler, Poetry and Fiction by Owen Barfield*, ed. by Jeanne Clayton Hunter and Thomas Cranidas, Afterword by Owen Barfield (New York: State University of New York Press, 1993).
22. *Saving the Appearances: A Study in Idolatry*, was first published by Faber and Faber in 1957.
23. The piece accepted by Eliot is the short story "Dope", published in *The Criterion* 1 (July 1923), pp. 322-328.
24. The letter is dated March 1924 (the exact day is not given). See *Barfield Sampler*, p.6.

Mythopoetic Core Reading List

MYTHLORE frequently publishes articles that presuppose the reader is already familiar with the works they discuss. This is natural, given the purpose of this journal. To be a general help, the following might be considered a core reading list, with the most well known and frequently discussed works. Due to the many editions printed, only the title and original date of publication are given.

J.R.R. TOLKIEN

The Hobbit, 1937; "Leaf by Niggle", 1945; "On Fairy-Stories", 1945; *The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring* 1954; *The Two Towers* 1954; *The Return of the King* 1955; *Smith of Wootton Major* 1967; *The Silmarillion* 1977.

C.S. LEWIS

Out of the Silent Planet 1938; *Perelandra* 1943; *The Hidden Strength* 1945; *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* 1950; *Prince Caspian* 1951; *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader* 1952; *The Silver Chair* 1953; *The Horse and His Boy* 1954; *The Magician's Nephew* 1955; *The Last Battle* 1956; *Till We Have Faces* 1956.

CHARLES WILLIAMS

War in Heaven 1930; *Many Dimensions* 1931; *The Place of the Lion* 1931; *The Greater Trumps* 1932; *Shadows of Ecstasy* 1933; *Descent Into Hell* 1937; *All Hallow's Eve* 1945; *Taliesin through Logres* 1938, and *The Region of the Summer Stars* 1944 (the last two printed together in 1954).