Project
MUSE®
Scholarly journals online

Editors' Introduction

This is the fifth issue of *Tolkien Studies*, a refereed journal dedicated to the scholarly study of the works of J.R.R. Tolkien. *Tolkien Studies* is the first academic journal solely devoted to Tolkien. As editors, our goal is to publish excellent scholarship on Tolkien as well as to gather useful research information, reviews, notes, documents, and bibliographical material.

In this issue we are pleased to re-publish two items by Tolkien: "Chaucer as a Philologist: *The Reeve's Tale*," a paper originally read at the 16 May 1931 meeting in Oxford of the Philological Society and subsequently published in the *Transactions of the Philological Society* for 1934; and the text of the rare pamphlet version of *The Reeve's Tale* prepared by Tolkien for the Oxford "Summer Diversions" of 1939. For the former, Christopher Tolkien has kindly made available to us the marginal notes and corrections written by his father into his own copies of the original publication.

George Steiner's essay "Tolkien: Oxford's Eccentric Don" was originally published in the French newspaper *Le Monde* on 6 September 1973. Coming scant days after Tolkien's death on 2 September, Steiner's is undoubtedly one of the earliest-published considerations of his work and its place in twentieth century literature. Thus the essay has a certain historical interest, as much for praise of its subject as for its inaccuracies and misconceptions (most now long put to rest). While a good deal that Steiner says is very much on the mark, especially about the deep connection between myth and language, the importance of myth to England and of both to Tolkien, he also reflects some early misconceptions then current about Tolkien and his work. *Tolkien Studies* is happy to provide this early view of Tolkien, and we are also grateful that the subsequent thirty-five years has witnessed a revaluation of the man and his work.

With these exceptions, and that of the lead article (which was solicited from an expert in the field), all articles have been subject to anonymous, external review. All required a positive judgment from the Editors before being sent to reviewers, and had to receive at least one positive evaluation from an external referee to qualify for publication. In the cases of articles by individuals associated with the journal in any way, each article had to receive at least two positive evaluations from two different outside reviewers. All identifying information was removed from the articles before they were sent to the reviewers, and all reviewer comments were likewise anonymously conveyed to the authors of the articles. The Editors agreed to be bound by the recommendations of the outside referees.

<div style="text-align:right">Douglas A. Anderson, Michael D. C. Drout, and Verlyn Flieger</div>

support. The efforts of editorial assistants Rebecca Epstein, Tara Mc-Goldrick, Lauren Provost and Jason Rea contributed a great deal to the success of the issue, as did Paula Smith-MacDonald, Vaughn Howland and Raquel D'Oyen. It has continued to be a pleasure to work with West Virginia University Press; thanks to Patrick Conner and especially to Hilary Attfield for all her work in the production of the issue. For permission to re-publish "Chaucer as a Philologist" the editors would like to thank the Philological Society, and Cathleen Blackburn and the Tolkien Estate. We likewise thank Christopher Tolkien and the Tolkien Estate for permission to re-publish Tolkien's version of *The Reeve's Tale*. And we thank George Steiner and *Le Monde* for allowing us to publish a translation of his article. Finally, we acknowledge a special debt of gratitude to our anonymous, outside reviewers who with their collegial service contribute so much to *Tolkien Studies*.

In Memoriam

Tolkien Studies marks with sadness the passing of three members of the larger Tolkien community: scholar Stephen Medcalf, and publishers Austin G. Olney and Ruth K. Hapgood.

Stephen Medcalf, born in 1936, went up to Merton College, Oxford, in 1956 as a classics scholar, soon switching over to English. Though Hugo Dyson was his tutor, he discussed medieval literature with Tolkien both at Merton College and in Tolkien's study at Sandfield Road. He also attended Tolkien's valedictory address in Merton Hall in June 1959. Medcalf taught at the University of Sussex, as Reader in English in the School of European Studies, from 1979 to 2002, and was for many years one of the few members of the British academic establishment to write appreciatively of Tolkien and his fellow members of the Inklings, C. S. Lewis and Charles Williams—in occasional essays, and via his book reviews in the *Times Literary Supplement*. Medcalf was one of the Guests at the Tolkien Centenary Conference held at Keble College, Oxford, in August 1992. He died in West Sussex on 17 September 2007.

Austin G. Olney, born in 1922, joined the Houghton Mifflin Company in Boston in 1946 as an editorial trainee and gradually worked his way up in the firm, holding several key positions, including manager of the children's book department, director of sales and promotion, editor-in-chief and director of the trade division. He was elected to the board in 1965, and in 1986 was named a senior vice president and made director of the newly-merged trade and reference division. In the mid 1950s he had worked on the original American publication of *The Lord*

of the Rings along with Paul Brooks and Anne Barrett, and afterwards had much involvement with the publishing of Tolkien in America. He was as gentlemanly and kindly as his British counterpart in Tolkien-publishing, Rayner Unwin, though Olney's name was less known to the public due to his preference for staying behind the scenes and letting his writers have all of the attention. (Olney wrote a commemorative booklet *The Hobbit Fiftieth Anniversary 1938-1988* and characteristically noted his authorship only in small print in the credits at the end.) The last book he oversaw at Houghton was *The Annotated Hobbit*, retiring just before its publication in 1988. His final years were diminished by Alzheimer's disease, and he passed away at his Marlborough, New Hampshire home in late February 2008.

Working with Austin Olney throughout the 1970s and 80s was Ruth K. Hapgood (born in 1920), who had joined Houghton Mifflin as an editor in 1962. After Olney's retirement in 1988, she took over the Tolkien list until her own retirement in 1993. She passed away in Lincoln, Massachusetts, aged 86, on 6 January 2007.

Conventions and Abbreviations

Because there are so many editions of *The Hobbit* and *The Lord of the Rings*, citations will be by book and chapter as well as by page-number (referenced to the editions listed below). Thus a citation from *The Fellowship of the Ring*, book two, chapter four, page 318 is written (*FR*, II, iv, 318). References to the Appendices of *The Lord of the Rings* are abbreviated by Appendix, Section and subsection. Thus subsection iii of section I of Appendix A is written (*RK*, Appendix A, I, iii, 321). The "Silmarillion" indicates the body of stories and poems developed over many years by Tolkien; *The Silmarillion* indicates the volume first published in 1977.

Abbreviations

B&C   *Beowulf and the Critics*. Michael D. C. Drout, ed. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 248. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 2002.

Bombadil   *The Adventures of Tom Bombadil*, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1962; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1963.

CH   *The Children of Húrin* [title as on title page:] *Narn i Chîn Húrin: The Tale of the Children of Húrin* by J.R.R Tolkien, edited

by Christopher Tolkien. London: HarperCollins, 2007; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2007.

FR   *The Fellowship of the Ring*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1954; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1954. Second edition, revised impression, Boston: Houghton Mifflin,1987.

H   *The Hobbit.* London: George Allen & Unwin, 1937. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1938. *The Annotated Hobbit*, ed. Douglas A. Anderson. Second edition, revised. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2002.

Jewels   *The War of the Jewels*. Christopher Tolkien, ed. London: HarperCollins; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1994.

Lays   *The Lays of Beleriand*. Christopher Tolkien, ed. London: George Allen & Unwin; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1985.

Letters   *The Letters of J.R.R. Tolkien*. Humphrey Carpenter, ed. with the assistance of Christopher Tolkien. London: George Allen & Unwin; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1981.

Lost Road   *The Lost Road and Other Writings* Christopher Tolkien, ed. London: Unwin Hyman; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987.

Lost Tales I   *The Book of Lost Tales, Part One*. Christopher Tolkien, ed. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1983; Boston: HoughtonMifflin, 1984.

Lost Tales II   *The Book of Lost Tales, Part Two*. Christopher Tolkien, ed. London: George Allen & Unwin; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1984.

LotR   *The Lord of the Rings* by J.R.R. Tolkien; the work itself irrespective of edition.

MC   *The Monsters and the Critics and Other Essays*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1983; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1984.

Morgoth   *Morgoth's Ring*. Edited by Christopher Tolkien. London: HarperCollins; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1993.

PS   *Poems and Stories*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1980; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1994.

Peoples   *The Peoples of Middle-earth*. Christopher Tolkien, ed. London: HarperCollins; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1996.

RK	*The Return of the King.* London: George Allen & Unwin 1955; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1956. Second edition, revised impression, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987.
S	*The Silmarillion.* Christopher Tolkien, ed. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1977. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1977. Second edition. London:HarperCollins, 1999; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2001.
Sauron	*Sauron Defeated.* Christopher Tolkien, ed. London: HarperCollins; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1992.
Shadow	*The Return of the Shadow.* Christopher Tolkien, ed. London: Unwin Hyman; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1988.
Shaping	*The Shaping of Middle-earth.* Christopher Tolkien, ed. London: George Allen & Unwin; Boston Houghton Mifflin, 1986.
TL	*Tree and Leaf.* London: Unwin Books, 1964; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965. Expanded as *Tree and Leaf, including the Poem Mythpoeia [and] The Homecoming of Beorhtnoth Beorhthelm's Son* London: HarperCollins, 2001.
TT	*The Two Towers.* London: George Allen & Unwin, 1954; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1955. Second edition, revised impression, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987.
Treason	*The Treason of Isengard.* Christopher Tolkien, ed. London: Unwin Hyman; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1989.
UT	*Unfinished Tales of Númenor and Middle-Earth.* Christopher Tolkien, ed. London: George Allen & Unwin; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1980.
War	*The War of the Ring.* Christopher Tolkien, ed. London: Unwin Hyman; Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1990.

Project
MUSE®
Scholarly journals online

Revenge and Moral Judgement in Tolkien

Brian Rosebury

Most of us have inconsistent attitudes to revenge, though we sometimes pretend otherwise. Asked in the abstract to evaluate revenge as a human activity, most of us would condemn it, and few of us would be as comfortable as Aristotle in saying that people "expect to return evil for evil—and if they cannot, feel that they have lost their liberty" (Aristotle V, v (1132b), 183). We do not, at any rate, expect to see revenge endorsed in respectable literary narratives, whatever the movies may get up to. When Odysseus, after regaining power in Ithaca, hangs his disloyal maidservants, and tortures to death the treacherous goatherd Melanthius, modern readers are shocked and repelled by this aspect of the "eucatastrophe"—and not merely because the vengeance seems disproportionate, especially in the case of the maids.

Yet many of us can imagine situations in which we would hesitate to condemn personal revenge, if it seemed just and proportionate—the killing of a sadistic concentration camp guard, for example, by a victim or a victim's survivor. And in the face of sufficiently dreadful crimes, the most liberal of us can suddenly see the point of vengeful wishes. After the deliberate shelling of civilian areas of Srebrenica during the 1990s war in Bosnia, Larry Hollingsworth, a United Nations humanitarian observer, addressing the international press corps, said, "My first thought was for the commander who gave the order to attack. I hope he burns in the hottest corner of hell. My second thought was for the soldiers who loaded the breeches and fired the guns. I hope their sleep is forever punctuated by the screams of the children."[1] At a more banal level, many believe that if A punches B, or wounds her self-respect with an insult or some other humiliating act, it is natural for B to feel an urge to retaliate, and that A is hardly in a position to complain if she does so.

In earlier times, moralists have disagreed over the value of such "natural" emotions, some deploring them as sinful, others seeing them as a necessary support, when moderated by reason, for the institutions of law and punishment. In the eighteenth century, Bishop Joseph Butler held that well-founded personal resentment was essentially the same, divinely-implanted, passion as indignation against wickedness, being at root "a fellow-feeling, which each person has in behalf of the whole species, as well as of himself." While he carefully distinguished such resentment from "the dreadful vices of malice and revenge," he was uncomfortably aware of the ease with which the one could "run into" the other: unless "subservient . . . to the Common Good," resentment would, he warned,

lead to "endless rage and confusion" (126-133). More recently, a number of writers have attempted, with varying degrees of plausibility and coherence, to overcome contemporary liberal inhibitions and rehabilitate revenge as an indispensable component of criminal justice.[2]

<center>II</center>

How did Tolkien come to terms with this complex theme? He had a special reason to be aware of the moral and narrative challenges it presented. His Christian faith commanded and celebrated forgiveness, and forgiveness is powerfully expressed at some key moments in his work, notably in Frodo's "Let us forgive him!" spoken of the departed Gollum on the slopes of Mount Doom (*RK*, VI, iv, 225). Forgiveness and vengefulness, though individuals at particular times may oscillate between them, are as principles morally and psychologically incompatible. But Tolkien also had a professional interest in legends from the pre-Christian North which take for granted the legitimacy, or at any rate centrality, of vengeance as a motive; and the cultures he presents in most of his work owe at least something to these models. He might criticise or renounce such pre-Christian values, but he could not suppose that they had no foundation in human emotions, or dismiss them as wholly incompatible with virtue.[3]

Tolkien was not essentially a theorist—his ideas are "in solution" (to quote Christopher Tolkien)[4] in his imagined world—but he was a serious thinker, and some attempt can be made to analyse the thinking that shaped his narratives. We know that he reflected anxiously about some moral dilemmas generated by his invention, such as the autonomy of Orcs and the legitimacy of killing them.[5] Comments in his letters on responsibility for the harms of war show that he took into account the possibility of vengeful responses to aggression, and was willing to ascribe a lesser (though still significant) degree of guilt to those who so responded.

> The aggressors are primarily to blame for the evil deeds that proceed from their own original violation of justice and the passions that their own wickedness must naturally (by their standards) have been expected to arouse. They at any rate have no right to demand that their victims when assaulted should not demand an eye for an eye or a tooth for a tooth.
> <div align="right">(Letters 243).</div>

We should expect him, then, to recognise the need for both moral judgement, and literary tact, in presenting episodes in which revenge occurs or is contemplated. I will try to show how Tolkien fulfils this need.

We should perhaps start with a reasonably clear definition of revenge.

A philosopher might define it as follows:

> A deliberate injurious act or course of action against an-
> other person, motivated by resentment of an injurious act
> or acts performed by that other person against the revenger,
> or against some other person or persons whose injury the
> revenger resents.

This is a deliberately broad definition, and there is quite a repertoire of more specific and limiting definitions and connotations available. Some writers, for example, controversially claim that only excessive retaliation, or only cold-blooded retaliation, should count as revenge. Others try to find a terminology that separates a good kind of revenge, which can be assimilated to legal punishment, from a bad kind. I shall ignore these attempted restrictions.[6]

The words "revenge", "vengeance", and "vendetta" all derived from Latin vindicare, have a common history in which can be discerned the connected ideas of:

> (i)   expressing (an intention, a threat);
> (ii)   declaring a claim; and so specifically
> (iii)   making a demand (for restitution) against an offender;
> and finally
> (iv)   inflicting harm on the offender, either as kind of res-
> titution in itself (the suffering of the offender being a repay-
> ment to oneself for one's own suffering), or as a punishment
> for the failure or impossibility of restitution.

With (iv) we arrive at revenge as defined above: the earlier elements may or may not be present. There is also the unrelated word "feud", denoting a "lasting state of enmity" (*OED*), in which acts of revenge and vengeful attitudes are likely to occur. In modern English, "feud" has taken on a comparatively light-hearted flavour, suggestive of rival football clubs or ice-cream companies, though this can easily be counteracted by inserting the word "blood" before it. Tolkien significantly uses it in the most bourgeois of contexts in the final chapter of *The Return of the King*, when Lobelia Sackville-Baggins leaves her remaining money to Frodo for charitable uses: "so that feud was ended" (*RK*, VI, ix, 301).

Despite these many nuances, I propose to stick with my broad definition of "revenge"; and in spite of its breadth, we can see at once that many acts of responsive violence exemplified in Tolkien's fiction actually lie outside it. Exacting revenge should not be confused, for example, with retaliating in order to incapacitate or deter, which is not (or at least, need not be) motivated by resentment. When the Warden of the Houses

of Healing laments the injuries of war and hints at a criticism of the Gondorian élite, Éowyn replies that, "It takes but one foe to breed a war, not two, Master Warden . . . And those who have not swords can still die upon them" (*RK*, V, v, 236). This implies, not a defence of revenge, but what moral philosophers call a "consequentialist" or utilitarian argument: the total quantity of human suffering would have been just as great, or greater, if Gondor and Rohan had opted for non-resistance. It is a classic anti-pacifist argument, omitting only the implicit claim (which the reader can take for granted) that there is a chance of reducing total suffering if the aggressor can be defeated and future aggressors deterred. By adding her second sentence, Éowyn also quietly repudiates the conception of warfare as a kind of game, or consensual social practice.[7] It is as if she were to say to the Warden, "If you pedantically insist that a "war" by definition requires two consenting parties, let me point out to you that a "massacre" does not." When she goes on to insist that it is not always evil to die in battle, Éowyn again makes no mention of vengeance—rather (we infer from the context) her motivation is a matter of honour and an obligation of service to her people, coupled with the indifference to survival caused by her unhappy love for Aragorn.

Similarly, the well-known speech by Gandalf defending Bilbo's mercy to Gollum (*FR*, I, ii, 68-69, recalled at *TT,* IV, I, 221) is not, except very obliquely, a repudiation of revenge. Gandalf uses or implies no fewer than five different arguments. I quote here from the later, recollected version in *The Two Towers*:

> *What a pity Bilbo did not stab the vile creature, when he had a chance!*
> *Pity? It was Pity that stayed his hand. Pity, and Mercy: not to strike without need.*
> *I do not feel any pity for Gollum. He deserves death.*
> *Deserves death! I daresay he does. Many that live deserve death. And some die that deserve life. Can you give that to them? Then do not be too eager to deal out death in the name of justice, fearing for your own safety. Even the wise cannot see all ends.*

Arguments 1 and 2 are related to Pity, and I will postpone these until section V for reasons that will become clear there. In argument 3, Gandalf defines Mercy as "not to strike without need" [italics added], rather than as a modification of Justice. Like Éowyn, he invokes a consequentialist morality: we may kill an enemy only when the end at which we aim by doing so is a vital one, and when we cannot achieve that end in any other way. Retribution "in the name of justice," in the spirit of the lex talionis ("an eye for an eye"),[8] and as implied by Frodo's assertion that Gollum "deserves death"—is discountenanced. By the end of *The Lord of*

the Rings, Frodo himself is maintaining this position in keeping to the necessary minimum violence against Saruman and his "ruffians": "his chief part had been to prevent the hobbits in their wrath at their losses from slaying those of their enemies who threw down their weapons" (*RK*, VI, viii, 295-296). That Saruman himself invokes petty versions of the lex talionis—"'one thief deserves another . . . one ill turn deserves another'" (*RK*, VI, vi 262, viii 298) only drives the point home.

The next two arguments criticize and refine this consequentialism. In argument 4, Gandalf impugns the motive of "fearing for your own safety."[9] (Note that Gandalf does not even suggest that Frodo might be motivated by vengefulness.) To kill with the aim of removing any future threat to oneself is to fail in altruism, a version of consequentialism which requires the agent not to prioritise his own welfare, but to take risks with it in order to help others. In argument 5, Gandalf limits consequentialism in a different way. Since "even the wise cannot see all ends," only the most clear and immediate need can provide justification for so serious an act as killing. To justify killing by its assumed ultimate consequences is to invest too much trust in one's own foresight. The ultimate consequences lie, rather, in the hands of Providence: the duty of individuals is to act with goodwill and virtue in the light of such definite knowledge as they have, and trust that the overall pattern of events will come out right. Tom Shippey calls this the "ideological core" of *The Lord of the Rings* (317).

III

Where, then, does Tolkien deal unmistakably with revenge? There are a number of examples, some clear, some marginal. Roughly speaking, I will begin with the wholly negative presentations of vengeful acts and motives, and then consider those cases in which a greater degree of sympathy seems to be implied.

1. Enemies

The supreme representatives of evil, the fallen angels Melkor and Sauron, sometimes perform actions that could be construed as vengeful. Typically, they conceive a special hatred for individuals or groups whom they perceive to have obstructed their designs. Melkor hates the Eldar "because in them he saw the reason for the arising of the Valar, and his own downfall" (*S* 66); his elaborate persecution of Húrin and his children goes beyond the necessities of war; Sauron views Elendil and his heirs with special enmity (*RK*, Appendix A, 317). Yet revenge remains an ancillary and not a primary motive in their cases. The evil qualities of Melkor and Sauron are often enumerated (see, e.g. *S* 31-32), with pride, cruelty and the desire to dominate other wills at the head of the list, but venge-

fulness is rarely emphasised. There are a number of reasons for this. Vengeance cannot be a primary motive for Melkor, since this would imply that his wrongful actions arose initially, at least in part, from his having himself been wronged. But Melkor had not been originally wronged: rather, his rebellion against Eru and the Ainur was itself the origin of evil, and his enmity towards the other Valar and towards the Children of Ilúvatar is founded on his self-willed estrangement from them, leading him not so much to vengeance as to fear, hatred, and envy. Later, in the episode of "the Unrest of the Noldor" (*S* 67-72) he is humiliated by a proud Fëanor and meditates future revenge, but this rebuff is itself the consequence of jealousies and suspicions that Melkor has fomented and of Melkor's desire to steal the Silmarils.

Moreover, the very concept of revenge is of something that has a reason, and therefore can in principle be completed: if a course of revenge is motivated by resentment of a given injury, then there must be some quantity of retaliatory harm, even if it is a thousand times greater than the original injury, that is sufficient to satisfy that motive. But the malice of Melkor and Sauron is limitless, capable of terminating only when all independent wills are annihilated: only incidentally does it take specifically motivated forms.

In the light, or rather darkness, of the nihilistic evil of Melkor and Sauron, revenge appears almost reasonable, belonging as it does to the world of intelligible purposes and loyalties. We are even told that "Orcs will often pursue foes for many leagues into the plain if they have a fallen captain to avenge" (*FR*, II, vi, 351).[10] Although Orcs are, of course, the aggressors in the first place, this suggests a certain *esprit de corps* which lifts them above outright egotism. (Compare the judgement made in "Valaquenta," that Sauron was initially less evil than Melkor in that he served another rather than himself (*S* 32).)

Gollum's vengefulness towards "Baggins," and later towards Sam, is subordinate to his desire for the Ring, but it does operate independently, as when he unwisely wastes energy in spitting and gloating (throwing back the "sneak" accusation) in his attack on Sam outside Shelob's lair (*TT*, IV, ix, 335). Like Sauron's tactical errors motivated by cruelty and moral blindness, this is a key moment at which evil undoes itself. Though we are reminded by the murder of Déagol that Gollum initiated his own misfortunes, his resentments do arise from specific, if largely unfair, grievances. In this respect, Gollum's first attempt at reciprocity, the riddle-game, is important. Mutual obedience to the rules of a game, or to law in general, is an example of "good reciprocity": the "bad reciprocity" of revenge is often the consequence when good reciprocity breaks down. By showing comprehension of the riddle-game rule, and hoping to eat Bilbo legitimately in virtue of them (*H*, V, 121) Gollum demonstrates that he, no less

than Bilbo, is a rational and morally capable creature, and it is just this quality that makes possible the massive yet still consistent development of his personality in *The Lord of the Rings*. The obsessive character of his resentment-based self-justifications for his crimes, both retrospective (the murder of Déagol) and prospective (the betrayal of Frodo and Sam to Shelob), shows that he remains sufficiently morally capable to be aware of the need to legitimise his actions to himself—not merely, like Sauron's emissaries, to others. In the revised riddle-game episode, Tolkien displays literary tact in avoiding outright breach of the rules by either party: it is essential that both should emerge without finally renouncing (at least the theory of) reciprocity. Gollum, who has the shadow of a case since Bilbo's final question "had not been a genuine riddle according to the ancient laws" (*H*, V, 127) avails himself of this excuse in his own mind, plays for time, and Bilbo runs off, realizing Gollum intends to murder him anyway. Tolkien also, of course, avoids the question of whether Bilbo would really have submitted to be eaten had he lost the game. No reader could seriously believe, or wish, that he would, but we are reassured of Bilbo's virtue by the fact that he clearly thinks he ought to submit.

2. Friends

It may initially seem surprising that there are conspicuous references to revenge in the comparatively light-hearted world of *The Hobbit*. When Bilbo tells Smaug that "We came over hill and under hill, by wave and wind, for Revenge" (*H*, V, 282), Smaug, as if to reprove him for using this heroic concept so complacently, instantly drops his amiably bantering manner ("Bless me! Had you never thought of the catch?") in favour of a kind of Old Testament grandeur ("Girion Lord of Dale is dead, and I have eaten his people like a wolf among sheep, and where are his son's sons that dare approach me?"). What he says is in effect that he has wiped out all his strongest enemies, and no one is left capable of taking revenge. This claim will rebound on him shortly afterwards, when he is killed in his imprudent attack on Lake-Town by one of Girion's descendants. The moral hinted at is that revenge can be just or can be the instrument of humbling immoral pride. But it is no more than a hint, for this may be a misleading example. Bilbo's speech about Revenge is improvised as part of his verbal contest with Smaug: he is, as it were, pretending to inhabit the heroic world in which such motives are really decisive. Apart from a little cursing of Smaug, there is actually little sign in the Dwarves' earlier conversation that they are motivated by revenge against the dragon, as distinct from the desire to recover their lost wealth: there is no mention of revenge in their song at Bag-End, for example.[11] And Smaug does not fall victim to an express act of revenge: Bard kills the dragon for utilitarian reasons, to save Lake-town and its people from worse harm.

A more unsettling example is provided by Beorn, who captures a Warg and a goblin, coerces them into providing information (the narrative avoids specifying how this is done), and then kills them.

> "What did you do with the goblin and the Warg?" asked Bilbo suddenly.
> "Come and see!" said Beorn, and they followed him round the house. A goblin's head was stuck outside the gate and a warg-skin was nailed to a tree just beyond. Beorn was a fierce enemy. But now he was their friend, and Gandalf thought it wise to tell him their whole story and the reason of their journey, so that they could get the most help he could offer. (*H*, VII, 182)

While the exposure may be done partly to deter others, we know enough of Beorn's ferocious temper to be sure that this killing of creatures at his mercy is in part an act of revenge against intruders and despoilers of his territory. It is not plausible to suppose that Beorn is acting in impersonal obedience to some larger strategy: as presented in *The Hobbit*, he makes his own rules and keeps himself to himself. The half-apologetic comment that "Beorn was a fierce enemy. But now he was their friend" ensures that this revenge is not endorsed by the narrative. Fierceness is a morally neutral quality: Beorn, lacking patience and magnanimity, is a dangerous weapon, and all Gandalf's diplomacy is needed to ensure he is pointed in the right direction.

Is there also here a sense that certain creatures are intrinsically evil and so may not merit forgiveness or mercy? This is a very rare case of an orc (or goblin) being captured by good characters. There are no such occurrences in the more serious world of *The Lord of the Rings*: even the merciless obliteration of Saruman's orcs by the Huorns occurs in the context of a battle. What would happen to a stray orc that wandered into an encampment of Elves? Would they kill it (even though it would be at their mercy) or attempt to "cure" it? Since the first answer is morally objectionable and the second would raise difficult questions extraneous to the needs of the narrative, Tolkien ensures that that we do not hear of such cases.

At least as fierce as Beorn is Helm Hammerhand, "a grim man of great strength"(*RK*, Appendix A, 346). His brisk revenge against his pushy rival Freca is, at best, the ruthless destruction of a would-be usurper: it is preceded by an exchange of personal insults, initiated by Helm himself, in the manner (though toned down) of Icelandic sagas. It retains a certain dignity only because he fights Freca man to man, and, as, Tom Shippey notes, leaves the law-governed space of the king's house to do so, acknowledging the potential conflict between personal revenge and

public order. In Helm's behavior Tolkien here depicts an archaic value-system that he personally repudiated but, as Shippey again points out, could not credibly exclude from the pre-Christian world of his invention: his literary tact relegated it to an Appendix, ensuring that it did not disturb "the major thrust of his story" (277-279).

Nevertheless, Beorn and Helm are part of the story and are not evil characters. If they existed in the real world, someone like Tolkien might express a judgement on them as follows: they act as a redoubtable person might act, had he not been vouchsafed the special moral insight of Christianity, its message of forgiveness, mercy and self-sacrifice. Their actions cannot be approved, but they can be respected. In the world of Tolkien's invention, what stands in for Christianity (in broad terms) is the evangelium of the Valar to the Eldar, initiated by Oromë (*S* 49-50) and consummated in Aman. It is communicated among Men primarily to the Númenóreans and their heirs. Beorn and Helm, and for that matter most of the Dwarves, have at most received imperfect echoes of that evangelium. They have something of the status of virtuous pagans.

When, in contrast, the Númenoreans themselves fall into pagan attitudes, their lapses are especially culpable. Gandalf's reproach to Denethor for acting like "the heathen kings" in his suicide is well-known (*RK*, v vii, 129) Equally revealing, and particularly relevant here, is Isildur's disastrous decision to keep the Ring, with the justifying words, "This will I have as weregild for my father, my brother" (*FR*, II, ii, 256, and cf. *S* 295). "Weregild" (man-gold, the value of a man) is a fine paid by an offender for an injury, especially a murder: originating in Germanic custom, it is a legal substitute for direct revenge. Gandalf uses just the same rhetorical formula, with even more dramatic effect, in his confrontation with the Messenger of Mordor at the Black Gate:

> "These we will take!" said Gandalf suddenly. . . . Before his upraised hand the foul Messenger recoiled, and Gandalf coming seized and took from him the tokens: coat, cloak and sword. "These we will take in memory of our friend," he cried. "But as for your terms, we reject them utterly. . . ." (*RK*, V, x, 167)

Whether or not the echo of Isildur's formula is intentional, there is a huge gulf in moral sentiment between "this will I have as weregild" and "these we will take in memory." Both imply indignation towards an antagonist, but while Isildur's accompanying act is justified as retribution against a defeated antagonist, Gandalf's speech affirms an intrinsic (social, aesthetic and agapistic) value which momentarily renders the antagonism irrelevant.

For the High Elves, who have benefited from the counsel and teach-

ing of the Valar in Aman, there may seem to be little excuse for vengeful deeds. If the primal sin of Fëanor is his possessiveness towards the Silmarils, it is quickly compounded by his determination to revenge himself on Melkor for his father's murder, pursuing him to Middle-earth against the express command of the Valar, and even more so by the Kinslaying he initiates at Alqualondë. The moral issues here are complex, since Melkor's own killing of Finwë is motivated by revenge for Fëanor's insults, which in turn reflect Fëanor's realization of Melkor's designs on the Silmarils. Yet the pursuit of Melkor is, if you like, a human response: not to make it would require Fëanor to have either superhuman forbearance, or faith in the ultimate punishment of Melkor by Eru; and one can understand his view when he denounces the Valar as Melkor's kin, and for their failure to protect their realm from him (*S* 82). What marks out his course as a kind of criminality is the excess to which Fëanor's vengeance leads him: his intemperance, contempt for the Valar and for the Teleri, and indifference to "utilitarian" considerations for himself and for others (as when, "consumed by the flame of his own wrath", he pursues the host of Morgoth until he is surrounded and slain; and when he binds his sons to renew the war he knows to be ultimately hopeless (*S* 107).)

The consequent revenges among the Eldar in Middle-earth, though accomplished by individual decisions, have the appearance of a tragic fate by which the participants are bound, as in the house of Atreus. The doom pronounced by Mandos (or his herald) as the Noldor depart contains a strikingly retributive phrase: "for blood ye shall render blood" (*S* 88). This suggests the *lex talionis*, yet it is a prophecy and not a sentence, since the Noldor must still act, within the inevitably tragic situation they have created. (The only definite sentence pronounced by the Valar is to "fence Valinor against" [88] those who leave.) The meaning then must be this: that in injuring and then renouncing the lawful peace of Valinor, the Noldor are entering the world of violent conflict, in which they can expect suffering and death; having spilt the blood of others, they will have no grounds to complain when this happens, least of all if it is the survivors of their own victims who afflict them.

IV

It is time to pull the analysis together. It seems that though revenge, in Tolkien's moral universe, is always wrong, there are gradations of judgement on particular acts of revenge, ranging from outright condemnation to what one might call non-approving respect. At one extreme are the revenges of Melkor; to represent the other, we might use the example of Gwindor of Nargothrond, who, enraged by the cruel hacking to pieces before his eyes of his already blinded brother by the heralds of Angband, leads a tactically disastrous unauthorised sally at the Nirnaeth Arnoediad

(*S* 191). Though this act cannot be approved, few readers will withhold respect from it. The literary effectiveness of the incident comes from a double psychological plausibility: Morgoth understands the psychology of revenge well enough to exploit it in this ruthless way; and we participate in it sufficiently to prevent us from distancing ourselves from Gwindor's response.

Among the many representations of revenge in Tolkien, there seem to be three main criteria which tend to allow respect for acts of vengeance, or to modify condemnation of them. Since these are not stated explicitly, we must to a large extent infer them from our own reactions to the fiction: uncovering them, therefore, tells us something about the structure of our own intuitions regarding revenge,[12] as well as about Tolkien's invention. They are (1) being in general a person of goodwill; (2) having grounds proportionate to the revenge; and (3) having deliberated, wherever this is possible, long and responsibly before acting.

As an example of (1) and (2), we can respect Sam's enraged attack on Snaga at the tower of Cirith Ungol, but not Shagrat's on Gorbag, since the former is a peaceful person acting exceptionally, in response to Snaga's gratuitous cruelty to Frodo, while the latter is innately cruel. Under (1), Wormtongue's revenge on Saruman at Bag End would not qualify for respect, but Wormtongue does benefit from (2), his cruel and degrading treatment by Saruman since the fall of Isengard having been vividly communicated: hence our sense that he is, by this point, as much a victim as a persecutor. His action is a classic case of "sudden loss of self-control" following, in this case, sustained and ultimately unbearable provocation—a mitigating feature in English law and in many other jurisdictions, though he did have the option of abandoning Saruman some months earlier. The cliché "something snapped" is even used (*RK*, VI, viii, 300). Gwindor, another sudden loser of self-control, qualifies on (1) and (2), and if he does not qualify on (3) it is only because the unbearable provocation is so immediate. To lighten the tone, a comic version of (2) may be mentioned: we are told that Frodo, Sam and Pippin, on leaving Bag End, "left the washing up for Lobelia" (*FR*, I, iii, 78): a trivial revenge not disproportionate to Frodo's grounds for grievance against her.

In some ways the most interesting criterion is (3), of which there are two striking examples. The Ents' assault on Isengard has an element of vengeance, most passionately expressed after the burning of Beechbone (*TT*, III, ix, 173) but present from the beginning of their march: "it is the orc-work, the wanton hewing . . . that has so angered us; and the treachery of a neighbour, who should have helped us" (*TT*, III, iv, 89). Vengeance is not the prime motive—we are carefully told that the Ents never become "roused" unless their lives and trees are in great danger. And crucially, they decide to act only after three days' deliberation. The

fact that, at the end of their slow deliberation, they become deafeningly "roused" quite quickly is important, since it marks the distinction between their sober reflection prior to the decision to take revenge, and the continuous brooding on revenge typical of corrupted minds such as Melkor's or Gollum's.[13] An even clearer example is provided by the Dwarves' revenge against the Orcs following the murder of Thrór.

> Then Nár turned [Thror's] head and saw branded on the brow in Dwarf-runes so that he could read it the name AZOG. That name was branded in the hearts of all the Dwarves afterwards. . . . Weeping, Nár fled down the Silverlode; but he looked back once and saw that Orcs had come from the gate and were hacking up the body and flinging the pieces to the black crows.
>
> Such was the tale that Nár brought back to Thráin; and when he had wept and torn his beard he fell silent. Seven days he sat and said no word. Then he stood up and said: "This cannot be borne!" That was the beginning of the War of the Dwarves and the Orcs, which was long and deadly, and fought for the most part in deep places beneath the earth. . . . Both sides were pitiless, and there was death and cruel deeds by dark and by light.
>
> (*RK*, Appendix A, 354-355)

To mark the moral dignity of Dwarves in comparison to Orcs, more is needed than that the Orcs should have committed the first outrage: the Dwarves must also have a sober attitude to revenge. The seven days' delay before Thrain decides the outrage "cannot be borne" shows that exacting vengeance is not a mere reflex for the Dwarves: so grave a decision must arise out of a deep and prostrating grief. But it is revenge, not just a utilitarian decision to deal with a dangerous enemy.

V

"Hate brings forth hate," according to the "Akallabêth" (*S* 274). Much of the previous discussion may have given the impression that Tolkien's writings are a study of rational decision-making, and it might be objected that fiction, in contrast to philosophy, deals with emotions rather than reason. Actually, I believe Tolkien was a rational writer, to whom the concurrence and co-operation of reason with the right kind of emotion was important.[14] He shows Sam Gamgee able to resist the temptation to use the Ring in Mordor thanks to (first, and mostly) "his love for his master" but also (secondly) "his plain hobbit-sense" (*RK*, VI, i, 177). "The Council of Elrond" and "The Last Debate" show long and com-

plex processes of information-gathering, assessment, argument and decision, yet in both cases the participants are moved by profound emotions of loyalty, devotion and courage to which their reasoning gives point and direction. Where emotion leads to the abandonment of reason, as in the cases of Fëanor or Ar-Pharazôn, the results are generally calamitous.

There are, moreover, good emotions and bad ones. Melkor and Sauron are characterised by bad emotions, inimical to reason. They are not rational monsters, like Sherlock Holmes's mathematics-professor adversary, Moriarty. Moriarty, motivated purely by reason and self-interest, enjoys the intellectual challenge of his conflict with Holmes, so that his final decision to revenge himself on Holmes at the Reichenbach Falls is a little out of character.[15] Melkor and Sauron are driven by fierce emotions—pride, fear, humiliation, anger, cruelty—and at crucial moments are led by them into error and despair. In contrast, the good emotions of the benign characters serve them well, though in ways that they cannot directly predict. In the *Fellowship of the Ring* version of his speech about Bilbo's mercy, Gandalf's first two arguments turn on Pity:

> "It was Pity that stayed his hand. . . . Be sure that he took
> so little hurt from the evil, and escaped in the end, because
> he began his ownership of the Ring so. With Pity." (*FR,* I ii,
> 69)

Argument 1, implied, is that Pity is an intrinsically good emotion. Argument 2, partly explicit, is that if you begin a dangerous course of action with a good emotion, your chances of maintaining psychological health through to the end are greater.[16] The two arguments are independent of one another because the second appeals to Bilbo's long-term self-interest, while the first turns precisely upon the claim that self-interest was not in Bilbo's mind when he spared Gollum; nevertheless, part of the force of the speech is that a good emotion is ultimately consonant with reason. The progression from argument 1 to argument 2 prepares the ground for argument 5, discussed earlier—that we should do what seems right in each separate situation, and trust to Providence for the longer term.

In most of Tolkien's characters we find either a consistent emotional life, good or bad, varied only by an occasional "temptation," or a clear progression towards greater maturity on the one hand (Bilbo, Frodo) or towards degeneration and despair on the other (Boromir, Denethor). It is, in general, pretty obvious how our moral judgements are supposed to be applied. There are, however, some characters whose emotions evoke more complex, even conflicting, sympathies. The pathos of Gollum's internal struggle during his journey with Frodo is an obvious example, and for many readers the fact that *The Lord of the Rings* can rise to such moral

and psychological complexity is one of the most decisive proofs of the work's greatness. But there are also a number of figures from the earlier legends in whom we find the psychological origins of wrongful, especially vengeful, acts sympathetically explored. I will end by discussing two: Eöl and Túrin.

In the case of Eöl, the Dark Elf, a bad outcome is virtually guaranteed by his gloomy and reclusive, but not innately evil, personal character, in combination with the tragic working-out of the doom of Mandos. Indeed Eöl provides a direct link between the crimes of the Noldor and their final major defeat, the overthrow of Gondolin, since it is his son Maeglin who is Gondolin's betrayer. As a Telerin Elf who did not journey to Aman, his resentment of the Noldor is based on his belief that they instigated the return of Morgoth to Middle-earth, on the Kinslaying, and on territorial defensiveness, all exacerbated by Curufin's contemptuous refusal to acknowledge him as kin to the Noldor through marriage. All in all, then, he does have grounds for resentment. As he says to Turgon, and then to Maeglin,

> "No right have you or any of your kin in this land to seize realms or to set bounds. . . . This is the land of the Teleri, to which you bring war and all unquiet. . . . Come, Maeglin, son of Eöl! Your father commands you. Leave the house of his enemies and the slayers of his kin, or be accursed!" (*S* 137)

Eöl's manner is high-handed (a natural response of his self-respect, one might feel, to his vulnerable and humiliating position as a captive at Turgon's court, for all that Turgon himself tries to welcome him), and we cannot of course be supposed to excuse his attempt to kill Maeglin, which leads to Aredhel's death. (Note incidentally that this is not a case of sudden loss of self-control but of meditated revenge: Eöl pauses in silence for a long time before hurling the javelin at Maeglin.) Nor can Maeglin be entirely blamed for his desertion to the side of the Noldor, led by his mother. Nevertheless, when Turgon has Eöl cast to his death over a precipice, and Maeglin stands by in silence, many readers' sympathies will swing back to Eöl, in spite of the fact that his execution is an act of justice by a well-intentioned ruler, while his own act was one of disproportionate vengeance, the more irrational for being directed at a comparatively innocent victim. (And it is more than vengeance against the Noldor: it is also an expression of a possessive father's love, like Denethor's attempted burning of Faramir.)

Túrin's is a different case—a fact displayed with special clarity in the recently published *The Children of Húrin*, with its *Bildungsroman*-like unity. For while Eöl's character is introduced to us fully formed, and is essen-

tially simple, with Túrin we are presented both with an already complex inherited nature, and with a process of character development, which tempts us to a painful hope that he may somehow escape calamity. It might be thought that Túrin's bad outcomes are even more predetermined than Eöl's, since Morgoth has cursed Húrin's children, correctly predicts that they will "die without hope, cursing both life and death" (CH 64), and actively intervenes against them, especially through the agency of Glaurung the dragon. But in reading the narrative it is difficult to take seriously the idea of Morgoth as a master-manipulator of events. Few of Túrin's fatal decisions are, in fact, forced upon him. He acts as he does because of the kind of person he is, and that is, in turn, at least as much a consequence of what happens to him as of his innate temperament. (Morgoth is, of course, the direct or indirect cause of most of what happens to Túrin, but that does not make Túrin his puppet: rather, he improvises around Túrin's own actions.)

Túrin has three primary misfortunes. First, like the rest of the Edain, he is a Man, in a world, dominated by the Eldar and their diabolic antagonists, which Men, by reason of their nature and history, cannot wholly understand. "Turambar" ("Master of Fate") is an ironic name, since the power of Túrin's will is continually thwarted by the imperfect knowledge inseparable from his identity and situation. Partly through Melkor's deceptions and partly through his own mistakes, the adult Túrin often lacks full comprehension of the events in which he is caught up, and an undercurrent of epistemic insecurity and isolation is established in the account of his childhood. When Húrin returns from time to time from service on the borders of Hithlum, "his quick speech, full of strange words and jests and half-meanings, bewildered Túrin and made him uneasy" (39). Later, Túrin half-wakes in the night to sense his father and mother looking over him by candle-light, "but he could not see their faces" (48). These, or their equivalents, are, if you like, normal experiences of childhood, but their selection for the narrative, as significant or representative moments of inner loneliness, makes us look more sympathetically at the sometimes blundering or accident-prone solitary hero of the later chapters.

Secondly, Túrin has certain qualities of temperament which will not make life easy for him.

> He was not merry, and spoke little. . . Túrin was slow to forget injustice and mockery; but the fire of his father was in him, and he could be sudden or fierce. Yet he was quick to pity, and the hurts and sadness of living things might move him to tears. (*CH* 39)

As we have seen, the capacity for pity ranks high among the virtues for Tolkien, and there is no psychological improbability in its being com-

bined with great sensitivity to injustice and mockery: just the qualities likely to move a 'sudden or fierce" person to rash acts of vengeance or proud self-assertion which might quickly be regretted. Examples of the latter include Túrin's excessive punishment of Saeros for his gibe about the women of Hithlum (90); and his proud and ultimately disastrous self-estrangement from Doriath, founded in his mistaken fear that he could not receive justice from Thingol (90-91). Yet his hypersensitivity to injustice also leads Túrin, though not directly or intentionally responsible, to blame himself for the death of Khîm, and offer compensation and apology to Mîm: "pity long hardened welled in Túrin's heart as water from rock" (132).

Thirdly, Túrin is emotionally damaged in various ways. In the first place, because of his reserved temperament he is "less loved" than his slightly younger sister Urwen/Lalaith. Next, the beloved Urwen herself dies of the Evil Breath, the wind-borne pestilence from Angband. While Húrin mourns openly and his mother Morwen maintains a chilly silence, Túrin weeps "bitterly at night alone" (40). Next, he loses his father forever into Morgoth's captivity. Next, he is separated from his mother, who sends him into dangerous exile rather than have him enslaved by the Easterlings:

> "But how will you find me, lost in the world?" said Túrin, and suddenly his heart failed him, and he wept openly.
> "If you wait, other things will find you first," said Morwen . . . "I am sending you to King Thingol in Doriath. Would you not rather be a king's guest than a thrall?"
> "I do not know," said Túrin. "I do not know what a thrall is." (*CH* 71-72)

Túrin must be less than ten years old at this moment.[17] Like many children in time of war, he is forced into a premature psychological independence for which he is scarcely equipped. Though the narrative says of his parting for Morwen, "This was the first of the sorrows of Túrin" (75), it is already the culmination of many. The rash, proud, excessive and violent actions of his later career seem less arbitrary in the light of them.

As even some recent reviewers of *The Children of Húrin* grasped, Túrin is a profoundly morally ambivalent character.[18] In Túrin's tragedy, we see working together two factors that must always complicate moral judgement on human action: epistemic fallibility, and dissonant emotion. Most of us could make morally correct decisions if we both understood our situation fully and felt those emotions that are most consonant with reason. But for Túrin, neither of these conditions applies, for reasons which are at least partly—though not wholly—beyond his control. His incest

with his sister is unintentional, but like Oedipus and Kullervo, he would have avoided incest had he had fuller knowledge. He is partly responsible for his own lack of knowledge, to the extent that it is caused by his voluntary exile from Doriath, a side-effect of his hot temper and his pride. His vengeful killing of the unarmed Brandir, following an "Icelandic saga" exchange of insults in which Brandir's are largely justified and his own largely unfair, is a crime to which he is driven by an emotional anguish which temporarily blocks the possibility of understanding the truth which is now ready to be revealed.

> "Níniel? Níniel?" [says Brandir]. "Nay, Niënor daughter of Húrin."
> Then Túrin seized and shook him; for in those words he heard the feet of his doom overtaking him, but in horror and fury his heart would not receive them, as a beast hurt to death that will wound ere it dies all that are near it. (*CH* 251)

It seems especially appropriate that Túrin's death is accomplished with words that themselves express the emotional need for vengeance, as much as they express moral judgement.

> And from the blade rang a cold voice in answer: "Yes, I will drink your blood, that I may forget the blood of Beleg my master, and the blood of Brandir slain unjustly. I will slay you swiftly."[19]
> Then Túrin set the hilts upon the ground, and cast himself upon the point of Gurthang, and the black blade took his life. (*CH* 256)

I hope in this paper to have shown that the treatment of revenge in Tolkien is complex and subtle. In meeting the challenge of presenting his readers with rational, and not wholly unsympathetic, agents engaged in and motivated by vengeance, Tolkien both maintains a credible moral framework, and does justice to the unsettling and unresolved role that revenge plays in our moral intuitions.[20]

Notes

1   April 13, 1993, as quoted in *The Observer*, London, 8 December 1996 (J. Sweeney, review of J. W. Honig and N. Both, *Srebrenica: Record of a War Crime* (Harmondsworth, 1996).

2   Among the better examples are Barton and Hershenov. I examine these issues more fully in Rosebury 2008.

3   In the lectures and notes edited by Alan Bliss as *Finn and Hengest*, Tolkien takes for granted the legitimacy of revenge as a poetic theme, remarking for example on the superior (literary) effectiveness of the revenge if it overtakes its victim on the site of the original offence (35). *Finn and Hengest* is essentially a work of exposition—an attempt to recover, not to criticise, the mental world we can glimpse through the fragmentary texts—and we should not infer too much from its lack of the kind of searching moral reflection and critique that we can discern in Tolkien's treatments of "Sir Gawain and the Green Knight," or "The Battle of Maldon." However, there is a hint of distancing from the revenge ethic. Tolkien refers twice to "the duty of revenge," but on one occasion (103) puts "duty" in inverted commas. On the second occasion (161) he does not do so, but here—in contrast to 103—the use is attributive: he is locating belief in such a duty in one character's "reminder" to another, rather than endorsing that belief himself.

4   In *J.R.R.T: a Film Portrait of J.R.R. Tolkien*.

5   See, for example, *Letters* (187-196, 355); and *Morgoth* (408-444).

6   See Rosebury (2008) for a further discussion of these questions.

7   Eowyn's position is of course consistent with Catholic "just war" theory, which requires that war be waged only in self-defence (or the defence of others unjustly attacked) and so rejects the pagan notion of warfare as an intrinsically virtuous activity.

8   Or in the spirit of Kant's notorious claim that a society about to dissolve itself should take care to execute any remaining convicted murderer "so that everyone will duly receive what his actions are worth" (102).

9   The latter phrase does not appear in *The Fellowship of the Ring* passage. While this is probably an accident of composition (see *War* 96-97), its addition in *The Two Towers* episode is appropriate to the context, since Frodo is now in much more direct danger from Gollum's malice.

10 This is also half-implied at in *The Hobbit* (VII, 182).

11 Though in the posthumously published "The Quest of Erebor," Thorin is said to be "burdened with the duty of revenge upon Smaug that he had inherited. Dwarves take such duties very seriously" (*UT*, 322; Cf. also *RK*, Appendix A, 358). It is not that the Dwarves of *The Hobbit* are wholly indifferent to revenge: Thorin briefly voices a hope of vengeance against the Necromancer, which Gandalf dismisses as

(for practical reasons) "absurd" (*H*, I, 58). But the revenge motif is largely excluded from the main action.

12 I have to trust that by "our intuitions" I do not simply mean "my intuitions." But literary criticism always involves making this assumption to some degree.

13 Armann Jakobsson convincingly suggests that a further reason for our ready approval of the Ents' retaliation against Saruman arises from their symbolic role, as representing victimized nature: "the Ents are, in the beginning, entirely passive, as nature is sometimes imagined. That may be why their revenge cannot be seen as evil" (personal communication).

14 In his recognition of the necessary congruence of appropriate emotions with rational judgement, and of the way in which our particular choices ultimately form our character, Tolkien shows a certain debt to Aristotle (probably mediated through Catholic teaching).

15 Or at least, we do not elsewhere hear of Moriarty's emotions. A completely consistent Moriarty would have done what Holmes himself does—fake his own death and leave the country for some years—and then rebuild his criminal empire under a new name.

16 It is just possible to read argument 2 as suggesting that Bilbo was divinely rewarded for his good deed, but this would imply a degree of detailed oversight and manipulation of events by Eru or the Valar that is rarely suggested elsewhere.

17 He leaves a few months before Nienor is born; but when Morwen is aware that she has conceived, Túrin is "only in his ninth year." Since she does not send him away immediately, it is possible though unlikely that he passes his ninth birthday during the period of her delay.

18 Among potentially skeptical reviewers who noted, if grudgingly, the moral and psychological power of much of *The Children of Húrin*, one might mention particularly Philip Hensher, *Daily Telegraph* 28 April 2007, p. 27; Murrough O'Brien, *ABC Magazine* 15 April 2007; and Andrew O'Hehir, salon.com, 17 April 2007. The award for imperceptiveness, on the other hand, must go to Marta Salij, *Detroit Free Press* 18 April 2007: "Tolkien's weakness for making his heroes so very, very good and his villains so very, very bad is particularly grating. Middle-earth is the place to go if you must have the morality of your fiction be black and white, and apparently the simplicity was worse early in its history."

19 Though the dialogue with the sword and the suicide itself are clearly suggested by the death of Kullervo in *The Kalevala*, this profoundly expressive speech by Gurthang differs markedly from that of Kullervo's sword. The latter common-sensically, perhaps cynically, mocks Kullervo's attempt to cast it as an agent of justice: "Why should I not eat what I like . . . ?/ I'll eat even guiltless flesh / I'll drink even blameless blood" (Lönnrot 495).

20 I am grateful to the following people for encouraging remarks, helpful suggestions and tactful criticism: Douglas Anderson, Michael Drout, Dimitra Fimi, Verlyn Flieger, Christopher Garbowski, Armann Jakobsson, and William Rosebury.

Works Cited

Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by J. A. K. Thomson and Hugh Tredennick. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976.

Barton, Charles F. B. *Getting Even: Revenge as a Form of Justice*. Chicago and La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 1999.

Butler, Joseph. "Upon Resentment" and "Upon Forgiveness of Injuries." In *Butler's Sermons*, ed. W. R. Matthews. London: George Bell and Sons, 1914.

Hershenov, D. B. "Restitution and Revenge." *The Journal of Philosophy* 96 (1999): 79-94.

J.R.R.T: A Film Portrait of J.R.R. Tolkien. The Tolkien Partnership / Visual Corporation Ltd, 1992.

Kant, Immanuel. *The Metaphysical Elements of Justice*. Translated by John Ladd. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1983.

Lönnrot, Elias. *The Kalevala*. Translated by Keith Bosley. New York; Oxford University Press, 1989.

Rosebury, Brian. "Private Revenge and its Relation to Punishment." *Utilitas*, forthcoming 2008.

Shippey, Tom. *Roots and Branches: Selected Papers on Tolkien*. Zollikofen, Switzerland: Walking Tree Publishers, 2007.

Tolkien, J.R.R. *Finn and Hengest: the Fragment and the Episode*. Ed. Alan Bliss. London: HarperCollins, 2006.

Brian Rosebury on J.R.R. Tolkien: A Checklist

COMPILED BY DOUGLAS A. ANDERSON

BOOKS

Tolkien: A Critical Assessment
> Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992 [hardcover]
> New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992 [hardcover]

Tolkien: A Cultural Phenomenon
> Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and New York : Palgrave Macmillan, 2003 [hardcover and trade paperback] [A revision and expansion of the 1992 volume, with two new chapters.]

TOLKIEN-RELATED CRITICAL ARTICLES AND REVIEWS:

"Good and Evil"; "Race in Tolkien Films"; "Symbolism in Tolkien's Works"; and "Tolkien Scholarship: An Overview." In *J.R.R. Tolkien Encyclopedia: Scholarship and Critical Assessment*, edited by Michael D. C. Drout. New York: Routledge, 2007: 250-51; 557-58; 630-31; and 653-4.

"*The Hobbit*"; "J.R.R. Tolkien (1892-1973)"; "*The Lord of the Rings*"; and "*The Silmarillion.*" *The Literary Encyclopedia*, posted (respectively) 8 March 2001, 8 January 2001, 8 March 2001, and 21 March 2002. <http://www.litencyc.com> [Excerpts accessed 21 January 2008]

"Revenge and Moral Judgement in Tolkien." *Tolkien Studies* 5 (2008): 1-20

"Shot from the Canon." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 7 September 2001.

BOOK REVIEWS

[Review of *The Lord of the Rings 1954-2004: Scholarship in Honor of Richard E. Blackwelder* (2006), edited by Wayne G. Hammond and Christina Scull] *Tolkien Studies* 4 (2007): 282-88.

[Review of *Tolkien and the Great War: The Threshhold of Middle-earth* (2003), by John Garth]. *Tolkien Studies* 2 (2005): 268-71.

"With chunks of poetry in between": *The Lord of the Rings* and Saga Poetics

Carl Phelpstead

Much previous scholarship has investigated the ways in which Old Norse-Icelandic literature influenced J.R.R. Tolkien's creative writing.[1] This work has concentrated almost exclusively on thematic rather than formal connections, but the present essay examines one of the most striking formal similarities between *The Lord of the Rings* and the Icelandic sagas: the mixing of verse and prose.[2]

Prosimetrum, the mixed verse and prose form, is a world-wide phenomenon attested in Indo-European literatures from ancient Sanskrit onwards, and Tolkien was familiar with prosimetric writings in other languages besides Old Norse-Icelandic: Latin and early Irish are the two most obviously relevant literatures; Lisa Spangenberg rightly notes, for example, that "Perhaps the most striking connection between *The Lord of the Rings* and Celtic mythology is one of form; Irish medieval stories mix verse and prose, with songs and poetry interspersed in the prose narrative." (448). [3] The influence of Icelandic prosimetrum must, however, have been more significant than that of early Irish saga, reaching Tolkien not only directly through his reading of Old Norse literature (in translation and in the original), but also indirectly through earlier prosimetric fantasy by William Morris.[4]

In a letter to his fiancée, Edith Bratt, in October 1914 Tolkien alludes to the seminal influence of William Morris's prosimetric romances on the form of his own creative writing, telling her that he is trying to turn one of the stories from the Finnish *Kalevala* "into a short story somewhat on the lines of Morris' romances with chunks of poetry in between." (*Letters* 7).[5] This statement has often been quoted by critics as evidence of Tolkien's acknowledged debts to both the *Kalevala* and the romances of William Morris, but critical discussion of the influence of Morris on Tolkien has nevertheless concentrated on thematic links and shared subject matter rather than the particular debt to which Tolkien here refers—the use, or revival, of prosimetrum.[6]

Earlier in 1914 Tolkien had spent part of his Skeat Prize money on works by Morris, including his translation of *Völsunga saga* and his prosimetric romance, *The House of the Wolfings* (Carpenter 69). Much later, in a letter written in 1960, Tolkien acknowledges the influence of Morris's *House of the Wolfings* and *The Roots of the Mountains* on some of the content of *The Lord of the Rings* (*Letters* 303). These prosimetric romances are late

works by Morris, written after he had learned to read Icelandic and col-
laborated on several saga translations with his teacher, Eiríkr Magnús-
son.[7] Morris himself links the sagas and his own prosimetric romances in
a letter to T. J. Wise in November 1888: he says of his soon-to-be-pub-
lished *The House of the Wolfings* that "it is written partly in prose and partly
in verse: but the verse is always spoken by the actors in the tale, though
they do not always talk verse; much of it is in the sagas, though it cannot
be said to be performed in their model" (Morris, *Letters* 302). Whether the
final clauses of this passage mean thematic material is derived from the
sagas although the form is not, or that the form is like that of the sagas,
but not identical to it, the passage confirms that the sagas and prosimetric
composition were naturally linked in Morris's mind.[8]

As his letter to Edith Bratt in 1914 makes clear, Tolkien began the
composition of prosimetric narratives long before starting to write *The
Lord of the Rings*, and a full account of his use of the medium would
consider a number of texts, including of course *The Hobbit*. The present
essay, however, concentrates on his most sustained prosimetric perfor-
mance, *The Lord of the Rings*. This text includes more than eighty poems
or verse fragments and only nineteen of the work's sixty-two chapters
contain no verse at all (every chapter to II, iv inclusive contains verse).[9]

Verse and Prose in the Icelandic Sagas

Since Icelandic sagas and Morris's saga-inspired romances provided
models for Tolkien's use of prosimetrum, critical concepts employed in
analysing the use of verse in sagas offer a framework for understanding
the relationships between verse and prose in Tolkien's fiction. In what
follows I shall first consider the distinction between authenticating and
situational verses and will then explore some of the aesthetic effects pro-
duced by the mix of verse and prose. We shall see that the effects pro-
duced by mixing verse and prose in *The Lord of the Rings* are similar to
those produced by the use of verse in the Icelandic sagas; in both the
sagas and *The Lord of the Rings* the use of verse extends the stylistic and
expressive range of the narrative.

Icelandic sagas are prose narratives, many but not all of which in-
corporate verses. In particular, Kings' Sagas (*konungasögur*) recounting the
history of the kings of Norway (or Denmark) and Sagas of Icelanders
(*Íslendingasögur*), set in the Icelandic past, frequently quote skaldic poetry:
verse of great metrical complexity and lexical richness that is usually at-
tributed to named poets.[10] Much of the scholarship on the use of verse in
sagas has sought to determine the authenticity of the verses. The Kings'
Sagas and the Sagas of Icelanders were written long after the events they
purport to recount, and this raises the question whether the verses in any
given saga were composed by the characters to whom they are attrib-

uted (and were then passed on orally until incorporated in the saga), or were instead composed by or for the writer of the prose narrative. There is also the possibility that they were composed later than the period to which they are ascribed in the saga, but before the saga was written, so that although the verses may be inauthentic, the saga-writer may not have believed them to be.[11] Tolkien does not work with existing materials in the way that the saga-authors, as writers of history or historical fiction, did. Nevertheless, although the verses in Tolkien's fiction are all his own, they are presented as either composed or recited from memory by the characters within the narrative. This puts Tolkien in a position analogous to that of a saga-writer who composed his own verses to satisfy readers' expectations of the genre (the difference being that in Tolkien's case the idea that the verses were composed by anyone other than the author of the narrative prose is a transparent fiction).

As Heather O'Donoghue, following Jan de Vries, points out, one of the distinguishing features of Old Icelandic prosimetrum (which is also characteristic of the use of verse in *The Lord of the Rings*) is that the verses in sagas "are not the primary carrier of the main body of the narrative: they are secondary to the prose, fulfilling either a corroborative or an ornamental role."[12] As is implied in the final clause of that quotation, two different kinds of use of verse can be identified in the Icelandic sagas (though the distinction is sometimes blurred).[13] Various terms have been employed for these two types of verse use, but in what follows I shall follow Whaley and others in distinguishing between "authenticating verses," cited by the narrator as corroboration of the narrative, and "situational verses" spoken by a character within the narrative (Whaley 252).[14] After illustrating these two different uses of verse in the Icelandic sagas I shall go on in the next section of this essay to employ this distinction developed in the study of Icelandic sagas to analyse aspects of Tolkien's use of verse in *The Lord of the Rings*.

Authenticating verses are quoted in sagas as corroboration of the content of the narrative; this implies that the verses are the writer's source for the immediately preceding material. Such verses are usually introduced by the phrases *svá kvað N* ("thus said N") or *svá segir N* ("so says N"). So, for example, in Chapter 14 of *Ynglinga saga,* one of the Kings' Sagas making up Snorri Sturluson's *Heimskringla,* a prose account of the accidental drowning of King Fiolnir in a vat of mead is followed by the statement:

So sings Thiodolf of Hvin:

Now hath befallen
In Frodi's house
The word of fate

To fall on Fiolnir:
That the windless wave
Of the wild bull's spears
That lord should do
To death by drowning.

(Morris and Magnússon, *Heimskringla* 25)

Here the verse is by a named poet who is not a character in the saga; his work provided source material for the later prose writer and is cited by the narrator as corroboration of the preceding prose narrative in much the same way that an academic writer today might cite his or her sources in a footnote.

Situational verses are sung or spoken by a character or characters within the saga-narrative. Such strophes are often introduced with words such as *þá kvað N þetta* ("then N said this . . ."). So, for example, at the end of the saga of the poet Gunnlaug Wormtongue, who shares a nickname with Tolkien's Gríma, Thorkel, husband of Helga the Fair, laments his wife's death:

then [Helga] sank back upon her husband's bosom, and was dead. Then Thorkel sang this:

Dead in mine arms she droopeth,
My dear one, gold-rings' bearer,
For God hath changed the life-days
Of this Lady of the linen.
Weary pain hath pined her,
But unto me, the seeker
Of hoard of fishes' highway,
Abiding here is wearier.

(Morris and Magnússon, *Three Northern Love Stories* 47)

In almost all cases, as here, a character within the narrative who speaks a verse is represented as extemporizing rather than reciting existing poetry. The major exception is when poets recite praise poetry from memory before the ruler it has been composed to glorify. Tolkien of course read sagas in Old Icelandic, but he also read at least some of the existing English translations (we know, for example, that he owned the Morris and Magnússon translation of *Völsunga saga*). I have here deliberately quoted from translations by Morris and Magnússon, published in 1875 and 1893, in order to illustrate the preference in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century saga translations for "sing" as an English equivalent of Icelandic verbs which would nowadays usually be translated by "say," "speak" or "recite." A very high proportion of the verses

in Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings* are said to be sung rather than spoken and in this Tolkien seems to be echoing the normal choice of verb in saga translations with which he would have been familiar.

Situational and Authenticating Verses in *The Lord of the Rings*

In the letter quoted above, William Morris remarks that in *The House of the Wolfings* "the verse is always spoken by the actors in the tale." In *The Lord of the Rings*, too, very nearly all the verses are situational verses spoken, recited, or (usually) sung by characters within the narrative. There are, however, two poems that are not spoken by characters, but instead quoted by the narrator as authenticating verses.

In *The Return of the King*, the narrator states that "without horn or harp or music of men's voices the great ride into the East began with which the songs of Rohan were busy for many long lives of men thereafter." A twenty-one line poem in alliterative metre about the muster of Rohan is then quoted ("From dark Dunharrow in the dim morning"). This is presumably one of those "songs of Rohan" sung during the "many long lives of men thereafter," though as it ends with the words "so the songs tell us" (*RK*, V, iii, 76-77) it could be a poem by the narrator which only alludes to, rather than quotes, authenticating verses.

Book V chapter vi ends with a twenty-seven line alliterative poem about the Battle of the Pelennor Fields:

> So long afterward a maker in Rohan said in his song of the Mounds of Mundberg:
>
> > We heard of the horns in the hills ringing,
> > the swords shining in the South-kingdom . . . .
>
> > > (*RK*, V, vi, 124-25)

The narratorial "so . . . said" corresponds to the saga formula *svá kvað*, though if this verse is cited to corroborate the prose account its value may be compromised by having been composed "long afterward."

As noted earlier, it is rare for characters in Icelandic sagas to recite existing verses from memory. However, such recitation happens frequently in *The Lord of the Rings*, and whereas this is sometimes done purely to provide entertainment, characters sometimes recite verses in order to provide authoritative information. This means that some of the situational verses additionally fulfil a function *within* the narrative that is comparable to that of authenticating or documentary verses in the Icelandic sagas, but at a different narrative level. This may be represented in tabular form as follows:

27

Icelandic Sagas

Situational verses	Character speaks a verse suited to the context
Authenticating verses	Narrator cites a verse corroborating his narrative

The Lord of the Rings

Situational verses	Character speaks a verse suited to the context
Authenticating verses	Narrator cites a verse supporting his narrative (only twice)
Situational authenticating verses	Character recites a verse as authority for information given

An important role performed by these "situational authenticating" verses is to contribute to the narrative's famous sense of "historical" depth, with characters sometimes using verse to provide information about the past of Middle-earth: for example, in *The Fellowship of the Ring* Strider/Aragorn recites a poem about Tinúviel (I, xi, 204-205); Gimli recites "The world was young, the mountains green", as evidence of what the realm of Moria was once like (II, iv, 329-30); Legolas recites a song about Nimrodel, an Elven-maid of former times (II, vi, 354-55); in *The Two Towers*, Treebeard uses a poem to corroborate his account of the Entwives (III, iv, 80-81); Sam offers Gollum a poem to explain what oliphaunts are (IV, iii, 254-55); and when Aragorn recites the prophecy of Malbeth the Seer in *The Return of the King* (V, ii, 54) his introductory words "Thus spoke Malbeth the Seer [. . .]" precisely echo the saga formula introducing authenticating verses: *svá kvað*.

Verse and Characterization

In an excerpt from a letter of 29 September 1968 recently printed by Scull and Hammond, Tolkien writes to his German translator, Margaret Carroux, that the poems and songs in *The Lord of the Rings*

> are an integral part of the narrative (and of the delineation of characters) and not a separable "decoration" like pictures by another artist. . . .
> I myself am pleased by metrical devices and verbal skill (now out of fashion), and am amused by representing my

imaginary historical period as one in which these arts were delightful to poets and singers, and their audiences. But otherwise the verses are all impersonal; they are as I say dramatic, and fitted with care in style and content to the characters and the situations in the story of the actors who speak or sing. (Scull and Hammond 768)

In a letter to his son Michael the following month Tolkien repeats this point about his use of verse: "it seems hardly ever recognised that the verses in *The L. R.* are all dramatic: they do not express the poor old professor's soul-searchings, but are fitted in style and contents to the *characters* in the story that sing or recite them, and to the situations in it" (*Letters* 396). Tolkien's emphasis here on dramatic suitability of verses for their speakers recalls the use of verse in Icelandic sagas to deepen characterization. In *The Lord of the Rings* verses not only illuminate individual character, but also emphasize the shared characteristics of kinds of being. So, for example, the hobbits' songs are generally comic and some of them concern typically hobbitic pleasures such as having a bath: "Sing hey! for the bath at close of day" (*FR,* I, v, 111) is said to be just *one* of Bilbo's favourite bath songs.

Similarly, particular metrical forms are associated with certain kinds of speaker. The hobbit songs use rhyming verse forms such as ballad metre, whereas the poetry of the Anglo-Saxon-like Rohirrim is in alliterative metre like that of Old English poetry. The antiquity of that metre no doubt also explains its use in the Entish catalogue poem that fails to mention hobbits until Treebeard composes additional lines (*TT,* III, iv, 67-68; III, x, 191).[15] Flieger notes that the different kinds of poem recited by Gollum reflect his split personality (529).

Extemporized Verse, Recitation, and Orality

In Icelandic sagas, particularly the *Íslendingasögur*, situational verses are typically represented as being extemporized by characters, implausible as this seems given the nature of skaldic verse. Middle-earth resembles saga Iceland in being populated by characters who are able to compose verse on the spur of the moment. Tom Bombadil speaks in verse rather than prose, and Frodo, Sam, Legolas, Aragorn, and Éomer are among other characters who extemporize verse. On two occasions characters jointly extemporize laments. In *The Fellowship of the Ring*, Frodo composes a six-stanza lament for Gandalf, to which Sam adds a (plausibly extemporized) verse celebrating the wizard's pyrotechnic skills:

The finest rockets ever seen:
they burst in stars of blue and green,

or after thunder golden showers
came falling like a rain of flowers. (*FR,* II, vii, 374-75)

After Boromir's death Aragorn and Legolas take turns to extemporize a memorial lay (*TT,* III, i, 19-20).

As in the sagas, a previously prepared poem may be recited at an appropriate moment, as happens when Merry and Pippin sing the sonnet "Farewell we call to hearth and hall!" (*FR,* I, v, 116), a poem said to have been "apparently got ready for the occasion" and modelled on the dwarf song with which Bilbo began his adventures in *The Hobbit*. The poems in Icelandic sagas authentically attributed to figures from the past were transmitted orally before their incorporation into written texts, and there is evidence in *The Lord of the Rings* of a similarly vibrant (imaginary) oral culture: Tom Bombadil teaches the hobbits a verse with which to call for help and Frodo later summons him with it (*FR,* I, vii, 145; I, viii, 153); "There is an inn, a merry old inn" (*FR,* I, ix, 170-72) is imagined as becoming the modern nursery rhyme "The cat and the fiddle" through a long process of oral transmission.

Saga Aesthetics: Stylistic Contrast

In some recent work on verse in the sagas critical attention has shifted from determining the authenticity of verses to what Heather O'Donoghue, in her book *Skaldic Verse and the Poetics of Saga Narrative*, calls "the aesthetic contribution of the poetry in saga narratives, that is, the role of verse in the poetics of saga composition" (4). The juxtaposition of verse and prose in sagas creates a profound stylistic contrast between the characteristically "plain" narrative prose style and the metrically intricate and lexically prodigious skaldic verse. Though there are sagas, such as *Hrafnkels saga Freysgoða*, that contain no verse, the stylistic contrast between verse and prose in the sagas is one of the most characteristic formal features of the genre as a whole.

Stylistic contrast between verse and prose is also significant in *The Lord of the Rings*. Tolkien employs a much greater variety of verse forms than is found in Icelandic sagas (in which the vast majority of verse is in *dróttkvætt* metre[16]): rhyming couplets, ballad metre, a variety of other stanza patterns (some unusual or unique), alliterative verse, free verse modelled on the Psalms, even sonnets. This formal variety is in accord with Tolkien's desire to represent the Third Age of Middle-earth as one in which "metrical devices and verbal skill [. . .] were delightful to poets and singers, and their audiences": in other words, as an age that resembled that of the Icelandic skalds in its appreciation of metrical virtuosity.

In *The Lord of the Rings* stylistic contrast between verse and prose is taken even further than in Icelandic sagas when a poem is in a different

language from the surrounding prose. The most substantial passages in Elvish (both Quenya and Sindarin) in the text are in verse: for example, "Ai! laurië lantar lassi súrinen" is seventeen lines long (*FR*, II, viii, 394). In *The Fellowship of the Ring* there is a brief passage in the Black Speech when Gandalf recites the inscription on the One Ring (II, ii, 267).

On other occasions, however, the stylistic contrast between verse and prose can be minimized when the prose is heightened by echoing the verse stylistically. An example of this occurs in *The Two Towers*, when Gandalf's words immediately before his recitation of a poem anticipate the language of the verse:

> "It is not wizardry, but a power far older," said Gandalf: "a power that walked the earth, ere elf sang or hammer rang.
>
> > *Ere iron was found or tree was hewn,*
> > *When young was mountain under moon;*
> > *Ere ring was made, or wrought was woe,*
> > *It walked the forests long ago."* (*TT*, III, viii, 149).

Though printed as prose, the final clause before the poem rhymes and also anticipates the repetition of "ere" in the following stanza. Such blurring of the contrast between verse and prose highlights the greater variety of prose styles in *The Lord of the Rings* compared to Icelandic sagas: though the stylistic contrast between verse and prose is still significant, it is not always as pronounced as in the sagas.

Other Effects: Pace and Emotional Range

Other effects achieved by the incorporation of verses in *The Lord of the Rings* have been noted by the few critics who have commented on the relationship between verse and prose in Tolkien's fiction. Tom Shippey, for example, draws attention to one of the ways in which Tolkien's handling of verse differs from the sagas when he shows how the three different versions of Bilbo's "Old Walking Song" acquire meaning in relation to their different contexts and so resonate independently of the intentions of the characters reciting the song (Shippey, *Road*, 167–70). Verses in sagas are rarely repeated in a way which could give them this kind of resonance.

Besides authentication, ornamentation, and stylistic contrast, verses in Icelandic sagas produce a number of other narrative effects. One of these is variation in narrative pace; as O'Donoghue puts it: "The virtue of simple contrast between two such different media leads to the possibility of verses being used to pace a narrative, to create tense climaxes or halt the inexorable flow of narrative cause and effect" (6). The verses have a similar effect on the narrative pace of *The Lord of the Rings*: Charles

Moseley suggests that in *The Lord of the Rings* "The poems pause the narrative, much as an illustration does" (51). I suspect that in reading both sagas and *The Lord of the Rings* many an impatient reader has skipped verses that pause the narrative in this way.[17] A particularly good example of verse slowing the pace of the narrative is the thirteen-stanza-long song "There is an inn, a merry old inn" (*FR*, I, ix, 170-72): this poem has no relation to the plot other than that its beginning with a reference to an inn brings it to mind in the Prancing Pony, and although Flieger writes of its "headlong pace" the poem's length and tangential relation to the plot mean that it in fact slows the narrative at this point, temporarily lightening the "already darkening atmosphere before the intrusion of the Black Riders" (524).

In Old Icelandic (and Old Irish) sagas the change from prose to verse enables a change of register appropriate for the heightened expression of emotions (it is no coincidence that romantic love is such a prominent feature of the *skáldsögur*, sagas about Icelandic poets).[18] In Icelandic sagas skaldic verses sometimes function like soliloquies that reveal emotions at psychologically significant moments; Heather O'Donoghue writes: "The expression of personal and deeply felt emotion in a skaldic strophe may provide a dimension to the men and women in a saga narrative which the saga prose, typically functioning as externally focalized narrative, does not" (6). A similar point was made six years before the publication of *The Hobbit* by Dame Bertha Phillpotts: "there is a mode of expressing deep feelings of which even the most reserved may avail himself, if he can. He can lay bare a broken heart, or a heart aflame with love, or he can boast without restraint, if he veils his feelings in a skaldic verse" (180). Thorkel's lament for Helga quoted above from the saga of Gunnlaug Wormtongue provides an example of such use of verse.

Verse is similarly used to extend the emotional range of the narrative in *The Lord of the Rings*. Frodo and Sam turn to verse to commemorate Gandalf (*FR,* II, vii, 374-75), Boromir is lamented in dignified long lines by Aragorn and Legolas (*TT,* III, I, 19-20), and Éomer turns to measured and archaic alliterative verse to mark the passing of Théoden King while rousing his men to continued valour:

> Mourn not overmuch! Mighty was the fallen,
> meet was his ending. When his mound is raised,
> women then shall weep. War now calls us!

Yet he himself wept as he spoke. (*RK,* V, vi, 119)

Verse provides a "high" style beyond the reach of prose not only for purposes of lament, but also for the ceremonial praise of Frodo and Sam following the defeat of Sauron, when the assembled host breaks into

verse modelled on the Psalms: "Long live the Halflings! Praise them with great praise!" (*RK*, VI, iv, 231).

Conclusions

Tolkien found formal models for his creative writing in earlier prosimetric composition. He acknowledged Morris's example as a writer of prosimetric romance and, like Morris, was himself deeply familiar with medieval Icelandic prosimetrum. The inhabitants of Middle-earth in the Third Age resemble those of saga Iceland in appreciating verbal skill and metrical virtuosity, and resemble saga characters in being able to extemporize the composition of verses. Distinctions made in analysing the role of verse in Icelandic sagas provide a framework within which to investigate further the relationship between verse and prose in *The Lord of the Rings*. Such an analysis of the text as prosimetrum reveals how verse is used to give depth to the narrative, to further characterization, to vary the pace of the narrative, and to provide stylistic variety and a heightened discourse for the expression of emotion. Reading *The Lord of the Rings* as prosimetrum also provides a valuable reminder that the influence of medieval literature on J.R.R. Tolkien's fiction was not limited to content, themes, and characterization, but also encompassed formal features.

Notes

1   The history of Tolkien's acquaintance with Old Norse language and literature is documented in Carpenter's biography and synthesized by Lazo. Many instances of the influence of Old Norse-Icelandic literature on Tolkien's creative writing are noted in Shippey's *The Road to Middle-earth* and in Burns's "Old Norse Literature"; brief overviews are provided by Heinemann and St. Clair. Burns's book, *Perilous Realms: Celtic and Norse in Tolkien's Middle-earth*, is more concerned with examining concepts of "Northerness" in Tolkien's writing than with analysing specific connections with Old Norse-Icelandic texts.

2   The previous focus on thematic links reflects the bias of Tolkien studies in general and work on Tolkien's medievalism in particular, in which research has, with a handful of notable exceptions, focussed on content rather than form. It is striking that even when critics do give extended attention to the formal or stylistic features of Tolkien's work it is almost always to *either* his prose style (e.g. Michael Drout's recent study, "Tolkien's Prose Style"), *or* his versification (as in Geoffrey Russom's essay "Tolkien's Versecraft"), rather than to the interrelationship of verse and prose in his work. The notable exception is

Verlyn Flieger's poem-by-poem discussion of the poetry in *The Lord of the Rings* ("Poems by Tolkien"), which makes many illuminating comments on the role of verses in the text, in addition to analysing their metrical and stylistic features. There is also some discussion of the role of verses in the prose narrative in Shippey (167–72) and, more briefly, in Moseley (51). St. Clair notes that both *The Lord of the Rings* and "most of the sagas" embellish prose narrative with verses but excludes this formal feature from her argument that Tolkien's work is best categorized as a saga because verse is "absent or minimal in some kings['] and family sagas" (14).

3   On Tolkien's knowledge of Irish see also Scull and Hammond (465). Dubs explores Tolkien's debt to (the content of) Boethius's prosimetric *De consolatione philosophiae*, and Moseley refers briefly to Tolkien's trying "Menippean mixtures of prose and verse (as in the medieval [French] *Aucassin et Nicolette*)" (43). On the variety and ubiquity of prosimetric composition see Harris and Reichl.

4   In his turn Tolkien has inspired more recent writers of fantasy to mix verse and prose, though with less happy results according to Roz Kaveney: "Another often-copied Tolkien mannerism is the interpolation of songs—where Tolkien was at least a minor poet of the Georgian school, few of his imitators are that competent" (Kaveney, 168).

5   "The Story of Kullervo" remained unfinished: see Carpenter, note *ad loc cit*.

6   Discussions of the influence of Morris on Tolkien's creative writing include, for example, Matthews, chapter 4; Burns's *Perilous Realms*, chapter 4; Perry.

7   Aho provides an overview of Morris's engagement with Old Icelandic language and literature, including a list of his translations with Eiríkr Magnússon.

8   The use of verse in prose narrative by E. R. Eddison, another fantasist who translated from Old Norse (*Egils saga*, 1930), provides an illuminating contrast with Tolkien's use of the mixed form. Eddison incorporates verses into the prose narrative of his fantasy, *The Worm Ouroboros* (1922), but rather than being composed for their context, these are pre-existing (even well known) poems incongruously incorporated as verses spoken by characters in the narrative. This discomforting procedure is, along with Eddison's infelicitous nomenclature, one of the aspects in which Tolkien's sub-creation is clearly superior to that of his predecessor. Tolkien admired Eddison's fiction, but

claimed to have read it "long after" it was published and denied that Eddison had been an "influence" (*Letters* 258).

9 Flieger writes that "Depending on whether you count variations as fresh poems, and how you parse the songs of Tom Bombadil, there are close to seventy-five poems in *The Lord of the Rings*" (522). My total of "more than eighty" counts the number of passages of verse with prose between regardless of whether such passages belong together in a single poem and without noting varied repetitions, but there is still some doubt as to whether some passages count as verse or not.

10 Snorri Sturluson's *Edda*, a handbook for poets that includes retellings of Norse mythology, liberally quotes both skaldic verse and eddic poetry, anonymous verse on mythological or legendary subjects in less demanding metres and preserved in the collection known as the *Poetic Edda*.

11 For an analysis of what the verses reveal about the origins of one particular *Íslendingasaga* see O'Donoghue, *Genesis*.

12 O'Donoghue (3). As will become clear, and as O'Donoghue's book itself demonstrates, "ornamental" does not do justice to the narrative functions performed by non-corroborative verses.

13 Bjarni Einarsson's account of this distinction has been particularly influential. Clunies Ross has provided a recent account of the matter in her *History of Old Norse Poetry and Poetics*, chapter 4 (especially 70–71, 78–82).

14 Harris prefers the terms "evidential" and "dramatic," while O'Donoghue has recently referred to the two uses of verse as "documentation and dialogue" (Harris 142; O'Donoghue, *Poetics* 77).

15 On the appropriateness of alliterative poetry to those who recite it in *The Lord of the Rings* see further Phelpstead (444–45).

16 The eight-line *dróttkvætt* stanza consists of two groups of four lines of six syllables each. Two stressed syllables in each odd-numbered line alliterate with the first syllable of the following even-numbered line and in addition there is internal half-rhyme within odd-numbered lines and internal full rhyme within even-numbered lines: in both cases the penultimate syllable of the line (which is the last stressed syllable) rhymes with a syllable earlier in the line.

17 As Tolkien himself admitted to doing when reading tales as a young boy: see "On Fairy-stories" (*PS* 151).

18 Cf. O'Donoghue (8).

Turku, Finland, ed. Keith J. Batterbee. Turku: University of Turku, 1993: 99–109.

Kaveney, Roz. "In the Tradition . . . ." In *Reading "The Lord of the Rings": New Writings on Tolkien's Classic*, ed. Robert Eaglestone. London: Continuum, 2005:. 162–75.

Lazo, Andrew. "Gathered Around Northern Fires: The Imaginative Impact of the Kolbítar." In *Tolkien and the Invention of Myth: A Reader*, ed. Jane Chance. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2004: 191–226.

Matthews, Richard. *Fantasy: The Liberation of Imagination*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Morris, William. *The Letters of William Morris to his Family and Friends*, ed. Philip Henderson. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1950.

——— and Eiríkr Magnússon, trans. *Three Northern Love Stories and Other Tales* [1875] reprinted with a new introduction. Bristol: Thoemmes Press, 1996.

——— and Eiríkr Magnússon, trans. *The Stories of the Kings of Norway called the Round World (Heimskringla) By Snorri Sturluson*. Vol. 1. London: Quaritch, 1893. The Saga Library Vol. 3.

Moseley, Charles. *J.R.R. Tolkien*. Plymouth: Northcote House, 1997. Writers and Their Work.

O'Donoghue, Heather. *The Genesis of a Saga Narrative: Verse and Prose in "Kormaks saga"*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

———. *Skaldic Verse and the Poetics of Saga Narrative*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Perry, Michael W. "Morris, William." In *The J.R.R. Tolkien Encyclopedia: Scholarship and Critical Assessment*, ed. Michael D. C. Drout. New York: Routledge, 2006: 439–41.

Phelpstead, Carl. "Auden and the Inklings: An Alliterative Revival." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 103 (2004): 433–57.

Phillpotts, Bertha. *Edda and Saga*. London: Thornton Butterworth, 1931.

Russom, Geoffrey. "Tolkien's Versecraft in *The Hobbit* and *The Lord of the Rings*." In *J.R.R. Tolkien and his Literary Resonances: Views of Middle-earth*, ed. George Clark and Daniel Timmons. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2000: 53–69.

Scull, Christina, and Wayne G. Hammond. *The J.R.R. Tolkien Companion and Guide: Reader's Guide*. London: HarperCollins, 2006.

Shippey, T. A. *The Road to Middle-earth*. 2d. ed. London: Grafton, 1992.

Spangenberg, Lisa L. "Mythology, Celtic." In *The J.R.R. Tolkien Encyclopedia: Scholarship and Critical Assessment*, ed. Michael D. C. Drout. New York: Routledge, 2006: 449–50.

St. Clair, Gloriana. "*The Lord of the Rings* as Saga." *Mythlore* 6 no. 2 (whole no. 20; 1979): 11–16.

——. "An Overview of the Northern Influences on Tolkien's Works." In *Proceedings of the J.R.R. Centenary Conference*, *Keble College, Oxford, 1992*, ed. Patricia Reynolds and Glen GoodKnight. Milton Keynes: Tolkien Society, 1995: 63–67.

Whaley, Diana. "Skalds and Situational Verses in *Heimskringla*." In *Snorri Sturluson: Kolloquium anläßlich der 750. Wiederkehr seines Todestages*, ed. Alois Wolf. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1993: 245–66.

The Myth of the Ent and the Entwife

Corey Olsen

In *An Experiment in Criticism*, C. S. Lewis defines a myth as "a particular kind of story which has a value in itself—a value independent of its embodiment in any literary work" (41). Seeking to illustrate this principle, he points to several examples in modern literature, including two from *The Lord of the Rings*: Lothlórien and the Ents (42-43).

Lewis here bestows rather extraordinary praise on Tolkien's depiction of the Ents and their "long sorrow" (*TT*, III, v, 102). By placing them in the same category as the story of Orpheus and Eurydice, and of Cupid and Psyche, Lewis attributes to the Ents a sublimity that greatly transcends their role in the *Lord of the Rings*. Although Lewis's compliment to his friend's achievement is profound, it is equally tantalizing; Lewis immediately moves on from his Tolkienian examples without analysis or explanation. He alludes to Treebeard and the Ents again briefly in his essay "The Dethronement of Power," remarking that "Treebeard would have served any other author (if any other could have conceived him) for a whole book" (13), but he never does elucidate exactly what it was that he saw in Tolkien's Ents that he believed to resonate so deeply with the human psyche. That argument he seems to have left to future generations of Tolkien's readers.

Unfortunately, no modern Tolkien critics have yet taken up the interpretive challenge implicit in Lewis's high praise. Indeed, few critics have shown much interest at all in the Ents and Entwives as literary creations. The critical literature is remarkably silent about them; few critics give them more than a passing glance. Of those who do consider them, some critics have contented themselves simply with discussing the Ents' possible mythological forebears. In *The Mythology of Middle-earth*, for instance, Ruth Noel observes that the Ents are "most like the huge, wild, hairy woodsprites of Teutonic myth" (130) and discusses possible connections between the division of the Ents and the Entwives and a similar separation and debate over different kinds of land in Norse mythology (131). However, no discussion follows regarding how Tolkien might be melding these mythological elements and what the literary results of such a blending might be.

Some critics do pay a modicum of attention to Tolkien's depiction of the Ents in his story, but often without going further than viewing it as some kind of allegorical representation of highly generalized ideas. Paul Kocher, for instance, characterizes the Entwives' departure from the forests to practice agriculture as "almost a parable of how Earth's

originally nomadic tribes settled down in one place when they learned to till the soil" (155), but he gives no explanation of the function that such a parable would serve in Tolkien's story, or of how it might fit into the larger patterns of Tolkien's thought. David Harvey concludes that the Ents are "symbolic personifications of raw elemental power," adding that as a race, the Ents "reflect the essence of nature" (111). These claims certainly point to clear correlations that Tolkien invites his readers to make with the Ents, but they still do not provide much beyond the broadest generalities. There is nothing in these observations to distinguish, for example, between the Ents' relationship to nature[1] and that of the Elves, or of Tom Bombadil, or even of the Entwives. Harvey's slightly more substantive claim that the loss of the Entwives "is symbolic of the irreplaceability of nature once it has been destroyed by the black, smoky, reeking powers of an industrial society" certainly points to an idea that is very important to Tolkien, but it does more to trivialize than to illuminate the delicacy of Tolkien's myth (111).

In their recent book, *Ents, Elves, and Eriador: The Environmental Vision of J.R.R. Tolkien*, Matthew Dickerson and Jonathan Evans engage in a much longer and more careful consideration of the Ents and Entwives, but their reading is premised on the same kinds of symbolic abstraction that Harvey relies upon. Dickerson and Evans see the Ents and the Entwives as embodying two different environmental perspectives. The Ents are "preservationists," dedicated to maintaining "the unspoiled character of wild nature in its original form" (250). The Entwives are "conservationists," believing in "the management of the earth in an effort to preserve a balance among species and to control its use for the extraction of benefits without destroying it" (124). The story of their estrangement, therefore, depicts the tragedy that comes from the lack of co-operation between environmentalist factions; Dickerson and Evans conclude that the legend of the Ents and the Entwives is "a moving and troubling myth" that persuasively illustrates the self-destructiveness of stubborn disagreement among environmentalists (252). To say this, however, is not to explore the legend as a myth in Lewis's sense, nor even to read it as a story in its own right. In this reading, Dickerson and Evans turn the legend into a mere fable with a simple "message" (252).

Anne Petty's treatment of the Ents in her book *Tolkien in the Land of Heroes* at least bestows upon Treebeard and the Ents the dignity of being treated as actual characters rather than mere symbols. She observes, for instance, that the longing of the Ents for the Entwives "both humanizes and gives depth to Treebeard," noting that this story is an example of Tolkien's "ability to convey melancholy and loneliness" (203). Despite her recognition of the status that Tolkien gives to the Ents as sentient, rational creatures, equal in the complexity of their psychology and the

uniqueness of their perspective to the other Free Peoples, Petty refrains from an in-depth examination of their story and their depiction. Instead, she contents herself with broad extracts, such as her comment that the Ents' loss of the Entwives is Tolkien's "veiled way of suggesting that one should not take their [sic] lovers for granted" (210). Once again, the subtlety and evocativeness of Tolkien's myth are being condensed into mere truism.

One notable exception to the general critical neglect of the Ents is Jane Chance, who does a good deal of analysis of the Ents both in her book *The Lord of the Rings: The Mythology of Power* and her recent article "Tolkien and the Other." She even spends some time examining the song of the Ent and the Entwife, which very few other critics even glance at. Chance focuses on the self-absorption demonstrated by Treebeard and the Ents, pointing to them in both works as an example of an "insensitivity to the Other" that leads to isolationism and sterility (Chance, "Tolkien and the Other" 181).

It is my contention that Tolkien's depiction of the Ents and their tragic estrangement from the Entwives offers some of Tolkien's most compelling insights on the complexities and conflicts of life in a fallen world. My discussion will focus on the song of the Ent and the Entwife. The song is a remarkably intricate literary artifact, invoking a complex interplay of different voices. It is an exchange between two first-person speakers, framed by an Elvish songwriter who shares the agenda of neither side, and then sung and glossed by Treebeard the Ent. Through the layering of these voices, Tolkien is able to convey several different meanings, praising the beauties of nature while simultaneously showing the dangers inherent in loving anything in this world, even nature itself, too much and too blindly. The song also may help us to understand why grief and loss are so pervasive in Tolkien's work.

One obvious focus of the song, underscored by the alternation of its speakers, is the difference in sensibility between the Ents and the Entwives. In some ways, the song's depiction of this difference appears to follow some basic gender stereotypes. As Anne Petty observes, the Entwives are domestic, they "tame the land with gentle understanding while Ents prefer the wild, untamed, undisturbed side of nature" (242). In the song, the Ent's spring is a spring of long strides through the wild woods in the keen mountain air. The Entwife's world is just as emphatically domestic, even, by comparison, cloistered. Her spring is not only contained within the fields and orchards, but it is walled up in the garth, the enclosed garden.

Although Petty is right to point to this correlation, Tolkien is less interested in these preferences alone than in the attitudes that underlie them. In one of his few explanatory notes about the Ents and Entwives in

his letters, Tolkien admits that his depiction of their disagreement is partially rooted in his own perception of what he characterizes as "the difference of the 'male' and 'female' attitude to wild things, the difference between un-possessive love and gardening" (*Letters* 212n). Tolkien here goes beyond the mere association of the masculine with wildness and the feminine with domesticity. He associates with the female the desire to domesticate and with the male a less intrusive appreciation. Although the accuracy of this generalization might be questioned, it is not merely a blind appeal to gender stereotypes. In Tolkien's development of this idea in the song, in fact, his depiction of the Entish and Entwifely perspectives runs exactly counter to the traditional gender concepts that characterize the feminine as the passive principle and the masculine as the active.

Tolkien begins the song with a glimpse of the Ent's point of view:

> When Spring unfolds the beechen leaf, and sap is in the bough;
> When light is on the wild-wood stream, and wind is on the brow;
> When stride is long, and breath is deep, and keen the mountain-air,
> Come back to me! Come back to me, and say my land is fair!
> $\qquad$ (*TT*, III, iv, 80)

Despite its emphasis on the comparative "wildness" of the Ents, Tolkien's depiction of the Ent in spring is remarkably passive. He speaks of actions, such as striding and breathing, but he does so almost exclusively through the use of linking verbs; he describes them as states of being. The only active verb in the first three lines is "unfolds," and that is something that is being done to the leaves by spring. The Ent uses two active verbs in his last line, but both are directed at the Entwife: he requests that she "come" and "say," while remaining stationary himself. The Ent's love for the wild wood may be unpossessive, but it is also nearly inert.

The Entwife's response echoes the Ent's repeated use of the linking verb "is," but she employs it in active verb phrases.

> When Spring is come to garth and field, and corn is in the blade;
> When blossom like a shining snow is on the orchard laid;
> When shower and Sun upon the Earth with fragrance fill the air,
> I'll linger here, and will not come, because my land is fair.
> $\qquad$ (*TT*, III, iv, 80)

In the Ent's world, the sap merely *is* in the bough. In the Entwife's word, blossom *is laid* on the orchard. In Tolkien's first draft of the song, published by Christopher Tolkien in *The Treason of Isengard*, the activity of the Entwife's spring is even more ostentatiously vigorous; there he speaks of "sprouting corn," of "blossom like a living snow," and of "flames of green" arising (*Treason* 421). The corn in the final version may be

described only passively as being in the blade, but it is acted on by the showers and the sun, whose activities overflow the earth and fill the air with fragrance. In the Entwife's springtime, things are happening; work is being done.

The lines describing summer underscore this initial distinction even more emphatically.

> When Summer lies upon the world, and in a noon of gold
> Beneath the roof of sleeping leaves the dreams of trees unfold;
> When woodland halls are green and cool, and wind is in the West,
> Come back to me! Come back to me, and say my land is best!
>
> (*TT*, III, iv, 80)

The Ent's summertime is beyond merely passive; it is a languid and somnolent escape from heat and activity within green, cool woodland halls. The leaves that had been the victims of the only action performed in the opening lines, having been unfolded by spring, are now resting from their exertions. The only things unfolding in summer are dreams. The Entwife's summer, on the other hand, is simply bursting with activity.

> When Summer warms the hanging fruit and burns the berry
>   brown;
> When straw is gold, and ear is white, and harvest comes to town;
> When honey spills, and apple swells, though wind be in the West,
> I'll linger here beneath the Sun, because my land is best!
>
> (*TT*, III, iv, 80)

The sun that seems only to make the Ent and his trees sleepy is now responsible for five different active verbs in only three lines. Even the linking verbs that the Entwife employs when she declares that "straw is gold, and ear is white" serve to signal fresh efforts by prompting harvest to come to town. The world of the Entwife is vibrant and dynamic, while the "untamed" world of the Ent is quiescent.

If the poem is supposed to be a debate between the Ent and the Entwife, it is not obvious who is winning. There is clearly much to like about the energetic and industrious Entwife and her fruitful fields, and the Ent might seem rather indolent by contrast. Such as assessment would be an injustice, however. If the Entwife's is an active life, the Ent's is a contemplative one. Nothing much happens in the Ent's passages because his focus is not on doing, but on observing. He drinks in the sensations of the world around him just as Treebeard drinks: in long, slow draughts (*TT*, III, iv, 74). He notes the light on the streams, the sap in the tree boughs, the greenness of the summer sunlight in the forest shadows, and the sensation of the wind on his own brow. The Entwife's lines focus on bringing

about beauty; the Ent's lines relate his own thoughtful experience of the beauty that is.

In truth, there need be no competition between the active and contemplative perspectives. They are two different but valuable ways of celebrating natural beauty. Both the Entwife who is always immersed in a harvest-time bustle and the Ent who would spend a week just breathing the woodland air may have something constructive to teach the Children of Ilúvatar about the appreciation of growing things. They would also, of course, have a great deal to teach each other. There is something tragic in the separation and isolation of such perfectly complementary perspectives. Each remains focused on its own virtues, escalating from "fair" to "best" with a parallelism that could be harmonious, but is instead merely competitive, seeking capitulation rather than understanding from the other. Rather than calling its readers to choose sides between the Ent and the Entwife, the song invites us to see the separate beauty and value of each perspective and to recognize the pathos in their self-absorption and rivalry.

The song brings us to see the situation from both sides by remaining objective itself. Readers often overlook the fact that, although it is Treebeard who sings the song to Merry and Pippin, it is not actually his song.[2] He describes it as "an Elvish song" and actively distances himself from its composition and style. He concedes that the song is "fair enough," but to his Entish poetic sensibilities it remains, regrettably, characteristically Elvish: "lighthearted, quickworded, and soon over". The song was "never an Entish song," either in language, style, or outlook; it is not tinted by a pro-Ent bias. Treebeard, in fact, rather regrets the impartiality of the song's treatment of the debate between Ent and Entwife, remarking that "the Ents could say more on their side, if they had time!" (*TT*, III, iv, 80-81). In this remark, we can hear both of Treebeard's primary criticisms of the song: the sad underdevelopment of the Entish position, and the song's lamentable brevity.

The genuine pro-Ent bias is apparent in Treebeard's earlier prose narrative of the separation of the Ents and Entwives. He describes the places that the Ents loved in grand and majestic terms: they "loved the great trees, and the wild woods, and the slopes of the high hills" (*TT*, III, iv, 79). His description of the Entwives' demesnes is not without a recognition of their beauty; he speaks of their love for "the sloe in the thicket, and the wild apple and the cherry blossoming in spring, and the green herbs in the waterlands in summer, and the seeding grasses in the autumn fields" (*TT*, III, iv, 79). However, if we listen we can detect the hint of his partiality in his reference to the Entwives' interest in "the lesser trees," and in the quiet hint of smugness and self-congratulation implicit in his comment: "Yet here we still are, while all the gardens of

the Entwives are wasted" (*TT*, III, iv, 79). If Treebeard were to write a song containing a debate between the Ents and the Entwives over their lands, he might try to do justice to the Entwives' fields, but there is no question which side would (eventually) emerge the clear winner.

The objectivity of the depiction of the Ent and the Entwife and their perspectives has an important effect on the song's audience. It allows us to see the virtues of each side of the debate and to recognize the narrow-mindedness of both participants. The Ent and the Entwife in the song are clearly in competition. They extol the beauty of their own lands and, simultaneously, the poignancy of their active or contemplative mode of engagement with that beauty, but their praise is undermined by their antagonism. The escalation in the demands they make of each other at the end of each quatrain demonstrates this most clearly. When you are asking someone to say that the thing that you love is "fair," you may perhaps be genuinely desiring to share its beauty with your interlocutor. When you are demanding a concession that the object of your affection is "best," you have coupled the praise of your own love with an implicit denigration of the object of your opponent's affection. The Ent and the Entwife of the song are so lost in their own loves and so entrenched in their own ways of thinking that they are blind to other things that are equally lovely and other perspectives that are equally valuable.

Treebeard's partisan response to the song dramatizes the very self-absorption that the song depicts. He completely misses the pathos in the song's depiction of the two perfectly complementary and yet sadly disconnected perspectives. Instead, as I mentioned above, he is disappointed by the song's objectivity, insisting that "the Ents could say more on their side" (*TT*, III, iv, 81). He sees the words given to the Entwife not as the counterpart, but as the rival to his own point of view. Through his own investment in the debate, he fails to see the larger and melancholy picture of misunderstanding and loss that the song paints.

Treebeard's failure to see this picture is particularly conspicuous in light of the insight into Entish values that he himself provides earlier in the chapter. When he is explaining to Merry and Pippin what Ents are, he compares and contrasts them to Elves and Men:

> [E]nts are more like Elves: less interested in themselves than Men are, and better at getting inside other things. And yet again Ents are more like Men, more changeable than Elves are, and quicker at taking the colour of the outside, you might say. Or better than both: for they are steadier and keep their minds on things longer. (*TT*, III, iv, 71)

Asserting the place of his people among the other (and more populous) races, Treebeard once again betrays a strong bias. His comparisons make

Ents sound as if they are a distillation of the good qualities of both Elves and Men with none of the bad qualities, and crowned with yet another good feature that is uniquely theirs and makes them "better than both." The very partiality of these comparisons makes them more valuable, however. By praising the Ents at the expense of the other races, Treebeard shows us very clearly what the Ents value. They value humility, investing themselves in the study and care of other things, "getting inside" them. Indeed, their humility goes beyond mere study or stewardship of their charges; they are "changeable," and themselves take "the colour" of the things they love. This is a kind of submission, a kind of self-forgetfulness, that makes even the Elves seem selfish and "interested in themselves" by comparison, and the Ents' steadiness of mind enables them to persevere in this devotion with great constancy.

The song's depiction of the rivalry of the Ent and the Entwife, corroborated by Treebeard's response, points to the Ents' failure to live up to their own value system. Treebeard claims that Ents value a humility so profound that it leads them to meld their very bodies and minds with the things that they love and care for. The Ent and the Entwife of the song may indeed have this self-effacing brand of love for the lands under their stewardship, but they completely fail to show this kind of humility to each other. The song shows us how the Ents and the Entwives, in their relations with each other, were so exclusively "interested in themselves," so incapable of "getting inside other things," that they became estranged.

Their estrangement not only demonstrates the corruption of their values; it also exacerbates it. The Ents and the Entwives, if unified, would balance and complete each other. Together, they would cherish and protect both the forests and the fields, and their complementary outlooks, their active and contemplative relationships to nature, would inform and instruct each other. In isolation, they are at risk of stagnation, even calcification. Having failed in the humility that would have led them to "take on the colour" of their mates, their pride in their own little worlds could lead them to become genuinely imbalanced.[3]

From Treebeard's conversation with Merry and Pippin, we can catch glimpses of the moral dangers for both the Ents and the Entwives in this imbalanced state. The danger that the Ents face is to allow their patient communion with nature to lapse into mere lassitude. Treebeard's own account of an Ent's life and duties is quite robustly active: "We keep off strangers and the foolhardy; and we train and we teach, we walk and we weed" (*TT*, III, iv, 71). Merry and Pippin's first impression on meeting Treebeard belies this energetic description, however. Their first sight of the Ent, whom they mistake for a stump, makes them think of an old man "blinking in the morning-light" (*TT*, III, iv, 65). Even after years of reflection, Pippin reasserts his initial association of the Ent with sleepiness:

to him it seemed that "something that grew in the ground—asleep, you might say, or just feeling itself as something between root-tip and leaf-tip, between deep earth and sky had suddenly waked up" (*TT*, III, iv, 66-67).[4] Gandalf, considering the Ents as a whole, echoes this conception when he predicts that the arrival of the hobbits will cause the Ents "to wake up and find that they are strong" (*TT*, III, v, 103). Even Treebeard admits that he and the Ents had nodded off, confessing: "I have been idle. I have let things slip" (*TT*, III, iv, 77).

The other two oldest Ents demonstrate this Entish tendency much more dramatically. Skinbark, or Fladrif, has "gone up into the high places . . . and he will not come down," Treebeard reports; Leaflock, or Finglas, has "taken to standing by himself all through the summer with the deep grass of the meadows round his knees" (*TT*, III, iv, 78). The Entish perspective, taken to its destructive extreme, results either in apathetic isolationism or somnolent oblivion.

We know less about the Entwives and we hear no tales of Entwives gone astray. Tolkien does, however, provide some suggestions as to what they might look like. Treebeard's description of the Entwives' outlook on the world offers several ominous and rather surprising parallels between the attitudes of the Ents' lost mates and those of their worst enemy, Saruman. When Treebeard observes that the Entwives' fundamental desire was for "order, and plenty, and peace" (*TT*, III, iv, 79), we can hear an echo of the goals that Saruman believes he shares with Gandalf: "Knowledge, Rule, Order" (*FR*, II, ii, 272). Both explicitly value order, and although we are not given any reason to connect Entwives with Knowledge,[5] Treebeard remembers that they did enjoy Rule. He notes that they wished their plants "to hear and obey what was said to them," and he explains that their desire for "order, and plenty, and peace" boiled down to wanting things to "remain where they had set them" (*TT*, III, iv, 79). Treebeard also recalls that the Entwives ordered the plants in their care "to grow according to their wishes, and bear leaf and fruit to their liking" (*TT*, III, iv, 79). This kind of mastery can easily lead to the more callous attitude of Saruman, who does not care "for growing things, except as far as they serve him for the moment" (*TT*, III, iv, 76). It only takes a small step to move from dominion to exploitation.[6] If the logical, unhealthy extreme of the Ents' outlook is dormancy, the logical extreme of the Entwives' attitude is tyranny.

The Elvish song does more than retell in lyric form the sad estrangement of the Ents and the Entwives. Legolas claims that "every Elf in Wilderland has sung songs of the old Onodrim and their long sorrow" (*TT*, III, v, 102), but the song that Treebeard recites is not one of those. The song says nothing about the grief of the Ents and their long and fruitless search; rather, it depicts the stubbornness and the self-absorption

47

that led to the rift in the first place. It is a cautionary tale, not a lament. The two sets of spring and summer quatrains illustrate both the causes and the effects of the estrangement, but the Elvish songwriter seems to have been aware that these lines alone would be insufficient to convey the exhortations implicit in them. In the treatment of winter, the songwriter introduces a dramatic shift in subject that throws those exhortations into grim relief.

The tonal shift of the song can best be appreciated if we compare it to Treebeard's earlier poem, "In the willow-meads." These verses, in which Treebeard reflects on the beauty and wonder of lost Beleriand, also adopt the seasons as an organizational principle. He recalls the land in all four seasons, and he finds each admirable in its own way. Treebeard, indeed, describes his appreciation of the land's beauty as escalating as the seasons progress from spring through to winter. Spring, he observes, "was good" (*TT*, III, iv, 80). Summer, he thought, "was best." Autumn "was more than [his] desire," and in winter his "voice went up and sang in the sky." The song lingers with ever-increasing delight over every variation of terrain and season.

The song of the Ent and the Entwife seems at first to follow a similar pattern, even echoing the escalation of praise from spring to summer ("good" or "fair" to "best"). The absence of autumn breaks the parallel; the depiction of winter brings us somewhere entirely different:

Ent.　　When Winter comes, the winter wild that hill and wood shall slay;
　　　　When trees shall fall and starless night devour the sunless day;
　　　　When wind is in the deadly East, then in the bitter rain
　　　　I'll look for thee, and call to thee; I'll come to thee again!
Entwife.　When Winter comes, and singing ends; when darkness falls at last;
　　　　When broken is the barren bough, and light and labour past;
　　　　I'll look for thee, and wait for thee, until we meet again:
　　　　Together we will take the road beneath the bitter rain!
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(*TT*, III, iv, 81)

In "Willow-Meads," Treebeard revels in winter, invoking the stark loveliness of whiteness, wind, and black branches. In the song, the Ent describes *this* winter as slaying the woods and even the hills. The boughs of the Entwife's tree are not merely dormant, they are barren and broken. Even the loss of Beleriand, lamented at the end of "Willow-Meads," is only a faint foretaste of the destruction depicted in the song. This is the ultimate Winter, the ending of the world and of history, when night shall devour day and the final darkness shall fall.

The apocalypticism of the winter stanzas stands out even more

sharply if we compare the final version of the Ent's winter lines to those in Tolkien's first draft, given by Christopher Tolkien in *The Treason of Isengard*:

> When winter comes and boughs are bare and all the grass is grey,
> When trees shall fall and[7] starless night o'ertakes the sunless day,
> When storm is wild and trees are felled, then in the bitter rain
> I'll look for thee, and call to thee, I'll come to thee again.
>
> <div align="right">(Treason 421)</div>

On the whole, these lines sound much more compatible with the merely seasonal winter. The boughs are bare, and the grass is grey. Trees are felled, but neither the woods nor the hills are being slain. The starless night and sunless day are already there, but the night is merely overtaking the day, not devouring it. In general, the song was in nearly its final form when it was first written; the only systematic change that Tolkien made upon revision was to emphasize the apocalypticism of the song's ending.

Through the differing perspectives of the Ent and the Entwife in the first four quatrains, the audience of the song is presented with a varied and holistic praise of the beauties of the world. The failure of both Ent and Entwife to show the Entish humility that would allow them to get inside each other's perspectives and thus come together to form that perfect whole superimposes upon this encomium a caution against losing perspective and giving in to pride and self-absorption, even when the source of pride and the object of absorption is itself a good and beautiful thing. The apocalypticism of the winter quatrains prompt us to look past that beauty entirely, to put it into cosmic perspective. The winter stanzas point to the inevitability of final loss, the harsh reality that all worldly things, howsoever good or beautiful they be, are fleeting and will sooner or later be destroyed. The song prompts the Ents, and the readers, to look beyond the world altogether.

Within the song, the reality of ultimate loss has a transformative effect on the Ent and Entwife speakers. The two interlocutors, formerly fixated only on the merits of their own lands and paying little attention to each other, now turn towards each other as they lament their losses. We can see them also, for the first time, emerging from their entrenched patterns of thought and activity. The Ent, formerly so passive and sleepy, now takes action for the first time. Instead of remaining in his place and calling to the Entwife as he had done, he now looks, calls, and comes to her. The Entwife, in turn, ceases her activity, waiting in new-found patience and unaccustomed stillness for the Ent to come to her. The harshness of the winter has driven them out of themselves and back together; the lesson in humility that they did not and would not learn while they

were enjoying the world is finally brought home to them to when the world is taken away from them.

The song is not nihilistic, however; the winter is a genuine apocalypse, serving not only to destroy the temporal world but to reveal the true and everlasting world that lies behind it. The final passage of the song, the last couplet spoken in unison, points to this world and to the hope that it promises:

> Together we will take the road that leads into the West,
> And far away will find a land where both our hearts may rest.
>
> (*TT*, III, iv, 81)

Already, in the winter stanzas, we can see the Ent and Entwife abandoning their self-absorption and stepping into each other's roles. In the final stanza, the blending, signaled by their speaking in unison, is complete. Once again, a glance at the first draft of the song is instructive. Tolkien only makes one change from the original draft of the last couplet: He replaces a plural "roads" with a singular road that the Ent and Entwife take together (*Treason* 421). Through this simple change, Tolkien accentuates the final unity of the Ent and Entwife, but he also stresses the linked destiny, their embarkation on the one road that leads to their final, mutual home in the West, beyond the world.

Although it is only the grim and violent winter that finally pushes the Ent and Entwife to change and to seek for their true and permanent homeland, they could have come to this realization earlier. Even in the midst of the peace and beauty of the spring and summer quatrains, they were being gently prompted to look beyond the lands and the world that they love, to remember where their ultimate hope lay. This prompting comes from the West Wind, mentioned in both the Ent's and the Entwife's summer quatrains. The West Wind is a reminder of things greater and higher than the beauties of Middle-earth. It is associated with Aman, the deathless land in the West "where the Gods dwell in bliss" (*S* 144), and in the West both Ent and Entwife will find rest together.[8]

There are two passages that illustrate the ideas Tolkien associates with the West Wind. The first is from the account in *The Silmarillion* of the downfall of Númenor. As the Númenóreans are nearing the final stages of their rebellion and preparing for war against the Valar, Tolkien pauses for a description of Númenor "aforetime," in its bliss. He explains the perfect weather conditions of the island, and then adds: "And when the wind was in the west, it seemed to many that it was filled with a fragrance, fleeting but sweet, heart-stirring, as of flowers that blossom for ever in undying meads and have no names on mortal shores" (*S* 276-77). The West Wind brings to the land of Men a breath from the immortal realm over the sea, a reminder of the blissful realm that exists beyond the

bounds of this mortal world. The second illustrative passage occurs not long after Treebeard's meeting with Merry and Pippin. After Gandalf restores Théoden to strength and purpose, the King of the Mark compares himself in his bewitchment to a snow-laden tree and proclaims that "a west wind has shaken the boughs" (*TT*, III, vii, 132-33). Here, the West Wind is connected with health, stimulation of the spirit, and refreshment of his perspective on the world. In both cases, the West Wind calls those who encounter it to look beyond their surroundings and the world that they know, obtruding on the mortal world an awareness of a higher beauty and poignant hope.

In the song, neither the Ent nor the Entwife is shaken by the West Wind. The Ent acknowledges the West Wind, but only within the languorous confines of his sleepy summer retreat ("When woodland halls are green and cool, and wind is in the West"). His boughs do not even stir perceptibly. The Entwife actively disregards the West Wind, stating that she will linger "*though* the wind be in the West" (my emphasis). She is far too busy to pay any heed. Lost in their enjoyment of their worlds, neither Ent nor Entwife can see beyond the mortal world to where their true hope and final destiny lie. But if their boughs are not shaken by the West Wind, they will certainly be shaken by the East Wind, on whose breath comes the destruction of the final winter.

The Ent and the Entwife have allowed their love for their lands, itself a good thing, to skew their priorities. They have become so entrenched in their own ways of thinking that they have forgotten their dependence on each other and their shared destiny. They have devoted themselves so completely to that which they love in Middle-earth that they will not turn toward the higher and greater world for which they are destined. Therefore, it is only through grief and loss that they can find the road that leads them, together, to final peace and rest.

The story of the Ents and the Entwives is a tragic one, as are many of the stories in Tolkien's works. His writings remind us again and again of the inevitability of suffering and of loss, and they echo throughout with grief and regret that are, in Galadriel's words, "undying, and cannot ever wholly be assuaged" (*FR*, II, vii, 380). His treatment of the Ents depicts that grief poignantly, and yet it also points beyond it to the transcendent joy that awaits. But the only road to that joy and peace leads through the bitter rain.

NOTES

1   It is even more unclear what exact relationship Harvey might be postulating that the Ents had with the elements, or whether he is using the word "elemental" figuratively.

2 Jane Chance falls into this error in "Tolkien and the Other," taking the fact that Treebeard has to play the part of both Ent and Entwife in the song as an example of the self-absorption of the Entish perspective (180). The actual situation in Treebeard's performance of the song, however, is almost exactly the opposite: Treebeard himself is playing neither part, but simply reciting a song in which an Elvish composer has envisioned both parts.

3 In the face of this possible moral slide, their crowning virtue, steadiness, becomes a handicap; instead of granting constancy, it merely enables a profound stubbornness.

4 Dickerson and Evans, in citing this passage, draw attention only to the "deep and profound understanding" that Pippin observes in Treebeard, without discussing Pippin's references to the sleepiness and inertness that frame the passage (127).

5 It is possible that the Men of the Second Age might disagree; Treebeard does mention that "Many men learned the crafts of the Entwives and honored them greatly" (*TT*, III, iv, 79). It seems unlikely, however, that Saruman would rate agricultural knowledge very highly, and the Entwives were certainly not dedicated to the accrual of Knowledge as a pursuit.

6 Dickerson and Evans make a similar observation, noting that agriculture, the "use of the natural landscape for destructive, selfish reasons," lies "on an ethical continuum whose furthest extreme is simple environmental waste and destruction" (124).

7 Christopher Tolkien explains that the blank space in this line "is left thus in the original" (*Treason* 421).

8 In Letter 338, Tolkien speculates at greatest length about the fate of the Ents. He cites the song as evidence that the Ents will not find the Entwives "in history" (*Letters* 419), by which he presumably means the history of Middle-earth envisioned and recorded by him (in the same letter, he is speculating about the course of history through about the year 100 of the Fourth Age, explaining that that is as far forward as he had ever gone). He suggests that "Ents and their wives being rational creatures would find some 'earthly paradise' until the end of the world," and then speculates that perhaps Ents would share the fate of Men, beyond the world. His reference to an earthly paradise before the end of the world would seem to be a contradiction of the winter quatrains' references to final darkness devouring night and day, ending life and time. Indeed, the earthly paradise idea also

stands in conflict with the immediately following suggestion that Ents share the fate of Men, which would mean that they would leave the world at death rather than retiring to an earthly paradise. In this letter, Tolkien is simply speculating; he begins the letter by flatly admitting concerning the Ents' ultimate fate: "I do not know." It is clear that he never worked out this issue fully.

Works Cited

Burns, Marjorie. *Perilous Realms: Celtic and Norse in Tolkien's Middle-earth*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.

Chance, Jane. *The Lord of the Rings: The Mythology of Power*. 2nd ed. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2001.

———. "Tolkien and the Other: Race and Gender in Middle-earth." In *Tolkien's Modern Middle Ages*. Ed. Jane Chance and Alfred K. Siewers. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005: 171-186.

Dickerson, Matthew and Jonathan Evans. *Ents, Elves, and Eriador: The Environmental Vision of J.R.R. Tolkien*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2006.

Harvey, David. *The Song of Middle-earth*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1985.

Kocher, Paul. "Middle-earth: An Imaginary World?" In *Understanding* The Lord of the Rings. Ed. Rose A. Zimbardo and Neil D. Isaacs. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2004: 146-162.

Lewis, C. S. "The Dethronement of Power." In *Understanding* The Lord of the Rings. Ed. Rose A. Zimbardo and Neil D. Isaacs. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2004: 11-15.

———. *An Experiment in Criticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Noel, Ruth S. *The Mythology of Middle-earth*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1977.

Petty, Anne. *Tolkien in the Land of Heroes: Discovering the Human Spirit*. Cold Spring Harbor, NY: Cold Spring Press, 2003.

Showing Saruman as Faber:
Tolkien and Peter Jackson

James G. Davis

The disagreement between supporters and detractors of Peter Jackson's movie adaptations of *The Lord of the Rings* is now seven years old and will probably, regrettably, continue for more years to come. However, as Maureen Thum shows in "The 'Sub-Subcreation' of Galadriel, Arwen, and Eowyn: Women of Power in Tolkien's and Jackson's *The Lord of the Rings*," the films can be used to help us better understand the novel. Says Thum, "in presenting Galadriel, Arwen, and Eowyn as stronger and more fully developed figures than we might at first expect from Tolkien's text, Jackson accurately represents the positive view of unconventional and powerful women throughout Tolkien's writings" (232). Thum's presentation of Arwen as the second coming of her ancestor Lúthien, who was indeed a "Warrior Princess" (a common, derisive complaint about Jackson's Arwen), leads convincingly to her conclusion: "Women for Tolkien are positive figures whose influence extends far beyond their often brief appearances in the pages of his writings, and Jackson's film reflects that fact" (254). Thum argues well that Jackson's treatment of Arwen leads to a greater understanding of her place in Tolkien's universe than Tolkien provides in *The Lord of the Rings* alone. Let this approach be our model.

The Argument

Relying as they do on visual images, films can add a great deal to the discussion and understanding of books. With all their limitations in plot pacing and internal character development, motion pictures can do one thing very well that novels cannot do at all, and that is to put visual images before the audience's eyes. Jackson does a startlingly good job of bringing Middle-earth visually to life.

Some of Jackson's visualizations of elements in the books seem to stand out more prominently than others, such as the lurid, red-lit, chaotic scenes of Saruman's factory complex beneath Isengard. These scenes, which are so vivid and memorable in the first two films, with their garish colors, shifting camera perspective, noise, and general chaos, play a prominent or even overpowering role in the films, but in fact are images that were never actually seen in the books. Defenders of the films, especially the director, writers, and actors in their commentaries on the enhanced DVDs, argue that the scenes are a metaphorically accurate depiction of a major theme of *The Lord of the Rings*: Tolkien's dislike of

modern industry and its destruction of everything that was pastoral and good in the world, especially trees. In this light, a comparison of Tolkien's and Jackson's presentations of Saruman could also contribute to our understanding of Tolkien's view of nature and its treatment by the inhabitants of Middle-earth. What is needed here is an examination of what Tolkien actually says in his text, what Jackson actually shows in his movies, and the differences between the two types of presentation.

Tolkien's Pastoral Vision

In Tolkien's text, industrialization is shown almost exclusively by negative metaphor: we are presented not so much with a view of the industrial, as we are with the absence of the pastoral that had been so pervasive at the beginning. Tom Shippey—in his *Oxford Book of Science Fiction Stories*, not in his Tolkien books—introduces to print the term "fabril" as the opposite of "pastoral." Pastoral literature, he says, "is rural, nostalgic, conservative. It idealizes the past and tends to convert complexities into simplicity . . ." (ix). This description of the pastoral is a near match for the Shire, which is commonly seen as Tolkien's depiction of his pastoral ideal. But let us consider just how diligently he strives to present this base reality to us at the start of *The Lord of the Rings*. Fully the first thirty percent of *The Fellowship of the Ring* is spent in the Shire, showing us the gentle beauty of life in Hobbiton, lovingly describing many of the favorite food crops of the Shirefolk, taking the three hobbits on a leisurely and extensive tour of the beauties of their homeland. We might also include in this pastoral ideal the next ten percent of the book, which takes us into the Old Forest, which is, at least for Tom Bombadil and Goldberry, just as pastoral as the Shire, in that life here involves interaction only with nature, with no elements of the "fabril" or industrial world in evidence. Tom's relationship with nature is in fact much older and more elemental than that of the hobbits, whose society is modern by comparison.[1] Tom delivers the hobbits past the Barrow Downs, at which point, after forty percent of *The Fellowship of the Ring*, the story finally passes out of its pastoral introduction. With this pastoral worldview as their foundation, the four hobbits, at least one of whom appears in almost every remaining scene in *The Lord of the Rings*, spread Tolkien's sense and morality of the pastoral throughout Middle-earth as a contrast to the different cultures they confront.

Continuing with Shippey's science fiction definition, pastoral's opposite, fabril literature, "is overwhelmingly urban, disruptive, future-oriented, eager for novelty; its central image is the 'faber,' the smith in older usage, but now extended . . . to mean the creator of artifacts in general—metallic, crystalline, genetic, or even social" (*OBSFS* ix). Shippey uses this as his definition of science fiction literature, with its emphasis on, and

primary concern with, technology and science and how they cause such rapid changes in the modern world. On the surface this appears to be a perfect description of Saruman, for he is certainly disruptive, eager for novelty in his attempts to create new weapons of war, and future-oriented in his quest to destroy everything to do with the past and create his own version of the future. Saruman also is the faber of things metallic, genetic (the Uruks), and social (his desire to change the political face of Middle-earth). Saruman is never shown directly conjuring any harmful magic; his methods of choice are those of a "faber" of the industrial age.[2]

However, in contrast to Tolkien's extensive presentation of the pastoral, little of Saruman's fabril world is ever seen directly by any of the main characters in the books. In fact, there are so few descriptions of anything remotely fabril in *The Fellowship of the Ring* that they all can be listed in one short paragraph. In section I of the Prologue, titled "Concerning Hobbits," we are told that Hobbits "did not understand or like machines more complicated than a forge bellows, a water-mill, or a hand loom" (*FR*, Prologue, 10). Two hundred sixty pages later, when Gandalf is telling how he was stranded atop Orthanc, the tower of Isengard, he says that he looked down and saw how the valley below "was now filled with pits and forges" (*FR*, II, ii, 273), and on the next page that "over all of [Saruman's] works a dark smoke hung" (*FR*, II, ii, 274). In Rivendell, Galdor says, in reaction to Gandalf's story, "We see that Sauron can torture and destroy the very hills" (*FR*, II, ii, 279). Finally, when Sam looks into the Mirror of Galadriel, he sees a red brick building with a red chimney, with black smoke around (*FR*, II, vii, 378). So in contrast to 160 pages spent establishing the pastoral base, we get barely three dozen words suggesting that another worldview may also exist in Middle-earth.

Of course, a similar examination of mentions of industrialization in *The Two Towers* will reveal a larger and more detailed accounting because much of the plot of the second volume focuses on Isengard. Early in *The Two Towers*, Treebeard tells Merry and Pippin that Saruman "has a mind of metal and wheels, and he does not care for growing things" (III, iv, 76). There are descriptions of the ruined, stump-filled fields around Isengard, and Treebeard repeatedly laments the death of so many trees in Fangorn forest: "[Saruman] and his foul folk are making havoc now. Down on the borders they are felling trees—good trees. Some of the trees they just cut down and leave to rot—orc-mischief that, but most are hewn up and carried off to feed the fires of Orthanc" (*TT*, III, iv, 76-77). The most directly visual description of Saruman's industrial complex comes when the Ents are attacking Isengard: "The shafts ran down by many slopes and spiral stairs to caverns far under; there Saruman had treasuries, store-houses, armouries, smithies and great furnaces. Iron wheels revolved there endlessly, and hammers thudded. At night plumes of va-

por steamed from the vents, lit from beneath with red light, or blue, or venomous green" (*TT,* III, viii, 160).

Still, no character on the side of the Fellowship ever sees the industrial complex; it is described by the omniscient narrator for the benefit of the readers. The only aspects of the complex ever directly observed by any of the main characters are the surface vents, seen functioning as a defensive measure against the Ents. As the Ents attack, calling Saruman "the tree killer," Saruman opens the vents: "Suddenly up came fires and foul fumes: the vents and shafts all over the plain began to spout and belch" (*TT,* III, ix, 173). But notice these are vents and shafts that can be opened and closed at the surface, in contrast to Jackson's glaring, open chasms, discussed below.

Saruman functions as faber also in his development of the Uruks. However, the Uruks are probably not the result of genetic engineering, as the screenwriters say in the DVD commentary—the concept of genetic engineering did not exist until decades after *The Lord of the Rings* was published. Instead, Tolkien in several places, especially with the slant-eyed southern travelers who come up the south road to Bree—"He looks more than half like a goblin," thinks Frodo—hints at a natural possibility of interbreeding between humans and orcs (*FR,* I, xi, 193). The Uruks more likely result from a much more pastoral practice, purposeful cross-breeding of animals, used in this case for less-than-pastoral purposes by Saruman, but still a version of a practice used, almost certainly, even by the Shirefolk. The development of the Uruks should not be too difficult to achieve in a culture that must be practiced in the selective breeding of farm animals. The industrial evil of Isengard seems in this instance to consist of its evil intent and results, rather than the means Saruman employs to raise his army.

The final and most obvious evocation of the evils of industrialization by Tolkien is to be found in the chapter titled "The Scouring of the Shire." Despite his statement in the foreword to the second edition that no "allegorical significance or contemporary political reference whatsoever" is to be read into the chapter (*FR,* Foreword, 7), Tolkien apparently wanted to end *The Lord of the Rings* with his strongest depiction yet of the evils of modernity. The factory that is using up all the Shire's resources and polluting the stream is the clearest visual image in all of *The Lord of the Rings* of a modern industrial edifice. But we cannot simply ignore Tolkien's own warnings against reading too much into the chapter. Luckily this "factory" is even more cryptic than the previous factory at Isengard. All we know about it is that it makes something that requires gravel and wood and produces much smoke and water pollution. It is almost a phony mock-up of a factory, full of smoke and chaos, producing nothing. Perhaps Tolkien should be taken at his word: "applicability" should not

be turned into "allegory," and the realm of Sharkey should not be seen as an accurate depiction of the contemporary world, but rather as another generally symbolic evocation of the evils of modernity.

Jackson's Fabril Visualizations

In Jackson's film version, the sense of the pastoral is introduced relatively briefly. After Bilbo's birthday party and Gandalf's later visit to Frodo to learn the true nature of the Ring, we are shown only three brief cut-scenes of the *four* hobbits enjoying the beauties of the Shire before the Black Riders are introduced and the movie becomes a perilous adventure story. Totally absent is any mention of the Old Forest, or Tom Bombadil and Goldberry and their life there. The screenwriters are well aware of what they are omitting: in the director's and writers' commentaries on the enhanced DVD, almost all that Jackson and his co-writers talk about in this section of the film is what they left out and why the omissions were absolutely necessary. Fran Walsh says of this section of the story that it "tends to completely undermine any dramatic urgency in the storytelling, so we couldn't honor that part of the book at all." Peter Jackson says, much less reverently, "We wanted to give the film a bit of heat, so that's why we deliberately cranked it up through here, to try to light a fire under the story." In other words, the novel's pastoral beginning is intentionally downplayed because it is not considered exciting enough to keep the interest of the audience.

Contrasted to Tolkien's reluctance to show the evils of industrialization, Jackson seems at times almost too eager. His vision of the underground factory is wide open for the world to see, brightly lit with lurid red fires and full of noise and chaos. To Jackson's credit the caves as depicted in the movies are almost exactly as described in the novel (see above), except that they are chasms open to the surface and thus more visually available. These huge, gaping, open caverns that disfigure the countryside are in stark contrast to the modest image Tolkien presents of vents and shafts that can be closed off completely. The shot of a whole huge tree falling hundreds of feet into the pit to be burned is especially dramatic and evocative of Saruman's mistreatment of the trees, much more evocative than Tolkien's tree stumps. Due mainly to the power of visual images, the movie's two unforgettable scenes showing the interior of Saruman's underground industrial complex give an exaggerated importance to the fabril in contrast to the few almost off-hand mentions of it in the book. Jackson's vision of Saruman's factories makes so strong an impression that Jackson can afford to omit the episode of "The Scouring of the Shire." Even though in the novel this chapter is Tolkien's strongest presentation of the destructive nature of the fabril world, in the movies, after the graphic factory scenes the episode would seem anti-climactic,

although streamlining the plot was probably a more important motive in its omission.

In addition, Jackson has the Uruks being produced in the factory. Instead of being born of flesh-and-blood mothers, as one supposes they are in Tolkien's novel, in the films the Uruks are shown emerging fully grown from artificial wombs in the mud floors of the factory—a very dramatic cinematic effect, but an idea never even hinted at by Tolkien. This visually stunning invention illustrates Jackson's technique of taking ideas that Tolkien barely mentions—or leaves for us to assume are happening off-stage, such as the cutting of Fangorn's trees—and transforming them into bright, noisy, noisome images to be shoved into the faces of the viewers. Indeed, the powerful, frightening visages of the Uruks become the major image of the fear, intimidation, and loathing engendered in the free peoples of Middle-earth by Saruman's onslaught throughout the first two movies, until they are finally wiped out at Helm's Deep and by the Ents' attack at Isengard.

In terms of the theme of man's relationship with nature, Jackson's major difference from the novel is the omission of the Old Forest. By eliminating the only storyline that shows any of the free races at odds with nature—the hobbits' conflict with the Old Forest—Jackson creates the impression that only Saruman and Sauron mistreat nature. This brief omission leads to a simplistic interpretation of Tolkien's ecological theme, but has the desired effect of heightening the perception of Saruman's evil by portraying him as the only enemy of nature in the first two movies.

Who Speaks for the Trees?

But what is it that Saruman does in the building and maintaining of his factories, and in his treatment of Fangorn forest, that is necessarily evil? Other than the Uruks (in the movies only) and "the fire of Orthanc," the only products we ever see from his factory are simple metal weapons and armor. So forging and smithing, then, are apparently crimes against the pastoral world. This cannot be so, however, since even the hobbits forge iron, albeit on a simple bellows forge. And, of course, all of the free peoples of Middle-earth are metalsmiths. As Patrick Curry points out, technology as such is not evil (*Defending* 64). So perhaps Saruman's special evil exists not so much in what he produces, but in his destruction of trees in order to produce it.

The most common symbols of Saruman's evil are tree stumps. But everyone uses wood. The dwarves apparently only regularly burn coal, but the other races burn wood for many purposes. The hobbits love a good fire, even on a summer evening. Eomer and his men chopped many Fangorn trees to cremate the hundred or more orcs they killed in the fight

during which Merry and Pippin escaped to Fangorn Forest. Notice also that the men collecting the dead after the battle at Helm's Deep wanted to chop wood to burn the thousands of dead orcs that lay before the wall, but desisted partly because they were afraid to chop trees that had walked there under their own power. Only the elves are never seen cutting living trees. So is cutting living trees a crime only if Saruman does it?

Matthew Dickerson and Jonathan Evans address this issue in *Ents, Elves, and Eriador: The Environmental Vision of J.R.R. Tolkien.* According to the authors, "In our view, the best foundation for an environmental consciousness is a Christian one identical with, or at least comparable to, Tolkien's" (26). Their overall theme is that Tolkien preaches a purely Christian brand of stewardship of nature in all his Middle-earth writings. Patrick Curry has been greatly critical of the book: ". . . serious problems follow from the authors' three subsidiary and closely-linked positions: (1) that a Christian environmental ethic is the best one; (2) that Tolkien's attitude to nature as found in his books is fundamentally Christian; and (3) that no non-Christian work on the subject is worth discussing" (Rev. 239). Curry examines and substantially discredits all three premises, calling into doubt the book's value as an addition to the discipline of ecocriticism, mainly due to its idealistic—read "blind to the real world"—vision of all things Christian. For the purpose here of exploring the ethical problems of cutting trees, Curry's most relevant point is that Dickerson and Evans can at times present mixed messages that are ultimately left unresolved. For example, in discussing the cutting of Fangorn trees by the Rohirrim to burn the bodies of dead orcs, Dickerson and Evans tell how the Rohirrim gave a pragmatic, not a moral explanation, for which Aragorn rebuked them. "In Aragorn's wisdom, however (and in Tolkien's), such a justification is unacceptable—cutting living trees from Fangorn is morally wrong, whether it is done wantonly by orcs or for some ostensibly practical reason by Men" (34). However, the authors then simply forget "Aragorn's wisdom" (and Tolkien's) in their drive to present Christian stewardship—the responsible *use* of Nature, especially trees, for man's betterment—as the sole environmental approach in Tolkien's writings.

This matter of the ethical problem of cutting trees is discussed in detail by Verlyn Flieger in "Taking the Part of Trees: Eco-Conflict in Middle-earth" which is then disputed by Patrick Curry in the new "Afterword" to the second edition of *Defending Middle-earth.* In examining whether Tolkien does indeed "take the part of trees as against all their enemies" (*Letters,* qtd. in Flieger 147), Flieger discusses the "noticeable disjunction between Tolkien's treatment of trees" in the Old Forest and Fangorn episodes (148). Her argument is that Tolkien presented the Old Forest and Old Man Willow as evil, while Fangorn and the Ents are presumed good; however, she says, qualitatively there should be no differ-

ence—Tolkien presented the forests in both cases as defending themselves against wholesale destruction. Thus her claim that Tolkien is internally inconsistent. Curry disagrees:

> It has been suggested (by Verlyn Flieger) that Tolkien was confused, or at least inconsistent, on this subject; that from nature's point of view, there is no difference between, say, the hobbits of Bucklebury cutting back the Old Forest and Saruman turning Fangorn into fuel for his war-furnaces. Flieger also thinks Tolkien shrank from recognizing that civilization is necessarily locked into a war with nature. But this is a misunderstanding in a number of ways. Most obviously, as that example shows, it oddly fails to distinguish limited self-defence (the human right to which, when it is necessary, I do not deny) from gross exploitation finally resulting in complete destruction. (155)

However, even while stating that "civilization is necessarily locked into a war with nature"—which seems an oddly aggressive form of woodsmanship—Curry continually underplays the level of that war. Curry's statement that the Bucklebury hobbits were practicing "limited self-defence" is an extreme simplification of the situation in Buckland. The hobbits and the Old Forest are indeed at war. Do not forget, as Flieger points out, that all the fields of the Shire and Buckland had been brought into existence by clearcutting the original forest, a process beside which Saruman's treatment of Fangorn would pale into insignificance, leaving the Old Forest "a survivor of vast forgotten woods" (*FR*, I, vii, 141). The Old Forest fought back most recently by attacking the hedge that kept it fenced in, but was beaten back when the "hobbits came and cut down *hundreds* of trees, and *burned all the ground* in a long strip east of the Hedge . . ." (*FR*, I, vi, 121, my emphasis). Now both the Old Forest and Old Man Willow try to kill any and all hobbits that happen through, and both would have succeeded if not for Tom Bombadil. Dickerson and Evans agree: ". . . although the two places are certainly different in nature in terms of their hostile regard for destructive intrusion, ultimately there is no discrepancy between the Old Forest and Fangorn. The hostilities are ancient, and there is a long-standing desire to defend the forests and to punish those who do wrong" (140).[3] Michael Brisbois also equates the Old Forest and Fangorn when he says that the Huorns "are like Old Man Willow in the fact that they are full of anger—the axes of Orcs have killed many of their kind . . . " (213). However, Dickerson and Evans, like Curry, in their desire to portray the hobbits as examples of good stewards of the land, continually downplay the active role hobbits have played in the recent history of the conflict with the Old Forest: "By the time Frodo

and his companions enter it at the end of the Third Age, this forest has become suspicious of all outsiders . . . and is hostile even to wandering Hobbits, who pose no genuine threat" (133). They ignore the battle at Buckland, because of which the Old Forest has every reason to see hobbits as a direct, current threat. Treebeard says, "It is the orc-work, the wanton hewing . . . without even the bad excuse of feeding the fires, that has so angered us. . . . There is no curse in Elvish, Entish, or the tongues of Men bad enough for such treachery. Down with Saruman!" (*TT,* III, iv, 89). Think of the hobbits who did exactly such "orc-work" at Buckland. The "things that go free upon the earth" (excepting the Ents and Huorns, and probably the Elves) cannot exist without destroying forest land, and the forests know it. This is a war much older, but just as bitter and intense as that between Fangorn and Isengard. The only difference is that Old Man Willow and the other trees of the Old Forest have less mobility than the Ents and Huorns and so had to give up the attack.

The relationship that remains between man and forest may seem similar to what Curry calls "woodsmanship," which he describes as "a sensitive and sustainable use of nature, not for profit but for life, which entails not the conquest of an objectified nature but an ongoing relationship with various subjectivities, many of them nonhuman. There will be conflicts, of course . . ." (*Defending* 156). As an example of that "ongoing relationship," remember that Treebeard hated the loss of all his friends, but was especially incensed when a tree was cut down and just left to rot, implying that human *use* of trees is better than just wasting them. As with the Christian stewardship of Dickerson and Evans, some cutting of trees for human use is acceptable—or at the least, Treebeard has been forced to accept it. However, there is so much friction between man and wilderness, such vast destruction of forest land, that I cannot see in the novel the pure woodsmanship that Curry sees. It may be his desire for twenty-first century man, but it does not exist in *The Lord of the Rings,* except possibly in Rivendell and Lothlorien. Even his concept of "limited self-defence" admits the existence of constant conflict between the trees and the hobbits who, after the elves, are the most ecologically unobtrusive of all Middle-earth's species. But even the hobbits are not blameless.

Michael Brisbois, in his essay "Tolkien's Imaginary Nature: An Analysis of the Structure of Middle-earth," addresses the Christian debate of dominion over nature versus stewardship:

> Another important medieval debate concerning nature was whether people held dominion over nature or were to be stewards of the land instead. Tolkien advocates stewardship over dominion in *The Lord of the Rings.* The treeherd Ents, the Elves, and the Hobbits all live in a relationship of stew-

ardship with nature; however, this relationship is not one of blissful harmony. (203)

Why not? Brisbois avoids this question and gives only illustrations, not explanations: "Elves and Ents seem to co-exist with nature and are not viewed as the ideal in Tolkien's work. Humans often cannot understand these entities and express fear of them" (203). These examples seem to indicate that perfect stewardship is not possible. The one final example apparently implies that some degree of domination is necessary for the maintenance of good stewardship: "The Hobbits likewise must engage in conflict with the wild forces of the Old Forest" (203). On the topic of domination, Brisbois says, "Saruman and Sauron are not caretakers; they are destroyers. They wish to smash nature and the world into submission" (203). But this statement directly links the hobbits with the "destroyers." The Old Forest has already been smashed into submission by Sauron and the Númenórians, but the hobbits are making sure the Old Forest remains submissive. This was exactly the purpose of the battle over the hedge at Buckland. The burning of hundreds of trees in order to put the Old Forest back into its place is domination, plain and simple. Brisbois does examine Old Man Willow's motivation in some detail in a separate context—"He is filled with anger at the environmental destruction he has witnessed" (212)—but this adds little to the discussion of the hobbits as stewards, because Brisbois, like Curry, like Dickerson and Evans, never blames the hobbits for taking part in any of that destruction, which they most certainly have done, and recently. Domination cannot coexist with "Christian stewardship," nor with Curry's "woodsmanship," which, remember, Curry describes as "not . . . conquest." Something is missing here. Curry, Dickerson and Evans, and Brisbois all are too eager to dismiss obvious problems between the hobbits and the Old Forest in order to portray the Shire as Tolkien's example of a perfect relationship with the environment. However, the contentious reality of that relationship, past and present, cannot simply be mentioned in passing and then forgotten or dismissed.

In the end, Flieger seems most correct when she says "civilization and nature are at undeclared war with one another. To make a place for itself, humankind will tame a wilderness whose destruction and eventual eradication, however gradual, is at once an inevitable consequence and an irreparable loss" (155-56).[4] The most reliable authority here is Treebeard, who knows that the Ents and Fangorn are doomed. The Entwives are long gone, and with them any hope for the survival of Fangorn as it is. It is "likely enough that we are going to *our* doom: the last march of the Ents. But if we stayed at home and did nothing, doom would find us anyway, sooner or later" (*TT,* III, iv, 90).

So Saruman is evil not simply because he cuts trees, nor even because

he cuts *too many* trees. All over Middle-earth, humans and hobbits alike continually use wood in their everyday lives, and profit from the past clear-cutting of vast tracts of forest into farm land. Even the hobbits currently participate in this domination of the forests. As Treebeard says, "I am not altogether on anybody's *side*, because nobody is altogether on my *side*" (*TT,* III, iv, 75). In Tolkien's novel, it is Saruman's evil intent, his desire to dominate the free races, that separates him from all the other destroyers-of-nature. Peter Jackson in his movies creates the impression that Saruman is evil *because* he destroys large numbers of Fangorn trees. Jackson accomplishes this thematic redirection by deleting all scenes that show anyone but orcs destroying trees, mainly by omitting all mention of hobbits interacting with the Old Forest. Where Tolkien constructs a complex interaction of moral judgments about man's relationship with nature, Jackson simplifies this morality to a basic level of obvious good versus obvious evil, with trees as the defining victims.

The Films

Any discussion of the differences between prose fiction and film as narrative arts must include Tolkien's own words from "On Fairy-stories." Tolkien stresses that Fantasy must exist inviolate in the mind of the reader: any intrusion of the "primary" world into the fantasy world destroys the "secondary reality" of the fantasy. Thus Tolkien's objection to fantasy presented on a stage, as a play, is that the actors and stage props present visual images that cannot then be imagined otherwise than they have been presented. The "primary reality" of the stage presentation, the physical presence of the actors and props themselves, thus intrudes and prevents the formation of the "secondary," or Fantasy, reality (*MC* 138-45). In other words, the imagination of the viewer has been taken out of the equation, and in Tolkien's formula for the creation of Fantasy, imagination is all.

But Tolkien's objection does not automatically invalidate any attempts to create Fantasy by way of the *film* medium. First of all, we must remember that the words on the page themselves are an intrusion into the reader's creation of Faerie. Without Tolkien's explanation of lembas, for instance, readers would see only the members of the Fellowship eating bread. The suggestive (and intrusive) explanations are necessary for shaping the reader's creation of the fantastic elements of that bread, but at the same time they *limit* the characteristics the reader is allowed to apply to this fantastic element (*FR,* II, viii, 385-86). Whether this necessary intrusion into the reader's imagination becomes destructive of Faerie thus becomes a matter of degree. Secondly, the differences between film and stage, in terms of the perceived reality of what one is seeing, are considerable. *Noises Off,* a successful play staged in London and New York

in the early 1980s, was famous for its frenetic, intricately timed dialogue and "stage business." Live on-stage, the timing and coordination of the controlled chaos were little short of amazing. But as a film, shot and re-shot, edited to the hundredth of a second, it fell flat. The viewers were aware at all times that what they were seeing on-screen was an artificial construction on the part of the director and film editor, not "real" people "really" carrying off the precise timing at all. Film comes with an inherent sense of fantasy, or at least artificiality, to the point that the difficulty filmmakers have is not convincing the audience that what they are seeing on-screen is fantasy, but rather presenting a convincing sense of "Reality." As a result of this inherent unreality of the film medium, images presented on film do not intrude as forcefully into the creation of Faerie as does the indisputable, physical reality of actors and props on stage, not much more forcefully, perhaps, than do words on a page. Both prose and film leave abundant opportunity for Fantasy—or the "creation of belief," Tolkien's preferred alternative to "the suspension of disbelief."

In the "Afterword" added to the revised second edition of *Defending Middle-earth,* Patrick Curry misses this difference between film and stage when he agrees with Tolkien that "Very little about trees as trees can be got into a play" and then carries this into his discussion of the films: "Despite the dramatic New Zealand setting. . . . [t]here was very little sense of something essential that permeates the entire book: Middle-earth itself, and almost all its places, as living, intelligent personalities" (157). On the contrary, this is exactly what Jackson was able to achieve so very well: using film images visually to bring Middle-earth to life. View again the stunning scenes at Caradhras or Moria or Fangorn to see just how alive Middle-earth itself is in the films.

Finally, Tolkien himself does not discount the possibility of the successful creation of Faerie *on stage:* "To make such a thing may not be impossible. I have never seen it done with success" (*MC* 141). If Tolkien grants this possibility to the level of stagecraft available in 1939, one can imagine his reaction to 21st-century filmcraft.

Since the release of the first of Jackson's films, they have been a popular subject for critical examination by scholars of both literature and film. Some of these studies have touched on topics relevant to studying Tolkien's novel. For example, Matthew Dickerson mentions only briefly, and generally praises, the most obvious differences between films and book, the deletions and additions of scenes and characters, but complains at length about the changes to some characters, specifically Elrond and Galadriel.[5] His major complaint, however, and one more germane to a study of the effects of the films' visual presentation, concerns the more graphic detail inherent in transferring the battle scenes from prose description to film image. He implies that the more graphic depiction of

the battles has the effect of glorifying violence, and that the overly graphic visualizations of battle, solely because of the visual presentation, are offensive not only to his own sensibilities, but also to Tolkien's work (62-66). In the context of our discussion, Dickerson does draw attention to the power of the films' visualizations to intensify the audience response, supporting the argument that Jackson's presentation of Saruman's factories is far more powerful than Tolkien's, even though Jackson for the most part follows Tolkien's prose description.

Alfred Siewers, in an essay about Tolkien's eco-politics, says that "recent film portrayals of Saruman's Isengard as a forest-consuming industrial hell-hole"—exactly my topic here—have greatly increased public appreciation for Tolkien's "green," ecocentric theme (141). The addition, then, of a more dramatic depiction of Saruman's factory complex has enhanced Tolkien's environmental theme and simultaneously aided modern "green" politics. But then he continues, "Indeed, an ecocentric theme is even more pronounced in the book's accounts of Tom Bombadil and Goldberry, the Old Forest, Radagast the Brown, and a large miscellany of scenes and details down to the point of view of a fox in the Shire observing Hobbits traveling—features left out of the movies." Whether this is intended as praise or condemnation of the movies is left unclear, but he does recognize the importance of the ecological theme as presented in the novels and enhanced in the films.

In his essay "Another Road to Middle-earth: Jackson's Movie Trilogy," Tom Shippey does indeed praise most of Jackson's deletions, additions, and changes to the plot as necessary to the quickened pace of the movie medium, but done in such a way as to preserve or even intensify the thematic "core of the original." Shippey says, discussing the ways in which Jackson speeds up the action at the Council of Elrond: "But whatever the cause or the effect, it must have been clear from very early on that the narrative medium of film could not cope with such a roundabout and leisurely unrolling. Jackson's effect was clear, direct, immediately arresting . . ." (239). This praise of "Jackson's straightening and lightening of the plot" ("Another Road" 240) could just as appropriately be applied to the present discussion of the opening scenes in the Shire. We can add to Shippey's list of Jackson's "deft transpositions" the shifting of emphasis from the pastoral Shire to the more obviously industrial vision of Saruman's factory complex. However, it should be noted that while Shippey praises Jackson for *not* subordinating silence to noise in order to speed up the action ("Another Road" 242), in this case Jackson has done exactly that. Indeed, the main reason for the creation of the factory scenes was to bring the noisy, flashy fabril elements into the foreground, while so many quiet pastoral scenes were eliminated. Similarly, Shippey supports Jackson's rendering of the Ents' attack on Isengard as

a noisy, rollicking special effects *tour de force,* instead of leaving the attack to be narrated in flashback by Merry and Pippin—"A moviemaker could clearly never allow anything as nonvisual as this. . . ." says Shippey ("Another Road" 245). So despite his praise of Jackson's quiet tact, Shippey is not above appreciation of Jackson's noisier transpositions, such as the factory scenes.[6]

Conclusion

Both Tolkien and Jackson deal with the same themes of pastoral versus fabril, and Saruman's evil and ecologically destructive fabril practices, but present them in markedly different manners. Tolkien spends large portions of his narrative evoking the pastoral world of the Shire in order to establish a base reality, the more thoroughly to highlight just what is being threatened by Saruman and Sauron: the selflessness and lack of hunger for power that are the hallmarks of the hobbits, and thus become the underlying values of the pastoral world. Tolkien shows the fabril, the modern industrial mindset that is threatening to eliminate the pastoral life, at first exclusively through understated image and metaphor. Later, in *The Two Towers*, the fabril nature of Saruman is shown more graphically in a brief description of his underground factory complex, but still the most common vision of Saruman's fabril evil is its elimination of the pastoral, in the form of tree stumps. Tolkien depends on his total immersion of the reader into the pastoral world to make the fabril stand out merely by brief and ephemeral contrast. Jackson, on the other hand, in his movies gives the pastoral a relatively brief introduction—Bilbo's birthday party—then powerfully and directly depicts the fabril nature of Saruman's evil through dramatic, startling visual images. Jackson's changes have the secondary effect of simplifying the relationship between civilization and nature into a straightforward good-versus-evil theme, with hobbits and humans the friends of nature, and Saruman and Sauron its only enemies. Tolkien created a much more complex relationship, with humans and hobbits, however much they love and appreciate nature, gradually but inevitably pushing the great forests, like the elves, out of their ancient position of dominance in Middle-earth. Each artist chooses to highlight the ideas that are his primary focus, and each uses methods that are most proper to his respective art form, but in the process they end up telling different stories.

NOTES

1   Indeed, it is this more modern society of the hobbits—more modern at least than the societies of the older, more elemental characters such as the elves and Tom Bombadil—that leads to the constant con-

flict between the hobbits and the Old Forest. This is discussed later in the section "Who Speaks for the Trees?"

2   In the first movie, Jackson does show Saruman using his staff to conjure battle spells in his fight with Gandalf at Orthanc. This "battle of the wizards" reveals Jackson's penchant for visually exciting action scenes, as opposed to Tolkien's leaving this scene to be recounted by Gandalf at the Council of Elrond. See also the discussion of Tom Shippey's essay in my section "The Films."

3   Although I agree with Dickerson and Evans that "ultimately there is no discrepancy" between the two forests, I must wonder how the two forests are "certainly different in nature in terms of their hostile regard for destructive intrusion." Is it the Old Forest's attempts to kill all intruding hobbits, or the Ents' destruction of Isengard, that the authors are implying is not "hostile" toward "destructive intrusion"? To my mind, both forests seem very hostile toward their enemies.

4   Also, Curry's statement, "Flieger also thinks Tolkien shrank from recognizing that civilization is necessarily locked into a war with nature," is not exactly correct. The quote from Flieger continues: "I believe that Tolkien agreed with each of these positions [including the idea that "civilization and nature are at undeclared war with one another"] at one time or another, but that he also felt too many of them at the same time for his own peace of mind or for the inner consistency of *LR*" (156).

5   See Daniel Timmons and David Bratman for a summary of complaints about Jackson's changing of the characters. Timmons, in "Frodo on Film: Peter Jackson's Problematic Portrayal," explores Jackson's portrayal of Frodo as lacking all of the qualities of ethics, morals, perseverance, courage, and common sense that, in Tolkien's conception, make him the ideal courier of the Ring. Bratman examines especially the moral and ethical changes to most of the other major characters in "Summa Jacksonica: A Reply to Defenses of Peter Jackson's *The Lord of the Rings* Films, after St. Thomas Aquinas." Both essays are collected in *Tolkien on Film: Essays on Peter Jackson's "The Lord of the Rings."* edited by Janet Brennan Croft.

6   I find Shippey's essay to be a clear and informative—and, at the time, much needed—defense of many of Jackson's methods in the films, but I must take issue with a statement by Rose Zimbardo and Neil Isaacs in the editors' introduction to the essay: "One basic difference between the two forms of artistic representation is that while the novel can provide entrance for the reader to another world, the movie

can go further, taking us into the interior of the minds of characters and making us see that world through a character's eyes and experience his feelings" (233). That statement is incorrect in every respect. Are they really suggesting that the film technique exists that can film Molly Bloom so intimately as she falls asleep, that it can reveal the 1600 lines of intricately thematic thoughts, feelings, and images that are running through her mind and body at the time? Film is necessarily a more superficial purveyor of what happens *inside* a character, than is prose.

Then Shippey comes close to collaborating in the editors' misstatement; all that saves him is the ambiguous usage of the word *can*:

> And there is one scene where pictures show that they can indeed do more than words as Gollum, clutching his "precious," falls into the fires of Mount Doom. Tolkien's last word on Gollum is "Out of the depths came his last wail *Precious*, and he was gone" (p.925). Jackson's camera follows him down and catches the expression on his face: shocked? grateful? contented? All are perfectly possible, and appropriate. ("Another Road" 243)

Yes, Jackson's treatment is an improvement in terms of clarity, but all this proves is that in this one particular instance, Jackson created a more definite interpretation with pictures than Tolkien did with words. Perhaps Tolkien wanted to leave it to the readers to put themselves in Gollum's place. In any case, Tolkien *could have* given a much more detailed accounting of what was going through Gollum's mind as he fell, but chose to leave it somewhat ambiguous, while the filmmaker has effectively exhausted the visual possibilities.

> A prose depiction of a character's thoughts and feelings can always, if the author chooses, be more detailed, revealing, and suggestive than any external images a camera could record. Think again of Molly Bloom.

Works Cited

Bratman, David. "Summa Jacksonica: A Reply to Defenses of Peter Jackson's *The Lord of the Rings* Films, after St. Thomas Aquinas." In *Tolkien on Film: Essays on Peter Jackson's "The Lord of the Rings."* Ed. Janet Brennan Croft. Alhambra, CA: Mythopoeic Press, 2004: 27-62.

Brisbois, Michael J. "Tolkien's Imaginary Nature: An Analysis of the Structure of Middle-earth." *Tolkien Studies* 2 (2005): 197-216.

Curry, Patrick. *Defending Middle-earth: Tolkien: Myth and Modernity.* New York: St. Martin's, 1997. Second rev. ed., New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2004.

———. Rev. of *Ents, Elves, and Eriador: The Environmental Vision of J.R.R. Tolkien*, by Matthew T. Dickerson and Jonathan Evans. *Tolkien Studies* 4 (2007): 238-44.

Dickerson, Matthew T. *Following Gandalf: Epic Battles and Moral Victory in "The Lord of the Rings."* Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos, 2003.

Dickerson, Matthew, and Jonathan Evans. *Ents, Elves, and Eriador: The Environmental Vision of J.R.R. Tolkien.* Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2006.

Flieger, Verlyn. "Taking the Part of Trees: Eco-Conflict in Middle-earth." In *J.R.R. Tolkien and His Literary Resonances: Views of Middle-earth.* Ed. George Clark and Daniel Timmons. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2000: 147-158.

The Lord of the Rings: The Fellowship of the Ring. Dir. Peter Jackson. Perf. Elijah Wood, Ian McKellen, and Viggo Mortensen. 2001. Special extended DVD. New Line Cinema, 2002.

Shippey, Tom. "Another Road to Middle-earth: Jackson's Movie Trilogy." In *Understanding "The Lord of the Rings": The Best of Tolkien Criticism.* Ed. Rose A. Zimbardo and Neil D. Isaacs. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2004: 233-74.

———. *The Oxford Book of Science Fiction Stories.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Siewers, Alfred K. "Tolkien's Cosmic-Christian Ecology: The Medieval Underpinnings." In *Tolkien's Modern Middle Ages.* Ed. Jane Chance and Alfred K. Siewers. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005: 139-155.

Thum, Maureen. "The 'Sub-Subcreation' of Galadriel, Arwen, and Eowyn: Women of Power in Tolkien's and Jackson's *The Lord of the Rings*." In *Tolkien on Film: Essays on Peter Jackson's "The Lord of the Rings."* Ed. Janet Brennan Croft. Alhambra, CA: Mythopoeic Press, 2004: 231-56.

Timmons, Daniel. "Frodo on Film: Peter Jackson's Problematic Portrayal." In *Tolkien on Film: Essays on Peter Jackson's "The Lord of the Rings."* Ed. Janet Brennan Croft. Alhambra, CA: Mythopoeic Press, 2004: 123-48.

Boromir, Byrhtnoth, and Bayard:
Finding a Language for Grief in J.R.R. Tolkien's
The Lord of the Rings

Lynn Forest-Hill

In *The Lord of the Rings* Tolkien explores many forms of grief. Grief can be a response to change as well as to death, and while in either case it may express a profound sense of loss, it can also signal transition of a positive kind. In any narrative, the circumstances in which a death occurs control its reception, as does the language in which it is conveyed. The circumstances surrounding the death of Boromir evoke the deaths of two warriors from earlier literature, deaths that separately define Boromir's nobility as well as his faults. Together, as these earlier deaths access a rhetoric of grief that enables the expression of male emotion, they impart a redemptive significance to Boromir's death that initiates important transitions in the plot, character development, and the structure of Tolkien's story.

The death of Boromir provokes ambivalent reactions in both readers and characters that recall the death of Byrhtnoth in the Old English poem *The Battle of Maldon*, the modern response to which has focused on the relationship between martial heroism and arrogance. Details of Boromir's death and subsequent mourning rituals also recall the death of Bayard, the early sixteenth-century knight "without fear or reproach" whose exploits and status shed additional light on Tolkien's flawed hero. The deaths of these warriors challenge the conventional view of Boromir and the notion that his arrogance is simply *hubris*. Moreover, they signal changes in Tolkien's depiction of heroism, which shifts, through the expression of grief, from Old English heroic pessimism to the optimism of Christian redemption.

The Battle of Maldon commemorates the battle fought in 991 between the Anglo-Saxon army commanded by earl Byrhtnoth, ealdormann of Essex, and a large force of Vikings who had been raiding East Anglia.[1] Byrhtnoth's strategy of allowing the Vikings to cross a causeway resulted in his death and the massacre of his army, and his motivation for adopting that strategy has generated much critical comment. Tolkien was deeply interested in the poem. He assisted his friend E. V. Gordon in his work on his 1937 edition of the text, offering philological insights and advice, for which Gordon thanked him in his Preface (Gordon vi), and in 1953 he published a seminal essay discussing Byrhtnoth's motivation.

The poem preserves the best-known occurrence of the rare Old English noun *ofermod*. Twenty examples exist of verb forms but the noun occurs only three times in poems, including the present reference,[2] and once in a glossary. Helmut Gneuss notes that almost without exception *ofermod* "occurs in religious contexts, whereas *The Battle of Maldon* is a Christian, but not a religious poem" (Gneuss 103). The survival of the word in texts such as the Old English *The Fall of the Angels*, where it defines Lucifer's presumptuous pride,[3] is, as Tom Shippey points out, liable to taint its translation in other contexts, since in its religious use it glosses Latin *superbia* with its implication of sinful pride (Shippey, "Boar and Badger" 227).[4] Although the use of *ofermod* in a secular heroic context is unique to *The Battle of Maldon* and calls up a range of philological possibilities, not all of which are necessarily pejorative (Shippey 228), some commentators on the poem still accept the translation of *ofermod* as simply "pride" or "arrogance." [5]

Tolkien had very definite ideas about the translation, or perhaps more accurately, the interpretation, of *ofermod* as it is used in the poem. Accordingly, the following analysis while acknowledging the range of opinions, discusses the implications of Tolkien's preferred translation for our understanding of his treatment of Boromir.

In *The Battle of Maldon*, *ofermod* is applied to Byrthnoth when the poet relates how he conceded ground to the Vikings. Tolkien defined the meaning of this word in an essay that accompanied his short play *The Homecoming of Beorhtnoth Beorhthelm's Son*,[6] which dramatized its emotional consequences.[7] In the essay, Tolkien asserted that *ofermod* should be translated as "overmastering pride" or "arrogance" (*TL* 168). He does not follow Gordon in translating it as "great pride; overconfidence" (Gordon 76) but prefers a more emotionally and morally charged variant.

When the poet relates how Byrhtnoth allowed the Viking army to approach, he says: "Ða se eorl ongan for his ofermode / alyfan landes to fela laþere ðeode: (Gordon, line 89). Tolkien translates this line as "Then the earl in his overmastering pride actually yielded ground to the enemy, as he should not have done" (*TL* 168). Thomas Honegger has noted "[t]he point here is not so much the rendering of *ofermod* with "overmastering pride," but the (additional and interpretive) "as he should not have done," which has no explicit equivalent in the Old English text" (194); and Shippey refers to Tolkien's admission that the noun only occurs twice in the OE poetic corpus as a "damaging footnote" ("Tolkien and the Homecoming" 9). These comments draw attention to the determination with which Tolkien pursued his own unique, morally coded definition of the poet's use of the word.

The naming of Byrhtnoth's decision as *ofermod* may suggest a flaw in his character akin to the wicked pride of the fallen angel. However, S.A.J.

Bradley asserts that the poet "is far from seeing it as the sin of Lucifer" (519), and Paul Szarmach points out that in the poetic artifice of the poem "*ofermod* is, after all, the poet's word in his bardic voice" (59). Nevertheless, drawing on the association of the word with the pride of the fallen angel, Tolkien argued that the use of the word signaled the poet's severe criticism of Byrhtnoth (*TL* 172).[8]

Tolkien's fascination with Byrhtnoth's *ofermod* seems to have begun when, around 1930-33, he began *The Homecoming of Beorhtnoth Beorhthelm's Son* as a sequel to the poem (TL 172).[9] In this little verse drama, he gives full rein to his interpretation of Byrhtnoth's decision and its consequences. He sets the scene after the battle. It is night and very dark. Two retainers, the young Torhthelm and the old Tídwald come to the battlefield to seek their lord Beorhtnoth (Byrhtnoth). Torhthelm is scared by the darkness and the carnage but also influenced by stories of heroic battles he has heard in poems like *Beowulf*. Throughout the play his own fanciful poetic compositions are set against both his horrified reactions to the realities of the battle and Tídwald's pragmatism.

The retainers eventually find Beorhtnoth's mutilated corpse when Tídwald notices the length of one corpse's legs, for the head has been hewn off. This gruesome detail is not mentioned in the original poem, but is found in the Ely Chronicle, which records the burial of the real Byrhtnoth, a devout benefactor of the Church (Gordon 18–21). The inclusion of the detail heightens the sense of horror, and silently alludes to the dead lord's Christianity by recalling the historical record, but the discovery prompts Tídwald's comments on Beorhtnoth's rash pride. He says:

> Too proud, too princely! But his pride's cheated,
>   . . . .
> He let them cross the causeway, so keen was he
> To give minstrels matter for mighty songs.
> Needlessly noble. It should never have been. (*TL* 163)

This criticism is much longer and more obviously pejorative than the Anglo-Saxon poet's comments on Byrhtnoth's conduct. Shippey has suggested that in his drama Tolkien was attacking Old English poetry and the "northern heroic spirit" it expresses, as this had been valorized by commentators like Gordon, who had not, in Tolkien's opinion, understood that the *Battle of Maldon* poet was condemning that very spirit ("Tolkien and the Homecoming" 12). Tolkien would therefore have been attacking the modern reception, rather than the original concept of heroic poetry.

Humphrey Carpenter sees *The Homecoming of Beorhtnoth Beorhthelm's Son*, as marking "the passing of the heroic age, whose characteristics are

exemplified and contrasted in the youthful romantic Torhthelm" (286).[10] In the contrast between the young man's fear and horror and his delight in heroic poetry, as much as in the exchanges between him and Tídwald, we may witness Tolkien's own ambivalent attitudes to the poetic representation of heroes and battles following his experiences in World War I.[11] Drawn to poetry such as *Beowulf* and *The Battle of Maldon*, with its ethos of vaunting valor, revenge, and the glory of battle, he also recognized a tension between artful depiction and grim reality.

Tolkien's sequel to the latter poem is not well known, and it differs greatly from the original as he asserts unequivocally the connection between arrogance in military strategy and its horrifying aftermath, which he depicts from the perspective of servants. He omits any sense of the glory of heroism,[12] as he interprets the poet's use of *ofermod* as condemnation of a leader so hungry for fame that he sacrificed his own life and those of his men. At the same time, Tolkien reveals the elegaic tone of much Old English heroic poetry by echoing its insistent pathos.[13] While it praises valor and records the heroic deaths of men defending their homes and lands, it also records with poignant artistry the sacrifice and sorrow of war.

In Shippey's opinion, from around the time of the publication of *The Homecoming of Beorhtnoth Beorhthelm's Son*, Tolkien was developing an academic insecurity centering on the relationship in tenth-century poetry between Anglo-Saxon Christianity and the "heathen" heroic code.[14] This concern centers on the combining of Christian and heroic elements, rather than centering simply on the modern reception of Old English heroic poetry. In his own creative writing, Tolkien strives to reconcile Christian and heroic elements,[15] and Shippey suggests that in order to do this Tolkien had to "sacrifice something of himself," and the "northern heroic spirit," and this sacrifice takes place in *The Homecoming of Beorhtnoth Beorhthelm's Son* ("Tolkien and the Homecoming" 13). However, in *The Lord of the Rings* Tolkien creates another, equally dramatic and more productive sacrifice to reconcile his concerns.

The drama, the assistance given to Gordon, and the essay were only successive stages in Tolkien's engagement with *The Battle of Maldon*.[16] The spectre of *ofermod* as he defined it—as "overmastering pride" or arrogance—haunts *The Lord of the Rings* as a theme and as a specific personal flaw or "defect of character" (*TL* 170). This recalls the *hubris* of the tragic hero in early modern drama,[17] but the example of Byrhtnoth provides a more illuminating comparator for Boromir than, for example, Macbeth, although all three are aristocratic warriors acting under definable external pressures. *Hubris* is, however, arrogance that is not necessarily connected with military strategies. *Ofermod*, on the other hand, specifically

in *The Battle of Maldon*, names the impulse behind the apparent fall from wisdom of an aristocratic and Christian military leader.[18] It is therefore more applicable to Boromir, Tolkien's heroic, aristocratic, and, as we shall see, unexpectedly Christian warrior. In *The Fellowship of the Ring*, Boromir, eldest son of the Steward of Gondor and Captain-General of its armies, (described thus in *TT*, IV, iv, 266) comes to believe that, in order to defeat the armies of Sauron that threaten his people, he can take the Ring without falling under its malign influence. However, Boromir's coercive and then violent attempt to wrest the Ring from Frodo reveals the effect that malign influence has already had—a shocking revelation prompting fear and horror in the hobbit, and the reader, who until this point has had only passing hints that Boromir might be succumbing to the Ring's influence. In his confrontation with Frodo, Boromir's arrogant dismissal of the power of the Ring and his overconfidence in his own ability and that of his race of Men, constitutes the flaw in his character. In this respect he resembles Byrhtnoth who, in Tolkien's translation, believed he could yield ground to that most potent evil force in Anglo-Saxon perception—the Viking army.[19]

Randel Helms likens Boromir's fall into evil to that of the corrupted Saruman (Helms 86), Jane Chance refers to Denethor's "good and evil sons" (*Tolkien's Art* 46) and Michael D.C. Drout in a passing parenthetical aside links Boromir's temptation with Gollum's "degradation" situating both within a nexus of terms such as "pride and despair . . . [m]adness and selfishness", without further comment or differentiation (Drout 146) However, in a letter Tolkien commented that critics of *The Lord of the Rings* generally had seen "all the good just good, and the bad just bad . . . Boromir has been overlooked" (*Letters* 197).[20] This authoritative remark challenges simplistic critical analyses of Boromir, who, unlike Saruman, repents his evil act and is "redeemed" and, like Byrhtnoth, dies fighting for a greater cause. Even as recently as 2001 commentators have only grudgingly allowed that Boromir's fall "is far from total. The warrior partly redeems himself in his, admittedly fruitless and ultimately fatal, defense of . . . Merry and Pippin" (Lowson, Mackenzie and Marshall 53). And although Jonathan Evans notes that Boromir "overcomes his selfish desire for power," he emphasizes the "gravity of the situation Boromir's treachery has created" (213). Given the Boethian cosmology Tolkien creates in *The Lord of the Rings*,[21] indeed, given the chain of events that clearly proceed from Boromir's death, his "treachery" is balanced against the positive effects of his defense of the younger hobbits, which cannot be accounted fruitless just because it has a less immediate effect than merely keeping them from capture. At the very least, as Marion Zimmer Bradley observes, "slain . . . Boromir is nevertheless a compelling force of emotional motivation throughout the book" (110).

Though flawed, Boromir is still a heroic figure and his virtues are many.[22] In "The History of Galadriel and Celeborn," one of the *Unfinished Tales*, Tolkien comments on his warrior's long solitary journey north: "the courage and hardihood required is not fully recognized in the narrative" (*UT* 264). Initially, Boromir's pride is only that consistent with his status as a nobleman and seasoned warrior: he knows his own worth and this is not simply based on his high birth but on his experience and achievements.[23] In this, he is no more flawed than Beowulf, of whom it is said that he was "leodum liðost ond lofgeornost," (kindest to the people and most eager for renown / praise).[24] The translation of *lofgeornost* raises problems akin to those posed by the interpretation of *ofermod*, offering several different but related possibilities, all of which help to expand the analysis of Boromir's characterization and its impact in the story. Although Boromir seems to want renown, he highlights the equivocal nature of praise. At the Council of Elrond he speaks of the plight of his homeland that is constantly attacked by Sauron's armies, declaring: "those who shelter behind us give us . . . much praise but little help" (*FR*, II, ii, 259). He then speaks of the desperate need of Gondor (*FR*, II, ii, 260). His concern for his embattled land echoes Beowulf's valiant attempt to save his people from the dragon, and likewise dooms him.

Later, under the influence of the Ring, Boromir declares impatiently "What could not a warrior do in this hour, a great leader? What could not Aragorn do? Or if he refuses, why not Boromir? The Ring would give me power of Command. How I would drive the hosts of Mordor, and all men would flock to my banner!" (*FR*, II, x, 414) Ignoring what he has been told of the corrupting power of the Ring (*FR*, II, ii 261) he sees that power in military terms. It is notable here that Boromir first names Aragorn as the "great leader" (although he has himself in mind). Nevertheless, as he acknowledges Aragorn, he acknowledges his own subordinate role as son of the Steward. His eagerness to be accounted a great leader is not necessarily or simply a sign of sinful pride or arrogance in the sense implied by the Greek term *hubris*. It is in the tradition of Anglo-Saxon *lofgeornost*, (most eager for renown or praise), and although this particular term has been interrogated for signs of criticism of Beowulf,[25] the concept of being eager for renown occurs in a less controversial context.

In his edition of *Beowulf* Friedrich Klaeber noted that *lofgeornost* "does not necessarily point to warlike renown" (cxx–cxxi). In the late ninth century poem *Andreas*, God speaks to St. Andrew, foretelling the suffering he will encounter as he goes to save St. Matthew from the prison of the savage Mermedons. God says:

Ðu þæt sar aber:
ne læt þe ahweorfan   hæðenra þrym,
grim gargewinn,   þæt ðu Gode swice,

dryhtne þinum.   Wes a domes georn.

[endure that pain; do not turn aside from heathen force, cruel hostility, forsaking God your Lord. Be eager for renown.][26]

Wes a domes georn may also be translated as "Be eager for [divine] judgment." The impulse to martyrdom implied by the possible variant interpretations: being "eager for renown" and longing "for divine judgment", emphasizes the Christian significance of the phrase and adds to the pathos of Boromir's fate. The Christian context of this passage makes eagerness for renown a virtue that is to be demonstrated by the stalwart endurance of heathen cruelty. In terms that were familiar in Anglo-Saxon heroic poetry, desire for renown was not necessarily indicative of sinful pride, nor was it incompatible with Christian virtue.[27] Boromir is unwilling to accept the advice of the Council of Elrond concerning the danger of the Ring, and cannot be excused for trying to take the Ring by force, even though the Ring may be inciting his actions. However, his error is not driven simply by arrogance, nor even by his inability to resist temptation, but by a warrior ethos akin to that deployed in Anglo-Saxon Christian poetry.

For *The Battle of Maldon*'s original Anglo-Saxon audience, the naming of Byrhtnoth's impulse to strategic misjudgment as *ofermod* may have evoked a sense of grief for the consequences of that flaw in such a renowned leader and devout benefactor of the church, as well for its disastrous consequences for England.[28] It may even have named the scale of their late leader's fall from excellence in terms familiar from sermons concerned with Lucifer's fall.[29] To suggest that Boromir's flaw is an example of *ofermod* contaminates him with the same scale of guilt, the same emphatic decline from excellence, especially as his desire for the Ring associates him with the satanic figure of Sauron. However, Byrhtnoth and Boromir both have their deaths framed with righteous Christian references, and a close analysis of the downfalls of the two warriors highlights Tolkien's significant amelioration of his treatment of the flawed hero.

The Battle of Maldon depicts Byrhtnoth fearlessly confronting a succession of Viking assailants, fighting on wounded until his sword arm is broken. The poet then gives the dying earl a final speech in which he begs God to protect his immortal soul from the devil's attack as it leaves his body at the moment of death.[30] Morton Bloomfield suggested that: "in the brutal killing of Byrhtnoth by a mass of heathens, the poet . . . saw the hordes of devils who were waiting for his soul."[31] There is, however, no indication that Byrhtnoth, or the poet, regards his death as punishment for his error of judgment (Szarmach 59). Indeed Byrhtnoth's speech has been seen as suggesting "a consciousness of [the earl's] martyrdom" (Bloomfield, "Patristics" 37-38). He does not ask for forgiveness, even for

his ordinary sins, although the problem of dying unshriven in battle was acknowledged in contemporaneous Old English texts as a concern in Anglo-Saxon Christian society (F. Robinson 425-44).

No less valiant and hardy, Boromir is a loyal companion in battle as he confronts demon-like orcs in defense of his hobbit companions. His warrior's mind-set makes him increasingly susceptible to the influence of the Ring and as Gandalf acknowledges, when he hears of the circumstances of Boromir's death after his own "resurrection," "It was too sore a trial for such a man: a warrior, and a lord of men" (*TT*, III, v, 99). In spite of his error, Boromir's final act—defending the younger hobbits, which brings about his death, returns him to the honorable status of the warrior. The fact that he cannot save them from being captured does not diminish the heroism of his single-handed attempt. Tolkien may appear to condemn the *ofermod* of his tragic hero by his death, but Boromir's personal destruction is not directly a result of his pride; he does not die trying to take the Ring, nor having taken it. Nor is his death directly the effect of his attack on Frodo.

In his essay on *ofermod* Tolkien carefully separated fighting that is motivated by the desire for renown from fighting that is a necessity or a mark of loyalty. He used the anachronistic term "chivalry" to define what he saw as the "excess" demonstrated by commanders like Byrhtnoth and by warriors like Beowulf who were, in his opinion motivated by pride and a desire for fame rather than by duty or necessity (*TL* 170). Although Boromir has earlier exhibited *ofermod*, his death cannot be attributed directly to any form of "chivalric" excess. In his last battle he cannot be motivated by pride, for he would hardly earn renown in this fight: as his father later remarks there are "only orcs to withstand him" (*RK*, V, i, 27).[32] *The Lord of the Rings* continually promotes the notion of heroism as an adjunct of necessity. Although Boromir has previously been a military commander, when he dies he is a subordinate companion on a joint venture who dies defending others.[33] Furthermore, the sequence of actions that surround his death does not only initiate the grief of others for the fallen warrior, but reveals his own grief at his fall from excellence as he exhibits contrition.

Mortally wounded, Boromir admits his wrongdoing in the form of a confession to Aragorn that he attempted to take the Ring, and he acknowledges his contrite expectation of punishment when he says as he is dying: "I am sorry, I have paid." Tolkien then allows his flawed warrior the comfort of "absolution," something that is absent from the account of Byrhtnoth's death in *The Battle of Maldon*, when Aragorn consoles Boromir saying "Few have gained such a victory. Be at peace!" (*TT*, III, i, 16). Boromir's acknowledgment of guilt is ironically juxtaposed to his desperate defense of Merry and Pippin to great effect and initiates the

profound pathos of his death, which is not merely heroic, but redemptive in its sacrifice.[34] Through Aragorn's "absolution" and Gandalf's later compassion, Tolkien ameliorates Boromir's culpability. His *ofermod* can be forgiven because it initiates self-awareness, contrition and confession. These are, of course, the required steps in the sacrament of Confession in the Roman Catholic faith to which Tolkien remained devoted throughout his life.

The ambivalent feelings evoked by Boromir's death may reflect Tolkien's own anxiety concerning the intermingling of heroic and Christian elements in post-conversion Anglo-Saxon poetry, but his treatment of Boromir, unlike his scathing condemnation of Byrhtnoth, marks a series of important transitions that are both internal and external to the story. The Anglo-Saxon heroic code was from an early period in insular history inflected with Christian ideals, as many extant texts bear witness (Wogan-Browne 215–35). Indeed, the same traditions of heroic poetry that define *Beowulf* and *The Battle of Maldon* were used in the service of Christianity by poets such as the composer of *Andreas*.[35] Byhtnoth's anxiety is a late demonstration of what was by the tenth century a traditional Christian influence and Tolkien's depiction of Boromir's death reflects an individual eschatological anxiety that belongs to Anglo-Saxon culture as much as to later Christianity, even though, unlike the *Beowulf*, *The Battle of Maldon* and *Andreas* poets, Tolkien makes no overt reference to Christianity in *The Lord of the Rings*.

For all his love of Anglo-Saxon sources, Tolkien neither accepts them uncritically, nor as his only point of reference, and Boromir's funeral rites continue the transition towards idealized Christian heroism which begins with his "confession." As a medievalist Tolkien may have known Jacques de Mailles's 1527 biography of the knight, Pierre Terrail, Seigneur de Bayard (1473–1524), known during his lifetime, and to history, as *le chevalier sans peur et sans reproche* who came from a noble French family that for nearly two centuries had sacrificed its eldest sons in battle.[36] On one occasion Bayard held a bridge single-handedly against two hundred enemy soldiers (de Mailles 91), and on another he served as rearguard during a retreat prior to the destruction of another bridge (de Mailles 92, 261–62). The similarities to Boromir's life and death are suggestive: he is his father's eldest son, and has recently been part of a desperate rearguard action to hold a bridge until it could be destroyed to prevent an orc invasion (*FR*, II, ii, 258-59). Bayard, in his final battle, is mortally wounded and, like Boromir, dies seated against a tree. He makes his confession to someone other than a priest; his companions like Boromir's weep for him; and his body is protected from post mortem attack (Digby 92-93)[37] such as that visited on the body of Byrhtnoth by the Vikings who removed the head (Gordon 20-21). Before he dies, Bayard declares that

he only grieves at not being able to serve his king any longer. Although Boromir omits such a declaration, his brother Faramir later acknowledges his potential to "greatly reverence" Aragorn as his king (TT, IV, v, 278). Bayard's biography echoes and illuminates Boromir's virtues. It also enhances the sense of transition and change of emphasis as Boromir shifts from a military leader flawed by the desire to command to Christian knight devoted to his king,[38] and from Anglo-Saxon "doomed man" to Christian warrior hero. Unlike Bayard, however, Boromir's perfection is tested to breaking point, making him a more human hero whose fall is fearful as it confirms the corrupting power of the Ring and the flawed nature of Men, but redemptive as it initiates his contrite humility, and salvific as it prompts the forward momentum of the Quest.

Tolkien associates *ofermod* with excess—what he calls chivalry—defining this as the arrogant desire to seek renown at all costs, and while the story of Bayard defines a shift from the Anglo-Saxon heroic ethos into the medieval chivalric, death in battle is still linked with fame and glory. However, the story of Bayard's death includes the hope of redemption implicit in his confession, so that grief for him is grief at the loss of his excellence. This contrasts with the focus in *The Battle of Maldon* as Byhtnoth's *ofermod* and its tragic consequences may evoke grief at a *fall from* excellence. As Boromir's death echoes the stories of both Byrhtnoth and Bayard, grief for him is grief for both his *fall from* excellence and for the *loss of* the excellence he represents.

Through the process of Boromir's death, Tolkien depicts both a transition and a reconciliation between the pagan heroic spirit and the doctrines of Christianity. This is embodied in the form of the flawed warrior-hero who seeks absolution and receives forgiveness even as he gives up his life in the greater cause. The process of revelation and consolation that precedes this death is deeply cathartic for the reader after the horror and fear engendered by the attack on Frodo. Catharsis is traditionally associated with *hubris* as the tragic hero acts, with terrible inevitability, in accordance with his fatal flaw. The emotional release defined by catharsis is absent from the depiction of the consequences of Byrhtnoth's decision in *The Battle of Maldon*, at least in the extant portion of the poem,[39] but Boromir's death does not conform to the cathartic paradigm either.

His death is a pivotal moment in the *process* of the story but cannot be read without significant interruption. When *The Lord of the Rings* was first published as three separate volumes, Boromir's "fall" into temptation was the climactic moment in the final chapter of *The Fellowship of the Ring*. His death and funeral rites take up the best part of the first chapter of the next volume, *The Two Towers*, creating a radical disjunction. There is nothing remarkable in ending a book with the revelation of a character's corruption and his consequent realization and grief—a

cathartic ending full of pathos. It is rarer to begin a book with the death of a warrior, associated acts of contrition, forgiveness, and his restoration to honor. However, even when *The Lord of the Rings* is published as a single volume, disjunction is still apparent, as *The Fellowship of the Ring* ends with the chapter "The Breaking of the Fellowship," and *The Two Towers* begins with the chapter "The Departure of Boromir," so that this death always marks a new beginning.

Structurally, Boromir's redemptive death forms an introduction to the theme of recovery and redemption that is apparent throughout Book III of *The Two Towers*. The recovery of King Théoden of Rohan from a state akin to living death, which is accomplished by the "resurrected" Gandalf, is notable, as is Gandalf's own "resurrection." Aragorn too "redeems" his former temporary tendency to procrastination and self-doubt. Initially after Gandalf's literal fall he simply follows the path the wizard had already chosen, but from Lothlórien to the breaking of the fellowship he is indecisive: a condition clearly expressed when he particularly welcomes Celeborn's gift of boats because "there would now be no need to decide his course for some days" (*FR*, II, viii, 384). He also errs in judgment (*FR*, II, ix, 402) and is so lacking in confidence that he finally exclaims against his "ill fate," and asks "what is to be done now?" (*TT*, III, i, 17). Only briefly, during the transit of the Argonath, is he transformed into a figure "proud and erect", but swiftly relapses into wistful uncertainty asking "whither now shall I go?" (*FR*, II, ix, 409). During this time, his choices are certainly complicated by competing duties and desires, but no more so than at the moment when he must decide whether to follow Frodo or seek Merry and Pippin. When he makes the decision to search for the younger hobbits,[40] and later declares his full identity to Éomer of Rohan, he asserts his recovery from uncertainty and self-doubt. All these "recoveries" follow Boromir's fall and its immediate consequences initiating the forward movement of the Quest within the story and rendering catharsis a transitional state for the reader rather than the final effect.

One recent discussion of catharsis proposes that it is not an emotion awaiting release, but an emotion prompted by imagery, rhetoric and the intertextuality of a text: a culturally defined response (Middleton 178, 182). This theory illuminates the affective process by which readers are engaged and grief is expressed in the text. Through the sequence of Boromir's actions, readers are confronted with imagery that incites emotional engagement. The fear and horror engendered by his attack on Frodo are purged by his heroic sacrifice. In the process, the reader is confronted with the description of Aragorn, the warrior leader, weeping (*TT*, III, i, 16). As in the account of Bayard's death, Boromir's companions grieve for the loss of their comrade, and to a twenty-first century reader it may not seem strange that Legolas and Gimli find Aragorn

weeping for him. The depiction of male tears in narrative is an ancient device, but from the later nineteenth century to the third quarter of the twentieth male tears were culturally and ideologically unacceptable.[41] For the weeping warrior in this instance Tolkien may have known Jacques de Maille's account of Bayard, but more probably drew on nineteenth-century medievalism, particularly in the form of Kenelm Digby's hugely influential book *The Broad Stone of Honour* which was constantly revised and reprinted during the second half of the nineteenth century.[42] Overt-ly Catholic in tone, *The Broad Stone* uses chivalric tales such as that of Bayard to set out codes of Christian conduct intended to offer moral education to young Englishmen. Its Catholic bias made it controversial but did not lessen its influence, and although Tolkien never mentions it, it is exactly the kind of moral and Catholic literature that his guardian Father Francis could have recommended to a Catholic boy growing up in England around the turn of the century.

The scale and form of mourning for Boromir, like that for Bayard, is consistent with his high status. It reveals the cultural links between Elves, Men, and to a lesser extent, dwarves,[43] but differs from the account in *The Fellowship of the Ring* of mourning for the wizard guide Gandalf, which, while potentially of more devastating significance within the story, is not narrated in such detail. Having reached safety, far from the scene of the wizard's physical fall in battle with the Balrog, the remaining members of the Fellowship stand weeping for some indefinite time. Only when they reach Lothlórien do they reminisce about Gandalf (*FR*, II, vii, 374). The sequence of events and reactions is narrated and may owe something to Tolkien's own experience of battle and loss, as his reluctance to define a language of grief for his pivotal wizard continues. The Elves, we are told, sing songs of mourning, but Legolas refuses to translate for his compan-ions because his grief is too recent (*FR*, II, vii, 374). Even Frodo's song for Gandalf is inhibited and curtailed (*FR*, II, vii, 374-75).[44] Of Aragorn's grief even less is mentioned. In fact, the ineffable nature of Gandalf's loss is precisely represented through a reluctance or inability to speak it both on the part of the characters and of the narrator.[45] However, after Boromir's death, accomplished in a few lines, Tolkien describes his funer-al rites at length as the chapter shifts from the tragic mode to the elegiac and funereal, and this process is given greater priority than concern for the welfare of the missing young hobbits.

As with the loss of Gandalf, Tolkien depicts overt male emotion, but, unlike the refusal to speak which defines Gandalf's loss, the mourning rit-uals for Boromir include the diachronic English tradition of the elegy. A rhetoric of grief is expressed in the dirges initiated by Legolas and sung by Aragorn and Legolas as they send Boromir's body on its last journey down the Great River in an elven boat, watching it depart to an unknown

end. These dirges relate the text to the English elegaic tradition, but they are dramatizations of loss on a macrocosmic, not a personal scale, unlike Frodo's and Sam's sorrowful commemorative verses for Gandalf. Tolkien does not, however, use the Old English alliterative form for the dirges, nor the classic elegaic meter, but the unusual heptameter line, noted by Mary Quella Kelly (170–200), which, when read on the page, creates solemnity by its length. However, Kelly does not note the importance of the medial caesuras in all Tolkien's heptameters. When these are given their full value the heptameter lines rescan and break naturally into the common measure associated in English culture with hymns. Though dissimilar in form, the dirges "perform" mourning in the English heroic and Christian traditions,[46] while their imagery reprises the conventions of nostalgia, idealization and harmony that define the English elegy in all eras (Mell 15).

John M. Hill notes that "much of [Old English] elegaic poetry especially reflects processes of transformation and redirection, perhaps because much of it is dedicated both to urging and dramatizing conversion, involving transformation from an ignoble to a glorious state" (28). [47] Anglo-Saxon poetry, often of the most martial kind, is characterized by its elegaic tone. The deaths of great warriors are mourned in poems such as *Beowulf*, and with their deaths comes the negation of their valiant deeds: only their fame remains while the world changes for the worse. Their valor does not save them or their people. Many aspects of *The Lord of the Rings* belong to the traditions of Anglo-Saxon elegaic verse with its emphasis on the fate of the "doomed man." Boromir's folly that negates the great deeds he has already done seems to place his death within this tradition. But Tolkien is also working within the Old English tradition when he portrays the transformation of Boromir. Moreover, Aragorn's consolation and the web of unforeseen events that follow Boromir's death challenge the Anglo-Saxon trope of the doomed man whose heroic death is ultimately futile (*MC* 18, 22), by asserting a clearer Christian belief in forgiveness and thus implied salvation. The very choice of chapter title "The Departure of Boromir," rather than "The Death of Boromir," signals transition rather than doomed finality.[48]

The significance of Boromir's death does not lie in his fall, but in his "absolution" and departure, and its full force is derived from the sequence of emotions that surround it. The reader is first horrified by the sudden change in the character's demeanor and then fearful for the outcome. As Boromir recovers himself from the influence of the Ring and becomes the hero again, to die defending the younger hobbits, Tolkien deploys a range of literary resources to depict the passing of the hero and engage the emotions of his readers. His treatment of Boromir also marks his rendering of the cultural and stylistic shift from the Anglo-Saxon

"doomed man" to the later fully Christian hero-knight for whom death is a transition or departure from mortality to salvation. By this technique Tolkien places Boromir within the Augustinian and Boethian cosmologies. At the same time, he depicts the necessary psychological process of mourning. In the aftermath of Gandalf's death, Aragorn's grief is alluded to (*FR*, II, vii, 373), but never freely expressed and until the completion of Boromir's funeral rites he often seems unable to act decisively or confidently.[49] After Boromir's "Departure," he becomes more positive in his decision-making, as though the expression of this grief purges an unresolved grief for Gandalf and restores his confidence.[50]

F.R. Leavis, Tolkien's close contemporary, regarded emotion in literature as "made respectable by the intelligence which releases it" (Middleton 173). Tolkien, writing when modernism was exploring the bleakness of early twentieth-century existence, looked back to an age that had drawn on medievalism as a counterbalance to its own social bleakness, and further back to the early Middle Ages and their cultural values. His specific form of the fantasy narrative, which revises the fragmented uncertainty of life into a linear form, is made up of traditional styles, including those of the Middle Ages especially as these were mediated through the medievalism of the nineteenth century. Emotion can be spoken and experienced within this fantasy, and fantasizing emotion through familiar literary forms allows its expression, and imagines a resolution that may be wholly impossible in real life (Žižek 6-7; 10-11).

Tolkien admitted the "dominance of the theme of Death" in *The Lord of the Rings* (*Letters* 267), but grief is not thematic in this book as it is in the "Silmarillion." Boromir's death may reflect upon the medieval concept of the *ars moriendi*, the art of dying well, as the hero regains honor by his sacrifice and absolution by his confession. It may also meditate on the ideal of death in a righteous cause, through which Tolkien contemplates his wartime experiences. In the first half of the twentieth century, men's lives included the necessary suppression and sublimation of emotion when confronting the horrors of two world wars.[51] Tolkien draws on earlier texts for literary modes by which the grief and horror of individual death in battle can be expressed using their language of masculine emotion at a time when manliness was defined by "self-control" and the inhibition of such emotion (Williams 62). He creates a language of grief confined within rhetorical forms (Middleton, 71-72), which mourns the hero and enables the forward momentum of the greater quest. It is in the diachronic extension of the traditions of rhetoric associated with elegy from its earliest Old English forms onwards, as well as in the echoes of Bayard's heroic and melancholy biography, that Tolkien displays masculine grief and emotional intensity in the episode of Boromir's death.

In his essay on *ofermod* Tolkien took the most critical view of Byrhtnoth's

action, and his drama exposes its effects. But in Boromir's "overmaster-
ing pride" Tolkien takes a broader view of flawed humanity and its po-
tential for redemption. Comparing Boromir and Byrhtnoth illuminates
for us aspects of Boromir's characterization that are often ignored even
though they tell us much about Tolkien's view of his hero. The parallels
between Boromir and Bayard, *chevalier sans peur et sans reproche*, then define
a significant shift of emphasis. Byrhtnoth's *ofermod* provides a paradigm
of flawed leadership against which instances of similarly desperate ac-
tions in *The Lord of the Rings* may be compared and their mournful con-
sequences assessed. Grief is part of each comparison. It is sublimated
in *The Battle of Maldon* into vengeance, spurring the English army to die
beside their leader.[52] In *The Homecoming of Beorhtnoth Beorhthelm's Son* it is
not expressed for Beorhtnoth but for the young men who died because
of his pride. Grief for Gandalf is barely expressible, but the death of
Boromir can be mourned in a language of grief that is powerful because
it is recognizable through long tradition, and because it signals not only
the forward development of characters and story, but the transition from
the doomed Anglo-Saxon hero to the redeemed Christian hero whose
errors can be forgiven.

NOTES

1   I retain the use of the title "earl" as it is given to Byrhtnoth in the
    poem, although as a title of the highest rank it has been regarded as
    an anachronism. See Gordon, Introduction to *The Battle of Maldon*
    (42, n. 6).

2   The other two are *Guthlac A*, line 269, and The Fall of Angels in *Gen-
    esis B* line 17. See also Schabram.

3   *Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader*, *The Fall of the Angels* (line 27).

4   I should like to thank Tom Shippey for his generous help with the
    philological aspects of this paper.

5   See for example, F. Robinson (435).

6   In this title, Tolkien uses the spelling "Beorhtnoth," a variant form of
    "Byrhtnoth" possibly derived from early West Saxon, and approxi-
    mating in modern English the pronunciation of the original name
    in the poem. I use Beorhtnoth when referring to the character in
    Tolkien's drama and Byrhtnoth to refer to the character in the poem
    and to the historical person.

7   I am grateful to my colleague Jason Finch for discussing his own

research with me. See Finch, "Revisiting *Maldon* and the Homecoming." I should also like to thank Janet Alvarez, Linda Backman, and the Southampton UK Tolkien Reading Group for discussing with me various aspects of this paper.

8   See also Shippey ("Tolkien and the Homecoming" 9).

9   Honegger traces the process of development of this drama and its accompanying essay, and notes the greater emphasis on "pride" in later versions (5). See also Carpenter (286).

10 See also Clark (44).

11 Tolkien may also have been reacting against the pre-World War I attitude of other writers of his generation such as Rupert Brooke and Ludwig Wittgenstein who "felt that the experience of facing death would in some way or other, *improve* him" (Scheff, *Emotions, the social bond and human reality* 138–39).

12 George Clark remarks: "Tolkien's reading of Maldon . . . erased most of the story" (41).

13 Many critics note the elegaic tone of Old English heroic poetry. See for example, Raw (281). Tolkien defines *Beowulf* as a heroic-elegaic poem in "*Beowulf:* The Monsters and the Critics" (*MC* 33).

14 Shippey notes that "in his academic work [Tolkien] became significantly more nervous about seeing a continuity from pagan to Christian eras in OE poems—as can be seen from 'The Homecoming' in 1953" (*Author of the Century* 150).

15 In "The Morality of Military Leadership," Janet Brennan Croft has suggested that Tolkien "considered how such early conceptions of heroism and leadership [as *Beowulf* and *The Battle of Maldon*] could be reconciled with Christianity and his real-life experiences and observations of war" (47).

16 *Ofermod* has also been considered in relation to Túrin in *The Silmarillion*. See West.

17 George Clark noted in 1968: "the received view of *The Battle of Maldon* defines the poem as a 'tragedy' and views tragedy in the *dubious light* of the theory of the tragic flaw" (my emphasis), and refers to Byrhtnoth's "fatal flaw . . . his hybris" [sic] (570).

18 In contrast to Tolkien's view, Byrhtnoth's decision to allow the Vikings across the causeway has been defended as a desperate and acceptable risk, a tactic deployed in the hope of deterring the enemy,

at least temporarily, from further attacks along the east coast. See for example, *Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader* (266–67). See also Scragg, ed., *The Battle of Maldon* (19). For a Christian interpretation see Bloomfield ("Beowulf, Byrhtnoth, and the Judgment of God" 547–61).

19 See "Wulfstan's Address to the English," in *Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader* (84–93). This famous sermon is entitled in Latin *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos quando Dani Maxime Persecuti Sunt Eos* [The sermon of Wolf to the English when the Danes were greatly persecuting them.] It post-dates the 991 invasion and expresses Wulfstan's horror at the demoralized condition of the English, naming the Vikings as emissaries of Antichrist and the devil.

20 Letter 154. Rose A. Zimbardo notes that "As in St. Augustine's, so in Tolkien's vision, nothing is created evil. Evil is good that has been perverted" (105).

21 See also Dubs.

22 John R. Holmes, while noting Boromir's "vainglory," also remarks "It is a relative vainglory . . . there is a great deal of heroism about him" (259). As A.N. Doane observes of *The Battle of Maldon* "characters may make mistakes . . . and moral failures may occur . . . without disqualifying the heroism and success of individuals" (Doane 63).

23 In the context of the *ofermod* controversy, Gneuss observes the "good sense of self-respect, knowledge of one's own worth" (121). On the distinction Tolkien creates in *The Lord of the Rings* between the negative use of "pride" and the positive use of "proud," see Blackwelder (181–82).

24 Line 3182. *Lofgeornost* can mean variously eager for renown, praise, or fame.

25 Dennis Cronan notes that in prose *lofgeorn* may be translated as "too eager for praise." In poetry the superlative form *lofgeornost* 'most eager for praise/renown' occurs only in *Beowulf* (400). It is possible that Tolkien, writing in prose, had in mind the prose translation that can shade into 'ostentation,' but his work on *Beowulf* is a persuasive argument in favor of the poetic version.

26 Brooks, lines 956–59; my translation.

27 Anne Savage remarks: "it seems . . . likely that the Anglo-Saxons constructed their own Christianity in a way consonant with their own views of themselves and lived it for the most part unaware of any contradictions, or . . . incurious about them" (41).

28 The first payment of Danegeld followed the defeat at Maldon. See S.A.J. Bradley's Introduction to *The Battle of Maldon* (518).

29 Cross, "Oswald and Byrhtnoth" (106). However, Hans Schabram's study of *superbia* suggests that Old English poetry and prose differ widely at times in their vocabularies. See Schabram, *Superbia*: *Studien zum altenglischen Wortschatz* 1 (123), cited in Shippey ("Boar and Badger" 227). On this difference see also Cronan.

30 Gordon (lines 175–79). This belief that the soul could be attacked was widespread throughout the Middle Ages. See F. Robinson.

31 Bloomfield, "Beowulf, Byrhtnoth, and the Judgment of God: Trial by Combat in Anglo-Saxon England" (550). See also Blake (337), on the Vikings as typological devils.

32 I am grateful to my anonymous reader for reminding me of this comment.

33 Jane Chance comments on "Tolkien's view of the subordinate as more admirable than the chief or king who employs his men as instruments to boost his name in battle" (*Tolkien's Art* 133). This does not take into account the dual roles Boromir has played, nor Tolkien's differentiation of the flawed but redeemable hero. Tolkien gives a precise definition of his concept of a subordinate as "a man for whom the object of his will is decided by another, who has no responsibility downwards, only loyalty upwards." See also *TL* (169). Although Boromir takes responsibility for protecting the hobbits, it is Aragorn who sends him after them.

34 Jane Chance's observation: "the flawed human lord Beorhtnoth who sacrifices his men to his pride . . . contrasts with the good Lord Christ who sacrifices himself for his men" further illuminates the redemptive quality of Boromir's heroism (*Tolkien's Art* 136). On the hero as a Christ figure see also Klaeber (cxx–cxxi).

35 *Beowulf* presents an "unsynthesized" conflation of heroic and Christian material in which the heroic tradition is dominant. See "*Beowulf*: The Monsters and the Critics" (*MC* 49, n. 20).

36 *The right joyous and pleasant history of the feats, gests, and prowess of the Chevalier de Bayard: the good knight without fear of reproach by the Loyal Servant.* This biography is now attributed to Jacques de Mailles. Sara Coleridge's translation was published in London: J. Murray 1825, but first published, Paris, 1527. O.H. Prior published a transcription of de Maille's French text as the *Histoire de Seigneur de Bayart* in 1927. I am most grateful to the librarians of the Hartley Library, University

of Southampton, for their assistance in locating obscure texts and articles.

37   Repeated in Dillon (56–57).

38   It might be objected that the influence of Bayard's biography seems at odds with Tolkien's declared aversion to the chivalric code. However, it may be considered in the context of Tolkien's interest in other high chivalric tales such as *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, or *Sir Orfeo*.

39   Gordon conjectures that one or more leaves are missing at each end of the MS. (38).

40   Aragorn's decision to follow the hobbits reflects Tolkien's notion of "responsibility downwards". See note 32 above.

41   By the 1880s and 1890s "ideals of manliness had largely been purged of open expressions of feeling in favor of a self-confident physical robustness that regarded any undue sensitivity with suspicion" (Glover 46).

42   An abridged version of *The Broad Stone of Honour* was published in 1924 under the title of *Maxims of Christian Chivalry*, cited above. I am most grateful to Charles Connell, and Dale Nelson for alerting me to the significance and lasting influence of *The Broad Stone of Honour*. See also Grigson (47).

43   It also differs from that of Byrhtnoth, which is only known from sources other than the *Maldon* poem. See Gordon (20–21).

44   See also Smith (43).

45   Without a corpse, there can be no funeral for Gandalf, and his death is not final, but this is not apparent unless readers have already read *Unfinished Tales*. Gandalf's Maia identity is not mentioned in *The Lord of the Rings* and other characters, apart from the High Elves, cannot be assumed to know it. On the critical lack of attention to such rhetorical effects as the reluctance to speak, see Drout (137). Tolkien would have known the significance of silence as a rhetorical device since it occurs in *The Battle of Maldon*. See Frese (93).

46   John W. Draper remarks: "the funeral elegy supplied . . . a diction and metaphor for the emotions, a whole technique of lamentation" (313).

47   Tolkien comments on the conversion process as the *Beowulf* text illuminates this transition (*MC* 22). He also regarded *Maldon* as transitional between *Beowulf* and *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (*TL* 173).

48 This sense of transition echoes the pagan/Christian shift defined by Tolkien in *Beowulf*. See "*Beowulf:* The Monsters and the Critics" (*MC* 23).

49 See for example *The Fellowship of the Ring* where he is described as being doubtful (II, viii, 358).

50 On the representation of "incomplete resolution of depression or melancholia" in *Maldon* and other OE poems see Hill (35). It is worth noting here that Freud published his study of hysteria in 1895, and his study "Mourning and Melancholia" in 1917. It is therefore possible, but not necessary, that Tolkien knew of them when writing *The Lord of the Rings*. See Freud (13–14). On "Mourning and Melancholia" see Levine (94–95, 212–215).

51 Middleton cautions we should be "wary of modern philosophical and literary theories which exalt emotion. They may involve denials of the material conditions of men's lives" (170).

52 On grief as vengeance see Schwab (82).

WORKS CITED

Blackwelder, Richard E. *A Tolkien Thesaurus*. New York and London: Garland, 1990.

Blake, N.F. "The Battle of Maldon." *Neophilologus* 49 (1965): 332–345.

Bloomfield, Morton W. "Patristics and Old English Literature: Notes on Some Poems." In *Studies in Old English Literature in Honor of Arthur G. Brodeur*, ed. Stanley B. Greenfield. Eugene: University of Oregon, 1963: 37–38.

———. "Beowulf, Byrhtnoth, and the Judgment of God: Trial by Combat in Anglo-Saxon England." *Speculum* 44, 4 (1969): 545–59.

Bradley, Marion Zimmer. "Men, Halflings, and Hero Worship." In Isaacs and Zimbardo, *Tolkien and the Critics*: 109–127.

Bradley, S.A.J., trans. and ed. *Anglo-Saxon Poetry.* London: J. M. Dent, 1982.

Brooks, Kenneth R., ed. *Andreas and The Fates of the Apostles.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

Brown, Phyllis Rugg, Georgia Renan Crampton, and Fred C. Robinson, eds. *Modes of Interpretation in Old English Literature: Essays in Honor of Stanley B. Greenfield*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

Calder, Daniel G. "Figurative Language and Its Context in *Andreas*: A Study in Medieval Expressionism." In Brown, Crampton and Robinson, eds, *Modes of Interpretation in Old English Literature: Essays in Honor of Stanley B. Greenfield*, 115–36.

Carpenter, Humphrey. *J.R.R. Tolkien: A Biography*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1977.

Chance, Jane. *Tolkien's Art: A Mythology for England*. Rev. edition. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2001.

———, ed. *Tolkien the Medievalist*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.

——— ed. *Tolkien and the Invention of Myth*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2004.

Clark, George, and Daniel Timmons, eds. *J.R.R. Tolkien and His Literary Resonances*. Westport, CT and London: Greenwood Press, 2000.

Clark, George. "*The Battle of Maldon*: A Heroic Poem." *Speculum* 43 (1968): 52–71.

———. "J.R.R. Tolkien and the True Hero." In Clark and Timmons, *J.R.R. Tolkien and His Literary Resonances*: 39–51.

Cooper, Janet, ed. *The Battle of Maldon: Fact or Fiction*. London and Rio Grande: Hambledon Press, 1993.

Croft, Janet Brennan. "The Morality of Military Leadership." *Mallorn* 42 (2004): 47–50.

Cronan, Dennis. "Poetic Meanings in the Old English Poetic Vocabulary." *English Studies* 5 (2003): 397–425.

Cross, J.E. "Oswald and Byrhtnoth." *English Studies* 46 (1965): 93–109.

Digby, Kenelm. *The Broadstone of Honour*. London: Edward Lumley, 1846.

Dillon, Nicholas, O.F.M. ed. *Maxims of Christian Chivalry*. Hartford, CT: Catholic Authors Press, 1924.

Doane, A.N. "Legend, History and Artifice in *The Battle of Maldon*." *Viator* 9 (1978): 39–66.

Draper, John W. *The Funeral Elegy and the Rise of English Romanticism*. London: Frank Cass, 1967.

Drout, Michael D. C. "Tolkien's Prose Style and Its Literary and Rhetorical Effects." *Tolkien Studies* 1 (2004): 137−62.

Dubs, Kathleen E. "Providence, Fate, and Chance: Boethian Philosophy in *The Lord of the Rings*." *Twentieth Century Literature*, 27 (1981): 34−42. Reprinted in Chance, *Tolkien and the Invention of Myth*: 133–42.

Evans, Jonathan. "The Anthropology of Arda: Creation, Theology and the Race of Men." In Chance, *Tolkien the Medievalist*: 195–224.

Finch, Jason. "Revisiting *Maldon* and the 'Homecoming'." *Amon Hen* 198 (2006): 15−17.

Flieger, Verlyn and Carl F. Hostetter, eds. *Tolkien's Legendarium: Essays on "The History of Middle-earth*." Westport, CT and London: Greenwood Press, 2000.

Frese, Dolores Warwick. "Poetic Prowess in *Brunanburh* and *Maldon*: Winning, Losing, and Literary Outcomes." In Brown, Crampton, and Robinson, eds, *Modes of Interpretation in Old English Literature*: 83−99.

Freud, Siegmund. *Studies in Hysteria*, trans. Nicola Luckhurst. London: Penguin Classics, 2004.

Glover, David. *Vampires, Mummies and Liberals*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1996.

Gneuss, Helmut. "*The Battle of Maldon* 89: Byrhtnoth's *ofermod* once again." *Studies in Philology* 73, 2 (April 1976): 117−39.

Gordon, E.V., ed. *The Battle of Maldon*. London: Methuen, 1937.

Greenfield, Stanley B., and Daniel G. Calder. *A New Critical History of Old English Literature*. New York and London: New York University Press, 1986.

Grigson, Geoffrey. *Samuel Palmer: The Visionary Years*. London: Kegan Paul, 1947.

Helms, Randel. *Myth, Magic and Meaning in Tolkien's World*. London: Panther, 1976.

Hill, John M. "Good Fields of Grief: Remnants of Christian Conversion." *Psychocultural Review* 2 (1978): 27−43.

Holmes, John R. "Oaths and Oathbreaking: Analogues of the Old English *comitatus* in Tolkien's Myth." In Chance, *Tolkien and the Inven-*

tion of Myth: 249–61.

Honegger, Thomas. "The Homecoming of Beorhtnoth: Philology and the Literary Muse." *Tolkien Studies* 4 (2007): 189–99.

Irvine, Judith T. "Registering Affect: Heteroglossia in the Linguistic Expression of Emotion." In Lutz and Abu-Lughod, *Language and the Politics of Emotion*: 126–61.

Isaacs, Neil D., and Rose A. Zimbardo, eds. *Tolkien and the Critics: Essays on J.R.R. Tolkien's "The Lord of the Rings."* Notre Dame, IN and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968.

Kelly, Mary Quella. "The Poetry of Fantasy." In Isaacs and Zimbardo, *Tolkien and the Critics*: 170–200.

Kilgour, Raymond Lincoln. *The Decline of Chivalry*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937.

Klaeber, Fr., ed. *Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg*. Boston: D. C. Heath, 1922.

Levine, Michael, ed. *The Analytic Freud: Philosophy and Psychoanalysis*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Liuzza, R.M., ed. *Old English Literature*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002.

Lowson, Iain, Peter Mackenzie and Keith Marshall. *The Guide to Middle Earth*. London: Reynolds and Hearn, 2001.

Lutz, Catherine A., and Lila Abu-Lughod, eds. *Language and the Politics of Emotion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Mailles, Jacques de. *The right joyous and pleasant history of the feats, gests, and prowess of the Chevalier de Bayard: the good knight without fear or reproach by the Loyal Servant*. Tr. Sara Coleridge. London: J. Murray 1825, first published, Paris, 1527.

Mell, Donald C. *A Poetics of Augustan Elegy*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1974.

Middleton, Peter. *The Inward Gaze: Masculinity and Subjectivity in Modern Culture*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Raffel, Burton. "*The Lord of the Rings* as Literature." In Isaacs and Zimbardo, *Tolkien and the Critics*: 218–246.

Raw, Barbara. *The Art and Background of Old English Poetry.* London: Edward Arnold, 1978.

Robinson, Fred C. "God, Death, and Loyalty in *The Battle of Maldon*." In Liuzza, *Old English Literature*: 425–444.

Robinson, Jenefer. *Deeper than Reason: Emotion and its Role in Literature, Music and Art*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005.

Rosenberg, Daniel. "Language in the Discourse of the Emotions." In Lutz and Abu-Lughod *Language and the Politics of Emotion*: 162–85.

Savage, Anne. "Pagans and Christians, Anglo-Saxons and Anglo-Saxonists: The Changing Face of Our Mythical Landscape." In *Reinventing the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. William F. Gentrup. Turnhout: Brepols, 1998: 37–49. Arizona Studies in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, vol. 1

Schabram, Hans. *Superbia*: *Studien zum altenglischen Wortschatz 1*. München: Fink, 1965.

Scheff, Thomas J. *Emotions, the Social Bond and Human Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Schwab, Ute. "*The Battle of Maldon*: A Memorial Poem." In Cooper, *The Battle of Maldon: Fact or Fiction*: 63–85.

Scragg, D.G. ed. *The Battle of Maldon*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981.

Shippey, Tom. *J.R.R. Tolkien: Author of the Century*. London: HarperCollins, 2001.

Shippey, T. A. "Boar and Badger: An Old English Heroic Antithesis?" *Leeds Studies in English* 16 (1985): 220–39.

———. "Tolkien and 'The Homecoming of Beorhtnoth.'" In *Roots and Branches: Selected Papers on Tolkien*, by Tom Shippey. Zollikofen, Switzerland: Walking Tree Press, 2007: 323-339. Previously published in *Leaves from the Tree: J.R.R. Tolkien's Shorter Fiction*. London: Tolkien Society, 1991: 5–16.

Smith, Leigh. "'I have looked the last on that which is fairest': Elegy in *Beowulf* and Tolkien's Lothlórien." *Mallorn* 44 (2006): 43–46.

Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader. Rev. Dorothy Whitelock. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Szarmach, Paul. "The (Sub-) Genre of *The Battle of Maldon*." In Cooper, *The Battle of Maldon: Fact or Fiction*: 43–61.

West, Richard C. "Túrin's *Ofermod*: An Old English Theme in the Development of the Story of Túrin." In Flieger and Hostetter, *Tolkien's Legendarium*: 233–45.

White, Geoffrey M. "Moral Discourse and the Rhetoric of Emotions." In Lutz and Abu-Lughod, *Language and the Politics of Emotion*: 46–68.

Williams, Raymond. *The English Novel from Dickens to Lawrence*. London: Hogarth Press, 1984.

Wogan-Browne, Jocelyn. "The Hero in Christian Reception: Ælfric and Heroic Poetry." In Liuzza, *Old English Literature*: 215–35.

Zimbardo, Rose A. "Moral Vision in *The Lord of the Rings*." In Isaacs and Zimbardo, *Tolkien and the Critics*: 100–108.

Žižek, Slavoj. *The Plague of Fantasies*. London: Verso, 1997.

Three Rings for—Whom Exactly? And Why? Justifying the Disposition of the Three Elven Rings

Jason Fisher

As with many of the artifacts in *The Lord of the Rings*, the final names, descriptions, and putative functions of the "Three Rings for the Elven-kings" were slow to emerge and changed many times. Indeed, the Elven Rings were originally to have been nine in number, with three for Mortal Men (*Shadow* 269). Later, these nine rings of the Elves became only three, associated first with "earth, air, and sky" (*Shadow* 260) and later with "earth, sea, and sky" (*Shadow* 319). During these early stages, Tolkien at one point also called the Three Rings "'*Kemen*, *Ëar*, and *Menel*, the Rings of Earth, Sea and Heaven'" (Hammond and Scull, *Reader's Companion* 671)[1]—logical, albeit later-abandoned, names which offer their own consistent etymologies (as glossed). And although the earliest form of the Ring-verse referred to *nine* Elven Rings, the earliest draft of the chapter "The Shadow of the Past" (one of the oldest parts of the manuscript, and then called "Ancient History") nevertheless referred to *three* Elven Rings from the outset (*Shadow* 260). Yet later, in the A manuscript for "The Grey Havens," there are no Elven Rings to be found; while in the B manuscript, the Rings are mentioned, but not named (*Sauron* 111-12). Furthermore, Galadriel's ring was initially to have been the Ring of Earth (*Treason* 252),[2] and it was not until the astonishingly late date of the first galley proof that the three Elven Rings were finally christened Narya, Nenya, and Vilya (*Sauron* 111-12) and described as we now know them (*Sauron* 132).[3]

All of this variability would seem to be symptomatic of the difficulties involved in adapting the Three Rings to the legend of an overmastering One Ring, and of weaving all four into the backcloth of an already rich and well-developed legendarium that had no rings at all until a serendipitous narrative decision in *The Hobbit*. It is no wonder, then, that many readers have found themselves confused over the exact nature of the Three Rings and on whom each ring was bestowed. It is not uncommon, for example, to surmise mistakenly that Elrond, rather than Galadriel, possessed the Ring of Water, arguing that this might explain his command over the defensive waters of the Bruinen. Others mistakenly contend that since Gandalf was destined to become Gandalf the White, he was appointed caretaker of the White Ring instead of the Red. Such conclusions may be intuitive, but they are nevertheless missteps. To correct them, one must tease out the reasons for the disposition of each of the Three Rings.

Narya / The Red Ring / The Ring of Fire

Narya is the easiest to trace, mainly because of its consistency with reader's intuition. Called the Red Ring and the Ring of Fire, Narya, like the other Elven Rings, was set with a jewel, a ruby (*S* 288), although we do not know of what metal the ring was fashioned. We do know that Celebrimbor conveyed both Narya and Vilya into the keeping of Gil-galad after his discovery of the scheming of Sauron. Subsequently, Gil-galad gave Narya to Círdan, Lord of Mithlond, though exactly when he did so is open to some question.[4] But Círdan did not use the ring, claiming that "it was entrusted to me only to keep secret, and here upon the West-shores it is idle" (*UT* 389).[5] Some time later, at Gandalf's arrival in Middle-earth, Círdan entrusted Narya to him, an act which would later stoke the fires of innate enmity between Gandalf and Saruman. Giving Narya to Gandalf, Círdan declared, "For this is the Ring of Fire, and with it you may rekindle hearts in a world that grows chill" (*RK*, Appendix B, 366).

Some readers point triumphantly to the statement that "Gandalf had made a special study of bewitchments with fire and lights" (*H*, VI, 105); however, as Douglas Anderson has noted, "Quoting *The Hobbit* to discuss Narya and Gandalf's use of fireworks seems to be posing a straw man only to shoot it down" (personal communication). Because *The Hobbit* preceded *The Lord of the Rings*, and therefore Narya, as such, did not exist at the time Tolkien first developed the Gandalf character, it is of little value to argue that the fireworks alluded to in the earlier book are in any way associated with Narya. If in hindsight we decide that they are, it is only because "the fireworks in *The Lord of the Rings* proceed naturally from the original character, and only afterwards seem to be a part of the developed pattern for the Three Rings" (ibid.). Still, in the context of *The Lord of the Rings*, it is reasonable to suppose that Gandalf exploited the power of the Ring of Fire to further his inherent abilities. Or, to look at the question from another angle, it may be that Gandalf was chosen as Narya's keeper precisely *because* of natural talents that placed him in harmony with those of that Ring. What we know for certain is that Tolkien offers a tantalizing hint to corroborate the assumption of *some* connection in a 1968 letter to Donald Swann, where he explains that "Fireworks . . . are part of the representation of *Gandalf*, bearer of the Ring of Fire, the Kindler: the most childlike aspect shown to the Hobbits being fireworks" (*Letters* 390). Though we are never *explicitly* told that Gandalf uses Narya in his manipulations of fire, it would seem that Tolkien meant us to infer this relationship.[6]

In further support of this supposition is Gandalf's declaration to the Balrog of Moria: "I am a servant of the Secret Fire, wielder of the flame of Anor. You cannot pass. The dark fire will not avail you, flame

of Udûn. Go back to the Shadow! You cannot pass." (*FR*, II, v, 344) The "Secret Fire" probably refers specifically to the "Flame Imperishable" of Ilúvatar (*S* 15), and the "flame of Anor" is probably meant to represent the power of the Sun; however, these references nevertheless associate Gandalf more strongly than any other Ringbearer with the primary element of the Ring of Fire. So, too, Gandalf's Ring of Fire is set in direct opposition to Sauron's lost Ring, the One Ring, tellingly called a "wheel of fire" (*RK*, VI, ii, 198 and passim). It may be worth noting here that in earlier drafts of the Balrog passage, the associations are less specific than in the final published text. In the first attempt, Gandalf is "the master of the White Fire" (*Treason* 198), while the B and C drafts vary only slightly from this: "the master of White Fire" (no definite article) and "the master of White Flame" (203).

Vilya / The Blue Ring / The Ring of Air

Vilya presents a somewhat more intriguing case. This was the Ring of Air, known as the Blue Ring—a sapphire set in gold—and called "mightiest of the Three"[7] (*RK*, VI, ix, 308). With Narya, Celebrimbor sent Vilya to Gil-galad in the west of Middle-earth; then, before his death, Gil-galad bestowed Vilya—and the vice-regency of Eriador—on Elrond. But what indications can we uncover to justify the appropriateness of his choice? The evidence is somewhat more scant and speculative than the case for Narya, but I believe we can make some progress.

Bilbo's first impressions of Rivendell offer a clue: "*The air* grew warmer as they got lower, and the smell of the pine-trees made him drowsy, so that every now and again he nodded and nearly fell off, or bumped his nose on the pony's neck" (*H*, III, 57, my emphasis). And a moment or two later, "'Hmmm! it smells like elves!' thought Bilbo, and he looked up at *the stars*. They were burning bright *and blue*" (*H*, III, 58, my emphasis). Likewise, when advised to aim for Rivendell on his departure from the Shire, Frodo's "heart was moved suddenly with a desire to see the house of Elrond Halfelven, and *breathe the air* of that deep valley where many of the Fair Folk still dwelt in peace" (*FR*, I, iii, 75, my emphasis). It is, of course, possible that these references to the chief element and color of Elrond's Ring are mere coincidence and that we may be falling into argument by hindsight again, as with Gandalf's Ring of Fire. But superficial though these clues may appear, they offer a glimpse into how Tolkien envisioned Rivendell, even from very early on. And in any case, this is not the only evidence we have.

To explain what I mean, a brief digression regarding the fates of the three Silmarils is needed. As attentive readers will remember, the Silmaril Beren and Lúthien wrested from the Iron Crown of Morgoth passed to Eärendil and became the Morning (and Evening) Star, riding the heavens

upon Eärendil's brow. Later, following the War of Wrath, Maedhros and Maglor, the last surviving sons of Fëanor, treacherously seized the two remaining Silmarils. But Varda had hallowed the Jewels, and the evils wrought by the Oath of Fëanor made it impossible for Maedhros and Maglor to keep them. Maedhros, "being in anguish and despair . . . cast himself into a gaping chasm filled with fire, and so ended; and the Silmaril that he bore was taken into the bosom of the Earth"; whereas, Maglor "could not endure the pain with which the Silmaril tormented him; and he cast it at last into the Sea, and thereafter he wandered ever upon the shores, singing in pain and regret beside the waves." Thus, each of the three Silmarils found its final home—"one in the airs of heaven, and one in the fires of the heart of the world, and one in the deep waters"[8] (*S* 253-54). Despite Tolkien's vacillations on the Elven Rings of Power, it can be no coincidence that he finally arrived at three rings, each aligned with the fate of one of the Silmarils before it. Moreover, let us remember that it was Celebrimbor, a grandson of Fëanor, who wrought the Three Rings, subtly echoing the work of his grandfather.

Clearly, then, the Silmaril Maedhros briefly claimed should correspond with the Ring of Fire, Narya; while the Silmaril taken by Maglor would foreshadow the Ring of Water, Nenya. But returning to Vilya, the Ring of Air, if it indeed corresponds to the Silmaril of Eärendil, riding above the earth as a star, then Eärendil's son, Elrond, would certainly seem to be an apt choice for its bearer. Indeed, in "Of the Rings of Power and the Third Age," we read that "ere the Third Age was ended the Elves perceived that the Ring of Sapphire was with Elrond, in the fair valley of Rivendell, upon whose house *the stars of heaven* most brightly shone" (*S* 298, my emphasis). And Tolkien writes that at his final departure from Middle-earth, "Elrond wore a mantle of grey and had *a star upon his forehead*" (*RK*, VI, ix, 308, my emphasis). It is no great leap to take the wording of these passages as an allusion to the Silmaril of Eärendil, that star "bound upon his brow" (*S* 250).

Nenya / The White Ring / The Ring of Water

Finally, there is Nenya, the Ring of Water, also called the Ring of Adamant, referring to its large, white gemstone—presumably a diamond. The ring itself was wrought of *mithril*, but the first description of it is telling: "It glittered like polished gold overlaid with silver light, and a white stone in it twinkled as if the Even-star had come down to rest upon her hand" (*FR*, II, vii, 380). Here, again, there would seem to be a connection to Eärendil's Star (and a possible source of confusion for readers); however, the Ring of Water is connected much more closely with Galadriel than it could ever have been with Elrond. For example, this description of the ring strongly echoes a description of Galadriel herself:

"Even among the Eldar she was accounted beautiful, and her hair was held a marvel unmatched. It was golden like the hair of her father and of her foremother Indis, but richer and more radiant, for its gold was touched by some memory of the starlike silver of her mother; and the Eldar said that the light of the Two Trees, Laurelin and Telperion, had been snared in her tresses" (*UT* 229-30).

One can also find ample evidence to explain how the Ring of *Water* relates to Galadriel and to Lothlórien. We are told that "[Galadriel] received Nenya, the White Ring, from Celebrimbor, and by its power the realm of Lórinand was strengthened and made beautiful; but its power upon her was great also and unforeseen, *for it increased her latent desire for the Sea* and for return into the West, so that her joy in Middle-earth was diminished" (*UT* 237, my emphasis). A little later in the chapter, Christopher Tolkien adds that "In its concluding passage the narrative returns to Galadriel, telling that *the sea-longing grew so strong in her* that (though she deemed it her duty to remain in Middle-earth while Sauron was still unconquered) she determined to leave Lórinand and to dwell near the sea" (*UT* 240, my emphasis).[9]

Perhaps unsurprisingly, there is an additional linguistic thread to be teased out. Before exploring it, a brief reminder of the etymologies of the Three Rings will be helpful. These are quite straightforward and do not offer any particularly useful hidden meanings but are worth rehearsing. The Three Rings each come by their names through the Quenya roots *NEN–* "water" (*Lost Road* 376), *NAR–* "fire" (*Lost Road* 374), and *WIL–* "fly, float in air" (*Lost Road* 398-9)—the Etymologies in *The Lost Road* also offer up a number of related derivatives of each of these. Each name is essentially a diminution or elemental abstraction, with the basic meanings of "watery," "fiery," and "airy," respectively. By straightforward, I mean that the etymologies of the Elven Rings' Elvish names are exactly synonymous with the English glosses Tolkien uses time and again. Readers who tend to confuse the rings would probably turn to their Elvish names for clues; however, if they were already confused even after reading the English glosses, then seeing the Elvish translations probably would not help them either. It would be interesting if the Elvish meanings hinted at something deeper, but they do not—at least, not beyond the observations I have made in this paper (for which the English glosses are just as evidential).

But, to return to the linguistic link I mentioned: as it happens, the etymology of Galadriel's name offers a tantalizing hint at her connection to the Ring of Water. In a late and primarily philological essay, "The Shibboleth of Fëanor," we learn that "the name [Galadriel] was derived from the Common Eldarin stem ÑAL 'shine by reflection'; **ñalata* 'radiance glittering reflection' (from jewels, glass or polished metals, *or water*) >

Quenya *ñalta*, Telerin *alata*, Sindarin *galad . . .*" (*Peoples* 347, my emphasis). As we know from early drafts, Tolkien's original intention regarding the etymology of Galadriel's name was to relate it to *galadh* "tree" (*Treason* 249), a choice which resonates perfectly with readers. However, Tolkien later decided against this policy, willfully relegating *galadh* to a false cognate, and altering his etymology as discussed above. We can only speculate as to precisely why he did this, but it is very tempting to adduce the change as solidifying evidence for a connection to the Ring of Water.

In addition, the descriptive language surrounding Lothlórien tends to focus on water-like images (whereas, the depiction of Rivendell more often relies on the air). Two notable examples should suffice: "Looking through an opening on the south side of the flet Frodo saw all the valley of the Silverlode lying like a sea of fallow gold tossing gently in the breeze" (*FR*, II, vi, 360); and later, "Frodo stood still, hearing far off great seas upon beaches that had long ago been washed away, and sea-birds crying whose race had perished from the earth" (*FR*, II, vi, 366). And then there is the Nimrodel. Setting aside for the moment the legend of Nimrodel and Amroth, it seems perfectly reasonable to conclude that Nimrodel's enchantment is maintained through the power of the Ring of Water. As Legolas says, "I will bathe my feet, for it is said that the water is healing to the weary" (*FR*, II, vi, 353).[10] And finally, perhaps most significantly, there is Galadriel's Mirror—and the Phial (filled with its water) that she bestows on Frodo. Again, one seems justified in suggesting that the water of the Mirror (and the Phial) derive their power from Nenya.

It is worth noting in passing some remarkable notes and marginalia connected with Galadriel, Nenya, and Aragorn, as discussed in *The War of the Ring*. Here, it appears that Tolkien briefly considered having Galadriel give her ring (Nenya, as yet probably unnamed) to Aragorn for his use against Sauron. Tolkien quickly dismissed this conception, as it would have left Lórien defenseless (*War* 425), but the fact that he entertained the idea, however briefly, is quite extraordinary. Perhaps even more so is the apparently connected claim that the people of Lebennin referred to Aragorn as "the Lord of the Rings." According to Gimli, even the sons of Elrond, Elladan and Elrohir, called him by that title (ibid.)—a title, I need hardly point out, that was generally used of Sauron. What Tolkien was thinking here, even Christopher was unable to say. Perhaps one reason Tolkien abandoned this idea was for the sake of the symmetry of the Three Rings we now have in the canonical text.

Conclusion

Although Tolkien's writings are rich and complex enough to allow many a conjecture as to who might have held which ring and when, it seems clear that Tolkien eventually decided—or intuited—exactly where

each of the Three Rings would *best* be bestowed. And therefore, the Blue Ring of Elrond would *not* have been responsible for the flood of the Bruinen, as his was the Ring of Air, not Water. Galadriel's Ring of Water would have been connected with the Nimrodel, her Mirror, and the Phial she gave to Frodo, though there is a secondary connection to the Star of Eärendil also. And Gandalf, as the kindler of the hearts of the Free Peoples, would have logically taken the Ring of Fire into his keeping.

At the time the concept of the Three Rings began to evolve, it seems clear that Tolkien was unsure where and how to fit them into his larger story; however, by the time he wrote the essay "Of the Rings of Power and the Third Age" (published with *The Silmarillion*), he had determined their final number as well as their names, descriptions, and bearers. Seeing this essay in draft form with Tolkien's characteristic notes and emendations would be very instructive; however, the evolution of the essay is nowhere traced. The development of its companion piece, the "Akallabêth," is discussed in *The Peoples of Middle-earth*; however, we have no such discussion for "Of the Rings of Power."

The best we can do is to place the first finished draft of the essay in (probably) the late 1940s, based on Tolkien's reference to it in a letter to Katherine Farrer of 15 June [1948?] (*Letters* 130).[11] Much of the essay may have been cobbled together years earlier, as we know from *The Treason of Isengard* that parts of the expository material from the drafting of "The Council of Elrond" were excised from *The Lord of the Rings* but incorporated into "Of the Rings of Power" (*Treason* 144-45). But though the essay had been at least roughed out by the middle to late 1940s, Tolkien must have continued to revise it all the way through the galley proof stage of *The Lord of the Rings* (some time in 1954), and perhaps well beyond it, since we know that key elements included in "Of the Rings of Power"—most significantly, the names of the rings—were not decided until that time.[12] It was therefore during the period between the late 1940s and the middle 1950s that the Three Rings appear to have coalesced into their final forms and were fitted into the larger tales and legends of Tolkien's fictive history.

Notes

1 These alternate names, from an unpublished manuscript at Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, are unattested in *The History of Middle-earth* (or anywhere else for that matter).

2 It is interesting to note that all four of the Classical elements—earth, air, water, fire—are represented among Tolkien's early conceptions of the Elven Rings. In the final text, however, only three of the four

remain; the element of earth is lost. Perhaps the *three* Rings are meant to evoke the Catholic Trinity. And if so, and the fourth element must be lost, perhaps Tolkien decided that the element of earth would resonate better with Dwarves than Elves. With a few notable exceptions (e.g., Thingol, Finrod, Thranduil), Elves are rarely associated with the earth. We may, however, see a lingering trace of Tolkien's original idea to give Galadriel a Ring of Earth in her welcoming words to Gimli, in response to which "the Dwarf, hearing the names given in his own ancient tongue, looked up and met her eyes; and it seemed to him that he looked suddenly into the heart of an enemy and saw there love and understanding" (*FR*, II, vii, 371). Such a reaction seems to reflect the beneficent mission of the Three Rings.

3   Christopher Tolkien does not say so explicitly, but it must also have been during the galley stage that the name Nenya was added to "The Mirror of Galadriel" and "Ring of Earth" emended to "Ring of Adamant."

4   It is generally agreed that this took place not long after Celebrimbor sent Vilya and Narya out of Eregion. One account, however, implies that Gil-galad may have retained Narya much longer—at least 1700 years longer, in fact—until he departed for Mordor with the Last Alliance. But this statement, which Tolkien made only in a marginal note, disagrees with at least three other sources (*UT* 254).

5   It is possible to argue that the mere possession of Narya, even without active use of it, nevertheless conveyed to Mithlond the beneficial power of preservation for which the Three Rings were known; however, this is beyond present scope of this essay.

6   Other, more metaphorical or symbolic interpretations of the rings and their uses, abound—see, for example, O'Neill (92-93, 149-50), Noel (157-61), and Allan (293-99)—however, for my present purpose, I am concerned with the literal associations between the Three Rings' primary "elements" and the putative abilities those elements conferred on their bearers.

7   Tolkien's designation of Vilya as "mightiest of the Three" was added only at the galley proof stage; see Hammond (670-71).

8   Another interesting pattern is that, of the three final claimants to a Silmaril, one died (Maedhros), one lived (Maglor), and one ended up, in a sense, somewhere in between, neither living nor dead (Eärendil).

9   Indeed, one also recalls Galadriel's song at the departure of the Fel-

lowship from Lothlórien (*FR*, II, viii, 388-89), in which Galadriel's "sea-longing" is given voice. Of all the bearers of the Three Rings (apart from Gandalf), Galadriel is (arguably) the only one to have seen the light of the Two Trees. Speaking of Galadriel, Tolkien writes in *The Road Goes Ever On* that "it was impossible for one of the High-Elves to overcome the yearning for the Sea, and the longing to pass over it again to the land of their former bliss" (*Road* 68). It seems unlikely to be mere coincidence that the Elda most burdened with this sea-longing should be fated to bear the Ring of Water.

10 As I mentioned above, some readers mistakenly assume Elrond to be the bearer of the Ring of Water on the basis of his control over the Bruinen. But one must remember that "the Three Rings were precisely endowed with the power of preservation" (*Letters* 177); moving the Bruinen to violence, even in defense of Rivendell, would seem clearly outside the purpose of the Three Rings. For that reason alone, Nimrodel seems a much likelier piece of evidence for Nenya's influence than Bruinen.

11 Tolkien also refers to "Of the Rings of Power and the Third Age" in his often-cited letter to Milton Waldman (most likely written in late 1951). It is thus clear that he regarded the essay as a completed work (though, like everything else he wrote, not immune to continuous niggling and revision) and had it clearly in mind while finalizing *The Lord of the Rings*. Also in this letter, in a lengthy passage omitted from the published *Letters*, Tolkien refers to the Three Rings by their proper colors and bearers (though not by their names); these facts, at least, were therefore apparently fixed by 1951. The excised portion of the Milton Waldman letter may be found in *Sauron* (132) and Hammond and Scull (*Companion* 749).

12 A look at the paratext of *The Lord of the Rings* is also instructive. Several months before Tolkien began reviewing the galley proofs for *The Return of the King*, Allen & Unwin asked him to develop some ideas for the dust-jackets. In March 1954, Tolkien submitted several designs, at least two of which incorporated the Three Elven Rings; see Priestman (2) and Hammond and Scull (*Artist and Illustrator* 179) for examples. Priestman suggests Tolkien may have been working on these designs "throughout 1953," possibly in error (61). In any case, Tolkien preferred this design, writing to Rayner Unwin on 26 March 1954: "I hope it is the one [preferred by Unwin] with the three subsidiary rings, since the symbolism of that is more suitable to the whole story than the one with a black centre and only the opposition of Gandalf indicated by the red-jewelled ring" (Hammond 92). In the event, it

was this design, emphasizing only the opposition of Narya (and Gandalf) to Sauron's One Ring, that was used (92-93). See also Scull and Hammond (*Chronology* 425-46).

WORKS CITED

Allan, Jim and Nina Carson. *An Introduction to Elvish And to Other Tongues and Proper Names and Writing Systems of the Third Age of the Western Lands of Middle-earth as Set Forth in the Published Writings of Professor John Ronald Reuel Tolkien*. Hayes, Middlesex: Bran's Head Books Ltd, 1978. Reprinted 2002.

Hammond, Wayne G. *J.R.R. Tolkien: A Descriptive Bibliography*. With the assistance of Douglas A. Anderson. New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Books, 1993.

Hammond, Wayne G. and Christina Scull. *J.R.R. Tolkien: Artist & Illustrator*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1995.

———. *The Lord of the Rings: A Reader's Companion*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2005.

Noel, Ruth S. *The Mythology of Middle-earth*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1977.

O'Neill, Timothy R. *The Individuated Hobbit: Jung, Tolkien, and the Archetypes of Middle-earth*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1979.

Priestman, Judith. *J.R.R. Tolkien: Life and Legend. An Exhibition to Commemorate the Centenary of the Birth of J.R.R. Tolkien (1892-1973)*. Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1992.

Scull, Christina and Wayne G. Hammond. *The J.R.R. Tolkien Companion and Guide: Chronology*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2006.

Tolkien, J.R.R. and Donald Swann. *The Road Goes Ever On: A Song Cycle*. Third edition. London: HarperCollins, 2002.

Chaucer as a Philologist: *The Reeve's Tale* [†]

J.R.R. T<small>OLKIEN</small>

[*Read at a meeting of the Philological Society in Oxford on Saturday, 16th May, 1931.*]

[The delay in publishing this paper is principally due to hesitation in putting forward a study, for which closer investigation of words, and more still a much fuller array of readings from MSS. of the *Reeve's Tale*, were so plainly needed. But for neither have I had opportunity, and dust has merely accumulated on the pages. The paper is therefore presented with apologies, practically as it was read, though with the addition of a "critical text", and accompanying textual notes, as well as of various footnotes, appendices, and comments naturally omitted in reading. It may at least indicate that this tale has a special interest and importance for Chaucerian criticism, even if it shows also that it requires more expert handling.

Line references without any prefix are to the actual lines of the *Reeve's Tale*. Numbers prefixed A or B refer to these groups of the *Canterbury Tales* in the Six-Text numbering.]

Chaucer as a Philologist.

One may suspect that Chaucer, surveying from the *Galaxye* our literary and philological antics upon the *litel erthe that heer is . . . so ful of torment and of harde grace*, would prefer the Philological Society to the Royal Society of Literature, and an editor of the English Dictionary to a poet laureate. Not that Chaucer *redivivus* would be a phonologist or a lexicographer rather than a popular writer—*the lyf so short, the craft so long to lerne*! But certainly, as far as treatment of himself goes (and he had a well-formed opinion of the value of his own work), of all the words and ink posterity has spent or spilt over his entertaining writings, he would chiefly esteem the efforts to recover the detail of what he wrote, even (indeed particularly) down to forms and spellings, to recapture an idea of what it sounded like, to make certain what it meant. Let the source-hunter *have his swink to him reserved*. For Chaucer was interested in "language", and in the forms of his own tongue. As we gather from the envoy to *Troilus and Criseyde*, he

chose his forms and probably his spellings with care, by selection among divergencies of which he was critically aware; and he wished to have his choice handed on accurately.

Alas! if the curse he pronounced on scribe Adam produced any effect, many a fifteenth-century penman must early have gone bald. We know the detail of Chaucer's work now only through a fifteenth-century blur (at best). His holographs, or the copies impatiently rubbed and scraped by him, would doubtless be something of a shock to us, though a shock we shall unfortunately be spared. In our unhappy case, he would be the first to applaud any efforts to undo the damage as far as possible; and the acquiring of as good a knowledge as is available of the language of his day would certainly have seemed to him a preliminary necessity, not a needless luxury. One can imagine the brief burning words, like those with which he scorched Adam, that he would address to those who profess to admire him while disdaining "philology", who adventure, it may be, on textual criticism undeterred by ignorance of Middle English.

Of course, Chaucer was the last man himself to annotate his jests, while they were fresh. But he would recognize the need, at our distance of time, for the careful exhuming of ancient jokes buried under years, before we shape our faces to a conventional grin at his too often mentioned "humour". Chaucer was no enemy of learning, and there is no need to apologize to him for the annotating of one of his jests, for digging it up and examining it without laughing. He will not suspect us of being incapable of laughter. From his position of advantage he will be able to observe that most philologists possess a sense of the ridiculous, one that even prevents them from taking "literary studies" too seriously.

Of all the jokes that Chaucer ever perpetrated the one that most calls for philological annotation is the dialect talk in the *Reeve's Tale*. For the joke of this dialogue is (and was) primarily a linguistic joke,[1] and is, indeed, now one at which only a philologist can laugh sincerely. Merely to recapture some of the original fun would perhaps be worth the long and dusty labour necessary; but that will not be my chief object. Other points arise from a close study of Chaucer's little *tour de force*, so interesting that we may claim that it has acquired an accidental value, greater than its author intended, and surpassing the original slender jest.

The representation of Northern dialect in the *Reeve's Tale* is so well known that it is taken for granted: its originality and novelty are apt to be forgotten. Yet it is a curious and remarkable thing, unparalleled in Chaucer's extant writings,[2] or, indeed (as far as I am aware), in any Middle English work. Even in our copies the dialect lines stand out astonishingly from the linguistic texture of the rest of Chaucer's work. We may well ask: Is this a most unusual piece of dramatic realism? Or is it just the by-product of a private philological curiosity, used with a secret smile to give

some life and individuality to a *fabliau* of trite sort, a depressing specimen of low-class knockabout farce? Or does it just pander to popular linguistic prejudices—ranking with what passes for Scotch, Welsh, Yorkshire, or American in supposedly funny stories of to-day? The answer, of course, requires elaborate enquiry. But I think I would here anticipate and say that to all three questions the answer is "yes".

Chaucer deliberately relies on the easy laughter that is roused by "dialect" in the ignorant or the unphilological. But he gives not mere popular ideas of dialect: he gives the genuine thing, even if he is careful to give his audience certain obvious features that they were accustomed to regard as funny. He certainly was inspired here to use this easy joke for the purposes of dramatic realism—and he saved the *Reeve's Tale* by the touch. Yet he certainly would not have done these things, let alone done them so well, if he had not possessed a private philological interest, and a knowledge, too, of "dialect" spoken and written, greater than was usual in his day.

Such elaborate jests, so fully carried out, are those only of a man interested in language and consciously observant of it. It is universal to notice oddities in the speech of others, and to laugh at them, and a welter of English dialects made such divergences more a matter of common experience, especially doubtless in London, then than now. There was already growing in and with London a polite language (there was a polite idiom available for Chaucer's own work), and a standard of comparison was beginning to appear. Yet this does not make such a joke inevitable. Many may laugh, but few can analyse or record. The Northern speech is elsewhere the subject of uncomplimentary reference before this date: in Trevisa's translation of Higden's *Polychronicon* it is called *scharp, slyttyng, and frotyng, and unschape*; but no examples are given. Dialect was, and indeed is still, normally only embarked on, in full and in form and apart from one or two overworked spellings or phrases thrown in for local colour, by those who know it natively. But Chaucer has stuck in a Northern tooth, and a sharp one, a deal more convincing than Mak's poor little *ich* and *ich be*[3]; and he has done it without a word of warning.

The result is, of course, not of any special importance as a document of dialect. It is dialect only at second hand, and Chaucer has affected to excuse himself from localizing it precisely.[4] We can hardly expect the lines to add anything to our knowledge of the northern speech in the fourteenth century. They have to be judged, and only reveal their interest when carefully examined, in the light of that knowledge such as it is. Almost at once, if we try to examine them in that light (none too clear and bright), we shall be confronted with lexicographical and textual difficulties. Lexicographically we shall observe, as usual, that we cannot walk far in such paths without the massive helping hand of the *New English*

Dictionary; yet we shall find quickly, nonetheless, how little knowledge is on free tap concerning English words, if we wish to enquire about their *distribution* at any given time. *N.E.D.* answers such questions reluctantly, or not at all. But such questions must be asked: the answers are essential to an estimate of the dialect dialogue, even if we must plough many texts to find them (or hints towards them), and hunt in unglossed verses for a phrase.

Textually we shall not be long in noting, or suspecting, that these dialect passages have been exposed to considerable adulteration—because they are in dialect, and because they are in dialect sandwiched between passages of narrative in Chaucer's ordinary idiom. In compensation we may reflect that usually it is difficult to catch Adam and his descendants at their tricks: we only know "Chaucer's language" (confidently though we set examination-questions on it) through the copies of scrivains, who were certainly not his contemporaries, and who would usually have thought no more of altering a spelling or a form than of brushing a fly off the nose—less, because they would notice the fly, but often hardly observe the spelling. We are to a certain extent at their mercy, and they interfere confoundedly with our prosody and our grammar. But here we may have a little revenge. We know something of northern dialect independent of them. What have they made of it? I believe that a close examination of all the manuscripts of the *Canterbury Tales* with respect to the northernisms in this tale would have a special textual value—and that some reputations for fidelity would be damaged. In fact, purely accidentally, the *Reeve's Tale* is of great importance to the textual criticism of the *Canterbury Tales* as a whole.[5]

But for the moment we can reserve these important points, lexicographical and textual, and take what we have got for a preliminary glance. The first thing to recollect, of course, is that (accurate or inaccurate) this northern dialect was intended not for Northerners, but for Chaucer's usual audience. Now "dialect" is seldom amusing in a tale, unless the audience has some actual experience of it (and can in effect laugh at private memories). Modern writers may often forget this, but Chaucer is not likely to have done so. And in any case, jesting apart, the dialect must be more or less intelligible. The talk of the two clerks had to be understood without a gloss: the *Reeve's Tale* when written was no place for explanatory footnotes or asides. We learn therefore from it at once—without considering textual adulteration, for that, if it has occurred, will naturally have tended to leave intact the most obvious and familiar elements—what most immediately struck the London ear as comic and unusual in Chaucer's day among the features of northern speech. At the same time we get a glimpse of how much a Londoner could be expected to understand, what sort of dialect details and words were more or less

familiar to him, though not used by him. This is in itself interesting: both what is in the *Reeve's Tale* and what is not (e.g. present participles in *-and*, or indications of a shift in the sound of *ō*) is instructive.

Chaucer plainly kept some of his knowledge up his sleeve, and even so he put in at least one touch (e.g. *slik*, on which see below) that cannot have been familiar, even if the context made it intelligible; but what has been said is generally true. He showed considerable skill and judgment in what he did: skill in presenting the dialect with fair accuracy but without piling up oddities; judgment in choosing for his purpose *northern* clerks, at *Cambridge*, close to *East Anglia* (whence he brought his Reeve). Indeed, in an *East Anglian* reeve, regaling Southern (and largely London) folk, on the road in *Kent*, with imitations of *northern* talk, which was imported southward by the attraction of the *Universities*, we have a picture in little of the origins of literary English. Too good to be mere accident. Whether fully conscious of this or not, it cannot be denied that Chaucer has shown an instinctive appreciation of the linguistic situation of his day which is remarkable. We shall be justified in paying close attention to the dialect-writing of an author such as this. The whole situation is cleverly contrived philologically. Many of the principal features of northern speech, especially in vocabulary, being largely of Scandinavian origin, were also current in the East; and Chaucer was able to use dialectalisms, recognizable as such, that were at once *correct* for the North, and yet, owing to the growing importance and influence of East Anglia, especially Norwich, not unheard-of in the capital. The reeve is at once the symbol of the direction from which northerly forms of speech invaded the language of the southern capital, and the right sort of person to choose to act as intermediary in the tale. Chaucer could have given a good philological explanation—should any hypercritical modern require one—of the ease with which the teller of the tale negotiates the talk of the clerks.

Perhaps it is for this very reason that he tinges the talk of his reeve also with linguistic elements of the same kind.[6] Slight as the touches are, they are nonetheless unusual, and unlike Chaucer's normal procedure; he makes no effort (as far as our manuscripts show) to touch the talk of the Dartmouth shipman with south-westernisms. In any case, it will be granted that a Norfolk man was well chosen as the teller of a story of Cambridge and of northern men.

On the *fer north* Chaucer's choice fell naturally—apart from possible private knowledge, and apart from the possibility that something in "real life", a meeting with real students of Cambridge that came from the North, lies behind not the *fabliau*, but the colouring given to it (a possibility that does not in the least affect the argument)—because, if dialect was to be attempted at all in a funny tale, one of a marked character, one perhaps already as conventionally comic in London as a Welsh "whateffer"

is to-day, was both easier to do and more effective. It is significant of the shift since Chaucer's day, that the *fer West* was not selected. It was peculiar enough in some respects, and it might have been put appropriately in the mouths of students of Oxford. But it was not. Probably, in so far as it then differed from the uses of London, it was too remote from London's ken and not a current joke.[7] The dialect-situation, in fact, jumped neatly with the answer of Cambridge clerks and Trumpington miller to Oxford Nicholas and Osney carpenter. Too neatly to be accidental. It had been well thought out.

If we now leave the generalizations and proceed to a more detailed scrutiny, we need as a preliminary to hear the dialogue passages in their setting. They should be read aloud, as one may fancy Chaucer reading them (if he ever did). In the absence of an accomplished renderer, such as Professor Wyld, each must do that for himself, with such approximate fidelity as philological knowledge allows. This is important because mere statistics, and numerical counting, fail altogether to represent the relative prominence of a linguistic feature to the ear, or to make clear the aston-ishing effect of the contrast of the dialogue with the narrative setting.

One thing arises from any such reading, that is even approximately correct, arises so clearly that no statistics are needed to support it: the most striking characteristic of northern speech in a London ear was the long $\bar{a}$ (of O.E. or O.N. origin), retained where the southerly forms of speech had an $\bar{o}$. The latter was probably in Chaucer's time still a pure, not a diphthongal, sound, the same as, or similar to, that in present south-ern *awe*, *or*. But in the North it remained $\bar{a}$, without trace of any rounding or tendency to an *o*-sound. The tendency in the North of England was rather to fronting, towards an $\bar{æ}$-sound (that is to the preservation of old $\bar{a}$ until it fell in with the later post-medieval shift of later $\bar{a}$-sounds, seen also in the South, which affected generally in all dialects such $\bar{a}$-sounds as those of French *blame*, *dame*, or of English and Norse *make*, *cake*). This is a trite phonological fact, but nonetheless remarkable; it was also of special importance, since the number of words affected was very large. The dat-ing of the later fronting (towards $\bar{æ}$) only becomes of importance in deal-ing with *geen*, *neen*, the one real problem that we encounter, and one that I reserve for a special note in an appendix. For the moment, though the full development of the shift towards $\bar{æ}$ was not, I believe, in Chaucer's day accomplished, later history probably warns us to give a quality to our Northern $\bar{a}$ which anticipates the change: it was not our present South-ern $\bar{a}$ (in *calm*, say), and the difference between Northern *bān* "bone" and Southern *boọn* was wider than that between modern *barn* and *born*. The sound was, indeed, part of the "sharp slitting" which offended Southern ears—in words where they were not accustomed to hear it.[8]

Statistics actually show (see below) that Chaucer has provided a nota-

bly large number of examples of this Northern *ā*: some thirty-nine in the manuscripts here used, probably more in his original version, a number far exceeding that of any other feature represented. So, even if we make allowance for the fact that examples were naturally numerous, we may regard the effect produced (which is even more striking than the statistics suggest) as intentional. The joke about *ā* was one all would appreciate, and this *ā* had the advantage of occurring in common words used in all dialects, which would be thus quite intelligible and yet all the more odd and laughable in alien shape because of their very familiarity.

Nonetheless, it is easy for dialect-imitators to seize on some such general correspondence as this *ā = ǭ*, and to apply it to cases where, for some historical reason, it is actually false to the dialect. Thus to the vowel-sound in our word *time* the dialects of modern Yorkshire respond in a very great number of cases with some variety of *ā*, but not in all cases—*lie*, *light*, and *eye*, for instance, are usually *lī* (or *lig*), *līt*, and *ī,* though imitators will produce *lā*, *lāt*, and *ā*. Indeed, such forms are actually heard from "natives", supposed to be speaking dialect. In that case they bear witness to the influence of standard English, under which "dialect" tends to become ordinary language altered in accordance with a few regularized sound-correspondences (and thinly sprinkled with local words and locutions). Traces of the same phenomenon have been observed in Middle English: a probable example (since it comes principally from areas where *ā* and *ǭ* approached one another geographically) is *tōn* "taken", derived, it would appear, from northern *tān*,[9] by substitution of the southern *ǭ*, although the *ā* of *tān* is a late lengthening of *ǎ,* and not an original O.E. or O.N. *ā* that would naturally have exhibited this southern change.

These things are mentioned here only in illustration of the fact that sound-correspondences are readily appreciated by the unphilological, where contact between closely related forms of language occurs, and in the absence of either historical or practical knowledge of both forms of speech in detail, may be, indeed certainly will be, occasionally wrongly applied. It would be interesting if we could detect Chaucer in a wrong application of his *ā/ǭ* " sound-law" to cases where for some reason northern dialect did not show *ā* for southern *ǭ*. There are no such errors. This would be more significant if there were more chances of error occurring. Southern *ǭ* which is not northern *ā* is derived mainly from older *o* lengthened (as in O.E. *hopa*, M.E. *hǭpe*), or from foreign words, chiefly French (as *cote*, *hoost*). Mistakes are not likely with the latter class; the former is comparatively infrequent. We have, it is true, *hope* (and in a dialectal sense) in 1. 109, and *hoste* (O.Fr. *hoste*) in 1. 211; but this is al1.[10] *hope* and *hoste* are correct, of course, for the North; but the distinction observed, even if a much larger number of instances occurred, could not be used

as evidence of Chaucer's direct knowledge of northern speech. He may have had a guide either in his own pronunciation or in that of old-fashioned people to aid in distinguishing words of this kind from those whose ǭ was northern ā. It is not certain that *o* in *hope* was in his day yet universally identical with that in *soap* (O.E. *hopa*, *sāpe*): the two vowels are still, of course, kept apart in the dialect of some areas that share in the rounding of older ā. His rhyming is strict in *Troilus and Criseyde*, and yet we have the famous case in the fourth stanza of the fifth book, where *lore*, *euermore* (O.E. *lār*, *māre*) are contrasted, and do not according to the system of his stanza rhyme with *forlore*, *more*, *tofore* (O.E. *forlǒren*, *mǒre*, *tǭfǒran*).

We may conclude, then, that the general correspondence of northern ā to southern ǭ was recognized by Chaucer (and also by his audience), and that it was one of the chief points illustrated in his representation of northern dialect: it was specially suitable for his purpose. But there is more in the dialect passages than these broad and easy effects, and we may now examine them in more detail. A fair initial assumption is that all departures from his normal usage, such words and forms as he nowhere else employs, are here intentional and offered to his readers as samples of northern speech. At least it would be a fair assumption, and on it we might justly put Chaucer through a linguistic examination, but for one grave difficulty: the candidate's scripts have been lost. Adam and his offspring have fortunately kept copies, it is true, but unfortunately they are unreliable on the very points we wish to scrutinize, less so perhaps in vocabulary, more so certainly in grammar, dialectal forms, and spellings. We are involved in the attempt to distinguish between Chaucer and his reporters; and a satisfactory comparison of the candidate's essay at " dialect" with his "normal usage" would require a more careful scrutiny of the individual habits (and the casual inadvertent evidence) of the manuscripts, both in the bulk of his work and in these special passages, than has, I believe, yet been made, at any rate with any such a purpose. The following study is merely tentative. For lack of time and opportunity it is based solely on the facsimile of the Ellesmere MS.; and on the Six-Text[11] and the Harleian MS. 7334 (Hl) printed by the Chaucer Society.

A more extensive investigation of other MSS. is obviously required. No classification or grouping made on other grounds seems to be a safe guide to the readings that any given MS. will offer in the dialect parts of the *Reeve's Tale*.[12] The similarity, for instance, often extremely close even in minor details of spelling, that can be observed between E and H does not prevent them from differing in notable points in their report of the clerks' northern English. A full comparison of the readings of these seven MSS. alone, even limited to points affecting dialect, would nonetheless occupy too much space. Instead, a preliminary essay towards a critical text of the dialect lines is offered, together with some commentary. It is based

on the following considerations. That the idea of making the clerks speak in dialect was Chaucer's is, of course, agreed. It need not be argued. Exceptional though the procedure is, dialectal ingredients are shown, in any case, to have existed in the original by the rhymes in ll. 167-8 and 209-210.[13] Nonetheless, it has been held, and may still be, that this idea was variously improved or enlarged upon by individual copyists. An examination of the seven MSS. does not, however, bear this out. The general tendency of all has been to southernize the original. A comparison of the small list given below of those northernisms which have been correctly preserved in *all seven*, with the much larger one containing those that have the support of a majority (and so can in the first instance be taken as Chaucerian) is sufficient to show this. Of northern *forms*, as distinct from vocabulary, only *swa* 110 and *ga* 182 are common to all in the middle of a line. There are also the rhyme-words in ll. 119-120 *fra*, *swa* (P *fraye*, *swaye*), 165-6 (*alswa*, *ra*), 167-8 (*baþe*), 209-210 (*bringes*).[14] The last two could not be altered. The ends of Chaucer's lines have, in any case, in general survived rough handling best; and here are found most of the forms on which the supposed archaism of his verse-language is founded, in reality a testimony to the fact that rhyme resists modernization. The northernisms of the surviving copies are, in fact, the residue of a gradual whittling away of the individuality of Chaucer's text, a residue naturally different in amount and distribution in each case. This is precisely what might be expected, especially in the treatment of dialect sandwiched between passages more or less in Chaucer's normal language. That Chaucer should trouble to write in dialect is remarkable, but it is hardly credible that each of these scrivains (and their predecessors) should at odd moments have had the fancy to improve his attempt. Actually a comparison of the critical text here put forward with the MSS. shows a procedure closely similar to that observable in southernizing copies of genuine northern originals.[15] The variations in reading, and the errors, are most numerous precisely where specifically northern forms are concerned; and the variations consist usually in the opposition of southern equivalents to a northern form or word; occasionally and most significantly there appear mongrel blends between northern and southern whose origin is not linguistic but scribal.[16] Had the northernisms been in any considerable measure due to the enterprise and wit of copyists, we should certainly have had frequent competition between different but equally genuine dialectalisms. No certain case of this appears.[17] We have corruptions which have been treated as genuine (in unjustified deference to E), and have even been intruded into historical grammars, such as *geen*, for instance; and we have occasionally the repetition, suitable or unsuitable, of northernisms certainly provided elsewhere by Chaucer in the dialogue[18]; we have little evidence that the copyists themselves possessed independent

information concerning the detail of northern dialect, or could use it in-
telligently to improve the original. Chaucer's jest required some popular
knowledge of the kind of dialect depicted, and this doubtless the scribes
usually possessed; but Chaucer's detail was finer than necessary, and this
probably as a rule escaped readers and copyists alike. The copyists must,
of course, usually have perceived that the clerks' lines were abnormal in
language (spelling alone in the earlier stages of the tradition probably
made it obvious and troublesome enough); but the principal textual ef-
fect of this was to render less secure their interpretation of letters, and to
weaken respect for the language: the normal checks on the making and
accepting of errors were reduced. The notion that "dialect" is a lawless
perversion of familiar vowels is no new one.

Accordingly, in the following text as a general rule each "northern-
ism" or dialectal feature offered by the seven MSS. as a whole has been
accepted, even if such a form is given in only one of them (where other
considerations are not, as in 103, against this). In addition, perhaps less
defensibly, the text has been normalized. For example, if the evidence is
held to justify the inclusion of *sal*, *na*, *es* in certain lines, these forms have
been used throughout the clerks' speeches. As will be seen, this entails
less alteration than might be expected. Even our MSS. taken as a whole
provide something approximating to a consistent text: the presumption
that, within the limits of rhyme and metre, Chaucer's own text was fairly
consistent in dialectal character is therefore strong. In any case, with the
small words such as *is*, *shal*, *no*, scribal procedure was casual and need not
be imitated slavishly. This gleaning of "northernisms" has not, all the
same, been purely mechanical. The habits and peculiarities of each MS.
used have to be considered,[19] and the evidence they afford is not of equal
certainty. In the note on *dreuen* 190 it will be observed that this form,
though frequently found in northern texts, may here show nothing more
than the *e* for *ĭ* which is almost the rule in C and common in L. At the
same time, it must be remembered that the chance of original dialectal
details surviving was much increased if they happened to look familiar to
later scribes. Some have been preserved not as "dialect" at all, but as (to
the scribe) permissible variants. Thus the preservation of "northern" *es* =
is in L only is undeniably connected with the fact that *es* for *is* occurs oc-
casionally in L outside the *Reeve's Tale*,[20] though *is* is, nonetheless, its usual
form. But the occurrences of *es* in L are far more frequent in the *Reeve's
Tale* than in any other passage of Chaucer of equal length. Moreover L
always uses *es* where its special dialectal employment as *am*, *art*, *are* is con-
cerned (except in 1. 319, where it has *am* not *is*). This sudden favouring of
es therefore has probably some special cause, and may proceed from the
original. An instructive example is *til* in 1. 190. All seven MSS. preserve
til in *til hething*, but in *til scorn* O P Hl have *to*. The universal retention in

the first case was due to the fact that *til* was not unfamiliar before *h* or a vowel. See the notes on *til* and *driue* (below).

Weight has been given to errors. P *ytwix* 251 is a mongrel, but it is even better evidence for the Chaucerian origin of the genuine northern *ymel* than the actual appearance of this word in E H. It is also a measure of the intelligence and linguistic knowledge shown in the copying of rare words in the *Reeve's Tale*. In the note to 1. 267 it is also pointed out that the reading *saule sal* rests securely on the error *God sale* (and similar forms) in some MSS., which finds its explanation only in the original presence in the text of these northern forms and in their comparative unfamiliarity to the copyists which favoured misreading.

The spelling adopted is not extremely northern. The original copy or copies made or corrected by Chaucer, and the elder derivatives, certainly differed in mere *spelling* from the usage of Chaucer when writing his own language. The source of Chaucer's knowledge of dialect was largely literary, and drawn from *written* northern works; also he was considering *readers*. The Miller and the Reeve were *cherles*, and we are expressly told by him to *turne ouer the leef* (A 3177) if we do not approve of their tales. It is a fair assumption that for readers' benefit Chaucer marked off the dialect lines or words by using certain of the characteristic northern spellings of the fourteenth century.[21] But such details have naturally been least observed in the MSS. and can scarcely now be recaptured. One marked peculiarity only has been admitted, tentatively and in illustration of the way in which the dialect could be made effective to the eye as well as to the ear, namely *qu* for *wh*. The evidence that Chaucer actually used this is very slender; but this might be expected. It is, in fact, the duty of an editor to weigh such gossamer—in cases where mere spelling is important. P has *qwistel* in 1. 182. This MS. is an extreme southernizer, and this spelling is, in it, quite isolated and remarkable.[22] The *q* must therefore be either inherited and by chance preserved[23], or due to a sudden northernizing whim. The latter is extremely unlikely in view of the general behaviour of P.[24]

It may be observed that the text so produced, possessing in most points direct MS. authority, even when only seven MSS. have been used, is in contrast with more familiar ones (or with E) very nearly purely and correctly northern. The exceptions, southernisms which cannot be removed, are mainly due to the needs of rhyme and metre; but they are in any case so small a proportion of the whole that even a philological examiner would award Chaucer a fairly high mark for his effort. Chaucer has on the whole avoided putting extreme northernisms into the rhymes, and since his scheme made necessary the linking of dialect lines with lines of narrative not in dialect, he has allowed himself some liberty, especially at these joints, and quite reasonably.

The letters ẹ and ë are used respectively to mark (*a*) unstressed *e* that seems to have been meant to be slurred or omitted, and in some cases was probably not originally written, and (*b*) unstressed *e* that seems to be a metrical syllable. This is done to assist later comment. The italics mark normalizations, that is northern, non-Chaucerian forms which *in the places where they appear* are not given by any of the seven MSS., though they are preserved elsewhere. The irreducible southernisms are underlined—which rather exaggerates their importance; but it serves to mark the curious fact that these certain southernisms and the possible ones (represented by the italics) are largely collected near the end. Chaucer himself probably allowed the linguistic joke to fade away as the knockabout business approached. Or he may have got tired of it before it was quite finished; as he did of other things.

102 (4022)   Alain spak first: "Al hail, Simond, i faiþ!
              Hou farës þi fairẹ doghter and þi wif?"

                  *   *   *   *

106 (4026)   "Simond," quod Iohn, " bi god ned has na per:
              Him boẹs seruẹ himseluën þat has na swain,
              Or els he *es* a folt as clerkës <u>sain</u>.
              Our manciplë, I hopẹ he wil be ded,
              Swa werkës ai þe wangës in his hed.
              And forþi es I cum, and *als* Alain,
              To grindẹ our corn and cariẹ it ham again.
113 (4033)   I prai ȝou spedẹs vs heþen as ȝe mai!"

                  *   *   *   *

116 (4036)   "Bi god, right bi þe hoper wil I stand,"
              quod Iohn, "and se hougat þe corn gas in.
              ȝit sagh I neuer, bi mi fader kin,
              hou þat þe hoper waggës til and fra."
              Alain answerdë: "Iohn, and wiltou swa,
              þen wil I be bineþën, bi mi croun,
              And se hougat þe melë fallës doun
              In til þe trogh. þat sal be mi desport;
              For, Iohn, i faiþ, I es al of ȝour sort:
125 (4045)   I es as il a miller as er ȝe."

                  *   *   *   *

152(4072)   And gan to crie: "Harrow and wailawai!
              Our hors *es* lost! Alain, for goddës banes,
              Step on þi fet, cum of man al at anes!
155 (4075)   Alas! our wardain has his palfrai lorn."

158 (4078)   "Quat! Quilk wai es he gan?" gan he to crie.

               *   *   *   *

164 (4084)   "Alas," quod Iohn, "Alain, for cristës paine,
              Lai doun þi swerd, and I sal min alswa.
              I es ful wight, god wat, as *es* a ra.
              Bi goddës hertę, he sal noght scapę vs baþe!
              Qui nad þou pit þe capel *i* þe laþe?
169 (4089)   Il hail! Bi god, Alain, þou es a fonne."

               *   *   *   *

181 (4101)   Wiþ "Kep, kep, stand, stand, Iossa, warderere,
              Ga quistel þou, and I sal kepę him here!"

               *   *   *   *

189 (4109)   "Alas," quod Iohn, "þe dai þat I was born!
              Nou er we dreuęn til heþing and til scorn.
              Our corn *es* stoln; men wil vs folës calle,
              Baþë þe wardain and our felawęs alle,
193 (4113)   And namëli þe miller; wailawai!"

               *   *   *   *

207 (4127)   "Nou, Simond," seidë Iohn, "bi saint Cutberd,
              Ai es þou meri, and þis *es* fairę answerd.
              I haue herd sai man suld ta of twa þinges
              Slik[25] as he findęs, or ta slik[25] as he bringes.
              But specialli I prai þe, hostë dere,
              Get us sum[26] metę and drink, and mak vs chere,
              And we wil paië treuli at þe fulle:
              Wiþ empti hand man mai na haukës tulle.
215 (4135)   Lo her, our siluer redi for til spende."

               *   *   *   *

249 (4169)   He pokedę Iohn, and seidë: "Slepest thou?
              Herdë þou euer slik a sang ar nou?
              Lo, quilk a complin es imell *þaim* alle!
              A wildë fir upon þair bodięs falle!
              Qua herknëd euer slik a ferli þing?
              ʒa, þai sal hauę þe flour of il ending.
255 (4175)   þis langë night þer tidës me na reste;
              But ʒit, na fors, al sal be for þe beste.
              For, Iohn," seidę he, "als euer mot I þriue,
              Gif þat I mai, ʒon wenchë sal I swiue.
              Sum esëment has lawë schapën vs;
              For, Iohn, þer *es* a lawe þat sais þus:

þat gif a man in á point be agreued,
þat in anoþer he sal be releued.
Our corn *es* stoln, soþli it *es* na nai,
And we hauę had an il fit al þis dai;
265 (4185) And sen I sal hauę nan amendëment
Again mi los, I wil hauę esëment.
Bi goddës saulę, it sal nan oþer be!”
þis Iohn answeredę: “Alain, auisë þe!
þe miller *es* a parlous man,” he seide,
270 (4190) “And gif þat he out of his sleep abreide,
He mightë do vs baþę a vilainie.”
272 (4192) Alain answeredę: “I countę him noght a <u>flie</u>!”

      *   *   *   *

281 (4201) “Alas” quod he, “þis *es* a wikkëd Iape!
Nou mai I sai þat I es but an ape.
ȝit has mi felawę sumquat for his harm:
He has þe mill*er* doghter in his arm.
285 (4205) He auntrëd him, and has his nedës sped,
And I li as a draf-sek in mi bed;
And quen þis Iapę *es* tald anoþer dai,
I sal be haldën daf, a cokenai.
I wil arisę and auntrę it, bi mi fai!
290 (4210) “Vnhardi *es* vnseli,” þus men <u>sai</u>.

      *   *   *   *

316 (4236) And seidë: “Far wel, Malinę, swetë wight!
þe dai *es* cum, I mai *na* lenger bide;
But euer*ma*, quar *sa* I *ga* or ride,
319 (4239) I es þin awën clerk, swa hauę I sel!

      *   *   *   *

329 (4249) Alain vpristę and þoughtę: “*Ar* þat it dawe,
I wil *ga* crep<u>ën</u> in bi mi felawe”;
And fond þe cradel wiþ his hondę anon.
“Bi god,” þoughtę he, “ al wrang I hauę mis<u>gon</u>;
Min hed *es* toti of mi swink tonight,
þat makës me þat I ga noght aright.
I *wat* wel bi þe cradęl, I hauę mis<u>go</u> :
336 (4256) Her li<u>s</u> þe miller and his wif al<u>so</u>.”

<a marginal note in one of Tolkien's copies reads “origi-
nally prob. <u>misgaa</u> / <u>alswa</u>”>

      *   *   *   *

342 (4262)   He seidę: "þou Iohn, þou swinës-hed, awak
For cristës saulę, and her a noblë game!
For bi þat lord þat callëd *es* saint Iame,
As I hauę þriës *i* þis schortë night
Swiuëd þe miller doghter bolt-vpright,
347 (4267)   Quils þou <u>hast</u> as a coward ben agast."

              *   *   *   *

389 (4309)   (Reeve) And greiþen þeim and toke *þeire* hors anon,
And ek *þeire* mele and on þeire wei þei gon.

    In the subjoined notes references are given to the sources of the "northernisms" adopted. MSS. not mentioned have substituted normal southern forms: thus 106 P *haþ*, L *haþe*.

    102. *i: yfayth* E, rest *in. hail*, etc., all.

    103. *fares* E H C O Hl. *fareþ þi fare* P: *fare* a possible northernism, since confusion, graphic and phonetic, of *ai, a* is found in N. texts, already e.g. in Cotton text of *C.M.* (possibly in rhyme 4141). But it is to be rejected, in spite of other similar spellings in P, as casual error due to influence of neighbouring words (here preceding *fareþ*). This type of error naturally common, but P supplies many examples. Cf. C *grate and smale*, corrected to *grete* 402; P *cauche* for *cacche* 185 (*caughte* in next line).

    106. *has* E H C O Hl; *na* E H Hl.

    107. *boes* E only. *bihoues* H O (partial southernizing); *by-, behoueþ* P L (southernizing); *muste* C, *falles* Hl (rewriting of extreme dialectalism). The word possibly early received glosses. *falles* is prob. not an alternative northernism; the *es* may be due to original, while this use of *falle* is not necessarily northern; *falles* also certainly occurred (in different sense) in original 122. *swain* all.

    himseluen : *hymselne* E, rest *-self. seluen* (used elsewhere by Chaucer) is better N., and preferable metrically, since *boes* is monosyllabic; Chaucer probably wrote *bos* as genuine N. texts. All have this word-order, but Chaucer may have written *himseluen serue þat* (or *at*).

    has E H C O Hl; *na* E H O Hl.

    108. *folt* O; *fon* Hl; rest forms of *fool*. Attrib. of *folt* to Chaucer doubtful; but variety of vocabulary likely to be his; variety of abusive words is in character (see below); while *folt* is a likely, though not necessary, starting point for alter. *fool* in contrast to preservation of *fon, fonne* in all 169 (though rhyme there made this necessary), and unanimous *fooles* 191. *fon* Hl probably from 169. Neither word was specifically northern; see notes on vocabulary.

    110. *swa* all. *werkes* all but P *worchen*. The latter a good example of

the southernizing of P; *worchen* is normal in P, and used elsewhere where others have *werke* (as A 779). The substitution is here made, although this *werkes* is a different verb. *wanges* all.

111. *forþi* E, rest forms of *þerfore*. These cannot be distinguished dialectally. *cum*: *come* monosyllabic all but P *commen*. See notes on grammatical forms below. P *commen* is not a northernism and is frequent generally in P.

es L, rest *is*. This *es* here accepted as original (extreme dialectal) for *is*, *am*, *art*. See remarks above, and below on grammatical forms. *als*: *alswa* L, rest forms of *eek*. It is here suggested that Chaucer wrote *als*: *eek* is a southern equivalent; L preserves trace of original (as not infrequently) but has expanded the dialectal form to detriment of metre (*alswa* occurs in 165). Cf. 240 *eek* all but C *also*. In 14th c. *als* " also" was mainly N. or northerly. Chaucer's occasional use of it (proved by rhyme *fals*, HF. 2071, Frank. T. 870) is unusual in South, and perhaps literary, cf. his *greithe*, *lathe*, *wight* (below). Cf. *C.M.* 21, 155; *Hand. Synne* 2748 (*fals* rh. *als* glossed *also*); and *Bk. Duch.* 728. *als* "as" occurs 257, q.v.

112. *ham* E O L Hl. H has the notable form *heem* which goes with *geen*, *neen* of E, but because unrecorded by Skeat has not received same notice as forms of E. See discuss. of *geen*. *again* is, of course, necessary for N. Chaucer may have used both *again* and *aʒein* (L here *aʒeine*) in his own language, both appear at any rate in the MSS. elsewhere.

113. *speedes* O, supported by plural pronoun, but rest *spede*, etc. *heþen* L; *hepen* P (error, *p* for *þ*, which supports genuineness of *heþen*); *heythen*, *heithen* E H O, *hene* C, *in al þat* Hl (rewriting). The word would not appear to have been readily understood (which is against northern scholarship of the scribes). L comes out well as frequently. *Heithen*-forms are possibly due to association with *heþen*, *heiþen*, "heathen" (the *ei* forms in this latter word are curiously widespread in M.E.), but *eith* for *eth*, for whatever reason, is frequent in E H : e.g. *wheither* A 570, 1157.

116. All have *stande* and rhyme-word 115 *hande*. Cf. 181.

117. *howgates* O P; *how þat* E Hl; *how(e)* H C L. Compare 122 *howgates* O *howe gates* L, *howe gate* P; rest *how þat*. Fair example of casual preservation of northernisms. The original assumed to have been *hougat* (*hugat*) on metrical grounds (not conclusive); cf. P 122. Forms with and without *es* are both N., but *hougat* a more likely antecedent of alter. or corrupt. *hou þat*. Cf. *C. M.* 27224 *þis word "hugat"* which refers to a preceding *hu* and provides good example of synonymity of *hu*, *hugat*. In 119 all have *how þat*, which is therefore retained. It is not impossible for N. Unanimity in 119 favours *hougat(es)* as due to original where there is disagreement. *gas* E H O Hl.

118. *sagh* P. The normal form for "saw" in P is *seegh*, *segh*.

119. *hou þat*, see 117. *wagges*: perhaps better *waggis*, so Hl, *wagis* C (but

in both flexional *is, ys* is frequent; cf. 122, 153, 167). All *s* inflexion, exc. *wagged* O, *waggeþ* P. *til and fra* E H O L, *to and fra* C Hl, *til and fraye* (rhyme *swaye*) P (cf. 103).

120, 121. *bineþen*, with preserved *n* required for strict N. not in any MS., but such a point would naturally be neglected (possibly by Chaucer, cert. by MSS.); *bineþen* is frequent elsewhere in Ch. *wiltou* is a correct N. form; so all but *wist þou* C. Cf. *C.M. weltu* 20355, but *þou will* in rhyme 8379, 20657. *swa* all but *swaye* P.

122. *hougat*, see 117. *falles* E H O P L, *fallys* Hl.

123. *intil, intill* O L. *sal* E H. *be* all, exc. *ben* C with southern *n*.

124. *yfaith, yfayth* E C. *in faath* P, *in faaþe* L: cf. *fraye swaye* (?), but see below, 289. *es al* L, rest *may ben*, etc., with southern *n* (Hl *be*) : *mai be* is equally likely; further readings are required here.

125. *I es* L, rest *I is. as ere* O Hl; *as ar* E H; *as is* C P; *as es* L. None of these forms are normal in the respective MSS. On choice see notes on grammatical forms. *miller: melner* L.

153. *lost* H O P L Hl; *lorn* E C. *lorn* is a usual Chaucerian form; but also possible in N. *lorn* certainly used in dialect passage 155 as shown by rhyme, but the sense is not there the same and derives directly from O.E. *forloren*, whereas in 153 O.E. weak verb *losian* "go astray" is also concerned. The distinction between *I am lost* and *I haue lorn* appears to be observed elsewhere in Chaucer. *banes* all, exc. C *bonys. goddis* P (flexional *is, ys* also found in P independent of the dialect passages).

154. *com(e)* of H C O P L; *cum on* Hl; *com out* E. *at anes, att anes* all, exc. *atonys* C.

155. *has* E H C O L. *haþ our palfray* P.

158. *whilk(e)* E H O P L, *whedir* C; *(what) wikked* Hl. *gan(e)* H L Hl, E *geen*.

165. Hl has *leg* (for *ley* ?). *sal* Hl, rest the normal forms of *will* in each MS. *alswa* all.

166. *I es* L, *I is* E H C O P Hl. *wight, wyȝt*, E H C Hl; s*wift* O P L. *waat, wat(e)* E H O P L Hl. *raa, ra* all.

167. *god* E H (metre shows this erroneous); *goddes* O L, *goddis* C Hl. *sal* E H O L Hl. *baþ*e, *bathe* all.

168. *nad thow* Hl; *ne had(de) thow (þou)* H O P L; *ne haddist thou* C: *nadstow* E; cf. 250. *pit* E H C, rest *put(te). capel* in various forms in all: also *lathe, laþe*.

169. *Ilhayl, il(le) hail*, etc., all (*il a hayle* L). *fonne, fon* all (*grete fonne* L). *þou es* L, rest *þou is*.

181. *stand(e)* all, exc. *stonde* P.

182. *ga* all. *qwistel* P, a remarkable spelling, perh. pointing to northern orthography, see above; rest *whistle*, etc. (but *wightly* Hl). *sal* H, Hl (*ga wightly þou sal*).

190. *er* L, *ere* O; *ar* H, *are* E C P Hl. Note distribution of forms differs from 125. *dreuen* L, *dreuyn* C (E Hl have southern form without *n*, *dryue*). These forms are part of "northern" language, but may here be due only to orthographic habits of L and C. In C *e* for *ĭ* is almost regular, in L same use is frequent: thus C *wretyn*, L *wreten* A 161, 1305; *redyn*, *reden* 1503; *resyn*, *resen* 1065, etc. For the form in N. texts, cf. *Northern Passion* (E.E.T.S.), pp. 150, 178 (Harl. MS.); also rhyme *driuen*, *heuen* in *C.M.* 22110. Under vocab. it will be seen the sense of *drive* here is Northern. *til heþyng* all; *til scorn* E H O L; *to scorn* C P Hl. It is possible second *til* is derived from first, and that Chaucer wrote *to scorn*; see notes to *til* and *driue* (below).

191. *stoln* E, *stolle* P L, rest *stole*; cf. 263. *men wil* H O P L, *me wil* E, *men wele* C, *men woln* Hl.

192. *bathe* E Hl.

207. *Cutberd* E H P L (*berde*); *Cutbert* C; *Cuthberd* O Hl.

208. *es thou* L, rest *is* except *art* C. *mery(e)* C O P L Hl, *myrie* E H.

209. *say(e)* O L Hl, *seye* H P, *seyd* E C. *man* E, rest *men. suld* Hl, *sal* E H O, *sall* L; *schal shal* C P; cf. 254. *taa* E; *tan* C; *tak*, *take(n)* H O P L Hl; cf. 210. *twa*, *tua* E H O L Hl.

210. The "such" forms are distributed as follows:—

      210. *slyk*, *slik*, 2ce. E Hl; *swilk(e)* H O L; *swich* C; *such* P.
      250. *slyk(e)*, *slik* E H O L, *sclike* P; *swich* C.
      251. *whilk* E; *swilk*(e) H O L; *slik* Hl; *sclike* P; *swich* C.
      253. *slyk(e)*, *slik* E O L. *sclike* P; *swilk* H Hl; *swich* C.

This is the only case of competition among northernisms. It is possible that *swilk* = *swich* (anal. to *whilk* = *which*) was well known, and that scribes have actually in this case introduced a new N. feature. But this would not be an example of their improving on Chaucer. Their use of a northern word was due to his initiative, and *swilk* is in effect a toning down of the dialect, since *slik* is a more extreme dialectalism of much more limited currency than *swilk* (though context made meaning of either obvious). But Chaucer may, as did genuine N. texts, have used both *swilk* and *slik*—if so, as far as evidence here given goes, we should select 250 as a place where original certainly had *slik* (only C, which resolutely has *swich* in all cases, differs); and 210 as possible for *swilk*, since P has *such*, but does not otherwise boggle at *slik*. In 251 where idiom allows *swich* or *which* (for *lo swich*, cf. A 4318, *P.F.* 570), E is possibly right in reading *whilk*; but *whilk* was already provided in 158. See appendix on *slik*.

fyndes E H O; rest southern *fynd* (? trace of original *findes*) C; *fint*, *fynt* P L Hl. Contrast *bringes* ret. by all in rhyme. *taa* E; *tak(e)* H C O P Hl; L omits; cf. 209.

211. *hoot and dere* C!

212. *sum* C L. If *gar us haue* (see footnote to text) is Chaucerian, then all our 7 MSS. have toned dialect down here.

213. *at þe* C Hl, rest *atte* (*att* L). C has *folle* rhyming *tolle*, but *o* for *ŭ* is characteristic of this MS. *tulle* seems, nonetheless, isolated; see Appendix (i). All exc. C Hl have *payen* with southern *n*.

214. *man*: all *men. na* Hl, *naan* O; *none* E H C; *not, nouhte,* P L.

215. *for til* O.

249. *slepest þou* L, sim. C O; *slepestow* E H and sim. P Hl. *slepest* is accordingly retained as an original southernism, but Chaucer may well have written correctly *slepes, slepis.* Cf. next.

250. *herd thow* H, *herde þou* P; *herdtow* E (mongrel); *herdist* (*herdest*) *þou* C L; *herdestow* (*-istow*) O Hl. Skeat inexplicably adopted O which represents end of southernizing process sufficiently exhibited here. Cf. 168. On *slik* see 210. *sang* all exc. *song* C. *ar* O only, rest *er* exc. *or* L; retention (if it is such) of *ar* by O is connected with fact that O has *ar* occasionally in other pieces (e.g. A 2398), and frequently shows *er > ar*.

251. On *quilk* see 210. *compline* L, rest errors (such as *cowplyng* E) ? derived from *cōplin > conplin, couplin. ymel* E H; *ytwix* P (mongrel, half-way to) *bitwixe, betwix* O Hl; *betuene* L; *among* C. *þaim*: all *hem*; but *þeym* occurs in L 389 (also *þeire* L 390), prob. original and meant for Reeve (see above). Cf. *þair* 252, and see notes on vocab. Retention of *þair* and rejection of *þaim* is due to fifteenth c. usage, probably not to original.

252. *þair* O Hl, *thair* E H, *þeire* L.

253. *wha* E H L Hl. On *slik* see 210. *ferly* all.

254. *ȝa* C, rest *ye*; *ȝa* occurs in N. texts; but C has *ȝa* elsewhere, e.g. A 1667; also in *R. T.* 348 (given to miller). *sal* E H, *sall* O; *schal, shal,* C P L; Hl *sul*; the last prob. a hybrid S. *schul*(*le*) + N. *sal* (*sul* prob. not a genuine N. form), but may be amateur "northern" on anal. *schal = sal*: Hl alone has s*uld* 209, and though this is a correct northern form, both its *sul* and *suld* are perh. dubious. *il,* etc. all, exc. *euel* L.

255. *tydes, -is* all, exc. *þer sal I haue* (imitated northern) L. *na* E H O L Hl. *lang*(*e*) E H O P L Hl.

256. *na* E H O P L Hl. s*al* E H L Hl. O has southern *ben*.

257. *als* E H O : *as* C P L Hl. *Als* "as" in fourteenth c. is mainly but not solely northern. MSS. of Chaucer (and Gower) occasionally use this form elsewhere.

258. *gif*: all *if*, but cf. 261, 270. *ȝon*(*e*) P Hl, *yon* E H O; *þe* C L. *sal* Hl, rest forms of *wil* which may be original.

259. *s*(*c*)*hapen* H O P L Hl; wrongly with southern prefix *yshapen, Ischapyn* E C. *has* E H C.

260. *says* E H C Hl.

261. *gif* E H; *ȝif* C, rest *if. á* (i. e. long stressed *â*): *a* E H C O Hl; *oon* P, *o* L. *agreued* correctly all but E *ygreued* wrongly with southern prefix.

262 *sal* E H L Hl. C has southern *ben*.

263. *stoln* E H Hl, *stollen* P L; *stolin* C, *stolen* O. *soþly*, etc., in all but *s(c)hortly* E C. *na* H Hl; *ne* E (cf. *geen*, *neen*); rest *no(n)*.

264. *haue* L Hl, rest *han*. *il(le)*, *ylle* all, exc. *euel* P, *yuel* L.

265. *seen* L, rest *syn*. s*al* E H Hl. *nan* Hl, *naan* H; E *neen* (cf. 267), rest *no*, *non*, etc.

266. *agayn*, *ageyn* all. *haue* all.

267. *goddes saule it sal* H P L; rest have errors due to proximity of *saule sal* which support these forms as original: *God sale it sal* E, *godys sale it schal* C, *goddes sale it sal* O, *godde sale it sal* Hl. *nan(e)*, *naan* H O P L Hl; *neen* E (cf. 265).

269. *parlous* L Hl: *perilous* E H O P, *perlyous* C.

270. *gif* E, rest *if*. *sleepe abreyde* E and sim. rest, but *slape abrayde* O (casual error due to neighbouring *as*).

271. *do* Hl, rest southern *don*, *doon*, etc. *bathe*, *baþe* E H L.

282. *say* Hl; *saie* L, *seie* P; *seyn*, *sayn* E H C O. *I es* L; rest *is*, exc. *am* Hl.

283. *has* E H.

284. *has* E H C O. All show genitival, *s*, *is* in *milleris*, but cf. 346.

285. *auntred* all (*auntreþ* P, *auntre* L). *has* E H C Hl.

286. *drafsek* E C, *-sak(ke)* H O P L Hl.

287. *tald* E Hl, rest *told(e)*.

288. *sal(l)* E H L Hl. *be* O P L Hl; *been*, *ben* E H C. *halden* : *halden a* H; *halde a* E; *holden a* L, *holde a* O P; *held a* Hl: *told a* C. *daf*, *daff(e)* all.

289. *auntre*, etc., all. C has rhyme *fay*, *say*; rest *fayth*, *sayth* in different spellings E H O L Hl; *fath*, *sath* P. Though dialect is not correctly restored by *say* (see notes on grammatical forms), this is less violently out of place (or a more natural "error" for Chaucer to make). P *fath*, *sath* may show later knowledge of *ai* > a (see above), but prob. depend on þ, y confusion—illustrated by C *þat* for *yet* A 563, 722, and L *boþe* for *boye* in *Gamelyn* 488.

317, 318: the use of southernisms *no*, *mo*, *so*, *go*, etc., by all the MSS. in these two lines is curious. Further readings required; perhaps significant, as southernisms begin at this point to multiply in all. Not ascribable, at any rate, to Alain's using a "southern tooth" for Maline's benefit—that he should be able to is rather out of character: in any case, the next line is full of northernisms.

319. *I is* E H C, *rest am*. *awen* E H. *swa* E. *seel*, *sel(e)* all, exc. O *hele*.

330. *cre(e)pen* with southern inf. in all, exc. *crepe* C; as line stands *crepen* must be dissyllabic.

332. *wrang(e)* E H L. All have the southern rhyme *mysgon* (Hl *Igoon*) with the *anon* of prec. line (which is narrative and not northern).

334. *makes*, *ga* Hl.

342. *swines-hed*: *sweuenyst* C !

343. *saule, sawle* E H O P.

344. *called*: *cleped* Hl, but this verb also found in N. texts.

346. *þe meller douhter* L, but similar ending of the two words and extreme frequency of omissions of final letters in L make this very doubtful as example of N. uninflected genitive.

347 *hast* all. On evidence of other verbal inflexions and use of *es, is* "art" we may assume Chaucer wrote northern *has* here; but since this has not been preserved in any of the seven MSS. *hast* is here retained.

389, 390. *greythen, greyþen*, etc., all, exc. *hastede* C. *þeym* L; *her hors, here mele*, but *þeire weie* L. <a marginal note in one of Tolkien's copies adds "P *greieþ*" >

Northernisms preserved intact in all seven MSS.: (a) vocabulary: *hail* 102, 169; *swain* in rhyme 107; *wanges* 110; *ill* 125, 169; *laþe* in rhyme 168; *fonne* in rhyme (eye-rhyme ?) 169; *til* before *h* 190; *heþing* 190; *ferly* 253; [*auntre* 285, 289.] (b) forms: *wanges* 110; *fra* (P *fraye*) rhyming *swa* (P *swaye*) 119, 120; *alswa* rhyming *ra* 165, 166; *baþe* in rhyme 167; *ga* 182; and the 3 sg. *bringes* in rhyme 210; *es, is* am 166. About twenty-four points, many fixed by rhyme.

Northernisms preserved in four or more MSS.: Add to the above: *es, is* art 208; *es, is* am 282; *has* 106, 107, 155, 284, 285; other 3 sg. forms in *s* 107, 117, 119, 122, 125, 260; 3 pl. in *s* 110; *a* for *oo* one 261; *na, nan* 107, 255, 256, 267; *ham* home 112; *wha* 253; *gas* 117; *banes* 153; *at anes* 154; *wat* 158; *saule* 343; *til* (*scorn*) 190; *til and fra* 119; *thair* 252; *sal* 167, 256, 262, 288; *lang* 255; *sang* 250; *whilk* 158; vocabulary: *yon* 258; *il* 254, 264; *seel* 319; *heþen* (accepting *heithen, heþen*), 113. About forty-one additional points.

Ellesmere (E) is sole authority for *boes* 107, *gif* 270, *swa* 319, *taa* 209, 210; and to these can perhaps be added *whilk* 251 and *stoln* 191, *yfayth* 102 (not necessarily northern). In conjunction with H it preserves an otherwise altered *sal* 123, *ymel* 251, *gif* 261, *has* 283, *awen* 319; with Hl *bathe* 192, *tald* 287: with C *drafsek* 286. But it shows over thirty cases of fairly certain error or alteration, of seven of which (such as *ygreued* 261) it alone is guilty.

The above text offers approximately ninety-eight lines put into the mouths of the northern clerks. If we now examine the departures from Chaucer's normal usage that there appear, and which we can assume that he offered as dialect, we shall discover what accuracy and consistency he achieved. The italicized forms which have not in their places, in the seven MSS. studied, actual MS. authority are omitted. Chaucer's consistency will then certainly not be exaggerated. The abnormal or dialectal features of the lines may be divided into: A. *sounds and forms*, that is,

words current in Chaucer's London English are presented in a different shape, due to a divergent development, from a common Old English or Old Norse original, in North and South; B. *vocabulary,* words (chiefly of Scandinavian origin) are used, which were not yet in Chaucer's time, and in some cases have never since been adopted into southern or literary English. Here will be included instances of dialectal senses of words current throughout the country.

A. Sounds and Forms.

(i) ā for ǭ: *na*, *nan* (O.E. nān) 106, 107, 214, 255, 256, 263, 265, 267. *swa* (O.E. swā) 110, 120, 319. *ham* (O.E. hām) 112. *ga*, *gan*, *gas* (O.E. gā-n) 117, 158, 182, 334. *fra* (O.N. frá) 119. *banes* (O.E. bān) 153. *at anes* (O.E. ānes) 154. *alswa* (O.E. alswā) 165. *wat* (O.E. wāt) 166. *ra* (O.E. rā) 166. *baþe* (O.N. báþi-r) 167 (in this case *a* fixed for the original by rhyme), 192, 271. *twa* (O.E. twā) 209. *qua* (O.E. hwā) 253. *á* (O.E. ān) "one" 261. *saule* (O.E. sāwol) 267, 343. *awen* (O.E. āgen) 319.

(ii) Similarly in the combinations *ald*: *tald* (O.E. táld) 287. *halden* (O.E. hálden) 288.[27]

(iii) *ang* for *ong*: *wanges* (O.E. wange "cheek") 110; see below on the meaning of this word. *sang* (O.E. sang) 250. *lange* (O.E. lang) 255. *wrang* (O.N. vrang-r) 332. Note that all the words in (i), (ii), (iii), with the exception of *wanges*, would be normal (Chaucerian) English with substitution of *o* for *a*.

(iv) *e* for *ĭ*: *dreuen* "driven" 190; authority doubtful, see note to the line.

(v) *k* for *ch*: *quilk* 158, 251; also possibly *swilk* 210 (and perhaps elsewhere: see notes above). These are derived from O.E. *hwilc* (*swilc*), whence also normal Chaucerian *which*, *swich*.

(vi) *verbal inflexions*: (*a*) *es*, *s* for *eth*, *th* in 3 sg. pres. *fares* 103. *has* 106, 107, 155, 259, 283, 284, 285. *boes* 107. *gas* 117. *wagges* 119. *falles* 122. *findes* 210. *bringes* 210 (fixed for original by rhyme). *tides* 255. *sais* 260. *makes* 334. There are seventeen instances. There cannot be any doubt that these *s*-forms are intended as a dialect feature, and this is specially interesting as showing that Chaucer largely made use of points that were to some extent familiar. Not only has this inflexion since become part of ordinary English, but Chaucer himself occasionally uses it in his own work, perhaps only to assist in rhyming (as e.g. in *Book of the Duchess*, 73, 257). He would hardly have done this if the inflexion was in his day entirely unfamiliar and odd to London ears. (*b*) *es* for *eth* in the imper. pl. *spedes* 113. (*c*) *es* for *e*, *en* in pres. pl. *werkes* "ache" 110. These are more distinctively dialectal and not elsewhere used by Chaucer (as far as rhymes and printed texts show). Though they appear later in London English,

they never became established. It is therefore perhaps significant that we have only *one* example of the indic. pl. as against 17 of the sg., and in the only other case of a verb in the pres. pl. the " incorrect" form *sain*[28] fixed by rhyme with *swain* is used. *fares* 103 might be pl. but is probably sg. as reckoned above; cf. 336. (*d*) Here may be observed the monosyllabic forms, with unchanged stems in the plural, of "shall" and "will"; as *wil* 91, 213; *sal* (v.r. *sul*) 254. Monosyllabic forms, with the stem the same as in the singular, are found elsewhere in Chaucer (according to the MSS.), but *shal* is rare as compared with *shul*, *shuln*, *shullen*. (*e*) The forms of past participles. These should in northern dialect have no *y*-prefix, and should retain the ending (*e*)*n* in strong verbs—except in a few cases where final *n* is lost in northern forms after a verbal stem containing *m*, *n*[29]: as *cum* "come", *bun* "bound". The following are all correct for northern speech: Strong: *cum* 111, 317. *born* (rhyming *scorn*) 189. *stoln* 191, 263. *dreuen* 190. *lorn* (rhyming *corn*) 155. *schapen* 259. *halden* 288. *gan* 158. *ben* 347. Weak: *lost* 153. *pit* 168. *answerd* 208. *herd* 209. *agreued* 261 (E wrongly *ygreued*). *releued* 262. *had* 264. *sped* 285. *tald* 287. *called* 344. *swiued* 346. Incorrect is *misgo* without *n*, rhyming also, 335; *misgon* 332 rhyming *anon* has correct form but southern vowel. The correct forms are in the great majority. But actually in most cases they coincide with variants possible or usual in normal Chaucerian grammar. At the same time most of them represent opportunities for error (as is seen in the southernized forms of some MSS.) that have been avoided. Some are additionally marked as northern by vowels, as *gan*, *tald*, *halden* (*dreuen*). *cum* (MSS. *come*) only occurs before a vowel where elision is possible. *stoln*, by metre probably a monosyllable in both instances, may be taken as more specifically dialectal: i.e. as *stŏln* with short vowel contrasted with normal Chaucerian *ystōle*(*n*), *stōle*(*n*), trisyllabic or dissyllabic; *stŏln* and later *stollen* (so P L) are characteristic of N. texts (e.g. *C.M.* 4904, *Sir Gawain* 1659). (f) The 2 sg. of the past tense. *nad þou* 168, *herde þou* 250.

(vi) *Various northern forms and contractions*: (*a*) *es* (*is*) for *am*, 111, 124, 125, 166, 282, 319. *es* (*is*) for *art*, 169, 208. *es*, not *is*, for *is*, 158, 251 (derived from uncertain evidence of L, see above). *er* for *ben* "are", 125, 190. All these are correct and specifically northern forms and uses. The choice among the variants in case of "are" 125, 190, assumes that Chaucer wrote *er* (or *ar*) in 190, where all the MSS. have *r*-forms, and that he also did so in 125, where the *is*, *es* of C P L are due to the preceding *I is* (*es*). The *r*-forms are correct in immediate conjunction with a pronoun, *es* (*is*) being only used normally when separated from a pronoun. An instructive contrast is provided by *Cursor Mundi* 354 *thre thinges þam es witjn*, and 356 *four er þai*.[30] Though the more extreme forms *es*, *er* have been adopted, *is* and *ar* are not necessarily incorrect. *is* varies freely with *es* in any of its uses in northern texts. O.E. *aron*, *aro* were both northern and midland,

and so were the derived forms in Middle English.[31] *es*, *er* were due to the influence of O.N. *es*, *ero*; they were not, of course, merely "northern" forms, but were also found in the East. The uses of *es*, *is* were probably due to the association of their *s* with the northern *s*-inflexion of verbs, which caused them to spread beyond the 3 sg. When replacing *am* this dialectal usage was probably found laughable: the specially large number of instances of this in the text may be noted. (*b*) *sal* 123, 165, 167, 182, 254, 256, 258, 262, 265, 267, 288 (all 1 or 3 sg., except 254 pl.); an irregular but well-evidenced form of *shal*, found still in northern dialects and in Middle English confined to northern texts.[32] This detail has been favoured by Chaucer and well preserved by the MSS, as a rule—some of the cases may even represent the substitution of *sal* for Chaucerian *wil* (see variants above). The pa. t. *suld* occurs in 209, a good northern form (but only in Hl). (*c*) *ta* 209, 210: an irregular reduction of *take*, which was specifically northern. Chaucer does not use it elsewhere. It remained dialectal, though the pp. (written *tan*, *taan*, *tane*, *tain*, and now *ta'en*) later gained some currency, especially in verse. (*d*) *als* (111), 257: a form characteristic of northern texts; but see notes to 111, 257 above. (*e*) *boes*107 : this is written in genuine northern texts *bos*, *bus*, and is a reduction of *bihoues*. Its preservation in E only is notable. E has not preserved the northernisms particularly well, and shows no tendency or ability independently to improve the dialect with such genuine details as this. (*f*) *gif* 261, 270: an irregular variant of *if*, of obscure origin, but well evidenced in northern language. There can be little doubt that it also appeared in 258. (*g*) To the above may be added *ar* "ere" 250, also current outside the northern area and found in various places in O (which gives it here) and L, for instance. ӡa 254 (see note on this line above). *sagh* 118, a familiar form and spelling in northern texts. *i* (for *in*), early found in the north, perhaps partly owing to O.N. *i*, but here only in *i-faiþ* 102, 124, where *i* probably had a wider currency; cf. *imell* in B, next. *pit* (for *put*) 168, found in modern northern and Scottish dialect, but rare in Middle English, where it is mainly, but not solely, northern.[33] The uninflected genitive *miller* 346 rests on poor evidence (see above). For the forms of *auntre*, *draf-sek* see below.

<center>B. Vocabulary.</center>

capel, 168 horse. This word did not obtain a footing in "standard" English, and is plainly intended as dialectal here, though it must have been a fairly familiar word, since Chaucer uses it himself elsewhere. Used by the Reeve in the narrative part of his tale (185), it is probably intended also to be dialectal or rustic; it is also used by the Summoner in his tale, and by the Friar in his, and by the Host in the prologue to the Manciple's Tale (none of them examples of elevated speech). Chaucer is right in making it an element of northern vocabulary, though it is found in the

West (*Piers Plowman*) and in alliterative verse generally, and was probably also known in the East (East Anglia, which accounts for the Reeve)—it appears at any rate in the *Promptorium Parvulorum*.

daf, 288 fool. This word is dialectal, and is probably quite correctly put into the mouths of northerners; but words of abuse are easily acquired, and have generally a wide distribution. This word is not limited to the North in Middle English (it occurs, for instance, in *Piers Plowman*); nor in modern dialect, where its use is, however, mainly northerly or Scottish.

ferli, 253 wonderful. This word, whether used as a noun, adjective, or verb, is very common in Middle English, both in the North and the West, and is especially associated with alliterative or alliterated verse. After Chaucer's time it is recorded almost exclusively from the North and West, yet it must be reckoned as one of the elements of the vocabulary of verse, with its roots in the alliterative verse of the Scandinavianized North and North-West, that has always been widely familiar, if never naturalized, in the South. Chaucer, however, does not himself use the word elsewhere.

folt, 108 fool. This word is perhaps less common than *fonne* but has a similar distribution, being found (with its derivatives *folte* v., *folted*, *foltisch*) chiefly in northern or eastern texts and writers.

fonne, 169. This is the only occurrence of the word in Chaucer. It is a northern and north-midland word. It did not become part of the "standard" language, though its derivative *fonned*, *fond*, which was until long after Chaucer's time still dialectal and northerly, has since become current. It is quite correct in the mouth of John, but must also be reckoned among the words that were, if northern, not totally foreign. The derivative *fonned* is found, contemporary with Chaucer, in Wyclif or Wycliffite writings; the simple *fon*, *fonne* is found in Manning, Mirk, and (after Chaucer) very frequently in the *Coventry Plays*: it seems thus marked as a widespread midland word.

That in this short vocabulary of dialectal words we should have three words for "fool" and one for jeering (*heþing*, see below), not to mention the universally current *fol* 190, or the words *drafsek*, *cokenai*, and *swines-hed*, is a perfectly just testimony to the richness of the northern and Scandinavianized dialects in terms of abuse. We have the same observant Chaucer behind the linguistic portraiture of this tale as behind the sketches of the *Prologue*.

hail in *al hail!* 102; *il hail!* 169. This is the Norse *heil-l* "hale, sound", used in greetings, such as *kom heill, far heill!* But the noun *heill* "(good) luck, omen" also used in greetings doubtless contributed. The adjective, except in the salutation, was and remained dialectal, and chiefly northern, or eastern (e.g. *Bestiary* and *Promptorium*).[34] The noun, especially in such

expressions as *il hail*, was always northerly: the most southerly example, older than or contemporary with Chaucer, given in *N.E.D.* is from Manning (Lincolnshire) in the expression to *wrother-haylle*.[35] In salutations, however, *hail* either alone or in formulae such as *al hail*, *hail be thou*, is found widely scattered. It is found, for instance, in *Vices and Virtues*, presumed to be from the South-East (Essex) and dated about 1200. It is, nonetheless, used little by Chaucer; outside this tale it appears only in the mouth of the somnour, who is a character in the *Friar's Tale*. We may, therefore, reckon Alain's salutation of the miller among the features intended by Chaucer to be taken as dialect, while recognized by him as familiar. The word later became current and literary, but its earliest record seems to be in the angelic salutation to Mary, in which alone it could still be said to be in general use.

heþen, 113 hence. This is from O.N. *heðan*, replacing *henne*(*s*) from O.E. *heonane*. It is quite rightly offered as a northern word; but was also used in the East from Lincoln to East Anglia (Manning, *Havelok*, *Genesis and Exodus*, *Ormulum*). It remained dialectal, and is not else used by Chaucer, nor by any southern or London writer.

heþing, 190 contumely, scorn. This again is a word rightly ascribed to the North, but in fact widely used, together with its relatives *heþe* jeer at, *heþeli* contemptible *or* contemptuous, in the Scandinavianized areas (N.W., N., and E.). It never became part of the literary vocabulary, and is nowhere else used by Chaucer. It is purely Norse in origin: O.N. *hæða*, *haæðing* (and *hæðni*), *hæðligr*, used precisely as in Middle English.

hougat, 117, 122 how. This word (with or without added *es*) seems to have been purely northern, belonging to Yorkshire, Northumberland, or Scotland. Skeat's failure to record its presence in the MSS. used for his edition is curious. The similar formation *algates* was frequently used by Chaucer.

il, 125, 254, 264, and in *il hail* 169, evil bad. This word was characteristic of East and North, and its frequent use (as opposed to its occasional appearance, especially as a rhyme-word) was in Chaucer's day still confined to the language of those areas. The word was later adopted into ordinary and literary English. It now remains current chiefly in uses derived from the M.E. adverb (*it is me ille*, I am ill). It may be noted that the uses here are adjectival. It is interesting to observe this familiar modern word employed by Chaucer to give an impression of dialect. He does not use it elsewhere, but if only because of its later acceptance, we may reckon this word also among northernisms already fairly familiar to his audience.[36]

imell, 251 among. This was and remained a characteristically northern word, and is among the more extreme dialectalisms used. It occurs in the forms *e-mell*, *o-mell*(*e*), *i-mell*(*e*), derived from Old East Norse; cf. Old

Danish *i mellae* (modern *imellem, mellem*), O. Icel. *í milli, á milli*. It is not used by Chaucer elsewhere. Compare the use in the *York Plays*, xi, 30, and xxxvii, 104, which is very similar to the use in Chaucer's passage.

laþe, 168 barn. This is derived from O.N. *hlaða* store-house. It is a genuine northern word, still in use in the North. It was also found in the East, and appears as early as *Genesis and Exodus* (probably representing East Anglia). There can be no doubt that it is meant to be one of the dialect features in the clerks' speech, and it has not been adopted in the standard language; yet it must also be reckoned as one of the words Chaucer could assume were familiar, for he uses it once elsewhere (*House of Fame* 2140, rhyming with *rathe*).

sel, 319 good fortune. This is of native origin, a dialectal preservation, not an innovation (O.E. *sǣl, sēl*). It is found widely in early Middle English (W., N., and E.), but it is certainly not wrong to put it in the mouth of a northerner. The word was obsolescent, and after the thirteenth century seems to have been preserved chiefly in the North.

slik, 210 (2ce), 250, 253, and as a variant for *quilk* 251, such. This is derived from O.N. *slík-r*, and competed with rather than replaced O.E. *swilc* in its regular northern form *swilk*. It was a word of more limited currency than any of the others here used as dialect by Chaucer, and so possesses a special interest. It cannot be counted among the widely known or familiar words, and though context usually interprets it, it is sometimes altered or misunderstood in copies of genuine northern texts. See the special note on this word, App. ii.

swain, 107 servant. This is from O.N. *sveinn*, which usually ousted the cognate O.E. *swān* (whence rare M.E. *swon*). It has ceased to be dialectal, though the process has probably been a literary one, and not a development in the colloquial language. Here the sense "servant" (as well as its use in what appears to be a proverb) marks it as colloquial and dialectal, and distinguishes its use from Chaucer's only other employment of the word, *Sir Thopas* 13. There its sense, "young warrior, knight," marks it as a literary borrowing from the vocabulary of the type of poem Chaucer is there ridiculing—a vocabulary that has various connexions with northern and alliterative verse. Compare the notes on *auntre* and *wight* below.

til, 190 (2ce), to; also in *in til*, into 123; and before infinitive *for til*, 215; as adverb in *til and fra*, 119. All these uses are correct for the North. *Til* is found in Old English, only in Northumbrian (Ruthwell Cross, Cædmon's Hymn, Lindisfarne glosses: in senses *to*, *for*, and before infinitive), and in Old Frisian; in Middle English its use and distribution was probably strongly influenced by Old Norse. The competition with the synonymous *to* produced (*a*) specialization of sense, and with reference to time *til* is found early in all parts, and is, of course, normal in Chaucer; (*b*) a tendency to use *til* instead of *to* before a vowel or *h*.[37] *Til* in such positions

appears as a synonym for *to* early and widely, and is well represented in MSS. of Chaucer; for instance, in A 180 (*Prologue*): *til a fissh*.[38] But *til scorn* (though see *driue*), and more still *for til spende*, and *til and fra* are specifically northern. The last is rarely recorded (as a variant of *to and fro*), and the present passage is the latest of the three instances cited in *N.E.D. In til* is probably better not treated as a distinct compound word in Middle English: it occurs before a vowel or *h* with same distribution as *til*. Later *intil* is specifically northern and Scottish. Here the use before *þe* is northern.

þair, 252 their. This has long since become the standard form, and was no doubt already familiar. It is, however, rare in MSS. of Chaucer, and was probably never used by him in normal language. (Had he used it, its later currency, which has assisted in preserving the present instance, would certainly have caused its frequent retention elsewhere.) Here he rightly uses it as a mark of northern speech, though it could in his day, and long before, have been heard, together with *þaim*, in familiar use side by side with the native *h*-forms in the East, certainly as far south as Norfolk—the home of the Reeve. It seems highly probable that this was recognized by Chaucer, and that he allowed the Reeve himself to use casually here and there the forms *þaim*, *þair*. The Lansdowne MS. actually represents him as doing so at the end of the tale, ll. 339-40: *And greyþen þeym and toke* her *hors anone, And eke* here *mele & on* þeire *weie ei gone*.[39] The conjunction with the dialectal verb *greyþen* (see below), and also the isolation of such a form in L, are strongly in favour of descent from Chaucer. As far as I can discover, L does not elsewhere use the þ-forms in genuine Chaucerian pieces. Support is given to this view by the occasional occurrence of þ-forms in the *Tale of Gamelyn* in various MSS.; for here on other evidence we are dealing with copies of a work originally in language of (North-) East Midland type, where the þ-forms would be likely or certain to appear.[40] It will be noted that even in *Gamelyn* the form *þair* is better preserved than *þaim*. For this reason, though *þaim* does not occur in any of the MSS. used in the clerks' speeches, I have adopted it for l. 251, instead of *hem*, and not treated this *hem* as an "unremoved southernism". The presence of *þaim* in Chaucer's version is very probable. To retain *þair* and substitute *hem* is, in fact, to bring the language into line with the usage of the century after Chaucer's death; it is the usage found in Lydgate. After Chaucer's time *thair*, *their*, *ther* quickly established themselves owing to the ambiguity of *her*, but *hem* maintained itself much longer and has never been completely banished.

wanges, 110. This word is usually explained as "back-teeth, molar teeth". The word is not elsewhere recorded in Middle English (in this sense); in fact, from the whole range of English the *N.E.D.* only cites this present passage, and a modern (1901) record of South Lancashire dialect, which gives *wang* as a word for "tooth" or " back-tooth". In favour

of the reference to teeth may then be urged (*a*) this modern dialect use, (*b*) the occurrence in Old English of a word *wang-tōþ* "back-tooth", whence M.E. *wangtooþ, wongtooþ,* the former appearing in Chaucer's *Monk's Tale* 54. The first element is O.E. *wang*(*e*) "cheek, especially the lower part, the jaw"; cf. *wang-beard* "sidewhiskers". If we accept this interpretation, we must then assume that *wang* "back-tooth" is a shortening of the compound, which would only be likely to take place after *wange, wonge* had become obsolete in ordinary language in the sense "jaw".[41] Against the sense "tooth" may be urged the doubtful evidence for its existence, indeed absence of any evidence for Middle English. The usual word for "back-tooth" was evidently *wang-tōþ,* which was in general use in Old English. It occurs in the North and in the southern laws (*Laws of Alfred,* sect. 49); it is fairly widely distributed in Middle English (e.g. Wyclif, Langland, Chaucer, *Promptorium*) and is still preserved in the dialects of recent times (though the last reference in *N.E.D.* is from Ray's collection of north-country words, 1674). Apart from the supposed occurrence in the *Reeve's Tale* one would naturally conclude that the scantily evidenced *wang = tooth* was a fairly recent development (*a*) long after the disappearance of *wang* " cheek" (which had not taken place in the Middle English period in the North and West), and (*b*) in connexion with the development of the sense "tooth" for *fang.*[42] One may enquire, then, whether the present passage really supports the sense "tooth". It is not easy to see why the manciple of the Soler-hall was likely to die of toothache—that the ache was in the molars may have made it more painful, but hardly more deadly. The manciple might feel like dying himself, of course, but John is not likely to have shared his fear, and we are expressly told that "he lay sick with a malady and people thought he would certainly die".[43] A violent headache, as a symptom of fever, is in our tale a much more likely explanation of John's words. It may be noted that the word *werke, warke* "ache" is specially associated with headache. The only compound in which it occurs is *head-wark,* found in various forms in Middle English in the North and East, and surviving down to modern times in the North; while *warking* means "headache" by itself and is in the *Promptorium* glossed *heed-ake, cephalia.*[44] It might seem, therefore, that unnecessary trouble has been made about the manciple's *wanges,* and that there is no need to look further than the O.E. *wang*(*e*), a word certainly still alive in the North and West in Middle English. But two difficulties occur. First: the simple *wange* in Old English seems generally to have been used of the lower cheek and jaw, though the words descriptive of unclearly defined parts of the body are specially liable to shifts of meaning. Second: it is a curious fact that in Middle English the word is almost solely recorded in the alliterative formulae *wete wonges* or *to wete þe wonges* with reference to weeping.[45] To the examples quoted by the *N.E.D.* (from *Cursor Mundi, Alysoun, Sir Tris-*

trem, Wyntoun, and the *York Plays*, all northern except the second which is probably western in origin) I can only add Layamon, *Brut* 30268: *wete weren his wongen* (the earliest M.E. instance), and *Joseph of Arimathie* (an alliterative poem) 647: *I wepte water warm and wette my wonges*, both of which show the same formula. This would certainly suggest that, though alive, the word was preserved in the North and West chiefly as part of the equipment of the alliterative poets and in the vocabulary derived from them—which might be reckoned a point in favour of "teeth". But it shows more. The M.E. *wange*, *wonge*, so far as it survived, was no longer used for the jaw, but for the upper part of the face. This is the sense of the cognate O.N. *vangi*, which refers to the side of the head from the ear to just under the eyes; and to Old Norse the M.E. use (in North and West) is probably largely due.[46] This sense would have, moreover, the support of the word *thunwange*, the common Germanic word for the "temples",[47] a word still alive in Middle English in the North and East.[48] We might then assume a use in the North and East of *wange* referring to the side of the head, especially in the neighbourhood of the temples and the eyes. This would fit the case of the sick manciple well enough; and though the evidence for the word is chiefly poetic and alliterative—a diction after all based largely on the actual speech of the northerly regions—it is, at any rate, much stronger in Middle English than the evidence for the sense "tooth". The influence upon native *wange* of the cognate and phonetically identical O.N. *vangi*[49] is a familiar process, very different from the abnormal (and probably recent) reduction of *wangtooth* to *wang*.[50] This discussion of the meaning of *wanges* has led far afield, but is not without point. Whichever meaning we finally decide on, it has been fairly well established that *wang* was dialectal, and correctly ascribed by Chaucer to the North. If the word meant "side of the head", we can also put it back into the list of those showing northern *ang* for *ong*.[51] In either case we can fairly conclude that the word was not a widely known one, and that Chaucer has for once allowed himself to use an oddity (unless an Eastern use of *wange* = *thunwange* existed, but has escaped record, which is unlikely). In fact, suspicion is aroused that Chaucer got this word from northern or western writings, and not from actual talk. There is a similarity both in the alliteration of Chaucer's phrase, and in the situation, to the recorded poetic formulæ in which *wanges* elsewhere appears.

werkes, 110 ache. The native word O.E. *wærcan* is in Middle English only found (rarely) in the West, or rather North-West, in the form *warche*: for instance, in MS. T of the *Ancren Riwle* and in the *Destruction of Troy*. It is recorded in the recent dialect of Shropshire. The forms with *k*, *werke*, *warke*, are either derived from or influenced by the cognate O.N. *verkja* "to hurt" (intransitive) and *verk-r* "pain". There can be no doubt that Chaucer was right in giving this word as a feature of northern dialect, but it

is curious that the present passage[52] is actually the earliest record of the verb *Wark*. As far as the evidence goes, this seems to be another word that was in use in the East as well as in the North—it is, at any rate, found in the *Promptorium*.

wight, 166 active. This word is probably of Scandinavian origin.[53] It is, at any rate, common in Middle English in the North and throughout the areas of direct Scandinavian influence, and wherever alliterative verse or the vocabulary related to it is found. Its area might be described as an arch round the South-East and London, from Robert of Gloucester and Layamon through the West and North (including Scotland) and down the East, where it is found, for instance, in *Havelok* and *Genesis and Exodus*.[54] It was clearly in its proper area, that of direct Scandinavian influence, not solely a literary and poetic word, though it is chiefly so in our records. It must be counted among the words widely familiar, though never adopted by the standard language, and as one, moreover, that tended to spread as a literary word, favoured in such formulæ as *wight as Wade*, which was last used by Morris in *The Defence of Guinevere*. It was from literature rather than dialect talk that Chaucer took the word, and he could rely on the reading of romances to make the word intelligible to his audience (and readers). Indeed, he uses the word once elsewhere, in the *Monk's Tale* 277: *wrastlen . . . with any yong man, were he never so wight*.[55] The use in the *Reeve's Tale* is specially interesting, for it occurs in the formula: *wight as es a ra*. The same formula[56] is found in the romance *Sir Eglamour of Artois* 261: *as wyght as any roo* (rhyming *goo* "go"), describing greyhounds, and showing a sense "swift" very apt for our passage. *Sir Eglamour* is one of the northern or northerly romances, in *rime couee*, of the kind ridiculed in *Sir Thopas*: it is indeed particularly ridiculous, but it must have been popular, to judge by the fact that four manuscripts of it survive.[57] Though Eglamour's name is not in the well-known list in *Sir Thopas*, unless it is concealed under Pleyn-damour, it is extremely likely that Chaucer had read (and laughed at) this very poem. If he had, he would have seen there *wight as any ra* (or *es a ra*), for our fifteenth-century copies are all more or less southernized, even Yorkshire Thornton's copy, and the original is seen from many rhymes[58] to have been in a dialect with northern *ā* for *ǭ*.

yon (ʒon), 258 yon. This adjective is only once recorded in Old English,[59] but it may once have been in fairly general colloquial use, for it is the kind of word that easily escapes literary record: it meant "that yonder" accompanied by pointing to some relatively distant object. In the South and East it evidently died out of colloquial speech (as German *jener* has), and where it remained it tended to oust or to compete with *that*.[60] It is clearly intended as dialect by Chaucer, who does not use it elsewhere; but it may safely be counted one of the familiar dialectalisms. Later it became literary again, though not apparently before the end of

the sixteenth century, and at first in the form *yond*, due to the influence of the related adverb *yond*, O.E. *geond*. It was fairly widely distributed in Chaucer's time, and though it is most frequently recorded from the North, with which its living colloquial use is now associated, it is found in *Piers Plowman* and *William of Palerne* representing the West, and in Manning's *Chronicle* in the East. Adjectival *yond*, *yend*, in uses which still reveal its originally adverbial function, such as *on yond half* or the yond "that one yonder", is found both earlier and much further south,[61] and this would, of course, assist in making the dialectal *yon* intelligible. Chaucer, however, who uses yond often, uses it only as an adverb "yonder".

[*tulle*, 214 " entice". On this form, for which there appear to be no parallels, see Appendix (i). Chaucer here either contented himself with an eye-rhyme *folle*, *tolle*, as probably also in *fonne*, *yronne*, or else the text is corrupt. He uses *tolle* "entice" elsewhere, in translating Boethius.]

[*gar*, 212 make. See the note and footnote. This word might easily have been altered to *get*,[62] and would provide another instance of genuine northern vocabulary. *Gar*, meaning "make, do", is used in Middle English chiefly with a following infinitive in the sense "cause one to do something, or something to be done". It is of Scandinavian origin and so found pretty generally, but not universally, in texts written in a language with a considerable Norse ingredient; it belongs especially to the vocabulary of Yorkshire and Northumbria and Scotland, though it is also found further south, as in Nottingham and Lincolnshire (*Havelok* and Manning's *Chronicle*).[63] The use here is, nonetheless, not easy to parallel exactly: *gar* usually approaches "compel" rather than "let".]

[*greiþen*, 389 get ready. This is used by the Reeve, since he is the narrator, and not by the clerks; but was probably, together with accompanying *þaim*, intended to tinge his speech with dialect. It is a Scandinavian word belonging to the North-West and East in natural speech, but it is another word that in early English tended to acquire a certain literary currency, though it did not ultimately keep its place in the standard vocabulary. It is notable that Chaucer employs it three times elsewhere, in the first and probably genuine fragment of the translation of the *Romance of the Rose*, in the *Monk's Tale*, and in the translation of Boethius—probably purely as a literary word, borrowed from books.[64]]

To the above words may be added the following:—

auntre, 285, 290 adventure, risk. This is, of course, strictly the same word as *aventure*, and shows what could happen to a French word when thoroughly popularized, and exposed to the reduction caused by stressing it strongly on the first syllable only, in English fashion. The reduced form is not solely northern, and the southern *aventure* represents rather the continued refreshment of the word by French than a dialectal divergence in development. Nonetheless, in the fourteenth century the

reduced popular form is found mainly in northern texts, and survives to-day in the North and in Scotland. An exception must be made in the case of *paraunter*, which Chaucer himself used occasionally beside *peraventure*.[65] Otherwise he never uses the reduced form (nor makes *aventure* a verb in any form), except once in the adjective *auntrous* in *Sir Thopas* 188—a significant place; compare the notes on *swain*, *wight* above.

draf-sek, 286 idle lump. The word *draf* "sediment of brewing; husks" is widespread in Middle English. It is not recorded in Old English and may be of Dutch origin.[66] Chaucer uses it, for example, in the prologue to the *Legend of Good Women* 312. The same Dutch origin is possible also for both the literal and figurative senses of *draff-sack* as "sack of refuse" and "idle glutton"; for Middle Dutch *drafsac* is used in both ways. It is noteworthy that the appearance here is according to the N.E.D. the first recorded, and nearly 150 years earlier than the next quotation for the word in either sense. That Chaucer meant the word as a whole to be dialectal (though comic and very appropriate to a miller's bedroom, certainly) is not clear. But it was made dialectal by the form *sek*. This is not a chance aberration.[67] It is a genuine form of the word "sack", and is found in Hampole and in such a thoroughly northern poem as *Ywain and Gawain*; though, like so many of the northernisms here used by Chaucer, it is also found in eastern texts, such as *Genesis and Exodus*, *Havelok*, or the *Promptorium*. In origin it is O.N. *sekk-r*, replacing or influencing O.E. *sæcc*, *sacc* The early occurrence of the compound in Dutch, and the occurrence of the *sek*-forms of "sack" in the East, may lead one to suspect that Chaucer did not go very far north to pick up this item; at the same time the dialectal accuracy of *sek*, which has no general analogy of sound-correspondences between northern and southern speech to support it, is specially interesting.[68]

Here may be added two cases of dialectal uses of generally current words.

hope, 109 meaning "expect without wishing". This sense appears only here in Chaucer, and is, of course, used primarily because it is comic in such a context to those accustomed to *hope* only as implying a wish. The joke was probably a current one and was still alive later: Skeat in his note on this passage quotes from the *Arte of Poesie* the tale of the tanner of Tamworth, who said "I hope I shall be hanged". In Middle English Chaucer is quite right in representing the usage as dialectal and specially northern: *hope* in the sense "expect, suppose, think" is very frequently met in northern texts of all kinds, and though it was probably not confined to the strictly northern dialects, it is seldom recorded elsewhere.[69]

driue, 190 in *dreuen til heþing and til scorn*. This use seems to be definitely northern, though the fact seems not previously to have been noted. The *N.E.D.*[70] gives only three examples, all closely parallel to our text and

all from *fer in þe norþ: Cursor Mundi* 26455: *his lauerd he driues to scorn*; ibid., 26810 *þai crist til hething driue*; and post-Chaucerian (1470) Henry *Wallace*: *thow drywys me to scorn*.[71]

We have now examined all the points in the clerks' speeches which can possibly be regarded as dialectal. The examination has shown Chaucer to be correct in his description of northern language in at least 127 points in about 98 lines, in points of inflexion, sounds, and vocabulary: a very notable result.[72] Further, we have found no proven case of false dialect, words, or forms used as dialectal but wrongly assigned and impossible for the North. In fact, this scrap of dialect-writing is extremely good and more than accurate enough for literary purposes, or for jest. It is quite different from the conventionalized dialect of later drama or novel, where this is not based on local knowledge, or from, say, modern popular notions in the South of "Scotch" or "Yorkshire". At the same time there is little in the lines that is extreme, or altogether outlandish, or, indeed, very definitely localizable more closely than "northern" or usually "northern and elsewhere". But this would be expected in a tale for a southern audience, whatever was the state of Chaucer's private knowledge, and is probably due rather to his skill in selection than to his own limited acquaintance as a Southerner with northern English. He has, in fact, put in a few very definite northernisms, some of limited currency, such as *gif*, *sal*, *boes*, *tan*, *ymel*, and especially *slik*, that show that his knowledge was not acquired casually in London, and was founded on the study of books (and people). As the primary northern characteristic *ā* for *ō* comes out first with some 37 instances[73]; it is followed by *s*-inflexions of verbs with 19; by *sal*, *suld* with *s* for *sh* with 12; and by *es* (*is*) for "am, art" with 8. All these were evidently pretty well known. It is interesting and suggestive to note how large a proportion of the dialect features he uses occur also, more or less contemporarily, in the East, usually at least as far south as East Anglia: *hail*, *heþen*, *heþing*, *ill*, *laþe*, *sek*, *swain*, *þair*, *werke*; as well as features more widely distributed and found also in the West or North-West, such as *capel*, *wight*, *yon*, and the verbal inflexions in *s*. Of the rest *auntre*, *daf*, *ferli*, *hope*, and *wanges* (if not taken as "teeth") were also not limited to the North; *auntre*, *wight*, and *ferli* were all three doubtless familiar to anyone acquainted with English literature. Indeed, one is tempted, in the middle of an enquiry into mere dialect, to turn aside and emphasize the occasional concomitant *literary* suggestions of some of the words already dealt with. The suggestions are faint and may be perceptible only to philological ears, but those who feel inclined to dismiss them as fancies should consider the description of the battle of Actium in the legend of Cleopatra, especially ll. 56 ff. As in the better known tourney in the *Knight's Tale*, it is impossible here to miss the accents of alliterative verse, turned (or thrust bodily) into "decasyllables". And

significantly we here come upon *heterly*. This word occurs only here in Chaucer; indeed it probably occurs here alone in Middle English outside actual alliterative writings, whether in the prose of the "Holy Maiden-hood" group, or in such poems as: *Sir Gawain* or *The Wars of Alexander*. If its source is not *William of Palerne* 1243: *and hetterly boþe hors and man he hurled to þe grounde*, Chaucer's *heterly they hurtlen* has been taken from some now lost piece he once conned and did not forget. *heterly* is dialect, but it is more. There was, after all, a literature of merit, especially in the West, before Chaucer's day, and before anything literary was written that can be ascribed to London. Chaucer was not independent either of the past or of the contemporary, and neither was his audience.

We may now consider a quite different type of "error", one far more excusable in a use of dialect for literary purposes: the failure to remove features of Chaucer's own normal London English, which would not oc-cur in pure northern speech. We have some right to ask, when an author goes out of his way to give us words and forms not natural to his usual literary medium, that these should be what he pretends, fair samples of the dialect he is representing. We do not necessarily demand that the dialect's greatest oddities should be dragged in, or that all its most char-acteristic features as tabulated in historical grammars should be present, as long as what we do get is genuine.[74] We have no right to insist that a poet, telling a funny story rapidly and economically, and in rhymed verse, should offer us dialect through and through. If he gives us about 130 correct dialect points to a 100 lines, this is ample to give a proper impres-sion of the clerks' talk, if the southernisms are not too frequent. All the same, an examination of the lines for this kind of "error", unremoved southernism, brings out one or two points of interest and emphasizes the fact that the *Reeve's Tale* is of importance to Chaucerian textual criti-cism generally, as a measure of manuscript fidelity to details upon which Chaucer lavished so much care. A proper text of the Canterbury Tales (or other major works of his), not to mention the recapturing to some extent of Chaucerian spelling and grammar, is not to be obtained from devout attachment to any one MS., certainly not Ellesmere, however at-tractive it may look.

The textual notes above will have shown that allowance has to be made for frequent but inconsistent southernizing of many details in the course of the tradition between Chaucer's copy or corrected copies and even the best MSS. that now survive. Accordingly those "errors" are here first presented which can, with varying certainty, be ascribed to the au-thor, since they appear to be required by metre or by rhyme. Usually we may say, rather, they were dictated by metre or rhyme, and that they were licences not errors; he was well aware of them and gives the cor-rect northern form elsewhere, but felt justified, as he was, in letting them pass.

(i) There is first the rather difficult case of final *e*. Here are omitted from consideration syllabic *e* in inflexions such as *es*, *en*, *ed*: these were certainly largely preserved in the North even at this date, though liable to reduction after vowels or sonorous consonants (as in *stoln*, 191, 263, and *quils* 347, where reduction appears actually in the MSS.). The examples of the metrical value of these inflexions are numerous in the text, though slurring or omission occurs, besides *stoln* and *quils*, also in *dreuęn* 190, *spedęs* 113, *findęs* 210 (unless L is right in omitting *ta*), as well as in positions where this was normal in Chaucerian English (e.g. in trisyllables such as *felawes*, *bodies* 192, 252). *Farës* 103 is marked in the text, but possible is *faręs* slurred with *fairë* syllabic. Also passed over is the usual ignoring of *e* by elision before a vowel or *h*. The slurring or omission of *e* in other positions, none unparalleled in Chaucerian use elsewhere, occurs in *Maline* 316 (probably); *in* (*I*) *haue* 332, 335, 345; and in the infinitive *haue* 254, 265.[75]

Metrically significant final *e* occurs in (i) the nouns *mele* 122, *hoste* 211, *wenche* 258, *lawe* 259, 260; (ii) in adjectival inflexion: *þis lange* (*schorte*) *night* 255, 345; and possibly in *þi faire wif* 103; (iii) in the adjectives where it was part of the stem inflected or uninflected: *a wilde fir* 252, and *swete wight*[76]; (iv) in verbal forms: past tense *herde thou* 250, *mighte* 271; imperative *auise* 262; and infinitive *paie* 213. This is combined probably with retention of southern *n* in *ga crepen in* 330, where the following vowel seems to require *n* to avoid elision. Are we to reckon all or any of these cases as untrue to northern dialect? *Crepen* 330 we certainly must, noting that it occurs in Alain's soliloquy (329-366), which is remarkable for the number of southernisms it contains in all the seven MSS.[77] The loss of final *e* in the infinitive, and in such imperatives as *mak* for *make* (so 212), was specially early in the North, but this does not certainly apply to words of French origin. Scansions such as *changë* are plainly indicated in fourteenth-century poems (e.g. Rolle) where native *stand*, or *luf* (love), are used. We may, then, allow Chaucer *auise* and *paie*. But he ought to have the benefit of the doubt in the remaining cases. The question of final *e* in the North or in general is none too certain. He was not necessarily, in any case, representing dialect right up to date without a literary flavour. The evidence of northern metre is dubious—it was probably syllabically far more irregular than in the South, certainly than in Chaucer, largely owing to the influence of native metrical feeling kept up by alliterative and alliterated verse—but it does at least show that final *e* was in various cases preserved much later than is commonly recognized, at any rate in verse tradition. It is certainly nonsense to say that *at the beginning of our records* e *was lost about 1300* (*Cursor Mundi*).[78] Whatever be the original date of the composition of *Cursor Mundi*, the best manuscript obviously misrepresents the original in this matter of final *e* (and many other points) in almost every

couplet, and, even so, many cases of metrical *ë* are preserved.[79] It is probable, however, that colloquial use in London, even in Chaucer's time, was beginning already to drop final *e*,[80] and we may conclude perhaps that its presence or absence was a point to which he would not give much attention in dialect speech, but would follow mainly the habits of his own language and literary tradition.

(*ii*) Certain southern verbal inflexions appear. The most definite are the infinitive *crepen* 330 already dealt with; and the past participle with southern loss of *n* seen in *misgo* 335 and fixed by rhyme with *also*. Both occur in Alain's soliloquy. In 108 occurs *as clerkes sain* with southern (strictly midland) plural *n*, fixed by rhyme with *swain*. The correct form, at any rate, for Northumbria, whence the clerks hailed (see below), would have been *men sais*.[81] Similar is the "incorrect" *men sai* or *saiþ* (sg.), rhyming *fai* or *faiþ*, 290, where northern English used *sais*, whether singular or plural was intended.

(iii) There are two proven cases of false vowels[82]: *misgon* 332 rhyming with *anon*—the latter is part of the (Reeve's) narrative and so cannot be altered to *anan* (this again is in Alain's soliloquy); and in 272 we have *flie* "a fly" rhyming *vilainie*, where northern English had *fle* or *flei*[83] (Alain again, but in a different place). The case of *hande* Simkin 114, rhyming with *stande* John 115 is rather different. *Stonde* would have been wrong for John, but *honde* more usual where no dialect is intended. But such forms as *hand*, since victorious, are not uncommon in Chaucer according to the MSS, though they cannot be decisively fixed for Chaucer's use by rhyme.[84] At the same time the comparative rarity of *and*-forms, and the absence of variants here, where all the MSS. have *hande*, *stande*,[85] suggest that Chaucer intended *stand* as true to the northern dialect, but was able to link it in rhyme with a non-dialectal line owing to the occurrence of such forms as *hand* already in London English.[86] *Anan* was a different matter and could not be ascribed to the Reeve. Although he obviously knew that *gan*, *misgan* were the proper northern forms, he evidently did not think it worth while to recast his rhyme in order to avoid *misgon*.

These are the only " incorrect" details in the dialect passages that can be fixed more or less definitely as belonging to the original:[87] The certain cases are only six in number (excluding the debatable final *e*), a number quite insignificant in comparison with the mass of correct details. But this list does not, of course, exhaust the "errors" actually found in the text of the dialect passages, even as given above, where the northernisms of all the seven MSS. are included. There we have (i) eight cases of southern *o* for *a* in all the MSS. in *no* 317, *euermo* 318, *wherso* 318, *also* 336, *go* 318, 336, *misgo* 335, *wot* 335. We need not here reckon *lord* 344, for though certainly southern in origin it was early borrowed by northern English. Already the most pure MS. (Cotton) of *Cursor Mundi* has frequently *louerd*,

lord beside the northern *lauerd*, *lard*. The case of *lo!* 215, 251 is interesting. There is no variant *la* here in either place, though this, of course, does not conclusively prove that Chaucer here wrote *lo*. It is, nonetheless, a fact that *lo* would be correct for northern dialect. The word is derived from O.E. *lā!* and this form can be found in northern texts; from it is derived Chaucer's usual *lo!* (probably *lǭ*, the ancestor of our present pronunciation *lou*). But in the North and West the word developed various forms, as is not unusual with exclamatory words; and *lo* (also *low*, *lowr*, and other oddities) occur in texts which either by reason of region or date have otherwise still *ā* for O.E. *ā*. The form *lo*, phonetically *lǭ* rhyming with and sharing the later development of such words as *tō*, is good northern English, and cannot be included among the errors. It may be noted that all the examples of southern *o* (in all the MSS.) come from the words of Alain to Maline or from his later soliloquy—except *lo* and *lord*. *lo* alone comes from the more carefully written (or faithfully preserved) part before l. 250, which strengthens belief that Chaucer actually wrote *lo*, and in one more minute point (like *sek*) showed his accuracy of knowledge. We have also (ii) the false 3 sg. form *lith* 336; and the 2 sg. forms *slepest* 249, *hast* 347. The latter have been retained in the text since by chance no cases of the preservation of the northern 2 sg. in *s* (*has*, *slepes*) occur elsewhere; there cannot be much doubt, all the same, that the *st* here is due to the scribes rather than Chaucer. Finally (iii) *hem* 251 should probably be included though removed from the text, since it is the form here given by all the MSS. This adds another twelve cases of error, none of which can, however, be certainly ascribed to Chaucer.

Before finally dismissing the question of unchanged southernisms two words require brief notice: *wenche* 258 and *cokenai* 289. The former is not dialect, though it now gives that impression. It was still a respectable and literary word for "girl" in Chaucer's time, and was probably in pretty general use[88] all over the country. It is recorded in modern dialects in practically all parts, including Scotland, Yorkshire, Northumberland, and Durham; but in this tale it contributes nothing to the linguistic characterization of the clerks either as rustic or northern. It was not actually the characteristic word for their dialect: that was probably already in Chaucer's time *lass*. This is well illustrated by *Cursor Mundi* 2608, where Sarah referring to Hagar says to Abram: *Yone lasce þat I biside þe laid*. Even the Göttingen MS. here substitutes *wenche* (as does naturally the southernized Trinity version), while the Fairfax version goes astray with *allas I hir*. *Cokenai* used by John in his soliloquy provides the *N.E.D.* with its first quotation for the sense "milksop"—for which sense the only other references given, that can be called Middle English, are northerly or easterly (the *Promptorium* and the northern but related *Catholicon Anglicum*). The only earlier quotation in any sense is taken from the A version of *Piers*

Plowman, where the meaning is "a small egg". Later this word was especially associated with London (or Londoners); but as it is never complimentary in its application, one would naturally suppose that this use did not develop in London, but in the East of England, which had the closest connexion with the capital. The word can hardly be true to the dialect of the "far North", except as a loan, even apart from the fact that the North used Scandinavian *egg* for English *eye*, *aye*.[89] But Chaucer quite justly puts it into the mouth of the Cambridge clerk. He does not wish when he gets back to college to be called a daff, a cockney—he is, as it were, glossing his more rustic *daff* with *cockenai*, the sort of word he would easily pick up in Cambridge; and it would be just the sort of criticism that a *testif and lusty* north-countryman would most resent, to be called a "soft townee". In fact, consideration of this word might lead us to defend all the inconsistencies of dialect, and the intrusion of southern and midland forms among the northernisms of John and Alain's talk, as not ignorant or even negligent, but intentional and true to life, a representation, in fact, of that mixture of speech that went on at the universities and was one of the causes contributing to the propagation of a south-easterly type of language. But such a defence is not necessary; and in general, whatever may be the case with the word "cockney", Chaucer does not seem to have represented a mixed language (unless here and there, and then to help a line or rhyme). The idea is too subtle for the Reeve (though he is made out a clever raconteur), and is probably too philological for Chaucer, though it is not beyond the nicety of his observation of external detail.

The critical text of the lines given above will perhaps prove, then, even when more abundant variants are compared, to be a fair representation of Chaucer's essay in northern dialect. Even if we allow some significance to the curious collection of southernisms, even those easily avoided, towards the end of the speeches (from 316 and especially from 329 onwards), and see in this either Chaucer's negligence or art, the errors will be few, not many more than fifteen, a small proportion set against the correct details. On the other hand, after textual examination, no MS., and certainly not Ellesmere, can escape the charge of casual alterations, careless of the detail of Chaucer's work and its intent.

The evidence offered, though far from complete or fully investigated, is sufficient to establish the claim of the dialect of the northern clerks to be something quite different from conventional literary representations of rustic speech, tempered though it may have been to Chaucer's literary purpose, and superior to ignorant impressionism. When we consider that it appears in a tale in rhymed verse, in which few words are wasted, we find a sufficient reason for the "impurities" that occur; the number of the certain cases is indeed very small. In accuracy and in abundance the dialectal features go far beyond what was merely necessary for the joke,

and we can hardly doubt that from one source or another Chaucer had acquired fairly detailed knowledge of the language of the North, and that such linguistic observations interested him.

The problem of *geen* and *neen* has been passed over, but the solution will not radically affect the general conclusion. A more suitable point with which to conclude a laborious annotation of a successful jest would be to consider more narrowly the question of locality. Chaucer may be imagined to have got his ideas about Northern English by applying his observant mind to people (travelling or on their native soil) or to books, or probably to both. But did he—in spite of the Reeve's disclaimer of any special knowledge of such distant regions—really, for his private satisfaction, give his clerks a home in some place he could have indicated, if he had chosen?

Most of the little evidence that can be extracted from words and forms has been glanced at. From accuracy in small details (such as *sek*), from such touches as *wight as es a ra* (and possibly *werkes ai the wanges*), as well as from the spelling, which in so far as it comes through from Chaucer's hand to us, reflects that of northern texts as we know them, *written* works may be put down as in part the sources of his knowledge. Other sources, of course, were open to him. The eastern speech was, as he seems to have recognized from the very setting of his tale, a natural intermediary between London and the North; and he would have many opportunities of hearing English of the eastern kind without straying far from London. Doubtless actual northern dialect could be heard in the same way. But Chaucer did not stay in the study. Once at least he is believed to have been in Yorkshire; and though a residence at Hatfield as a very young man would not provide even an inquisitive person, less biassed than usual by southern prejudices against dialectal *harring, garring*, and *grisbitting*, with much opportunity for observation of the local vernacular, we may probably take this fleeting glimpse of Chaucer in Yorkshire as a reminder that people moved about, especially those of his class and station. On such occasions Chaucer would not shut his ears. He was observant, and even the least curious were necessarily more dialect-conscious than we are now: dialect assailed the ears more often. It also assailed the eyes, in written works. Chaucer's complaint at the end of *Troilus and Creseyde* concerning the *greet diversitee in English and in wryting of our tonge* has already been referred to. He desired his own work to be handed on in detail as he wrote it, for he wrote as he did by choice among divergences, written as well as spoken. When, then, he suddenly departed, even for a few lines of jest, from his chosen language, he did this deliberately and certainly with some care for detail.

Why he should elect to use the observations he had made to enliven and to plant more firmly in native soil a poor *fabliau* of this sort, to use his

knowledge just at this point and not elsewhere, though other appropriate occasions occurred in the *Canterbury Tales* where the same dramatic touch would have been useful, can now hardly be guessed. To guess is not, in any case, the province of the philologist. The chance events of the actual lives of authors get caught up into their books, but usually they are strangely changed and intricately woven anew one with another, or with other contents of the mind. To others may be left the geography of the tale, and the mill of Trumpington, and surmises concerning visits of Chaucer to the East, including Cambridge, the identity of the Reeve, and the possibility of meetings with actual undergraduates. Even if all these details were established facts of Chaucerian biography, it would not alter the more important point that in his selection from his varied experiences he showed a linguistic insight that is remarkable.

At any rate, the Reeve's *fer in the north* means what it says: it means not some way north (of Norfolk), but in the remote North; if not Scotland, then (we may make a preliminary guess) beyond the Tees. To make this clear it may seem vain to appeal to the dialect—we should be asking a comic poet to indicate in a few lines a narrow localization which our own studious analysis can rarely manage in texts many times the length. There are some indications nonetheless. The non-linguistic may be glanced at first.

In line 94 we are told of the place of John and Aleyn's birth: a "town" called *Strother*. Skeat says there is now no such town in England. This is true, but it has little to do with Chaucer; for his *toun* does not mean "town", but what we should call a village, a place large enough to have a proper name, possibly a church. This is, of course, the sense also in the *Reeve's Tale*, 23 and 57, and in the *Prologue* to the *Canterbury Tales*, 478. There are at least two villages of the name still existing, both north of Tees: Strother (Boldon) and Strother (Haughton), not to mention Haughstrother, Broadstruthers, and the now lost *Coldstrother*.[90] The name is confined to Scotland and the North of England, and is, in fact, a dialect word meaning "marsh", M.E. *strōther*,[91] peculiar to the northern region, and there frequent in names. Chaucer could hardly have chosen a name from among all the northern hamlets more local or appropriate. He may, indeed, have known its then still current dialectal meaning; but neither this meaning nor, in the absence of ordnance maps, the existence of such places is likely to have become known to him except by a visit to the North or contact with actual people from those parts.

The word *strother*, though characteristic of Northumbria (in the narrower sense), is not solely Northumbrian; it is found in Scotland and appears probably in the West Riding name Langstrothdale, for which in the thirteenth century *lange strother* is recorded.[92] But we possess a second indication which points to Durham or Northumberland. In line 207 John

swears *by seint Cutberd*. The form of the name is a perversion, produced or favoured by the needs of rhyme, of *Cudbert*, the more natural medieval form of St. Cuthbert's name. It is true that oaths in Chaucer are all too often but valueless fillings of a line; but this comes in neatly and naturally, it is no mere padding like *for by that lord that called is seint Jame*, 334. Chaucer does not elsewhere mention the great northern saint, and mentions him here undoubtedly for local colour. The local colour is that of Northumbria—not of Scotland. There was small friendship between St. Cuthbert and the Scots, at least in the fourteenth century. Lawrence Minot says:—

> þe Scottes with þaire falshede þus went þai obout
> For to win Ingland, whils Edward was out.
> For Cuthbert of Dorem haued þai no dout;
> þarfore at Neuel Cros law gan þai lout.

The author of the *Metrical Life of St. Cuthbert* has similar views (cf. ll. 4881 ff.) regarding even the ninth century.

"The Durham area, when first distinguished from the rest of the earldom of Northumberland, was known as *Haliwer(es) folc* or *Haliwersocn* = the people or soke (i.e. jurisdiction) of the holy man or saint, a term which is the equivalent of the common Latin expression *terra* or *patrimonium Sancti Cuthberti*."[93] This term originally included considerable parts of the present county of Northumberland. It was still in use in the fourteenth century, though it went out of use in the next. In the *Metrical Life of St. Cuthbert* (c. 1430) the expressions used are *Cuthbert folk* (*men, lande*) and *saint pople*.[94] But quite apart from this special use the peculiar association of this part of England with St. Cuthbert and the devotion there to him was familiar throughout the country.[95]

There can be little doubt, then, that Chaucer had actually in mind the land beyond the Tees as the home of his young men and of their speech. For philological purposes that is all that is required. Skeat, and Professor Manly since, have pointed to the actual family of *de Strother* from Northumberland. The names Aleyn and John were borne by its members, though the popularity of these names detracts considerably from the interest of this fact. Aleyn de Strother (whose son was John), was at one time constable of Roxburgh Castle; he died in 1381. The family was important in the North. This may indicate one way, at any rate, in which Chaucer could have learned of the place-name, and even, indeed, have listened to the dialect; for in his days members of such a family might speak dialectally enough at home or at court. If so, in addition to other ingenuities here ascribed to him, Chaucer may possibly have added a crowning touch of satire on living persons. As Chaucer has drawn them,

his young men, of course, are not relatives; they came from the same village, and were *felawes* (283), and they were clerks and poor. If we must seek for "real life" at the bottom of all Chaucer's characters, this must be a composite picture. But this is beside my present object, and I will end with one more philological point. The narrower localization seems clear: did Chaucer, or could he, make this appear also in the dialect used? It would be difficult to do, and at any rate difficult now to pick up the hints, were they given, in our ignorance of local peculiarities within the generally uniform Northern (or North-Eastern) English of the time.

Among the dialect words used only one holds out any hope: this is the word *slyk*, 210, 250, 253, for "such", which, if we take in 251 the variant *slike* as descending from Chaucer, is also the sole word for "such" in the clerks' mouths. The words and forms of words for *such* in Middle English require an investigation which I have not been able to give to them. I began to pursue *slike* with a light heart, trusting my casual impression that it was a word limited to (Eastern) Yorkshire that occurred only in a few easily examined texts. Here it seemed Chaucer had clearly been careless, and had fobbed off a Yorkshire Scandinavianism on his Northumbrian clerks. It soon became plain that a diligent search through many northern texts (mostly ill-glossed or not at all), and an enquiry into their textual history (mostly tangled and seldom known), and finally a considerable knowledge of the recent northern and Scottish dialects, would be required. But Chaucer would emerge triumphant. I have not been able to do more than give a preliminary glance at the available evidence, but even so one fact, the only one that really concerns this paper or the criticism of Chaucer, comes out plainly: if *slike* was ever anywhere at home, as the usual, or even exclusive word for "such", it was precisely in England beyond the Tees. A more typical word, and yet one that though strange would still be sufficiently interpreted by the context without need of a footnote, could hardly have been found. After that the critic of Chaucer's dialect and his skill in using it may well retire. In fact, one may end by remarking that even this one odd word bears out the general impression: even under the limitations of a comic tale in rhymed verse told to a Southern audience, Chaucer took a private pleasure in accurate observation and was probably far more definite in his ideas, and more interested in such linguistic matters than he admitted, just as he loved digressions while ever declaring that he was pushing on with the utmost speed. A deal of pother may have been made over a few comic lines of his, yet we may feel sure he would appreciate the attention, and have more sympathy with such pother, and with such of his later students who attach importance to the minutiæ of language, and of his language, even to such dry things as rhymes and vowels, than with those who profess themselves disgusted with such inhumanity.

Appendix I

Tulle

Tulle, 214 "entice" rhyming *fulle*. On examination this reveals a small problem, difficult to solve. It would seem from the rhyme that Chaucer intended the word to have $\breve{u}$, as still in modern *full*. But this form appears to be unparalleled. Has Chaucer made a mistake, or has he provided us with a genuine dialect form which has otherwise escaped record?

Chaucer's *tulle* here is the only evidence given in the *N.E.D.* for a M.E. *tulle* "entice" from O.E. **tullian*, a supposed variant of *tollian* (also unrecorded in Old English but assured by the frequent M.E. *tolli-n*, *tolle-n*).[96] The latter, giving modern toll "attract, entice, decoy", remained a literary word till the end of the seventeenth century, and is or was till recently used in dialects of the South and Midlands.[97] But *N.E.D.* does not give any instances of this verb (at any rate in this sense) from northern texts, and I have not been able to discover any. Neither fact is conclusive negative evidence; but whether any examples are to be found or not, it is plain that the usual northern equivalent was the related form *till*, from O.E. *tyllan*.[98] This is very frequent and easily found.[99] These words are supposed to have originally meant "pull". This would be intelligible semantically, and provide a possible link with *toll* applied to bells (see *N.E.D.* TOLL, v.[2])[100]; but the evidence is very shaky. As far as *N.E.D.* goes, at any rate, it in effect consists of a few citations of modern uses of *tolle*, *tole* in the sense "pull, drag, draw". The M.E. examples, both under TOLL v.[1] and TO-TOLL are all doubtful, some certainly misplaced. Discrimination is not easy owing to the variety and vagueness of the senses, and of the forms, produced by contact with the foreign word *toil*.[101] The latter exhibits in Middle English the senses "contend, fight, struggle (with), harass, pull about, drag at". See *N.E.D.* under the various words, all of the same origin, TOIL, TOLY, TUILYIE.[102] But, in any case, from TO-TOLL must certainly be removed the citation from *Arthour and Merlin* 8531: the form is *totoiled* and the rhyme *defoiled*.[103] The two instances (all that remain) of *to-tolled* from the *Poem on the times of Edward II* are both under suspicion, since here is a variant reading to the former of them: *totoilled*. From TOLL v.[1], sense 3, must be withdrawn the citation from *York Plays*, xli, 58: *þei toled hym and tugged hym*. In this text *o* is a letter of varied uses, and this example cannot be separated from the following occurrences in the same text: ix, 281, *to tole and trusse* "to struggle (or toil) and pack" (Noah refers to the trouble of getting his goods and family into the Ark); xxviii, 18, *þou [schall] with turmentis be tulyd*; xlii, 168, *ȝe me þus tene and tule*. With the last compare *Destruction of Troy* 10160: *The Troiens with tene toiled ful hard, With a rumour ful roide*.[104] A better example, though not conclu-

sive since the text shows strange vagaries of spelling, is *Wars of Alexander* 3640, where *tolls of þe tirantis* probably means (the passage is not lucid) "they pull down the tyrants off (their horses in battle)".[105] Further, the A version of *Piers Plowman*, Pass. v, 127, has *putte hem* (i.e. strips of cloth) *in a pressour and pinnede hem therinne, Til ten ȝerdes other twelue tolden out threttene*.[106] Here probably *tolden* means "counted", but B has *hadde tolled out*, and C *tilled out*, apparently meaning "(had been) stretched out (to)". Though not entirely clear, and in a re-touched passage, these uses do seem to point to a verb *toll*, varying with *till*, meaning "draw, pull"; and the variation would seem to confirm its identification with *toll*, *till* "entice". A further example is possibly *Destruction of Troy* 914: *he tilt out his tung with his tethe grym* (of the dragon attacked by Jason). However, there is a further complication: namely O.E. *ge-tillan*, *a-tillan* "touch, reach, attain (to)". It is to the descendant of this verb (TILL v.²) that *N.E.D.* ascribes the C reading and the occurrence in the *Destruction of Troy*. It seems to me that *out* is against this[107]; and that though we must allow M.E. *tillen* (*to*) "reach (to)" to be derived from O.E. *ge-tillan*, and even to have had some influence on the sense and form of other verbs, it would not by itself have developed the meanings "pull (out), extend".[108] Of *tille* "pull, draw, extend" we seem also to see a trace in *tille* used of setting nets and snares or pitching tents. This is taken in *N.E.D.* as a special development of TILL from O.E. *tilian*, *teolian* "labour, care for, cultivate". But this cannot be at any rate its sole origin[109]; certainly not of *tillen* in *Ancren Riwle* (Morton, 334), which is infinitive. O.E. *tilian* should and does in this text (384) yield *tilien*. Here we have rather the blending of *till*-forms meaning "draw" with *tilden* (*teldin*) "pitch a tent or covering".[110]

Out of this tangle we can select the following possibilities in explanation of Chaucer's *tulle*:—

(*a*) A form *tulle* (O.E. **tullian*) actually existed beside *tollian*, *tyllan*, comparable to M.E. *pill-*, *pull-* "pluck",[111] but has escaped other record.

(*b*) *Tollen* "entice" also had a sense "pull". Chaucer saw such forms as *tuled*, *tulyd* (possibly even *tulled*, *tullyd*) in uses such as those exemplified in the *York Plays*, and mistook them for dialectal forms of *tollen*.[112] These forms were, at any rate, northern.

(c) Chaucer misused Western *tullen* = *tyllan* = N. *till*. Extremely unlikely. He plainly knew a northern text when he saw it.

(*d*) He was content with a bad rhyme or eye-rhyme, *folle*, *tolle* (as in the Cambridge MS.), owing to the difficulty of finding good rhymes to *tolle*. Such spellings as *folle* can be found in northern texts, but were also characteristic of the South-East.[113] Such a procedure is not worse than Chaucer's elsewhere in a careless moment or a difficulty. Though he seems in general to have taken detailed care with the *Reeve's Tale*, and had no need to rhyme on a word that was a nuisance, we can compare *fonne*

169 (which contains ŏ as in the modern derivative *fond*)[114] rhyming with *yronne* 170 (which contains *o* = *u*, modern *run*).

(*e*) The passage is corrupt in spite of the consensus of the 7 MSS. (not the only place where this is possibly true), and Chaucer did not write *at þe fulle*, which is not an inevitable expression defying alteration, but something rhyming with *tolle*, or better with the northern *till*. For example, either *as þou will* (a piece of good northern grammar) or *at þi will*.[115] This will probably only be seriously considered, if a reading containing some such version, or trace of it, turns up. If it is rejected we must fall back on (*d*)—the others are all improbable, even if the existence of M.E. *tolle*, *tille* "draw, pull" and its identity with *tolle*, *tille* "entice " is granted.

Appendix II

Slik

I give here a few notes leading to the conclusion expressed above. Since *slīk* is a purely Scandinavian word that has followed a line of development from an older common *swalīk which is quite different from that seen in native English *swelc* and its variants, and is, moreover, a form for which English possessed a clear brief equivalent, over which the Scandinavian form possessed no advantages, one would expect to find it less widespread than many other well-known Scandinavian loans, and would look naturally to the East. From the East it appears one can immediately subtract the area south of the Humber (for what reason is not clear). But absence of any trace of *slīk* in the *Ormulum* (which shows only *swillc*, *swillke*), in *Havelok* (*swich*, s*uilk*, *swilk*), and, as far as I can find in Manning, as well as the absence of other textual or dialectal evidence, seems conclusive, even for the otherwise highly Scandinavianized language of Lincolnshire. The text of *Havelok*, and of Manning's works, especially the latter, has been in places greatly, even violently, southernized; but *slik* has elsewhere contrived to survive, if it appeared in the original, even thoroughgoing attempts at substituting other more usual words for "such". The *Ormulum* at any rate has not suffered this adulteration.

In Yorkshire *slīk* was known, especially it would seem in the North and East Ridings, in the parts, that is, that to this day are classified as belonging to the true Northern dialect area (which includes Durham and Northumberland). But in Yorkshire it was not in exclusive use, and it had to compete even in the East with *swilk* (just as in the West *swilk* competed with such forms as *soche* and *siche*); variant MSS. of the same work constantly substitute *swilk* or *soche* for *slik*, or else rhymes and other tests show that the author used both. This is the case with the *York Plays* and with the rhymes of that admirable text *Ywain and Gawain*. Minot may be said

to use only *slīk*, but he by chance uses in his surviving verses a word for "such" only once (viii, 35).

If we turn to the metrical homilies printed by Small, which on non-linguistic evidence appear to have a connexion with Durham, we shall meet *slik sli*, as the usual word for "such", and observe the alien *swylk* appearing wherever, owing to the lacunæ in the best MS. (Edinburgh), a piece from a different MS. of slightly different linguistic texture is intruded by the editor. The massive *Cursor Mundi* is scantily glossed by Morris, but small search beyond the examples he gives shows that its language knew probably in the original both *slik* (*slic*, *sli*, *scli*) and *suilk* (*swilk*, *squilk*). Both occur in rhyme (e.g. *slike* with *suike*, *relike*, *like* in 4371, 8002, 9775, 9854; *suilk* with *milk* 5794). For the *slik*, etc., of the Cotton MS. the others usually substitute another word (*suilk* in G, *suche* in FT), or remodel the line to avoid the rhyme. It is interesting to compare 5794, where the rhyme *suilk—milk* is preserved in all, even the southernized T, with 9775 where *slik—lik* has disappeared from FT, and *slik* in G is a correction of *suilk*. *Slik* was the least current of all forms of "such".

If one seeks for a text in which *slik* is used not only frequently but exclusively, one is to be found—namely, the Metrical Life of St. Cuthbert, written in the very *Cuthbert lande* mentioned above. It is a long text, of over 8,000 lines, and *slyke*, *slike* is extremely frequent, and there is no other form employed at all, save for a single *syke* (5117).[116] This is probably not a casual error, but an actual later form of *slyke* (however developed), and the ancestor of the varying forms, such as *seik*, *sāk*, *saik* still characteristic of the extreme northern area of English.

Needless to say, in this text most of the other northernisms of the clerks are to be found, especially *gif* (the sole form of *if*) and *hedewerk*, used of a headache of which a lady was like to die, and *hope* in its dialectal sense—St. Cuthbert says of the land tilled in vain "I hope this erde is noght of kynd whete to ȝelde". There also are *auntir*, *bus*, *es*, *ferly*, *fra*, *ȝon*, *heþin*, *ill*, *laþe*, *sal* (*suld*), *seel*, *swa*, *ta*, *till* and *whilk*.

Appendix III

Geen *and* Neen *in Ellesmere MS.*

These strange spellings occur as follows: *geen* gone, 158; *neen* no, none, 265, 267. To them should be added *ne nay*, 263. These, *geen*, *neen*, *ne*, are the readings of the Ellesmere MS., from which Skeat adopted the first two, not *ne nay*, for his text. On the readings of the other MSS. *gan*, *nan*, *na*, beside *gon*, *non*, *no*, see textual notes above (H has *a*).

The textual problem requires for its solution further evidence—the readings in these places of all other MSS. The linguistic problem is more

or less independent of such evidence. As the evidence available to me stands these forms cannot be attributed to Chaucer. Additional readings of the same character (if independent) might shake this opinion, but it would not alter the linguistic situation—these forms are not those of any spoken dialect anywhere in Chaucer's time. Until they are demonstrated as Chaucer's, therefore, we need not attribute to him these fictitious forms; and the evidence for his authorship will have to be strong before such an attribution is made in face of the credit with which Chaucer has in other respects passed philological examination.

The view here expressed that these forms are not genuine is based on the following considerations. (1) *geen* and *neen* are not to be found elsewhere as far as I can discover. It is to dialect texts, not to MSS. of Chaucer's dialect imitation (which have demonstrably adulterated this), that we should go for information on this point.[117] (2) *geen* and *neen* do not exist elsewhere in genuine M.E. dialect, because there is no basis for their formation. The antecedents of all English dialect forms of "gone, none" are O.E. (*ge*)*gān*, *nān*. There was no O.E. *gēn*, *gēn*, or *nēn*, nor any sufficient cause for the development of such forms in Middle English.[118] Scandinavian influence which accounts for many dialectal forms, especially in the North, here fails. The East Norse *ē* (for West Norse, *ei*, *ei*, M.E. *ei*, *ai*) is rare in M.E. loanwords. It cannot occur here, for Norse has not the word "go" in any form, while E. Norse did not use **nēn* (W. Norse *neinn*). (3) The view that *geen*, *neen* are representations of real Northern pronunciation of written *gan*, *nan* is untenable. Why was this southern phonetic zeal operative only in a few places? In the paper above abundant examples have been given of the preservation of the symbol *a* for the descendants of O.E. and O.N. *ā*; all of these probably go back to Chaucer, in many of the cases there is, at any rate, a consensus of Skeat's seven MSS. (e.g. 106, 107, 117, 182, 255, 256). And why should the amateur phonetician (Chaucer or another) adopt the notation *ee*? It is a fact of later development that northern *ā* was "fronted", and moved in a direction *ǣ* > *ē*. The orthodox view, however, is that this does not show its first traces until late in the fifteenth century, and cannot be seriously reckoned with until the sixteenth. The view that this process was complete in the fourteenth century is based either on evidence which does not prove the point or on this very supposed Chaucerian *geen*.[119] But debate on the question is here unnecessary. The shift in the pronunciation of *ā* was common to the whole country, and proceeded at least as rapidly in the South as in the North.[120] In that case, since the Southerner's own *a* (in such words as *name*, *blame*, *make*, *fare*, which he shared with the Northerner) was moving in the same direction, the letter *a* would remain *far and away the most probable symbol for him to adopt to represent the northern sound*, until long after Chaucer's time, whether in words with common English *ā* or

in those with specially Northern *ā* (as *gan*). The use of *ee*, the principal suggestion of which was long tense *ē*, would be an astonishing choice for anyone in a sudden and inconsistent access of phonetic zeal to make. The unlikelihood of such a choice is, in fact, increased by the very attempt to push back the chronology of English vowel changes; for on this theory *ee* must commonly have been associated with a sound-value *ī*. In any case the joke about northern *a* for *o* depends on the occurrence in words like *gon* of the vowel heard in *name* (not that in *been*, for instance), and this is phonetically very much more effective when the *ā*-words are given an *a*-sound, showing at most the first hint of its later fronting, than with a "mid-front" *e*.

If *geen* and *neen* are not genuine dialect, how have they come to stand at any rate in the Ellesmere text? It is clearly unlikely that Chaucer is in that case responsible for them. But we will deal first with this improbable alternative. If Chaucer wrote them, then they are forms he heard somewhere, and his spelling meant *ē* of some variety. We need not suspect him of fobbing off on us arbitrary and pointless perversions. There is only one possible source remaining: the "Low Dutch" dialects. In Low German, Dutch, and Flemish *ē* regularly corresponds in cognate words to O.E. *ā* and its medieval English sequels; and language of this kind could have been heard, doubtless, by him in London, Norwich, York, or other places. The wool-trade was one of the principal causes of this linguistic contact, which has left its traces in many loan-words.[121] But Chaucer, at any rate, would have known such speech for what it was, and it may be asked why he should casually intermingle it with truly observed Northern English. The question hardly arises, however, because precisely in the case of the words "go" and "none" this source fails us. "Low Dutch" does not possess exact cognates of O.E. *gān*, *nān*. For "gone" it employed *ghe-ghaan* (with an *a* of different origin from O.E.); for "none" derivatives such as *gheen* of O. Saxon *nigēn*; *neen* was used, but only as an adverb "no". If *geen* and *neen* are to be derived from such a source, we have either to assume they are from Frisian dialect (*gēn*, *nēn*), or produced by a complication of errors—e.g. the taking of *gheen* "none", *neen* "no" as "gone" and "none" by the singularly unfortunate application of an amateur "sound-law" (based on such correspondences as *heem = hoom* "home ") to two cases where it did not apply.[122] In fact, "Low Dutch" fails as the source of *geen* or *neen* either in Chaucer's own hand or that of any later amateur re-toucher of his trifle.

If Chaucer did not write these forms they cease to have any great importance for this paper—and they lose most of their value for any purpose. The arguments used above are almost equally weighty against *neen*, *geen* (as real spoken forms) even if we consider them as the work of some later "editor". That these forms are "corruptions"—the products

of inadvertence or ignorant whim—may seem difficult to hold in view of their occurring three times, and rash to argue without complete collations. But that this is their origin is not impossible in such a context. The idea that the vagaries of dialect are lawless is old, and this feeling would co-operate in producing and perpetuating anomalous forms—it would allow palæographical similarities to have more effect than when checked by a more familiar or a more respected form of language.

It may be observed that Skeat did not admit Ellesmere's *ne nay* to his text, and rightly. The confusion, whether linguistic or scribal, between *ne* "not, nor"; *na*, *no* (O.E. *nā* "no" adverb); and *no*(*n*), *na*(*n*) "none" is well known in Middle English. But it is not very different in kind from *neen* for *noon* (*naan*), and this reduces somewhat the authority of *neen*. I do not speak with confidence on the palæographical point, but confusion (in the absence of normal checks especially) is obviously possible in fourteenth and fifteenth-century hands between *a* and *ee*, and *o* and *e*; *o* and *e* (both formed with two curved strokes, of which the right-hand one in *e* should finish about half-way down the other, but often exceeds this) are often, even in carefully written books, very similar to the eye. Editors are often confronted with *o* for *e*, and vice versa, in familiar words where there is no question of linguistic variation. I note, though this is from a thirteenth-century MS., *to gene* "to go" from *A Song on the Passion* (MS. Egerton G 13) in *O.E. Miscellany*, p. 199. That this is an error is shown, if not by the rhymes with vowels of like origin, *alone*, *one*, at least by the rhyme with *trone* "throne".[123] But one need not go so far afield. The MSS. of Chaucer themselves provide abundant evidence of such errors, especially of careless interchange of *e* and *o* (rather misformation of these letters, in many cases). There is no more reason for putting the Ellesmere *geen* 158 into a Chaucerian text, or into grammars, than for doing the same by Hengwrt *heem* 112, which Skeat scorned to record even in his variants; and both are probably as genuine as the *ge* for *go* in the Cambridge MS. line 32 (which rhymes with *to* "two").[124] Indeed Chaucerian "Scotch" *geen* has a ghostly look.

Notes

†   Editors' note: This text of "Chaucer as a Philologist: *The Reeve's Tale*" incorporates a small number of corrections and revisions, as well as a few marginal notat ions (here presented within pointed brackets, e.g. < >) taken from Tolkien's own copies of the original publication. These corrections were kindly supplied by Christopher Tolkien.

1   As plainly perceived by Skeat, though his enquiry amid the mass of his general labour in the service of Chaucer did not proceed very

far.

2   For we can scarcely compare the occasional representation of rustic or ignorant forms such as the *astromye* of the *Miller's Tale*, A 3451 (E H L), 3457 (E H), and *Nowelis* for *Noes* in the same tale, A 3818, 3834 (E H C); nor even *sooth pley quaad pley as the flemyng seith*, in the *Cook's Prol.*, A 4357.

3   Which is all that survives clearly, at any rate in our Towneley text, of Mak's "Southern tooth" —and that is the nearest parallel to Chaucer's effort that exists.

4   The words, l. 95, *fer in the north, I can nat telle wher*, are, of course, actually put in the mouth of the Reeve, and so are partly and justly dramatic. Actually, as we shall see, Chaucer was not so vague.

5   Especially if combined with a study of the forms in the *Tale of Gamelyn*, where a piece not originally in Chaucerian language is treated often by the same scribes.

6   Thus the Reeve, even according to our southernizing MSS., used *ik am*, *so thee'k* (contrasted with Harry Bailey's *thee'ch*, C 947) in *Reeve's Prol.*, 10 and 13. These forms are under no necessity of rhyme or metre. The Reeve also uses *capel* "horse", though this may be mere repetition of its use just before by the clerks (see also below for fuller note on this word); and also the dialectal *greithen*. <a marginal note in one of Tolkien's copies reads "but *agraiþi* in the *Ayenbite*"> The rare word *sokene* (l. 67) is also actually put into his mouth, and may be meant as rustic or dialectal. At any rate, outside legal use it is rarely found elsewhere (as far as *N.E.D.* records, or I can discover), but it is found notably in the East Anglian *Promptorium Parvulorum*. That he is represented as using on occasion *þeir* and *þeim* is also probable (see below).

7   It is interesting to contrast the usual southerly or south-westerly stamp of conventional dialect later, as on the Elizabethan stage, after the partial northernizing of the language of the capital.

8   This is, of course, usually the case. A sound will be dubbed uncouth by speakers of another dialect, owing to its contrast to the familiar sound. It may well be itself current in their own speech in another context. There is no reason to suppose that Northern and Southern speech differed much in the pronunciation of $\bar{a}$ in, say, *nāme* "name".

9   This form occurs in the *R.T.*; see below.

10 For "stolen", ll. 191, 268, Chaucer here probably used *stoln*, *stollen* (representing the northern dialect, with retained short *o*): see below.

11 Presenting besides Ellesmere (E) the following five MSS. : Hengwrt (H), Cambridge University Library Gg. 4. 27 (C), Corpus Christi College, Oxford (O), Petworth (P), Lansdowne 851 (L).

12 This doubtless indicates that alterations *affecting dialect* are relatively late events in the tradition, and in considerable measure due to the procedure of the actual scribes whose works we possess.

13 Certain errors (noted below) dependent on the presence of *northern* forms also show that such forms lie behind the existing copies.

14 Also the preservation of *es* or *is* in senses *am*, *art*, in 111, 166, 169.

15 The process can be studied, for instance, in the various MSS. of *Cursor Mundi* or of the *Northern Passion* as printed in the E.E.T.S. These examples have been specially examined for the present purpose.

16 In our text an example is furnished by the readings in l. 251 (q.v.).

17 On *swilk slik* 210, 251, 253, see notes on text and appendix on *slik*. On *falles* see notes to ll. 107, 255.

18 Cases probably are: Hl *wightly* for *whistel* 181—*wight* occurs in 166, but was, in any case, a literary word (see below); *sal*, probably wrongly in all but Hl, for *suld* 209—*sal* occurred frequently elsewhere; *es*, *is* for *er* 125, or for *may be* in L 124—*es* was probably used several times in the original; or the *to and fra* rhyming *alswa* of C 373 (others, *fro*, *also*) in the narrative not in the dialogue—compare C *to and fra* (others more correctly *til*) rhyming *alswa* in the dialogue, 119-120. A case equally derivative, but showing greater corruption, is L. 255, *þer sal I haue* (shown to be spurious by *þer*) for *þer tides me*. On *folt*, *fonne*, see note to l. 108.

19 Not necessarily the same thing as each "scribe". The linguistic complexion of each MS. doubtless in varying degrees owes something to its predecessors. Some consideration has been given to this: at least the groups A and B of the *Cant. Tales* have been examined with the forms of the *R. Tale* in mind. The *Tale of Gamelyn* has also been glanced at. It would probably repay closer study for this purpose. It is certainly not by Chaucer, and was originally in an Eastern or North-East Midland type of language in many ways nearer to northern dialect than Chaucer's own natural speech. The behaviour of the MSS. in *Gamelyn* and the dialectal places in *R. Tale* deserve comparison. *Gamelyn* also may be taken as a stray specimen of the English writings

that Chaucer had read.

20 Probably not as a northernism, but in such cases related to the use of *e* for *ĭ* alluded to above. Unstressed *is* was identical, or nearly so, with unstressed (inflexional) *-es*, as is frequently shown in Chaucerian rhymes: e.g. *nones—non es* (O P L), *nonys—noon ys* (E) in A 524. Examples of *es* in L not due to rhyme-spelling are A 573, 658, 1677 (*na es = nis*, preceding stage possibly *nas*; C has also erroneous pa. t. *dawede* in preceding line).

21 The general impression given (see notes on words below) is that texts similar to those surviving now from the early fourteenth century in northern dialect were familiar to Chaucer. One may dismiss any idea that he attempted phonetic gymnastics or tried to bring his "dialect" right up to date and indicate pronunciations taken straight from the mouth by odd and uncouth spellings. The oddities, such as *geen*, *heem*, *neen*, *swaye*, *faath*, *sale* "soul", *slap*e, etc., which may be gleaned from various MSS. are the products of copyists, perhaps in some cases in the interests of post-Chaucerian dialect-phonetics (P seems to favour equating *a*, *aa* and *ai*, *ay*), most often demonstrably the product of error and the conviction that monstrosities were good enough in barbaric dialect.

22 So far as I can discover P uses *qw* frequently for *qu* (a frequent use of its period), but nowhere else *qw*, or *qu* for *wh*. *qu*, *qw* for *wh* are not, of course, purely northern, and also occur in texts of eastern origin. *qw* is, for instance, much used by the Dulwich MS. of *Handlyng Synne*.

23 As is the case in P with certain other dialectalisms, elsewhere altered, both in *R.T.* and *Gamelyn*.

24 At the same time it must be noted that Hl has *wikked* for *quilk* 158 and *wightly* for *quistel* 182. While these errors suggest that the word concerned had unfamiliar forms that caused difficulty at some stage in the tradition of Hl, they point rather to *w* as the initial letter at least in the immediate source of Hl.

25 Chaucer possibly here wrote *swilk*; see notes below.

26 Tyrwhitt (from MS. unspecified) cited by Skeat, notes p. 121, here gives reading *gar us have*.

27 But *ald* occasionally occurs in the MSS. elsewhere: e.g. *houshalder* A 339 O P L; *halde* A 414 in L.

28 Whether Chaucer used the "incorrect" pl. *sai* or sg. *saith* is not clear in 290. Such forms as *sain* do, of course, occur (in rhyme) in works

from some parts of the North (in general this is rather a feature of the debatable North-West). Cf. *Sir Eglamour* 52 *layne* "conceal" / *sayne* inf.; 223 *payne* "pain" / *ye sayne*. Under *ra* will be seen a hint that Chaucer had read this poem or things like it.

29 A similar development is found in some German dialects.

30 *C.M.* 4847 *es we* cited by Skeat is a passage dubious textually.

31 The MSS. seem not elsewhere to represent Chaucer as using the now current *are*, certainly not in rhyme, though there are a few cases of *arn* (probably not genuine). The later currency of *ar(e)* probably explains the retention of the dialectal *r*-forms in these two lines.

32 Apart, of course, from spellings with *s*, *ss*, for *sh*.

33 *pitte* pa. t. occurs in Gower, *Conf. Am.*, viii, 2796 (MS. F.).

34 It is found nonetheless in Layamon (who has many surprising words), and more curiously in Gower, who uses it at least twice in rhyme, *Conf. Am.* 1703, 2122 (*heil* rhyming *seil*, *conseil*).

35 Cf. also *Hand. Synne* 3672, where *wroþerheyl* in one MS. is in others altered to *wroþer yn helle*. I have noted an earlier example in the reading of the Corpus MS. of *Ancrene Wisse*: *to himmere heile hire to wraðerheale*, which corresponds to the Nero reading *to wrother hele* (Cleopatra *himmere*), Morton, p. 102. Here we have both native *hēlu* and the Scand. word. The *A.W.* contains a notable Scand. element; and the distribution of *hail* is plainly related to the areas of Scand. influence.

36 This important word is here passed over lightly; it requires more investigation. In distribution it would probably be found to agree with many other Scandinavian words (e.g. *wight*): that is, it would be likely to turn up almost anywhere except in the south, including originally London; while its later currency was probably due to eastern influence (coupled with some literary influence proceeding from the vernacular writings of N. and W.). It certainly appears in the west (in Layamon, for example). Its early appearance in the south-east—for example in *King Horn* (? Essex), where it seems certainly to be original—is well-known and curious. More remarkable is its occurrence in the *Owl and Nightingale*, 421 (adj.) and 1536 (adv.). Compare *hail*. It is clear, nonetheless, that Chaucer here used the word as a dialect substitute for *yuel*, *euel* (by which some MSS. replace it).

37 This probably appears in the earliest examples; all four examples cited in Bosworth-Toller from Old Northumbrian are before vowel or *h*. It is still a feature of dialects that use *till* for *to*. Compare also the

quotations under *driue* below.

38 E H O P L *til*, *tille*; C *to*. Other examples are *til a bere* (A 2058 *Knight's Tale*), H C O *til*, E P L *to*; *til a tree* (A 2062), E C O L *til*, H P *to*, Hl *in til*; *til Athenes* (A 2964), E H O P L *til*, C *to*.

39 For *þeym þeire* the other MSS. in Six-Text have *h*-forms. In l. 71, for *her whete* C has the very unusual spelling *heyre*, which is conceivably a relic of an antecedent *theyre*.

40 *Gamelyn* 49 *þeire* L, rest *h*-forms; 426 *þair* O, *þeir(e)* L Hl, rest *h*-forms; 569 *þeir(e)* O P L, Royal, Harl. 1758, *þer* Sloane, *here* Hl. *Gam.* 438 *þam* O, *þeim* L, rest *hem*; 485 *þam* O, *þaym* L, rest *hem*.

41 We must in that case also delete this word from our list of northern-isms of vowel above, since its *ang* is then probably to be ascribed to shortening in the first component of a compound. Compare the many names of the type *Langley*, *Langford* that occur far south where *long* is the normal form of the separate adjective. It may also be noted that the form *wang* is odd in S. Lancs. This area belonged from early O.E. times to the W. Midland (not to the technically Northern or Northumbrian) dialect region, an area specially characterized by *om*, *on*, *ong*, independent of lengthening. The original compound from which the word is supposed to be derived should here be *wong-tōþ*, the quality of the vowel being unaffected by composition. Cf. Lancs names of the type *Longley*. *Wang* then has the appearance of not be-ing originally native to S. Lancs even if recorded there, and its form alone may be some sort of evidence for a former wider diffusion. But Lancashire is a difficult dialect area. North of the Ribble it belonged anciently to the Northumbrian area, and there has been a good deal of shifting and interchange, in addition to the disturbance of the Scandinavian settlements, as far as place-name forms go largely in favour of *an*. Of this Camden's *Lonkashire* compared with the current *Lancashire* may be taken as an illustration. See Ekwall, *Place-Names of Lancashire*.

42 The earliest reference in *N.E.D.* to sense "tooth" for *fang* is from six-teenth century. The sense was not unknown to the dialects: see *N.E.D.* FANG 6, quotation from Cheshire. The form *fengtōþ* once recorded in O.E. is interesting. It is glossed "canine tooth" by Sweet, but seems to mean the same as *wangtōþ*; see Bosworth-Toller, *Suppl. Feng* is the native English form later almost universally replaced by Norse *fang* "seizing".

43 Some will say, it is obviously a joke—the petty malady, and the pother

about it, and the final comic *I hope he wil be deed*. Unfortunately with an ancient writer it is dangerous to remain content with the findings of one's private sense of humour; verbal jokes cannot be assumed unproved.

44 But cf. quot. in *N.E.D.* (from Jamieson), app. Scottish of seventeenth century, where "toothache" seems equated with "head-work".

45 The well-known passage in *Alysoun*, a highly alliterated poem, *forþi my wonges wexeþ won*, refers also to weeping, and is so only a partial exception; though it does supply an example of the word *wong* without the concomitant *wet*. This conjunction is curiously illustrated by the Yorkshire place-name *Wetwang*, though this probably contains the distinct but related O.N. *vang-r* "field".

46 Such a use is actually found in late Old English, e.g. in *wonges loc-feax* glossing *cesaries*; and in Ælfric's Lives of the Saints, *St. Mary of Egypt* (E.E.T.S., iii, 236, l. 556): *ic . . . þa wongas mid tearum ofergeat*.

47 O.E. *þunwange*, O.N. *þunnvangi*, O.H.G. *dunwengi*.

48 It is found in the *Promptorium* and in the *Catholicon Anglicum* (Yorks). In Robert Thornton's MS. (MS. Linc. Ai. 17) occurs a medical recipe for a plaster to be put on the *forhede* and *thonwanges* of a sick man (quoted in Halliwell's *Dict. of Archaic and Provincial Words*, where another reference is given to medicinal anointing of the *thounwanges*, taken from MS. Linc. Med. f. 280).

49 Its form at time when Norse influenced English may be represented **wange*.

50 Whereby the original noun is lost and only the determinative element is retained.

51 The simple word should have been *wang* in the North, usually *wong* elsewhere. Actually the form *wong* does occur in northern texts (in the citations in *N.E.D.*, for instance, from *Cursor Mundi*, *Sir Tristrem*, Wyntoun)—which suggests that we have traces of the (North)-Western influence on alliterative vocabulary that is seen in other words, such as *blonk*. Cf. the corruptions of *wonges wete* in two MSS. of *C.M.* to *wordes swete*, which indicates both *o* in the original, and obsolescence or dialectal limitation of the word; *wanges wete* with *a* occurs, however, in *C.M.* 25552 (not in *N.E.D.*) and in the *York Plays*.

52 Not quoted in *N.E.D.* s.v. WARK.

53 Its usual derivation from the neuter *vígt* of O.N. *vígr* "able to fight,

skilled in arms" presents certain difficulties.

54 And after Chaucer's time in the *Promptorium*.

55 The *Tale of Gamelyn* and his *wight yonge men* (893), wherein wrestling plays the same part as in *As You Like It*, is perhaps actually echoed here.

56 Not cited in *N.E.D.*

57 In spite of Mr. Trounce's essay in *Medium Ævum*, i, 2, pp. 86 ff., I remain of opinion that Chaucer was precisely "misusing the gifts of genius to make a cheap caricature of the 'heroic' effects of the old poem". *Sir Thopas* is clever, but in some ways regrettable; but precisely the result to be expected from the contact of a man of Chaucer's temperament with the conventions of the tail-rhyme poems. Here, however, we are principally concerned with the close study which Chaucer gave to these works and their diction: see Trounce, loc. cit., and sequels.

58 E.g. *oke* "oak" rhyming *wake* "wake".

59 In the *Cura Pastoralis* 443, 25; *aris and gong to geonre byrg*.

60 Producing the blended form *þon* seen in some dialects.

61 *Ormulum*, *Owl and Nightingale*, *Ayenbite*.

62 Cf. not infrequent confusion of *þat* and *þar*, *þer* in the MSS.

63 It seems to be absent from the *Ormulum*. It is found fairly frequently as an alliterating word in versions B and C of *Piers Plowman*; as far as the references in Skeat's glossary go, only in passages where the A version has been remodelled. It does not appear in the A version (?).

64 The word does not seem to have been used by Gower, nor by any other writers of London or standard English. The word is bungled by P *greieþ* and altered by C to *hastede*. It may be noted that *fit* 264 is also fairly frequent in Chaucer, but apart from quotations from his works appears in *N.E.D.* as chiefly northern; it is apparently not used by Gower.

65 E.g. in *L.G.W. Prol.* B 362, and *H. Fame* 1997.

66 Middle Dutch *draf*, whence probably also the same word in the later Scandinavian languages. But *draf and chaf* occurs in Layamon, which favours perhaps a native origin from an O.E. **dræf* cognate with the Dutch word.

67 It is preserved in both E and C. It may be noted that in l. 97, which is outside the dialect speeches, all seven MSS. have *sak*(*ke*).

68 In fact, it went contrary to the general tendencies. No one could guess that a man from the N. or N.E. would say *seck* for *sack* without direct experience of this detail (in speech or book).

69 It occurs in the N.W.M. as, for instance, *Sir Gawain*. It occurs once at least (once in Skeat's glossary) in the C version (x, 275) of *Piers Plowman*, which is somewhat northernized in vocabulary as compared with A (cf. *gar* above).

70 s.v. DRIVE iii, 17.

71 The contrast, here from genuine northern texts, between *til hething* and *to scorn* suggests that it is possible that Chaucer wrote *to scorn* and the second *til* in 190 is derivative from the first. *Til* is, however, found frequently before consonants in northern texts, and the MSS. readings and general procedure point rather to the second *to* as a southernization.

72 The figure, while including all points and each proved occurrence (so that, e.g. *werkes* counts 2, being northern in inflexion and in sense), excludes (*a*) all doubtful points textually—*dreuen*, *es* for *is*, *als* 111, *ar* "ere", *ʒa*, *sagh*, *i* for *in*, *miller* as gen. sg., *til scorn*, *þaim*; (*b*) all cases of common forms possible in Chaucerian language as well as North, such as the past participles other than *stöln*, *stollen*, or the forms of *wil*; (*c*) *gar* not recorded in the MSS. used, or *greiþen* outside the clerks' speeches. None of the northernisms which were probably used by Chaucer, but are in the critical text italicized since all seven MSS. have at that point southernized, have been included. The actual total of points achieved by Chaucer was therefore probably a good deal larger even than 127.

73 Including the words with *ald*, *ang*.

74 Chaucer has given no sample of several well-known northernisms; the present part. in *and*, for instance. This is purely accidental, by chance no opportunity occurs.

75 Correct for N. Chaucer may have used the specifically N. *haf*.

76 O.E. *wilde*, *swēte*; and cf. O.N. *villi-eldr* "wild-fire".

77 Though it also contains *wrang*; and (on the evidence of Hl only) *makes* and *ga*, 334.

78 Jordan, *M.E. Gram.*, § 141.

79 *Flours þar es wit suete smelles* is, for example, a pretty clear case, *C.M.*1014.

80 Owing to various causes, grammatical and phonetic.

81 Cf. *as clerkes sais þat are wis* in *C.M.* (Cotton) 343 (v.rr. G *seis*, F *sayne*, T *say*). On such forms as *sayn* in N. or N. Midland texts see above.

82 *misgo* 335 is not absolutely fixed since *alswa* (used elsewhere) might have appeared in 336: *misga* would have been, nonetheless, a mistake.

83 Both occur in *C.M.*, for instance.

84 Unless one accepts such cases as the rhyme with *gerland* in *Knight's Tale* 1071-2 (the word frequently is written *gerlond* in M.E.), or with the name *Gerland*, in *N.P. Tale* 563-4.

85 In 181 only P. has *stonde*.

86 Owing to the doubt in this matter the three occurrences of *stand* have not been included above among the correct northern details.

87 *Wiltou* 120 is not incorrect as are the forms *nadstow*, *sleepestow*, etc., offered by some MSS. In the latter *tow* prob. depends on the presence of a *t* in the preceding inflexion which did not appear in the North. In *wiltou* and *saltou* the *t*-inflexion was common to all areas and such forms are found in such markedly northern texts as *C.M.* (Cotton) or Minot's poems. But such present forms as *hastou* beside *þou has* are found in northern texts of fairly pure dialect such as the Harl. MS. of the *Northern Passion*.

88 A reduction of O.E. *wencel*, early M.E. *wenchel*.

89 Which seems certainly to be the final element in the word.

90 Mawer, *Place Names of Northumberland and Durham*, pp. 191 and 240.

91 Representing an O.E. *strōdor, *strōðor, probably a variant form (originally from a single ancient noun, as O.E. *salor—sæl*) of O.E. *strōd* (*strōð*), O.H.G. *struot*. The sense in E. seems to have been "marshy land (overgrown with brushwood)". The shorter form is found in charters, and probably survives in various southern place-names, such as Strood in Kent and Stroud in Gloucestershire. See W. H. Stevenson, in *Phil. Soc. Trans.*, 1895-8 (p. 537), quoted also in Mawer, op. cit.; and Bosworth-Toller and Supplement, s.v. *strōd*. The existence of this native word should be added to the recent note by Onions and Gordon on *strothe* in Pearl 115 (*Med. Ævum*, i, 2, p. 128); it prob-

ably disturbed the development of the imported Norse *storð* similar in meaning, but only remotely related etymologically, if at all.

92 Smith, *Place Names of the North Riding*, p. 229.

93 Mawer, op. cit., introduction.

94 Surtees Soc., No. 87, ll. 4608, 4794, 7098, 7517.

95 A similar case of local colour in oaths is provided by the Oxford carpenter who in the *Miller's Tale* 3449 swears by *seinte Frydeswyde*.

96 Such a variation is not in itself impossible and might be compared with *pill*, *pull* "pluck, pull".

97 And in U.S.A. especially, according to *N.E.D.*, used of decoying birds, sense closely resembling Chaucer's use.

98 Found in *for-tyllan*, rel. to *tollian* as *fylgan* to *folgian*, etc. This variation, which is of ancient origin, suggests that the word is old (from a type *tollē-n), even though there seems to be no record of a cognate form outside English.

99 It may be noted that *tylle*, *tyl* occurs four times in rhyme in *Handlyng Synne* (Lincs), 7091, 7614, 7721, 9036, whereas *tolle* occurs (probably) only once, not in rhyme, 9039: this text has been considerably southernized. *Till* is, however, easier to rhyme on than *toll*. But *Havelok* has *tilled* and not *toll*. *Ancren Riwle* and *H. Meidhad* Group appear to have both *tollin* and *tullen* (= *tyllan*: *u* = *ü*).

100 It would also help to explain the senses shown by the foreign word *toil* in English, if these were due to contact with a native *toll* "pull" of similar sound; see below.

101 Mere graphic confusion between *toll*, *toil*, *toill* is also obviously likely to occur.

102 They are derived, at any rate in form, from O. French *toeillier*, *tooillier*, *touillier*.

103 This same rhyme occurs also in same poem 6945. Contrast in same text *tolling* "enticing".

104 Which also illustrates the (northern) interchange of $\bar{o}$, $\bar{u}$, *oi*.

105 "Entice" is *tillid* in this text, 5479: so rather than "draw (physically)" as *N.E.D.*

106 According to Skeat's text.

107 Also *ge-tillan* and its derivatives are either *intr.* or have as their object the thing reached, not the thing extended.

108 *tillin* "reach" also seems a definitely S.W. word, apart from the debatable passages in *P.Pl.* and *D. Troy.* In the latter poem also occurs in a description of a storm, 3704: *þere takyll was tynt, tylude ouer borde.* But this is probably an error for *tylt-*, introducing yet another complication: *tilt* "tip up" *trans.* and *intr.* from O.E. *tyltan [**tultj-* not West-Saxon *tieltan, *tyltan from *tealt* "unsteady", as *N.E.D.*, for *tilt* (*tult*) occurs in the N.W. and N.]; see *N.E.D.*, s.v. TILT.

109 Of the recent S. W. dialect forms *teel*, *tile* I cannot judge; but they seem rather formations from *teld-*, *tild-*, like *spene* beside *spend*.

110 Cf. the variants in *P.Pl.*, A, ii, 44 (cited in *N.E.D.*) *tentes itilled*: *iteldyde*, *teldit*, *teled*. Corpus, Cleop., and Titus also all offer *tildeð* for *tillen* in the above passage from *Ancren Riwle*. Cf. the same (Morton 279) *tildunge* "snare". The contact of this *till* with yet another *toil*, TOIL s.² and v.² "snare, ensnare" may be passed over since this *toil* seems post-medieval.

111 Perh. influenced by it. In *pullian* the vowel *u* between a labial and *l* is more normal and can be compared to the vocalism of O.E. *wull*, *full*, *wulf*.

112 He knew *tollen* and used it himself (in sense "attract") in translating Boethius.

113 They are a marked feature of MS. C, which has many other S.E. characteristics.

114 That a form *funne* existed is, however, possible. See *N.E.D.* s.vv. FON, FUN.

115 Cf. *at þi will*, rhyming *sal be still*, in *Ywain & Gawain* 1289. Error or alteration could have occurred in either *wille* or *tille* first, preferably the latter, and caused change in the rhyme-word. Cf. *at þe fol* in Trinity, alteration of *ouer all* of Cotton, in *C.M.* 4008.

116 I read it through for this purpose, so this assertion is probably, but not certainly, true.

117 There is a late northern *geen* = given (cf. Cotton MS. 2nd hand of *Cursor Mundi*, E.E.T.S., p. 958, 1. 77, and 962, 1. 14); but this is not likely to have been erroneously taken as "gone".

118 The mutated vowels in *gēst*, *gēþ*, or in *nǣnne*, *nǣnig* might conceivably have spread to other forms, though this would have been contrary

to the observed lines of development in Middle English. There is, in fact, no trace of such a development, and the North is marked, actually, by early rejection of the mutated forms. Chaucer uses *goost*, *gooth* (cf. rhymes in *C.T.* B. 3123, and *T.C.* iii. 1108) beside archaic *geeth* (e.g. in rhyme *L.G.W.* 2125). Mod. N. dialect *gēn*, *giən*, *nēn*, *niən*, etc., derive from M.E. *gān*.

119 Thus Professor Wyld in his *Short History* (2nd ed., p. 107) has doubtless compressed the evidence, but may be supposed to have selected the cream. He adduces as rhymes which show the fronting of O.E. *ā*: Rolle *mare*—*ware* "were" subj.; Barbour *gais* "goes"—*wes* "was"; *mair*, O.E. *mār* [*sic*]—*thair*, O.E. *þēr*. The only other evidence is *geen* from the *Reeve's Tale* (and this is attributed to Scotland). But the first and third of these rhymes are clearly on identical vowels, and so prove nothing. M.E. *wāre*, *wǭre* (pa. t. pl. and subj.) is abundantly evidenced; its origin, at least in part, is O.N. *váro*. So also is M.E. *þāre*, *þǫre*, "there", from O.E. *þāra*. The second rhyme has little evidential value, since it may depend on *was*, the usual form in such rhymes in *The Bruce*. The MSS., long after Barbour's time, cannot be held to represent his distribution of the varying forms of "was", and, in fact, palpably fail to do so.

120 This seems agreed; for those who would push back the northern development would also see the first traces of the southern as early as the thirteenth century. Wyld, op. cit., p. 168.

121 An example which illustrates the sound-correspondence discussed is M.E. *no freese* "no risk" = "doubtless" (*Towneley Play of Noah*, 391), which appears to be a loan from this source; cf. O. Saxon *frêsa* danger, M. Dutch *vreese* (Frisian *frāse*, *frēse*); related to O.E. *frāsian*.

122 Such "false" applications do occur in mixed languages produced by the contact of cognate tongues. Examples can be found in the history of the relations of Norse and English, or of the German dialects. Cf. the note on Yorkshire dialect above. But for such a Flemish-English jargon there is little evidence. If there were, we should still be remote from Chaucer's town of Strother.

123 Yet it is from this same piece that the error *meden* for *maden* (or perhaps *makeden*) is taken and used as evidence in the *Short History*, p. 168, for a phonetic change $a > e$ in the thirteenth century.

124 Or as the frequent *woye* for *weye* "way", or other oddities such as *wayko* "weak", *dofende* (MS. L., B. 932, 933), *heor* for *heer* "hair" (P at line 56), and so on. Where any assistance is given by words in the

neighbourhood such errors take even more bizarre forms; but the *opinioun* in A 337 is quite as far away from *Epicurus* in A 336, which it has in alliance with *o/e* similarity turned into *opiournes* in MSS. O. and L., as *heþen* is from *ham* in, *R.T.* 112, 113; and *heþen* has doubtless contributed to *heem*, as the adjacent *he* has to *geen*.

Project
MUSE®
Scholarly journals online

[Editors' note: In August 1938, Tolkien took part in the Oxford "Summer Diversions" organized by John Masefield and Nevill Coghill. He impersonated Chaucer and recited, from memory, "The Nun's Priest's Tale." In the following year, on 28 July 1939, Tolkien returned with a similar performance of a slightly abridged version of "The Reeve's Tale." For this occasion a pamphlet was issued, containing Tolkien's prefatory remarks and his version of "The Reeve's Tale." Although prepared for a general audience, it nevertheless was compiled with Tolkien's usual care and skill, and *Tolkien Studies* is pleased to reprint the text of this rare pamphlet as a companion to his scholarly essay on the same subject. Tolkien later noted that "The recitation [in] 1939 of Reeve's Tale was swamped by war and though successful was not noticed."]

The Reeve's Tale

Version Prepared for Recitation at the 'Summer Diversions'
Oxford: 1939

J.R.R. TOLKIEN

Among Chaucer's pilgrims was a reeve, Oswold of Baldeswell in Norfolk. The miller had told a story to the discredit of an Osney carpenter and Oxford clerks, and Oswold, who practised the craft of carpentry, was offended. In this tale he has his revenge, matching the miller's story with one to the discredit of a Trumpington miller and clerks of Cambridge.

The story is comic enough even out of this setting, but it fits the supposed narrator unusually well. Nonetheless, 'broad' as it is, it probably fits the actual author, Chaucer himself, well enough to justify the representation of him as telling it in person. Apart from its merits as a comic tale of 'lewed folk,' this piece has a special interest. Chaucer seems to have taken unusual pains with it. He gave new life to the *fabliau*, the plot of which he borrowed, with the English local colour that he devised; and he introduced the new joke of comic dialect. This does not seem to have been attempted in English literature before Chaucer, and has seldom been more successful since.

Even in the usual printed texts of Chaucer the northern dialectal character of the speeches of Alain and John is plain. But a comparison of various manuscripts seems to show that actually Chaucer himself went

further: the clerks' talk, as he wrote it, was probably very nearly correct and pure northern dialect, derived (as usual with Chaucer) from books as well as from observation. A remarkable feat at the time. But Chaucer was evidently interested in such things, and had given considerable thought to the linguistic situation in his day. It may be observed that he presents us with an *East-Anglian* reeve, who is amusing *southern*, and largely London, folk with imitations of *northern* speech brought southward by the attraction of the *universities*. This is a picture in little of the origins of literary and London English. East-Anglia played an important part in transmitting to the capital northerly features of language—such as *ill*, *their* and the inflexion in *brings*, which are in this tale used as dialectalisms, but have since become familiar. The East-Anglian reeve is a symbol of this process, and at the same time in real contemporary life a not unlikely person to have negotiated the dialect in such a tale. The whole thing is very ingenious.

The dialect is. of course, meant primarily to be funny. Chaucer relied for his principal effect on the long *ā*, preserved in the north in many words where the south had changed to *ō*: as in *haam*, *bānes*, *naa*, for 'home, bones, no.' But in these short speeches there are many minor points of form and vocabulary which are finer than was necessary for the easy laugh, and show that Chaucer had a personal interest in linguistic detail. For instance: the phrase *dreven til hething* is typically northern in the form *dreven* for *driven*; in the use of *driven* for *put* in this expression; in the substitution of *til* for *to*; and in the use of the Scandinavian word *hething*, 'mockery.' Other marked dialectalisms are *slik* 'such,' *imell* 'among,' *bōs* 'behoves.' Chaucer makes the Reeve disclaim any accurate knowledge of the locality—it is *fer in the north, I can nat telle where*. But Chaucer himself seems to have been less vague: he was thinking of the northernmost parts of England, now Northumberland and Durham. Strother is a genuine village name in that region. The clerk John swears by Saint Cuthbert, just as the Osney carpenter swore by Saint Frideswide. Saint Cuthbert was the patron of Durham, the *terra sancti Cuthberti*, and his name, not elsewhere mentioned by Chaucer, is here certainly a final touch of local colour.

The text given here is slightly abbreviated. Only in the words of the clerks is there any material departure from the text as printed by Skeat. These words are presented here in a more marked and consistently northern form—in nearly every case with some manuscript authority. A star * is prefixed to the two or three lines that the process of abbreviation made it necessary to alter. Unlike many of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales, the Reeve's tale is neither easy to shorten nor improved by the process.

J.R.R.T.

A t Trumpingtŏn nat fer fro Cantebrigge
    ther gooth a brook and over that a brigge,
upon the whichë brook ther stant a melle.
And this is verray sooth that I yow telle:
a Miller was theer dwelling many a day;
as any peecok he was proud and gay.
Pipen he couthe, and fissche, and nettës bete,
and turnen cuppës, and wel wrastle and schete;
and by his belt he bar a long panade,
and of a swerd ful trenchant was the blade. 10
A joly popper bar he in his pouche;
ther nas no man for peril dorste him touche;
a Scheffeld thwitel bar he in his hose.
Round was his face and camus was his nose;
as pilëd as an apë was his skulle.
He was a market-beter attë fulle.
Ther dorstë no wight hond upon him legge,
that he ne swoor he scholde anoon abegge.
A theef he was for sothe of corn and mele,
and that a sligh, and usaunt for to stele. 20

    His namë was hoten deignous Simkin.
A wif he hadde, ycŏmen of noblë kin:
the persoun of the toun hir fader was.
With hir he yaf ful many a panne of bras,
for that Simkin scholde in his blood allie.
Sche was yfostrëd in a nŏnnerie;
for Simkin noldë no wif, as he saide,
but sche were wel y-norissed and a maide,
to saven his estat of yomanrie;
and schee was proud, and pert as is a pie. 30
A ful fair sightë was it on hem two!
on halidaies beforn hir wolde he go
with his tipet bounden aboute his heed,
and sche coom after in a gite of reed,
and Simkin haddë hosen of the same.
Ther dorstë no wight clepen hir but *dame*;
nas noon so hardy that wentë by the weye
that with hir dorstë rage or ones pleye,
but if he woldë be slain of Simkin
with panade or with knif or boidëkin. 40
For jalous folk been perilous euermo;

algate thay wolde hir wiues weenden so!

    A doghter haddë thay betwixe hem two
of twenty yeer, withouten any mo
sauinge a child that was of half-yeer age:
in cradel it lay and was a proprë page.
This wenchë thikke and well ygrowen was,
with camus nose and yën greye as glas,
with buttokes brode and breestës rounde and hie;
but right fair was hir heer, I nil nat lie.   50

    Greet sokene hath this miller, out of doute,
with whete and malt of al the lond aboute;
and namëliche ther was a greet collegge
men clepen the Soler-halle at Cantëbregge,
theer was hir whete and eek hir malt ygrounde.
And on a day it happëd in a stounde,
seek lay the maunciple on a maladie:
men weenden wisly that he scholdë die.
For which this miller stal bothe mele and corn
an hundred timë morë than beforn;   60
for ther-beforn he stal but curteisly,
but now he was a theef outrageously.
For which the wardain chidde and madë fare;
but ther-of sette the miller nat a tare:
he craketh boost and swoor it nas nat so.

    Than were ther yŏngë pourë clerkes two
that dwelten in this halle of which I seye:
testif thay were and lusty for to pleye;
and only for hir mirthe and reuelrie
upon the wardain bisily thay crie   70
to yeue hem leuë but a litel stounde
to goon to mille and seen hir corn ygrounde—
and, hardily, thay dorstë leye hir nekke
the miller scholde nat stele hem half a pekke
of corn by sleightë, ne by force hem reue;
and attë laste the wardain yaf hem leue.

    Jon highte that oon, and Alain highte that other.
Of o toun where thay born that hightë Strother:
fer in the north—I can nat tellë where.
This Alain maketh redy al his gere,   80

and on an hors the sak he caste anoon.
Forth gooth Alain the clerk and also Jon,
with good swerd and with bukeler by hir side.
Jon knew the wey, hem nedëdë no guide,
And attë mille the sak adoune he leith.

    Alain spak first: "Al hail! Simond, i faith!
How faris thy fair doghter and thy wif?"
    "Alain! Welcõme!" quoth Simkin, "by my lif!
And Jon also! How now? What do ye heer?"
    "Simond!" quoth Jon, "by god, need has na peer!   90
Him bos himseluen serue at has na swain,
or els he es a folt, as clerkis sain.
Our manciple, I hope he wil be deed,
swa werkis ay the wangis in his heed.
And for-thy es I cum, and als Alain,
til grind our corn and carie it haam again.
I pray yow, spedis us hethen as ye may!"
    "It schal be doon," quoth Simkin, "by my fay!
What wõl ye doon whil that it is in hand?"
    "By god, right by the hoper wil I stand,"   100
quoth Jon, "and see hougat the corn gaas in!
Yit sagh I neuer, by my fader kin,
hougat the hoper waggis til and fra."
    Alain answerdë: "Jon! and wiltu swa,
then wil I be binethen, by my croune,
and see hougat the melë fallis doune
in til the trogh. That sal be my desport.
For Jon, i faith, I es al of your sort:
I es as il a miller as er ye!"

    This miller smilëde of hir nicëtee,   110
and thoghte: "Al this nis doon but for a wile:
thay wenen that no man may hem beguile.
But, by my thrift, yet schal I blere hir yë
for at the sleighte in hir philosophie.
The morë queintë crekës that they make,
the morë wõl I stelë whan I take.
In stede of flour yet wõl I yeue hem bren.
'The gretteste clerkës been noght the wiseste men,'
as whilõm to the wolf thus spak the mare.
Of al hir art I countë noght a tare."   120

Oute attë dore he gooth ful priuëly,
whan that he sagh his timë; softëly
he loketh up and doune til he hath founde
the clerkës hors, ther-as it stood ybounde
behindë the mille under a leefsel;
and to the hors he gooth him faire and wel.
He strepeth of the bridel right anoon;
and whan the hors was loos, he ginneth goon
toward the fen, ther wildë mares renne,
forth with wee-hee thurgh thikke and thurgh thenne.   130

This miller gooth ayein; no word he seide,
but dooth his note, and with the clerkës pleide,
til that hir com was faire and wel ygrounde.
And whan the mele is sakkëd and ybounde,
this Jon gooth out, and fint his hors awey,
and gan to crie: "Harrow!" and "weilawey!
our hors es lost! Alain, for goddis banis,
step on thy feet! Cum of, man, al at anis!
Alas! our wardain has his palfray lorn."

This Alain al forgat bothe mele and corn,   140
al was out of his minde his husbondrie.
   "Quat! Quilk way es he gaan?" he gan to crie.
The wif coom lepinge inward with a ren;
sche saide: "Alas! you hors gooth to the fen
with wildë mares, as faste as he may go!
Unthank cŏme on his hond that bond him so,
and he that bettrë scholde han knit the reine!"
   "Alas!" quoth Jon, "Alain, for Christis peine,
lay doun thy swerd, and I sal min alswa.
I es ful wight, god waat, as es a raa;   150
By goddis herte, he sal nat scape us bathe!
Quy nadde thu pit the capil in the lathe?
Il hail! By god, Alain, thow es a fonne!"

Thise sely clerkës han ful faste yrŏnne
toward the fen, bothe Alain and eek Jon.
And whan the miller sagh that thay were goon,
he half a busschel of hir flour hath take,
and bad his wif go knede it in a cake.
He saide: "I trowe the clerkës were afeerd.
Yet can a miller make a clerkës beerd   160

178

for al his art. Now lat hem goon hir weye!
Lo, wheer thay goon! Yee, lat the children pleye!
Thay gete him nat so lightly, by my croune!"

    Thise sely clerkës rennen up and doune,
with: "Keep! keep! stand! stand! jossa! warderere!
gaa quistel thow, and I sal keep him here!"
But, schortly, til that it was verray night,
thay couthë nat, thogh thay doon al hir might,
hir capel cacche, he ran alwey so faste,
til in a diche thay caghte him attë laste.   170

    Wery and weet, as beest is in the rein,
cõmth sely Jon, and with him cõmth Alain.
"Alas!" quoth Jon, "the day that I was born!
Now er we dreuen til hething and to scorn.
Our corn is stoln. Men wil us folis calle,
bathë the wardain and our felaus alle,
and namëly the miller. Wailaway!"

    Thus plaineth Jon, as he gooth by the wey
toward the mille, and Bayard in his hond.
The miller sittinge by the fir he fond.   180
For it was night, and further mighte thay noght,
thay for the lõue of god han him besoght
of herberghe and of ese as for hir peny.

    The miller saide ayein: "If ther be eny,
swich as it is, yet schul ye han your part.
Min hous is streit, but ye han lernëd art:
ye cõnne by argumentës make a place
a milë brood of twenty-foot of space.
Lat see now if this placë may suffise!
Or make it roum with speche, as is your guise!"   190

    "Now, Simond," saidë Jon, "by saint Cudbert,
ay es thow mery, and this es faire answerd!
I haf herd say 'man suld taa of twaa thingis
slik as he findis, or taa slik as he bringis.'
But specially, I pray yow, hostë dere,
get us sum mete and drink, and mak us chere;
and we wil payë treuly at thy wille.
With empty hand men may na haukis tille—

179

lo, heer our siluer redy for til spende!"

    This miller in to toune his doghter sende   200
for ale and breed, and rostede hem a goos,
and bond hir hors, it scholdë nat goon loos;
and in his owne chambre hem made a bed
with schetës and with chalons faire yspred,
noght from his ownë bed ten foot or twelue.
His doghter hadde a bed al by hirselue
right in the samë chambrë, by and by:
it mightë been no bet—and causë why:
ther nas no roumer herberghe in the place.

    Thay soupen and they speke hem to solace,   210
and drinken ever strong ale attë beste.
Aboutë midnight wentë thay to reste.
Wel hath this miller vernischëd his heed;
ful pale he was fordrŏnken, and nat reed.
He yexeth, and he speketh thurgh the nose,
as he were on the quakke or on the pose.
    To bed he gooth, and with him gooth his wif;
as any jay sche light was and jolif,
so was hir joly whistel wel ywet.
The cradel at hir beddës feet is set.
    To beddë wente the doghter right anoon;   220
to beddë gooth Alain and also Jon.
Ther was namore, hem nedëdë no dwale.
This miller hath so wisly bibbëd ale
that as an hors he snorteth in his sleep,
ne of his tail behinde he took no keep.
His wif bar him a burdon, a ful strong:
men mighte hir routinge herë two furlong;
the wenchë routeth eek *par cŏmpanie*.

    Alain the clerk, that herde this melodie,   230
he pokëde Jon, and saidë: "Slepis thow?
Herdë thow euer slik a sang ar now?
Lo! quilk a cumplin es imell thaim alle!
A wildë fir upon thair bodis falle!
Qua herknëde euer slik a ferly thing?
Ya, thay sal haf the flour of it ending!
This langë night ther tidis me na reste;
but yit, naa fors, al sal be for the beste.

Sum esëment has lawë schapen us.
For, Jon, ther es a lawë that sais thus: 240
that gif a man in aa point be agreued,
that in another he sal be releued.
Our corn is stoln, sothly it es naa nay,
and we haf had an il fit al this day;
and sen I sal haf naan amendëment
again my los, I wil haf esëment.
By goddis saule, it sal naan other be!"

This Jon answerde : "Alain auisë thee!
the miller es a parlous man," he saide,
"and gif that he out of his sleep abraide, 250
he mighte do us bathe a vilainie."
Alain answerde: " I counte him noght a flie!"

And up he rist, and by the wenche he crepte,
*ther-as sche lay al stille, and fastë slepte,
til he so nigh was, er sche mighte espie,
that it hadde been to latë for to crie.

This Jon lith stille a furlong-wey or two,
and to himself he maketh routhe and wo.
"Alas!" quoth he, "this es a wikkid jape!
Now may I say that I es but an ape; 260
and quen this jape es tald an other day,
I sal been halden daf, a cokenay.
I wil aris, and auntre it, by my fay!
'Unhardy es unsely,' thus men say."
And up he roos, and softëly he wente
unto the cradel, and in his hond it hente,
*and bar it softe, and by his bed it sette.
*[I can nat tellë dremes that hem mette,]
til that the thriddë cok began to singe.
*Alain aroos thanne in the daweninge, 270
*when attë laste ypassed was the night;
he saidë: "Far wel, Maline, swetë wight!
The day es cum, I may naa lenger bide;
but euermaa, quar-sa I gaa or ride,
I es thin awen clerk, swa haf I seel!"

"Now, derë lemman," quoth sche, "go, far weel!
But er thow go, oo thing I wõl the telle:

181

whan that thaw wendest homward by the melle,
right attë entree of the dore behinde
thow schalt a cake of half a busschel finde   280
that was ymaked of thin ownë mele,
which that I heelp my fader for to stele.
Now godë lemman, god the saue and kepe!"
And with that word almoost she gan to wepe.

    Alain uprist, and thoghte: "Ar that it dawe,
I wil gaa crepen in by my felawe";
and fond the cradel with his honde anan.
"By god!" thoghte he, "al wrang I haf misgaan!
Min heed es toty of my drink to-night,
that makës me that I gaa noght aright.   290
I waat wel by the cradel I misgaa:
heer lis the miller and his wif alswa!"

    And forth he gooth a twenty-deuel wey
unto the bed ther-as the miller lay.
He weende han cropen by his felawe Jon;
and by the miller in he creep anoon,
and caghte him by the nekke, and softe he spak.
He saide: "Jon, thow swinis-heed, awak!
for goddis saule, and heer a noblë game!
*For I haf had this gracë, by saint Jame . . .   300
quils thow has as a coward been agast!"

    "Yee, falsë harlot!" quoth the miller. "Hast?
A! false traitour! falsë clerk!" quoth he,
"thow schalt be deed, by goddes dignitee!"
And by the throtë-bolle he caghte Alain;
and hee hente him despitously ayein,
and on the nose he smoot him with the feest.
Doune ran the blody streem upon his breest;
and in the floor with nose and mouth to-broke
thay walwe as doon two piggës in a poke.   310
And up thay goon, and doune ayein anoon,
til that the miller spurnëde at a stoon;
and doune he fil, bakward upon his wif,
that niste nothing of this nicë strif.

    And with the fal out of hir sleep sche breide.
"Help, holy crois of Bromëholm!" sche seide.

"*In manus tuas!* lord, to the I calle.
Awak, Simond! The feend is on us falle!
Min herte is broken. Help! I nam but deed.
Ther lith oon up my wombe and up min heed.   320
Help, Simkin! for the falsë clerkës fighte."

    This Jon sterte up as faste as euer he mighte,
and graspeth by the wallës to and fro
to finde a staf; and sche sterte up also,
and knew the estrës bet than dide this Jon,
and by the wal a staf sche fond anoon,
and sagh a litel schimmeringe of a light;
for at an hole in schoon the monë bright.
And by that light sche sagh hem bothë two,
but sikerly sche nistë who was who,   330
but as sche sagh a whit thing in hir yë;
and whan sche gan the whitë thing espie,
sche weende the clerk hadde wered a volupeer;
and with the staf sche drogh ay neer and neer,
and weende han hit this Alain attë fulle—
and smoot the miller on the pilëd skulle.

    Than doune he gooth, and cride: "Harrow! I die!"
Thise clerkës bete him wel and lete him lie,
And graithen hem, and toke hir hors anoon,
and eek hir mele, and on hir wey thay goon.   340
And attë millë yet thay toke hir cake
of half a bussehel flour ful wel ybake.

    Thus is the proudë miller wel ybete,
and hath ylorn the grindinge of the whete,
and payëd for the souper euery deel
of Alain and of Jon, that bete him weel.
    And therfore this prouerbe is said ful sooth:
"him thar nat wenë wel that yuel dooth";
a guilour schal himself beguiled be.

    And God that sitteth high in magestee   350
saue al this cumpanië, grete and smale;
*for al is doon; thus endeth now my tale.

183

Steiner on Tolkien

Ross Smith

On 6 September 1973 the French newspaper *Le Monde* published a retrospective article by George Steiner on the life and work of J.R.R. Tolkien, who had died a few days earlier at the age of eighty-one. Titled "Tolkien, Le Mandarin Excentrique D'Oxford," the article studied Tolkien's achievements in the light of his academic background, the sources of his fiction within English culture and the turbulent years in which he produced his major works. The article shows that Steiner was already well aware of the most important currents in Tolkien's literary output long before the most significant critical works on Tolkien were published. This will not surprise those familiar with Steiner: one of the twentieth century's outstanding polymaths and probably its greatest literary critic, his interest in the Humanities and Art, and his overall erudition, seem limitless. His most important work, *After Babel* (1975), is a philological *tour-de-force* and even now, three decades after its original publication, it is unsurpassed as a study in comparative literature and the phenomenon of translation. He has also made important contributions to modern scholarship in the areas of philosophy, music and linguistics. This is the only essay George Steiner ever wrote specifically about J.R.R. Tolkien, and it displays his usual breadth of learning and freedom from prejudice.

One would have imagined that the opinion of one of the twentieth century's greatest literary critics on the twentieth century's "most popular author"[1] would have been of considerable interest to the English and North American community of Tolkienian scholars, particularly in view of the unsympathetic treatment Tolkien has usually received from famous post-war literary critics (Edmund Wilson and Harold Bloom, in particular). Steiner's encyclopaedic, multilingual knowledge of world literature gives him a critical perspective which is considerably broader than that of most Anglo-American critics, enabling him to appreciate the whole picture of Tolkien's overall creative achievement. His article has remained virtually unknown in British and American academic circles, however, for the simple reason that it was written in French.

Starting from a single sentence concerning Tolkien's fiction with a source reference "George Steiner—*Le Monde* 1973" posted in Spanish on an Internet book site, I have tracked down the original *Le Monde* article and have translated it into English, so that it can be enjoyed by Tolkien specialists and by enthusiasts of English literature in general. It is certainly an intriguing combination: the sharpest mind in post-war literary criticism taking a quick but incisive look at the century's most

remarkable and atypical philological fictionist.

The publication of this translation has been authorized by George Steiner and by *Le Monde*.

Tolkien, Oxford's Eccentric Don

GEORGE STEINER

[Originally published in *Le Monde*, 6 September 1973]

In the September 4 edition of Le Monde we announced the death of the English writer J.R.R. Tolkien, whose greatest work, "The Lord of the Rings," is currently being translated into French. George Steiner, a professor at Cambridge University, provides us with the following account of Tolkien's attractive and original personality.

To comprehend Tolkien's character we must take into account two apparently contradictory psychological and intellectual traditions that co-exist in the English—or rather Anglo-Saxon, in the strictest sense of the term—mentality. One is the subterranean but still powerful force of myth. The other is the tradition of the eccentric Oxbridge Don, the erudite who displays a deliberately bizarre persona. In Tolkien and his work, these two currents came together.

Despite its role as the initiator of modern industrialism, England was still a largely regional and, dare I say, nocturnal country during the first half of the 20th Century. Outside the urban centres, the provinces kept their secrets. The North with the celebrated heaths of Yorkshire, Wales with its soaring mountains and narrow valleys, East Anglia with its misty sea, all retain an often archaic atmosphere. Not far from Cambridge, there are villages where traces of pre-Norman Danish can still be heard. Through a subtle mechanism which seeks to keep the balance of mutual trust between imperial and pragmatic England, this island, which remains turned towards the open sea, has gathered into itself the silences and burdens of its earthly past.

While there is certainly some mythology to be found in 20th century French literature, it is on the fringe of the main literary forces and is often reduced to the level of folklore. In the case of England, in contrast, the Celtic, Irish, Scottish and Saxon myths and the Arthurian cycle have made their presence felt in a number of the most significant works of contemporary poetry and prose. It is impossible to appreciate the lyrical genius of Robert Graves, the novelistic force of John Cowper Powys or William Golding, the bestiaries of Ted Hughes whose violent tones current dominate English poetry, without recognising the enduring and obsessive presence of ancient epics and legends in the current intellectual climate.

Project MUSE®
Scholarly journals online

remarkable and atypical philological fictionist.

The publication of this translation has been authorized by George Steiner and by *Le Monde*.

Tolkien, Oxford's Eccentric Don

GEORGE STEINER

[Originally published in *Le Monde*, 6 September 1973]

In the September 4 edition of Le Monde we announced the death of the English writer J.R.R. Tolkien, whose greatest work, "The Lord of the Rings," is currently being translated into French. George Steiner, a professor at Cambridge University, provides us with the following account of Tolkien's attractive and original personality.

To comprehend Tolkien's character we must take into account two apparently contradictory psychological and intellectual traditions that co-exist in the English—or rather Anglo-Saxon, in the strictest sense of the term—mentality. One is the subterranean but still powerful force of myth. The other is the tradition of the eccentric Oxbridge Don, the erudite who displays a deliberately bizarre persona. In Tolkien and his work, these two currents came together.

Despite its role as the initiator of modern industrialism, England was still a largely regional and, dare I say, nocturnal country during the first half of the 20th Century. Outside the urban centres, the provinces kept their secrets. The North with the celebrated heaths of Yorkshire, Wales with its soaring mountains and narrow valleys, East Anglia with its misty sea, all retain an often archaic atmosphere. Not far from Cambridge, there are villages where traces of pre-Norman Danish can still be heard. Through a subtle mechanism which seeks to keep the balance of mutual trust between imperial and pragmatic England, this island, which remains turned towards the open sea, has gathered into itself the silences and burdens of its earthly past.

While there is certainly some mythology to be found in 20th century French literature, it is on the fringe of the main literary forces and is often reduced to the level of folklore. In the case of England, in contrast, the Celtic, Irish, Scottish and Saxon myths and the Arthurian cycle have made their presence felt in a number of the most significant works of contemporary poetry and prose. It is impossible to appreciate the lyrical genius of Robert Graves, the novelistic force of John Cowper Powys or William Golding, the bestiaries of Ted Hughes whose violent tones current dominate English poetry, without recognising the enduring and obsessive presence of ancient epics and legends in the current intellectual climate.

The language of the Elves

Mercia, "the Western Marches," the site of an ancient and fabulous kingdom during the dark centuries that followed the departure of the Roman legions, had fascinated Tolkien since his infancy. He had made a detailed study of the area's dialect (the West Midland dialect of the An-glo-Saxon period). Like W.H. Auden, one of his most enthusiastic read-ers, Tolkien was convinced that the English language took its magical traits from its contact with these ancient lands. He was convinced—and this is one of the main features of his thinking—that all creation contains the vestiges of a mythology. He insisted on this idea in his teaching. To study the grammar of a language, particularly an ancient or partly-lost language, is to engage in mental archaeology. The philologist and the grammarian bring out to the light of day the conventions of dreams, the fundamental concepts of art, the historic memories of a buried world. For Tolkien, mythical invention was, above all, philological.

It was around 1911 at Exeter College in Oxford, which maintains close ties with the West of the country, that Tolkien tried to devise a secret language. This "Elvish tongue" was endowed with grammatical precision. It had its own phonetic laws, rules of declension and participle agreements. But very soon Tolkien made his great discovery: the basic design of a grammar is a lifeless thing without a mythological content, without the image of a partly real and partly imaginary world which gives human speech its vital mixture of communications and secrets.

The Hobbits, the world of Middle-earth, the quest for the magical ring which long after would bring Tolkien world-wide fame, all derived from an insight. It is on the basis of this philologist's vision that Tolkien, with the help of *Beowulf*, the Celtic legend of the Grail and the narrative techniques of Anglo-Saxon and Chaucerian poetry, fashioned his epic.

The Merton clique

However, he remained a teacher as much as a mage. Behind the walls of Merton, Oxford University's most medieval college, Tolkien pursued his career as a respected academic. *The Hobbit* made its debut in the guise of a children's story. This inevitably brings to mind another Oxford sage, who also started writing to amuse some young nieces and friends. Tolk-ien's work, like Lewis Carroll's, represents a fantastic accident. Alice also went down a tunnel to discover a land of wonders. No less than Tolkien, Carroll too invented secret languages with solid logical structures. The humour of these two mythomaniacs is what the English call "donnish," that rather pedantic, devious, slightly snobbish humour of an Oxford or Cambridge professor (the dominant caste) by the fireside at the close of day. In the world of Frodo and Mordor there are threatening moors, dark

forests, dragons' caves and an England from days gone by, but also present, hidden behind the scenes, are the banter and quips of an academic club.

Converted to Catholicism in 1900, Tolkien chose his close friends from among those who, at least in part, shared his religious feelings. In C. S. Lewis, himself a master of legends, and Charles Williams, an expert on Dante's mysticism, Tolkien found his select companions. He was close to C. L. Wrenn, a major authority on Anglo-Saxon. Professor Nevill Coghill, a poet and Chaucerian, was an intimate friend and will probably be responsible for editing a posthumous book called *The Silmarillion*[2].

Tolkien's books have been sold by the million and translated into dozens of languages, they are the source of slogans painted on walls from New York to Buenos Aires; yet his work retains its private character. Between the lines, one has the impression of hearing the hopes, fears and misgivings of a small inner circle of university lecturers meeting in the book-lined rooms of the Master, to hear a voice whose fast delivery and soft tones were both legendary. But we must not forget how much the epic of Hobbits, Orcs and the war between Good and Evil reflects, on an imaginary scale, the political events of the thirties and forties. By reading successive episodes to his close friends, Tolkien sought to give consolation and hope in circumstances that seemed to threaten the very existence of the English people. Those who understood this at the time know better than anyone else the themes of his tales.

Creating a coherent mythology in the middle of the twentieth century, and conveying a sense of what is truly universal in this mythology to millions of readers often infinitely far removed from any mythological knowledge: that is indeed a rare achievement. Tolkien's immense success remains a little mysterious, as it must; he himself was vaguely surprised by it and viewed with a certain irony the swarms of devotees that converged on him from all over the world. May the enchantment that he cast over so many others help to protect him, now that he is crossing "the land of Mordor, where the shadows lie."

NOTES

1   Tolkien was voted the twentieth century's most popular author in extensive polls conducted by the BBC, Amazon.com and Waterstone's between 1997 and 2003.

2   As readers are doubtless aware, *The Silmarillion* was edited for publication by Tolkien's son and literary executor, Christopher and published in 1977.

Book Reviews

[cover title:] *The Children of Húrin* [title as on title page:] *Narn i Chîn Húrin: The Tale of the Children of Húrin* by J.R.R Tolkien, edited by Christopher Tolkien. Illustrated by Alan Lee. London: HarperCollins, 2007. 315 pp., plus foldout map. £18.99 (trade hardcover) ISBN 9780007246229; £60.00 (deluxe slip-cased hardcover) ISBN 9780007252237. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2007. 315 pp., plus foldout map $26.00 (trade hardcover) ISBN 9780618894642; $75.00 (deluxe slip-cased hardcover) ISBN 9780618904419.

Though little of the material contained in *The Children of Húrin* will be a revelation to longtime students of Tolkien, its publication is nonetheless a welcome event. The story of Túrin Turambar is one of Tolkien's strongest. It has languished for too long in incomplete versions in various installments or samples of the legendarium. Moreover, it has been overshadowed, even within the published "Silmarillion" tales, by the Lay of Leithian, the tale of the matchless love of Beren and Lúthien, because of that story's inherent nobility and grace as well as for its important role in the thematic backbone of *The Lord of the Rings*. But the story of Túrin, as Elrond makes clear in his acclamatory comments to Frodo after the council, is no less important among the tales of the Elder Days, or, as these days would be called after *The Lord of the Rings* was written, the First Age.

In *The Children of Húrin*, Christopher Tolkien has put together a full, orderly narrative account of the story of Túrin Turambar, based on the iteration of the "Narn i Chîn Húrin" provided in *Unfinished Tales*. Christopher (with the assistance of his son Adam, who seems an adept of Middle-earth studies in his father's tradition) has made this piercing and riveting tale available to a far wider audience. The book is compact, with large print, and copiously illustrated, with eight full-color, glossy pictures and numerous small black-and-white illustrations before and after chapters. Yet it is not a coffee-table book or an enhanced *livre de luxe*. Those interested in a deluxe edition have available for them such a work, offered by Houghton Mifflin in the US and HarperCollins in the UK. This comes with a slipcase and special binding, and color frontispiece (of the Alan Lee dust-wrapper image) and color illustrations. The UK trade edition is also of larger dimensions than the US trade version, and gives the reader less of a cramped sensation than the reader of the US edition occasionally feels. (The deluxe UK and US editions are the same size.) The illustrations aside, the US trade edition looks and handles like any other

book on the bestseller list. This is perhaps an aesthetic detriment but a help to those who want to get Tolkien read as literature and not merely as a publishing and marketing phenomenon.

Advocates of Tolkien in literary terms have long had the problem that his writing about Middle-earth is really one giant work. But when described in publishing terms, Tolkien's Middle-earth writings consist of one complete work of narrative fiction, *The Lord of the Rings*, accompanied by a prequel written originally for children, *The Hobbit*, and supplemented by a vast array of posthumously published and heterogeneous background material possessing various degrees of narrative unity. *The Children of Húrin* solves the quandary of the casual reader who is interested in Tolkien's vision but who is, to put it bluntly, fatigued by hobbits, as no less an aficionado of Tolkien than the young Rayner Unwin once admitted to being. It gives the hobbit-averse somewhere to go. It also perhaps tells the hobbit-friendly just what their preferences as readers are. The readers who like the hobbits, find their absence lamentable, and find the Túrin story too depressing and the characters unlikable, are at least potentially more novel-readers than epic or tragedy-readers; their expectations of narrative situations are closer to *Middlemarch* or *David Copperfield* than the *Aeneid*, the Theban Plays, or for that matter *Beowulf*.

It is good in general for Tolkien to have a short, accessible work in circulation, one that is part of the overall legendarium yet is not *The Lord of the Rings*; it will provide people an alternative complete work by which one can enter the oeuvre aside from the magnum opus. This is an option lacking, for instance, in the oeuvre of as great a writer as Marcel Proust. The respectful reviews the book has received so far—even the negative ones are not totally dismissive of Tolkien the way they would have been in previous decades—show that the book's publication has achieved its purpose, that it has fortified Tolkien's reputation as a writer for adults willing to come to grips with life's elemental sadness.

Indeed, the story of Túrin undoes many misapprehensions about Tolkien: that he invariably told stories with happy endings, that he could not write women characters, that his work is somehow not weighty enough to be among the truly great in the ranks of literature. *The Children of Húrin* is not just a sequence of tragic events but palpably conveys the psychology of loss and desperation, the courage of those whom malicious fate has conspired against from the beginning. That that malicious fate is here epitomized by incarnate evil in the form of Morgoth Bauglir does not mean that the fate of Túrin and Niënor, and many others, is any less tragic than that of Oedipus and Jocasta, or Kullervo and his sister. *The Children of Húrin* is modern fantasy. But it is also modern tragedy. This is something missed, for instance, by the capsule description of the book in *The New York Times Book Review* bestseller list: "an evil lord wants

to destroy his rival's children." Yes, but there is a vast disparity in kind and strength between Morgoth and Húrin. This disparity both exalts and dooms Húrin and his children.

In his introduction, Christopher Tolkien situates the Túrin saga, for the untutored reader, with extraordinary deftness and tact. Quoting all of Treebeard's haunting and lovely song "In the willow-meads" from Book III, chapter iv, of *The Lord of the Rings*, he uses Treebeard's elegiac description of "places he had known in remote times" (18) to orient us to the geography of Beleriand. This not only provides an entertaining way to learn a lot of necessary background but brings the Ents back, at least symbolically, into the history of Beleriand as Tolkien intended to do had he had world enough and time. In general, Christopher tries to use his father's own words to tell the story as much as possible, even if this means considerable emendation and recasting. Respect for the author's original intent (as far as that can be deduced from textual remains) is thus combined with an acknowledgment that any text produced at this point is an interpretive one. Indeed, as Gergely Nagy has impressively demonstrated, one of the great appeals of Tolkien's work is the sense of textual plurality and endless proliferation it furnishes. Every rendering of one of these texts entails choice, and the editor's choices here are all in the direction of narrative continuity and providing a rounded, complete story. The use of Treebeard's song is a particularly ingenious example of this sort of felicitous rearrangement.

Yet, as Christopher admits in the Appendix, and as other critics and online commentators have noted, the text "differs in a number of ways" (283) from that in *Unfinished Tales*. Some emendations are linguistic, as when, in Fingon's famous, and foredoomed, proclamation that the day has come, "Utulie'n aure"(53) one of the most moving extant snatches of Quenya, the expanded version of the phrase is "Aiya Eldalië ar Atanatarni"—not "Atanatari." This emendation, as Christopher Tolkien explains in *The War of the Jewels*, is made because the extra consonant is not dropped with a vowel ending in the plural of the word for "father," so the "n" in the suffix did not thus have to be dropped. This spelling may look unfamiliar to those used to the versions in *The Silmarillion* or *Unfinished Tales*, but there are sound linguistic reasons for making the revision.

Other instances, such as when Fingon, not Húrin, is said to oppose a direct assault on the plain during the Nirnaeth, or when it is made clear that Finduilas is speaking when Gwindor is rebuked in Nargothrond, are efforts to correct mistakes made in the original version. More controversial are passages such as these, when Túrin refuses Beleg's injunction to go to the empty and foreboding land of Dimbar, he says (118) " 'To Dimbar I call you!' 'Nay, I will not walk backward in life,' said Túrin. 'Nor can I come easily to Dimbar now. Sirion lies between, unbridged and

unforded below the Brithiach far northward; it is perilous to cross. Save in Doriath. But I will not pass into Doriath, and make use of Thingol's leave and pardon.'" Why is this interpolation, wonderful in terms of sheer language—it is the quintessence of the tragic hero that he refuses to walk backward in life; Oedipus does the same, tragically—justifiable in textual terms?

Christopher Tolkien knows his father's body of writing inside and out, and his long study of the manuscripts has only increased his awareness of complicated textual issues. Christopher has come to feel he allowed himself "more editorial freedom than was necessary" (285) in the 1980 version and many of the changes that so disconcert veteran readers of that version of the "Narn" may actually be a product of efforts to get closer to the author's original intention. Christopher is adept at finding some fragment to shuffle into the main text that was actually written by his father and makes semantic and narrative sense in the context. In an admittedly subjective comparison, he surely knew his father's intentions more than, say, the compilers of the First Folio knew Shakespeare's. Christopher is also almost a secondary author of the text; as someone intimately acquainted with the composition, and (in terms of drawing the maps) involved in the production of the original edition, he has an intellectual and moral authority that very few other editors of an author's posthumous material have had.

One of the ways Tolkien differs from other fiction writers, and even from other writers of modern fantasy, is in the way his work is what he termed, in the preface to the Second Edition of *The Lord of the Rings*, feigned history. In other words, he gives the reader a historical tableau so studded with meaningful incidental detail that, even though this tableau is in fact a total fabrication, the reader comes to see it not just as a well-constructed secondary world but as a world one can "refer" to as one would our own. One can go to a Tolkien conference and hear people discussing the history of Middle-earth in much the same way as one can, mutatis mutandis, go to a classical literature conference and hear people talking about ancient history. So editing Tolkien is more like, say, editing Tacitus or Thucydides than it is editing Vergil or Sophocles; respect for the author's intention and the original text is there in both cases, but with respect to the historians there is a sense of an anterior and external historical record that can be used to supplement the "actual" text when linking sentences, or when information clearly attested from other sources is missing. That this astonishing imputation of historicity to fictional material can and does occur is tribute to Tolkien's uniqueness as a writer of fiction, and, along with Christopher's intimate relationship to the material, makes the changes above defensible.

Providing the emendation that Túrin, were he to go to Dimbar,

would have to traverse a risky Sirion passage or a Doriath whose difficult entry would entail re-opening a complicated relationship with Thingol, is like saying than an Emperor passed through Pannonia on the way back to Rome from fighting the Dacians, and was confronted with whatever known issues existed in Pannonia at the time. Even if the ancient historian did not explicitly put this in, the modern editor would not be totally out of bounds doing so because he would know from an anterior record that Pannonia would be on the route back to Rome from fighting the Dacians. Tolkien's fictional world is structured like a historical world. In turn, that world is formed on a linguistic basis, just as our knowledge of past civilizations is enabled or even framed by, an awareness of the languages they used. This not only justifies a greater degree of editorial legerdemain than might be normally accepted, it also explains why so much background material and terminology has to be provided at the end of the book, as has occurred in every volume about Middle-earth since the final installment of *The Lord of the Rings* was published in 1955 as *The Return of the King*.

Even in *The Children of Húrin* proper, much background has to be provided, without simply retelling the "Quenta Silmarillion." The full story of the Nirnaeth Arnoediad (omitted from the version in *Unfinished Tales*, but here restored in line with Tolkien's original intentions) is presented here; not just the narrative outcome but the details of its military tactics. The devastating battle of tears unnumbered in which the long hoped-for day turned out to be a yet-more horrible defeat creates the conditions for Túrin's world, Morgoth has won the field in a military sense, but the core of his enemies has survived, and he cannot, as Melian points out, "come forth from Angband" (166) to pick off, in physical terms, those who resist him. He must operate by fear, treachery and the twisting of fate of his victims, which are the conditions amid which Túrin attempts to live a moral life.

Thus the individual strand of Túrin's story is never lost even though all the necessary internal and external background is provided. The book also contains a glossary, two substantial epilogues on the evolution of the great tales of the Elder Days from the 1920s to the 1950s, and a textual history of the manuscript sources of this book. These recapitulate material available in *The History of Middle-earth*, without overwhelming the general reader picking up the book for pleasure. There are, though, some intriguing tidbits for the Middle-earth connoisseur, among them the revelation that Saeros, Túrin's rival in Doriath, was to have his name restored to its *Book of Lost Tales* version of Orgol, which, as Christopher Tolkien notes, coincides with the "Old English *orgol, orgel*, 'pride' (287)" and also with its French cognate, *orgueil*. Though Tolkien claimed this coincidence was a "linguistic accident" (287), if it stood it would have a far more al-

legorical quality, given that Saeros is filled with pride. Especially since Orgol is very close to "Orleg," the name of a member of Túrin's outlaw band, Christopher Tolkien seems wise to have let "Saeros" stand.

As the above example indicates, this book, though largely for the general reader who may well be encountering the story for the first time, also has many rewards for the experienced student of Tolkien. These include not only points of information like the above, but the opportunity to focus on the story itself, as a self-contained unit, free from the necessary but at times distracting welter of places, names, and concepts that constitute the 1977 *Silmarillion*.

The Children of Húrin is a story about men, in literal terms—Atani. In terms of stage-time and narrative importance, Elves and dwarves play about the role they do in Tolkien's Third Age works. That the protagonists of the tale are men, not hobbits, gives it a different flavor. Although the name "Hildórien" is not mentioned in the text, we learn of Morgoth's early snaring of men and their escape to the West in the belief, in the words of Bëor, that "there we shall find Light" (25). As the genealogical tables at the end of the book made clear, Túrin is descended from all three houses of the Edain, deriving his parental descent from Hador, his maternal from Bëor, and even descending from the more obscure line of Haleth through Hareth, his paternal grandmother. Túrin is thus the epitome of man, and, like the Greek tragic heroes, represents both the potential and the corruption of humanity. In terms of the corruption aspect, how many people expect it to be said of a Tolkien hero, as is said of Túrin during the outlaw period, that he "became hardened to a mean and often cruel life, and yet at times pity and disgust would wake in him, and then he was perilous in his anger" (102)?

Túrin is also mannish in that he has the sole fully tragic fate of the three great heroes of the First Age, Tuor, Túrin, and Beren, and that he is the only one that does not marry an Elven-maiden. It is precisely Túrin's tragedy that he, unlike Beren and Tuor, does not materially contribute to the salvation of the two kindreds from Morgoth, and thus, again unlike Beren or Tuor, he is not an ancestor of the Peredhel or the Dunedain. (The sobriquet "Adanedhel" bestowed on him in Nargothrond points to precisely this potential.) Yet Elrond honors Túrin in Imladris (*FR* II, ii, 264) even though of necessity he is not a direct descendant. Túrin made terrible mistakes, and some mistakes seem similar to those of later men whose moral flaws do put them beyond the pale. When Túrin demands in Nargothrond that "The Lord of Waters come forth and speak more plainly" (173) he is evincing the same doubt in Ulmo's efficacy that Sauron will later, in the Akallabêth, sow in the mind of Ar-Pharazôn, convincing him Eru is but an invention of the Valar to maintain their power. This prompts the Elf Arminas to ask, "Are you indeed of the House of

Hador?" (173), a question Arminas is asking in the moral, not just in the genealogical, sense. Yet Túrin is not the human equivalent of a petty-dwarf. He will fight for Nargothrond, however rashly and impetuously. He will not go over to the other side. Indeed, Túrin's most consistent trait throughout is his defiance of Morgoth. This is the fullest reverberation of the title *Narn i Chîn Húrin*, not just that the children are cursed by Morgoth due to Húrin's adamant opposition to evil in Middle-earth, and his faith and hope that day will come again, but that they share in and suffer for this opposition. Not only does the title give Túrin and Niënor, as it were, equal billing, it also balances their mistakes and, especially, Túrin's many flaws with an awareness that neither child of Húrin who lived to adulthood compromised their father's defiance of incarnate evil. They both suffer endlessly. But they never succumb.

We see the linkage between Beren and Frodo even in *The Lord of the Rings*, and more so in the various versions of "The Lay of Leithian"; what *The Children of Húrin* does is make us see the commonalities and differences between Beren and Túrin, and draws the circle complete around Elrond's comparison of Frodo's heroism to Túrin's at Rivendell. That we see Túrin's moral shipwreck as adult also lets us see Beren's moral rescue as adult. The apposition of tragedy makes us see eucatastrophe for the singular, noble, cleansing accomplishment it is. Probably the reader looking at the 1977 *Silmarillion* for pure information, or for fleshing out of what had been limned in *The Lord of the Rings*, does not linger over the Túrin story; its emotional tonality, as well as its lack of direct linkage to the major events in the history of the Eldar, does not immediately appeal to *The Lord of the Rings*-oriented reader. It is likely only later, when readers are experiencing times of peril and bitterness on their own lives, the lives of their friends and family, or the life of their nation and the world, that the bitter salience of the Túrin story comes to the fore. Like Greek tragedy, like the story of Kullervo, like the story of Jephthah, the Túrin story is for the bad times, for the bitter times. That such a story appears in Tolkien's works, and is given new prominence by this edition, establishes convincingly Tolkien's full range as an author and a teller of tales.

The tale's thematic complexity is paralleled by the intricacy of its textual evolution, which began, after an initial prose telling in the late 1910s, as a two successively longer alliterative poems, then, in the 1930s, was converted into a prose narrative. Tolkien could never fully decide if this was to be a kind of condensed précis of an overall saga to lie as a back-cloth away from the "synopsis" (273) the reader saw in the foreground, or to be fully flushed out as "a far richer narrative conception" (274) directly in front of the reader.

Christopher Tolkien helpfully reminds us that the shorter version of the Túrin story found in the published *Silmarillion* and the longer one

found in *Unfinished Tales* are from the same source, the one chiseled down to suit its role in a saga stretching over generations, the other left to exfoliate in its majestic incompletion. One of the moments in both versions is Niënor's reaction to the revelation of her marriage's true nature. Niënor is told by the Dragon Glaurung that the "the worst of all his deeds shall you feel in yourself" (243). She is shown to suffer an agonizing consciousness of sin, of violation, and deception. This matters because Tolkien is so often accused of creating idealized characters in general, and, especially, women who are gossamer figures, acclaimed only for their ethereal bodies. Firstly, Niënor is given a name—indeed two names—and a history unlike Kullervo's sister. Far from being angelic and insubstantial, Niënor dies fully aware that she is incarnate, and that she not only possesses a human body but, regarding her now-terribly unwanted pregnancy, a specifically female body. It is not the mere fact of incest and tragedy that is important, though by itself it undoes overly idyllic characterizations of Tolkien's world. It is the way these events are described that bring out the forlorn regret and biting despair that we see the characters feeling at the moment of their ruin.

The aura of the Túrin story is very different from any other of Tolkien's great tales. Some of this may have to do with its sources, and with its explicit modeling on the story of Kullervo from Elias Lönnrot's compilation of the *Kalevala*. For instance, the reader notices the gorge-vantage from which Niënor leaps, Cabad-en-Aras, "Leap of the Deer," for its mention of deer, an animal not very present in Middle-earth, other than, again intriguingly, in *The Hobbit*. The allusion to deer points to the Finnish links of the tale, and perhaps, internally, to the more northerly average latitude of Beleriand than the rump Middle-earth we see in *The Lord of the Rings*. Issues of source might also inform some of the textual difficulties in the Túrin and the outlaw scene, which was the aspect of the saga in the worst shape when Christopher Tolkien examined the early 1950's "Narn." This scene seems very folkloric in nature and may well have imaginative links to another body of stories, whether the Jephthah and the outlaws scene in Judges 11 in the Old Testament, or, alternately, in outlaw scenes in Norse myth (Gísli Súrsson in the Icelandic saga) or English folklore (Robin Hood or Hereward the Wake). In any event, the outlaw scene is not in the earliest version of the Túrin saga, Turambar and the Foälóke. Its relationship to the rest of the story, although straightforward in terms of narrative (in fact Tolkien arguably conceived it as providing a necessary narrative bridge), seems in practice to have always been tense and fraught. Túrin's creator seemed to have shared the character's sense of being "irked by the squalid camp of the outlaws" (103), its sense of degradation instead of even the tragic grandeur of defeat.

Before the late 1930s, Tolkien was working on the "Silmarillion."

After that point, we see him working on *The Lord of the Rings*. The Third Age action becomes the linchpin of the overall Middle-earth story, and any later revisions Tolkien made in the "Silmarillion" material went in the direction of being retrofitted to suit *The Lord of the Rings*, not vice versa. But, in the late 1930s, there was a fascinating, three-cornered compositional situation where Tolkien's long-conceived Elder Days cycle, his *jeu d'esprit* for children that had unexpectedly taken far flight, and the extraordinary work that was to come out of the interpenetration of their sensibilities, stood juxtaposed to one another, the final road their linkage would take being by no means clearer. Did the Túrin saga have any impact on *The Hobbit*? Their fictional worlds seem far apart. Yet when Túrin is called "Thúrin Adanedhel" (169) in Nargothrond, we think of Thorin Oakenshield. This is a stretch, though both were tragic figures whose chief immediate enemy was a dragon. But proper names should certainly never be treated as accidental in Middle-earth. Other aspects of the tale seem to pick up on Tolkien's general scholarly interests; for instance (as sometimes happens, even no doubt against the avowed intentions of the author) some Eldarin personal names sound Germanic, as "Gelmir," the northern Elf sent to warn Nargothrond sounds like "Gelimer," the last king of the Vandals—and both were part of realms about to fall; and other names like "Beleg" sound biblical, like the postdiluvian patriarch "Peleg" (whom the Tolkien character does not otherwise resemble). Even if the Thorin and Gelimer and Peleg resemblances are totally unintended, the reader, knowing Tolkien's authorship of *The Hobbit*, his background in Germanic lore, and his obvious knowledge of the Bible, can posit these connections.

Christopher Tolkien notes that, as was first revealed in *The Lost Road*, volume five of *The History of Middle-earth*, Tolkien stopped working on the first prose version of the "Narn" at the point of "Túrin's flight from Doriath and his taking up the life of an outlaw" (276). At this same time, the publisher Allen & Unwin made their famous rejection of the "Silmarillion," and "three days later, on 19 December 1937 Tolkien wrote to Allen & Unwin, "saying 'I have written the first chapter of a new story about Hobbits—the long-expected party'" (276). In the 1930s, Tolkien assayed the Great Tales of the Elder Days in prose, first as bald summaries but then undergoing considerable "expansion and refinement" (275). Did this turning away from the alliterative poetry which had earlier characterized his work foreshadow his writing his major narrative work as prose fiction?

Tolkien seemed to find Túrin a fascinating yet perplexing figure whose story he was drawn to tell and retell, eventually finding it "the dominant story of the end of the Elder Days" (281). It is, in a structural sense, difficult for a storyteller to present someone so rash, so impulsive,

so self-hindering, and so surly as Túrin, as a valorous hero on the side of the good. It is part of Tolkien's achievement in the Túrin story to do just this. If Túrin is "wicked," as some English translations of the *Kalevala* describe Kullervo, he is so only in the connotative sense of being ensnared, enthralled.

We can make these assessments of Túrin's character because the text given us is so seamless and reads so effortlessly, prompting the reader to notice not just the course of the narrative but individual characterizations. The most poignant of these is Lalaith, Túrin's "other" sister, whose death when a young child from disease is, in its austerity of treatment, its integrity of feeling, and its commemoration of a brief life untimely ended, one of the most tender moments in Tolkien's legendarium. But other secondary characters also appear in greater salience here than ever before, if only because of the psychological effect of reading the tale as a self-contained book and not as part of a larger history. Mablung's fealty to Thingol and his selfless sense of regret on losing track of Túrin's kinswomen are notable, as are Beleg's loyalty and stamina. Thingol himself is seen at his best in the Túrin saga, made wiser by the loss of Lúthien and, in narrative terms, not the blocking-figure he had been in "The Lay of Leithian." Finduilas is also fascinating. Of rights, she should be Túrin's great love, since his "actual" wife ends up being revealed as his sister. Túrin even says to Finduilas that she reminds him of Lalaith, and says, "Would that I had a sister so fair!" (165). With tragic irony, he treats someone who could have been his wife as a sister, and unknowingly makes his sister into a wife she should never have been.

With respect to Finduilas, Túrin has "no love of the kind she wished" (166). He treats her as a friend and a counselor, not a romantic partner. Perhaps he has a sense, shared by Finduilas, that the love of Beren and Lúthien should not be rivaled. On an earlier and more intimate level, when talking to Beleg as an adult, Túrin spurns the memory of his walks in the woods with the elf-maiden Nellas out of a similar sense of the limits of human-Eldar interrelations or even of his own relationships with women, as such. Even when, after taking control of the outlaws, he confronts Larnach's daughter, "her clothes . . . rent by thorns" (103), there seems a palpable sense of unease.

The betrayal by Mîm the petty-dwarf is as spiteful and petty as it appears in previous versions, and we get a nice sense of Túrin's daily life amid the caves of Amon Rûdh. As a character, Túrin seems never at home. He feels unworthy of Thingol's patronage in the storied realm of Doriath. But he always thinks himself above his circumstances when he is not among the Elves. For instance, at an earlier stage in his career he does not even "deign to go" (102) to the people of Haleth in Brethil among whom he eventually dwells.

One of the major reasons for the inveterate Tolkien reader to buy this book is the art of Alan Lee. Lee is well known for his work on book and film versions of *The Lord of the Rings*. His treatment of various scenes is perhaps more eldritch and foreboding than other Tolkien illustrators. This is certainly suitable to the tale, even though Lee had never illustrated First Age scenes before undertaking this work. The illustration of Húrin, tormented, in Angband is filled with pathos and torment. But Lee's finest work here is in those pictures in which small-scale human figures are overshadowed by topography—as in the painting of the thousand caves of Menegroth—or where humanity is entirely absent, as in the depictions of the murky eaves of the Ered Wethrin or in the cold and clear waters of the Teiglin into which Niënor casts herself, as they rave and course remorselessly. We are used to seeing Tolkien's rivers as arteries of replenishment and navigation, vessels of Ulmo's might and succor. Here, the turbulent rush of the waters through the ravines bears nothing but bitterness and agony. The Túrin story is a powerful human tragedy, as Christopher Tolkien puts it, of "convincing power" and "immediacy" (281). Yet Lee's illustrations show us its crucial physical backdrop.

Túrin's fate is inseparable from the landscape of Beleriand in which it plays out. Like Bilbo's story, it has, in Tom Shippey's phrase, in *The Road to Middle-earth* (1982) "a cartographic plot" (94)—and thus we are grateful for Christopher Tolkien's map of part of Beleriand, drawn on the same familiar principles his father set out over fifty years ago, with stylized forests, sketched wisps of mountains, and place names festooning the paper in large red print.

Indeed, the plot of this story is so cartographic that, by the end, the forests of Brethil and the river Teiglin are virtually characters. If forests are, as Jared Lobdell has recently put it in *The Rise of Tolkienian Fantasy* (2005), "the heart of Tolkien's world" (146), then Brethil is the bitter heart of this tragic yet beautiful story. Throughout his life, Túrin is on the lam, on the run, sheltered in great Elven realms (Doriath; Nargothrond) in their declining days in which he is also somehow sequestered. That the Elven realms are less specifically rendered than those dwelled in by the Edain helps express the protagonist's emotional distance from the Eldar. The book makes the emotional tonality of the landscape of Beleriand easier to apprehend by the inclusion of Treebeard's song, with its sense of vanished joy and wistful regret even within the fantasy, and justifies what might seem at first a summary attempt to link this book more securely with *The Lord of the Rings*. Beleriand is a lost land, and the reader knows that in just a few decades after Túrin's lifetime, all the lands he has known will be whelmed by the wave. Indeed, Túrin is (excepting the Noldorin exiles) one of the best traveled of First Age protagonists. His life-trajectory could be the basis of a geography of Beleriand just as

Aragorn's could be for the Middle-earth of his own time.

All this is but a sample of the pleasures that await the experienced Tolkien reader by browsing through this "new" book by Tolkien. What would our experience of Middle-earth be like without over fifty years of Christopher Tolkien's stewardship of his father's legacy? Just as there might not have been a Queen in Gondor, if the ouster of Smaug and the consequent re-establishment of the kingdom of the Lonely Mountain had not hindered the Nazgûl's planned strike against Rivendell, who knows how much Tolkien scholarship there would be even today if not for Christopher's exhaustive recovery of his father's textual remnants. The presentation of the full, readable distillation of one of the most compelling tales of Middle-earth shows how re-encountering one of the saddest of stories can also be a heartening event.

<div align="right">

Nicholas Birns
The New School
New York, New York

</div>

WORKS CITED

Nagy, Gergely. "The Great Chain of Reading: (Inter-)Textual Relations and the Technique of Mythopoesis in the Túrin Story." In *Tolkien the Medievalist*, ed. Jane Chance. London: Routledge, 2003, 239-258.

———————

Early Elvish Poetry and Pre-Fëanorian Alphabets, by J.R.R. Tolkien; including "Pre-Fëanorian Alphabets, Part 1," edited by Arden R. Smith; "Early Elvish Poetry," edited by Christopher Gilson, Bill Welden and Carl F. Hostetter; "Qenya Declensions," edited by Christopher Gilson and Patrick H. Wynne; "Qenya Conjugations," edited by Christopher Gilson and Carl F. Hostetter; and "Qenya Word-lists," edited by Patrick H. Wynne and Christopher Gilson. Cupertino, CA: Parma Eldalamberon, 2006. 150pp. $30.00 (oversize paperback) [no ISBN]. *Parma Eldalamberon XVI*.

Reviewing J.R.R. Tolkien's 1920s writings on Qenya as published in *Parma Eldalamberon XIV*, I noted that they fail to shed much light on the poetry he wrote in that language at the start of the next decade: "In vain does one scrutinize the Elvish poems of Tolkien's 1931 paper on language invention, 'A Secret Vice,' hoping they will accord closely with these Qenya grammars: they do not" (Garth 251). Now the reason becomes clear: a further tranche of grammatical revision preceded the 1931 talk. That intervening stratum of linguistic invention has now been

Aragorn's could be for the Middle-earth of his own time.

All this is but a sample of the pleasures that await the experienced Tolkien reader by browsing through this "new" book by Tolkien. What would our experience of Middle-earth be like without over fifty years of Christopher Tolkien's stewardship of his father's legacy? Just as there might not have been a Queen in Gondor, if the ouster of Smaug and the consequent re-establishment of the kingdom of the Lonely Mountain had not hindered the Nazgûl's planned strike against Rivendell, who knows how much Tolkien scholarship there would be even today if not for Christopher's exhaustive recovery of his father's textual remnants. The presentation of the full, readable distillation of one of the most compelling tales of Middle-earth shows how re-encountering one of the saddest of stories can also be a heartening event.

<div style="text-align:right">

Nicholas Birns
The New School
New York, New York

</div>

WORKS CITED

Nagy, Gergely. "The Great Chain of Reading: (Inter-)Textual Relations and the Technique of Mythopoesis in the Túrin Story." In *Tolkien the Medievalist*, ed. Jane Chance. London: Routledge, 2003, 239-258.

———————

Early Elvish Poetry and Pre-Fëanorian Alphabets, by J.R.R. Tolkien; including "Pre-Fëanorian Alphabets, Part 1," edited by Arden R. Smith; "Early Elvish Poetry," edited by Christopher Gilson, Bill Welden and Carl F. Hostetter; "Qenya Declensions," edited by Christopher Gilson and Patrick H. Wynne; "Qenya Conjugations," edited by Christopher Gilson and Carl F. Hostetter; and "Qenya Word-lists," edited by Patrick H. Wynne and Christopher Gilson. Cupertino, CA: Parma Eldalamberon, 2006. 150pp. $30.00 (oversize paperback) [no ISBN]. *Parma Eldalamberon XVI.*

Reviewing J.R.R. Tolkien's 1920s writings on Qenya as published in *Parma Eldalamberon XIV*, I noted that they fail to shed much light on the poetry he wrote in that language at the start of the next decade: "In vain does one scrutinize the Elvish poems of Tolkien's 1931 paper on language invention, 'A Secret Vice,' hoping they will accord closely with these Qenya grammars: they do not" (Garth 251). Now the reason becomes clear: a further tranche of grammatical revision preceded the 1931 talk. That intervening stratum of linguistic invention has now been

excavated, along with the hitherto-unseen drafts of those Qenya po-
ems and their English translations. These are the first substantial Elvish
compositions extant after the poems "Narqelion" (1916) and "Sí Qente
Feanor" (*c.* 1917); and the best is vastly more ambitious, linguistically and
poetically.

But first things first. Arden R. Smith's on-going presentation of
Tolkien's invented writing systems now brings us to the latter half of the
1920s, and an evolving series of "pre-Fëanorian alphabets." Drawn from
the Valmaric of the early 1920s (see *Parma Eldalamberon XIV*), these scripts
look increasingly like the familiar *tengwar* of Fëanor, with characters often
composed of bow- and stem-combinations and arranged according to
sound-value. But the *tengwar*'s elegant matching of shape to sound has
not yet been fully achieved: to my mind the head-letters of each series in
the first "Qenyatic" chart evoke their Roman counterparts *p*, *t*, *ch*, *k*, and
q (14). On the other hand, we may also witness, I think, the antecedence
of the irregular *tengwar* for *l* (*lambë*) and *s* (*silmë*)—made of curls rather
than bows and stems—in a context where they are not irregular at all but
belong to a phonemic *t*-series entirely characterized by curls (20). Mean-
while the diacritic signs later known as the *tehtar* continue to take shape,
performing various roles, but are gradually assigned the vowel functions
they would retain in the *tengwar*.

Smith has identified several sub-groups among these alphabets and
reproduced all of Tolkien's value tables, script samples and associated
doodlings—snippets of the *Aeneid*, Nelson's famous signal-message "Eng-
land expects . . .", a nursery rhyme and, most curiously, a couple of
words from the Khasi language of eastern India. Tolkien's names for
the writing systems, Qenyatic, Falassin, Noriac, Banyaric and Sinyatic,
contain Elvish elements and therefore imply a connection with the leg-
endarium, but transcriptions of lines from "Narqelion" furnish the only
further link. I wonder whether instead he primarily intended these al-
phabets for private use, in his diaries, as he had earlier used his Rúmilian
script. A further set of "pre-Fëanorian" documents, dating from 1929, is
promised for a later issue.

The "Secret Vice" poems are presented next, by Christopher Gilson,
Bill Welden and Carl F. Hostetter. Of the three, two are slight: "Nien-
inqe" and "Earendel." The former is particularly interesting for linguistic
reasons, as we now see, because while its first draft dates back to 1921
(and depicts a sprite of Valinor who was never to resurface in the leg-
endarium), its final version comes from 1955 and appears virtually unal-
tered—despite the intervening decades Tolkien had spent niggling with
his invented languages. Here is compelling evidence of the continuity
underlying his ceaseless work in this private field, which must be regard-
ed as a process of moulding or nurturing rather than demolition and re-

building. Christopher Tolkien has already noted his father's tendency to preserve some of the oldest Elvish nomenclature through many decades while inventing fresh etymologies more congruent with later conceptions (see, for example, the note on *Ecthelion* and *Egalmoth* in *The War of the Jewels*, 318-19). In the 1955 "Nieninquë" we see the etymology and sense a word coined in 1921, *pirukendëa* "whirling lightly," rewritten in a similar way to mean "on the point of [one's] toes" (88-9).

The centerpiece of *Parma Eldalamberon XVI*, inevitably, is the manuscript history of the poem which was ultimately named "Oilima Markirya" or "The Last Ark," and which evolved into an apocalyptic vision of a ship of ghosts at the end of days. In *The Monsters and the Critics* (an essential companion volume to this issue), Christopher Tolkien presented three Elvish versions: the one read to Tolkien's audience of philologists in 1931; an earlier, ghost-free draft; and a redaction from three or four decades later. As it turns out, "Oilima Markirya" went through twelve incarnations, none precisely dateable, going back to a two-line gobbet probably written simply to illustrate syntax and grammar. Certainly at the outset Tolkien had no idea where the poem would lead. He began on familiar ground, or rather water: the hymning of a ship and the green sea that is also evidenced in the contemporary "Earendel" (and I think *tinweninqe-* "white star" or "star-white" hints that Tolkien had the star-mariner in mind briefly here as well). But the poem's true shape only emerged midway through a long metamorphosis, seemingly as much of a surprise to its author as the advent, years later, of the first Black Rider in the Shire. Green waves turn ominously dark in the poem's third draft; but it is the next that reaches for the sublime by raising terrors all around the now apparently doomed ship. The tremendous opening image of "pale phantoms / in her cold bosom / like gulls wailing" (71) was virtually the final touch, arriving in a series of English translations that veered progressively from the Qenya text.

The editors, whose job is not literary exegesis, examine the "Secret Vice" poems using the yardstick Tolkien erected for himself: their fitness as expressions of a language in a given state. As he commented in "A Secret Vice," if you are going to invent a language it is no good changing all its rules as soon as you try to say something in it:

> If you construct your art-language on chosen principles, and in so far as you fix it, and courageously abide by your own rules, resisting the temptation of the supreme despot to alter them for the assistance of this or that technical object on any given occasion, so far you may write poetry of a sort. (*MC* 218-19)

Accordingly the editors anchor the agglutinative Qenya of the "Se-

cret Vice" poems in the lexicographical, grammatical, syntactic and ety-
mological ideas upon which Tolkien founded them. Earlier phases of his
linguistic invention may have been rich in semantic and phonological
data but were sometimes set aside before the grammar was complete.
However, marshalling his tools for the "Secret Vice" poems, Tolkien ap-
pears to have been largely satisfied with his lexical corpus, and the new
wordlists here retread old ground, presumably functioning as *aides-mé-
moire*. In contrast, his work on verb- and noun-forms produced complex
revisions and paradigms of unprecedented fullness. The noun declen-
sions exhibit a proliferation of cases worthy of Tolkien's inspiration,
Finnish, with the arrival of the instrumental and partitive and then the
allative, inessive, ablative, adverbial, and two adjectival cases; among the
declension-suffixes are several which Tolkien was still using in *The Lord
of the Rings*. He is just as prolific with his verb conjugations, which also
depend on suffixes—an earlier experiment with prefixes ("Early Qenya
Grammar," *Parma Eldalamberon XIV*) having proven short-lived. Three
verb paradigms are presented here, and as the editors note, "Each . . .
consists of the forms of the verb in eight to ten categories that indicate
tense or a combination of tense and *mood*. For each of these categories
there is a set of inflections distinguishing three *numbers*, singular, dual and
plural, three *persons* and an *impersonal* form, with three *genders* in the third
person, masculine, feminine and neuter, and both exclusive and inclusive
forms of the first person dual and plural . . ." (116). In true philological
fashion, the editors have also striven to explain the orderly thought con-
cealed beneath apparent irregularities in these paradigms.

Clearly, none of this is for the faint-hearted, but for anyone who has
tried to analyze the "Secret Vice" poems in *The Monsters and the Critics*,
opening this issue of *Parma Eldalamberon* is like being drawn at last into an
inner sanctum. And the confluence of such riches—the paradigms and
the poems—is a boon for those interested in Tolkien's invented languages
or intrigued by the notion of an art-language *per se*. Here are theory and
practice side-by-side, and we can see whether Tolkien successfully avoid-
ed becoming the "supreme despot" by altering his language's rules on the
hoof for compositional ends. In fact, although he systematically adjusted
entire grammatical paradigms while preparing to write the poems, what
we do not see is piecemeal changes to the system to meet a particular
contingency *during* poetic composition: to fit a rhythm or make a rhyme.
Displaying extraordinary attention to detail (in one instance casting the
net so wide that they take in evidence from *c*. 1916 and 1972 for one verb
inflexion [*anta*, 91]), the editors find abundant evidence that the syntax
and grammar of the poetry does indeed function in accordance with
Tolkien's contemporary linguistic notions.

Tolkien was more prone to linguistic despotism in the matter of vo-

cabulary, I suspect, and would coin a word on the spot when none existed so far; perhaps also when he had rejected or even forgotten a previously invented word: "alder," which had been *(ul)uswe* in the *c.* 1915 Qenya Lexicon, is now *polonde*. For certain *hapax legomena*, the editors have not been able to provide convincing cognates, though they have certainly taken a crack at the tougher nuts (*nyuuken*, *fundu-*, *valkane*, *panya-*) from every conceivable angle. Other words have been analyzed insightfully in terms of the legendarium, or of wider philology. A precedent is found in Virgil's Latin for the use of the same word for "foot" and "sail"; while I particularly like the suggestion that Qenya *losse*, apparently cognate with older flower-words, was now applied to (moonlit) whiteness because Isil the Moon is the last bloom of the White Tree of Valinor. I wonder whether the severe constraints of writing formal verse in an invented language contributed to the visionary air of the poems, with their strange similes—"wings like stars," "sailing like a butterfly."

The larger question of where (or indeed whether) the "Last Ark" itself fits into Tolkien's mythological concepts remains mysterious. Curiously, he played with the idea that the poem was linked with the Finnish *Kalevala*, the chief original literary inspiration for his "Lost Tales": some of the Qenya texts are orthographically Finnish, with *j* for *y*, *kv* for *qu* and *aa* for *á*; while one of the English versions even mentions Tuonela, the Land of Death in the *Kalevala*. An interesting pre-1931 note outlining his private hobby lends support to the idea that prior to the "Secret Vice" talk Tolkien had already shown his invented languages to someone (92; see also *MC* 213 and 220 note 7). Do these appeals to Finnish constitute an attempt to provide that earlier audience (perhaps his former teacher R. W. Reynolds, or his Oxford colleague C. S. Lewis) with some reference point more accessible than Tolkien's unpublished legendarium?

The vision of the ship occupies a similar imaginative niche in Tolkien's evolving conceptions to the later idea of the ships of Ar-Pharazôn and Elendil sailing to their respective ends at the downfall of Númenor. The image of the wailing phantoms within the ship's chilly bosom surely harks back to the vessel that ferried mortal souls to purgatorial Arvalin in the "Lost Tales" of *c.* 1919; and thence, I suspect, back to Tolkien's own feverish voyage home from the Battle of the Somme on a hospital ship full of wounded soldiers in 1916. But none of this completely unlocks the enigma of "Oilima Markirya," with its prison-like "ark" of souls menaced by shadows from an abyssal hell that shifts or swells (*mandu túma*) as if to burst.

In the "Secret Vice" poems and their associated analytical materials, we see Tolkien laying the ground for Galadriel's High-elvish lament, *Namárië*, by forming the dry clay of his grammars into living literature. If it seems a long stretch to accept that his entire legendarium sprang from

a desire to invent languages, in his Elvish verse we can see the leap from linguistics to literature at a glance. Such poetry—especially if written in one of his invented alphabets—most fully realizes his ideal of a self-consistent "sub-created" world, because it describes that world entirely in its own terms.

<div align="right">

John Garth
London, England

</div>

WORKS CITED

Garth, John. [Review of *Early Qenya & Valmaric*, by J. R. R. Tolkien; including *Early Qenya Fragments*, edited by Patrick Wynne and Christopher Gilson; *Early Qenya Grammar*, edited by Carl F. Hostetter and Bill Welden; and *The Valmaric Script*, edited by Arden R. Smith. Cupertino, California: Parma Eldalamberon, 2003. *Parma Eldalamberon XIV.*] *Tolkien Studies* 2 (2005): 249-53.

––––––––––––

Whittingham, Elizabeth A. *The Evolution of Tolkien's Mythology: A Study of the History of Middle-earth.* Jefferson, NC, and London: McFarland & Company, 2007. xii, 230 pp. $35.00 (trade paperback) ISBN 9780786432813. Critical Explorations in Science Fiction and Fantasy, 7.

There has been no dearth of critical studies of J.R.R. Tolkien's works during the last few years, and yet relatively little attention has been focused on the twelve volumes of The History of Middle-earth. Elizabeth Whittingham, author of this current study, cites important exceptions to this lacuna in Tolkien scholarship: *A Question of Time* and *Interrupted Music* by Verlyn Flieger; *The Road to Middle-earth* and *J.R.R. Tolkien: Author of the Century* by Tom Shippey; *Tolkien's Legendarium*, edited by Verlyn Flieger and Carl Hostetter; and *J.R.R. Tolkien and his Literary Resonances*, edited by George Clark and Daniel Timmons. Whittingham acknowledges her debt to Flieger in the preface and introduction to her book, noting that Flieger's *Interrupted Music* comes closest to achieving what she sets out to do, that is to undertake "a comparison of the texts for the purpose of discovering patterns or movement in any direction" (2). Whittingham's approach is to trace Tolkien's many revisions to his legendarium over time, and through meticulous comparison and analysis of the variations, determine whether his handling of elements of myth such as cosmogony, theogony, cosmology, thanatology and eschatology evolved in a significant way.

The Evolution of Tolkien's Mythology is aimed both at an audience of specialists who are already familiar with The History of Middle-earth

a desire to invent languages, in his Elvish verse we can see the leap from linguistics to literature at a glance. Such poetry—especially if written in one of his invented alphabets—most fully realizes his ideal of a self-consistent "sub-created" world, because it describes that world entirely in its own terms.

John Garth
London, England

Works Cited

Garth, John. [Review of *Early Qenya & Valmaric,* by J. R. R. Tolkien; including *Early Qenya Fragments*, edited by Patrick Wynne and Christopher Gilson; *Early Qenya Grammar*, edited by Carl F. Hostetter and Bill Welden; and *The Valmaric Script*, edited by Arden R. Smith. Cupertino, California: Parma Eldalamberon, 2003. *Parma Eldalamberon XIV.*] *Tolkien Studies* 2 (2005): 249-53.

––––––––––––

Whittingham, Elizabeth A. *The Evolution of Tolkien's Mythology: A Study of the History of Middle-earth.* Jefferson, NC, and London: McFarland & Company, 2007. xii, 230 pp. $35.00 (trade paperback) ISBN 9780786432813. Critical Explorations in Science Fiction and Fantasy, 7.

There has been no dearth of critical studies of J.R.R. Tolkien's works during the last few years, and yet relatively little attention has been focused on the twelve volumes of The History of Middle-earth. Elizabeth Whittingham, author of this current study, cites important exceptions to this lacuna in Tolkien scholarship: *A Question of Time* and *Interrupted Music* by Verlyn Flieger; *The Road to Middle-earth* and *J.R.R. Tolkien: Author of the Century* by Tom Shippey; *Tolkien's Legendarium*, edited by Verlyn Flieger and Carl Hostetter; and *J.R.R. Tolkien and his Literary Resonances*, edited by George Clark and Daniel Timmons. Whittingham acknowledges her debt to Flieger in the preface and introduction to her book, noting that Flieger's *Interrupted Music* comes closest to achieving what she sets out to do, that is to undertake "a comparison of the texts for the purpose of discovering patterns or movement in any direction" (2). Whittingham's approach is to trace Tolkien's many revisions to his legendarium over time, and through meticulous comparison and analysis of the variations, determine whether his handling of elements of myth such as cosmogony, theogony, cosmology, thanatology and eschatology evolved in a significant way.

The Evolution of Tolkien's Mythology is aimed both at an audience of specialists who are already familiar with The History of Middle-earth

and for whom this book can serve as a very useful teaching and reference tool—the author provides a synthesis of themes as treated in each work, accompanied by insightful exegetical commentary—and at an audience of readers whose knowledge of Tolkien's mythology is limited to their familiarity with *The Hobbit*, *The Lord of the Rings*, and perhaps *The Silmarillion*. Having taught a large lecture course on the subject of "Myth and Legend in the work of J.R.R. Tolkien" to undergraduate students whose prior contact with Tolkien's mythology ranged from the superficial (those students who had only seen Peter Jackson's films) to the arcane (those students who knew by heart the complete genealogies presented in the Appendices of *The Silmarillion*), I wish I could have had Whittingham's study as a ready reference to satisfy the needs of both groups.

In order to facilitate her discussion of a complex body of work spanning nearly sixty years and to track more efficiently changes which Tolkien made to both the physical and the metaphysical aspects of his vast sub-creation, Whittingham breaks down Tolkien's writing into six chronological stages: 1914-1920; 1920-1935; 1937-1938; 1938-1948; 1948-1959; and 1960-1973. With the exception of Chapter 1, "Influences in Tolkien's Life," the chapters are grouped according to types of myth. Chapter 2, "Tolkien's Mythology of Creation," offers an analysis of "The Music of the Ainur" (1918-1920), and both the early (late 1930s) and the later (late 1940s) version of the "Ainulindalë." In this chapter, the author stresses the disappearance of a narrative framework in Tolkien's creation myth, which has the overall effect of presenting the reader with a text that may be less accessible, because of the absence of a mediating character, but which is more "primal" and "stark" in that it "describes the solitary presence of Eru, the One" (56-57). This evolution in Tolkien's cosmogony brings it closer to Book of Genesis than to the works containing creation myths from which he also drew inspiration, such as Hesiod's *Theogony*, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, the *Poetic Edda* and the *Kalevala*. In Chapter 3, "Tolkien's Mythology of Divine Beings," Whittingham traces the various incarnations of the Ainur, the Maia and the Valar from "The Coming of the Valar and the Building of Valinor" (1918-1920) to the "Valaquenta" (late 1950s), noting that ". . . Tolkien's initial description of these divine beings, their activities, and their palaces resembles that of pagan gods and goddesses, but his later portrayals increase their similarity to biblical angels" (64). Chapter 4, "The Physical World of Middle-earth and of Eä" highlights Tolkien's apparent hesitation between a flat-earth cosmology and a more rational, scientifically plausible, global shape for Middle-earth. For Whittingham, Tolkien's uncertainty as to which form the physical landscape of his sub-created universe should take reveals his struggle to reconcile his personal preference for epics and myths expressing a pagan, primitive understanding of the world with his desire to

create a mythology for England which could be accepted by "people of a modern, scientific age." Because Tolkien's cosmology is only reflected in "sentences and paragraphs scattered through the various tales that he wrote between World War I and his death in 1973" (107), thus lacking (according to Whittingham) "a coherent textual history," she is unable to trace a clear pattern or evolution in the way in which Tolkien conceived his universe. She therefore concludes that Tolkien's goal of creating "a mythology that the twentieth-century English could read and accept as their own" (122) was unsuccessful. (I shall return to this point later.)

Throughout the last three chapters of the *The Evolution of Tolkien's Mythology* it becomes clear that the strongest pattern that Whittingham has uncovered in her study of The History of Middle-earth is a steady movement away from the archetypes and structures of ancient pagan myths, towards a mythology for the modern era which includes more elements inspired by biblical texts. Chapter 5, "Death and Immortality among Elves and Men," is both a comparative study of the thanatology found in Judeo-Christian theology, Classical and Nordic mythology, and Tolkien's work, and an exploration of Tolkien's increasing preoccupation with metaphysical matters such as the destiny of the soul after death. Of great interest is Whittingham's discussion of "Athrabeth Finrod Ah Andreth" drafted during Whittingham's fifth stage (1948-59) of Tolkien's trajectory as a writer and published by Christopher Tolkien in *Morgoth's Ring*, the tenth volume of The History of Middle-earth. This text consists of a debate between Finrod and a mortal woman, Andreth, and revolves around issues such as whether death was given to mortals as a gift or as a punishment in consequence of a fall from grace, and whether Eru has abandoned both Men and Elves to their fate, or will bring about the healing of Arda. The tone of the debate, which "alternates between hopefulness and doubt or despair" (159), the eventuality of the restoration of Arda after its destruction, and the possibility of Ilúvatar's intervention in the fate of Middle-earth is, in Whittingham's analysis, the closest approximation to Christian theology that can be found in Tolkien's legendarium. Whittingham also notes that while Tolkien never fully abandoned his concept of reincarnation among the Elves, the only Elf in his entire legendarium who returns to Middle-earth is Glorfindel, who is slain in battle for Gondolin at the End of the First Age as recounted in "The Fall of Gondolin" (1916-17) and then reappears in *The Fellowship of The Ring*, in which he helps lead Frodo and the company to Rivendell. The implication here is since reincarnation is not a tenet of Christian theology, Tolkien maintained this possibility as a way of preserving the immortal nature of the Elves, but did not apply it to any characters other than Glorfindel.

It is not difficult to see in the titles of Chapters 6, "The Last Days

of Middle-earth," and 7,"The Final Victory," an evocation of the "End Times" and "Rapture" as prophesied in the eschatological writings of Christianity. Indeed, Whittingham draws attention to the image of Satan as a "great red dragon" in Revelation (12.3) and the "Great Dragon of Morgoth" which will be slain by Túrin in the Last Battle. But what Whittingham sees as Tolkien's most significant evolution in his mythology during the fifth and sixth stages of his writings is his elaboration of a remaking or healing of Arda after the Last Battle, and his increasing use of the theme of hope and the goodness of Eru. To support her thesis, Whittingham focuses on "Myths Transformed," a section of *Morgoth's Ring* containing short notes in which, as she argues, Tolkien went back over "certain concepts essential to his mythology" (187), but also "made some of his last modifications to the legendarium" (188). Counter to Christopher Tolkien, who expressed reluctance to read these minor changes as a definitive version of the eschatology of Middle-earth, Whittingham argues that it was not just because of his deeply felt Catholicism but also in response to letters from his readers that Tolkien explored the idea of an Arda Healed emerging after the defeat of Melkor in the Last Battle.

All of this discussion of comparative mythology and theology is quite dense, and Whittingham's command of both the ancient texts and Tolkien's voluminous legendarium is impressive. Following in the footsteps of Tom Shippey, Jane Chance, Verlyn Flieger, Marjorie Burns and other Tolkien scholars who have analyzed the mythology of Tolkien's universe, Whittingham provides her readers with a solid survey of Tolkien's sources, to which she adds a chronological tracking of the influence of these sources on the evolution of Tolkien's own mythology. But as convincing as the author's argument that Judeo-Christian theology had an increasingly important influence on the shaping and reshaping of many aspects of Tolkien's legendarium may be, I must take issue with some of her other claims. In Chapter 4, in which the author examines Tolkien's revisions to the physical world of Middle-earth and of Eä, she concludes that because he did not arrive at a decisive geographical conception of his secondary world, "he found that his mythology was not relevant to people of a modern, scientific age" (122). In the final chapter, however, Whittingham states that Tolkien "does not forget that what he started out to write was a mythology" and that he "worked so that his mythology would achieve the 'inner consistency of reality'"(193). It is in this context that Whittingham stresses the enormous role that Tolkien's readers had in prompting him to rethink, revise and refine some of the more complex elements of his mythology, such as immortality versus mortality, the separate destinies of the souls of Elves and Men, and the fate of Arda after the Last Battle. The majority of Tolkien's revisions to such discussions occurred after the publication of *The Lord of the Rings*, during the fifth and

sixth stages of his writing career, when readers were especially hungry to learn more about the peoples of Middle-earth. Thus, for example, one of the last modifications that Tolkien made to his legendarium includes a brief new section about the Dwarves (published in *The War of the Jewels*) in which they help Aulë remake Middle-earth. The fact that the inhabitants of Tolkien's secondary world who were the most uniquely his own creation—Tolkien's Elves and Dwarves, but also Hobbits and Ents, who are not treated here—stimulated such interest and discussion among his readers is an indicator of the success of Tolkien's mythology. Had Tolkien truly failed in his effort to write a mythology that was relevant to readers of the modern age, not only would his works have had little success with the public at large, but there would not be such diversity of approaches among the critical perspectives on his work. "The Final Victory," to quote the title of Whittingham's last chapter, is Tolkien's, and it has been won with the help of an army of readers.

Deidre A. Dawson
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Thompson, Kristen. *The Frodo Franchise: "The Lord of the Rings" and Modern Hollywood*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007. xxii, 400 pp. $29.95 (hardcover) **ISBN** 9780520247741.

Kristen Thompson is well known within the field of film studies for her work on the popular textbooks *Film Art: An Introduction* (2006, 8th ed.) and *Film History: An Introduction* (2002, 2nd revised ed.), both co-written with her partner, renowned film scholar David Bordwell, as well as for a number of influential essays. Now Thompson has applied her extensive knowledge of film and her penchant for rigorous research to the writing of a new book, *The Frodo Franchise: "The Lord of the Rings" and Modern Hollywood*, on the making, marketing and reception of Peter Jackson's trilogy of films based on J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*. This is not a work of film theory or criticism but a combination industry study, reception study, cultural study, history, and study of new media that provides a nearly complete picture of the *Rings* film phenomenon, including its world-wide financial and technological impact on the motion picture industry and the cultural impact on its audience.

With this text, Thompson covers a surprisingly broad range of topics while managing to discuss each in depth. Over seventy-five people were interviewed for this book, many of them numerous times, including: director Peter Jackson, producers, screenwriters, cast members, de-

signers, crew members, publicity people, effects supervisors, propmakers, distributors, documentary filmmakers, fans, film critics, politicians in New Zealand (where the films were made), webmasters, and video game producers—to name only a sample. Thompson also traveled to New Zealand three times, where she was given unprecedented access (for a film scholar) to the people and facilities involved in the pre-production, production and post-production of the films.

Just some of the topics covered in *The Frodo Franchise* include: the rights issues involving *The Lord of the Rings*, how the production deal was made, financing, distribution, the approaches to marketing and publicity, adaptation, motivations and inspirations of the artists and artisans involved, special effects, shooting, merchandising, fandom, the internet, the economic effect on the country of New Zealand and the professional effect of working on the film for the people involved. Not surprisingly, it takes nearly 400 pages to accomplish this, and Thompson confesses that there was much more she would have liked to include.

In spite of the broad scope and significant length of *The Frodo Franchise*, Thompson has produced a lively and quick read that should appeal to scholars and fans alike. The author accomplishes this by combining biographical, historical and technical information with excerpts from new interviews and heretofore unheard anecdotes, without dwelling on facts and figures or dry chronicling of events. Throughout the text, and especially when introducing a new topic, Thompson draws upon her knowledge of film history, film production and the workings of the motion picture industry to provide even the layman with a comfortable foundation from which to understand the topic in regard to *The Lord of the Rings*, as well as a context to appreciate the production as a unique and ground-breaking venture. Thompson's approach is somewhat biographical, providing background on a number of important figures involved (including Jackson), as well as autobiographical. She does not shy away from letting her own feelings for Tolkien's writing and the film adaptations be known. She herself was admittedly a fan at the start, and one of those "built-in audience members" ready to see the film. The text is infused with not only her own passion, but much of the obvious enthusiasm for Tolkien's novel that those involved in production and marketing also felt. Thompson manages to provide the reader with a feeling of what it might have been like to "be there" during the filmmaking process, the media (including internet) promotion, the first screenings, and the resulting audience reaction that resulted in an enormous merchandising campaign and worldwide internet community of fans.

The book should be of interest to film scholars involved in industry, reception, fandom, popular culture in general, and media studies, as well as to fans of the films and members of the motion picture industry—but

what of more literary types and Tolkien scholars? Though the film realization of Tolkien's world and characters has been examined at length in TV documentaries, DVD supplements, the *Official Movie Guides* and *Visual Companion* texts and numerous articles and interviews, there is a wealth of new information on this subject in *The Frodo Franchise*. Of greatest interest, however, may be the sections that include interviews Thompson conducted with director/screenwriter Jackson and screenwriter Philippa Boyens regarding the adaptation of Tolkien's work to the big screen. In these interviews, Thompson asks some very pointed questions regarding their general approach to adapting *The Lord of the Rings* to film as well as about specific instances where changes were made in the story and characters. Instead of brushing these questions off, Jackson and Boyens answer them candidly, thoughtfully, and thoroughly, demonstrating that every detail of the adaptation process was seriously and carefully considered.

The Frodo Franchise may be encyclopedic in scope, but it is not in structure. Thompson organizes the book into four parts with a number of chapters each. The titles of some of the parts and chapters could be frustrating to those who wish to use the book as a reference since they are a bit too cryptic to give a clear idea what they are about. Also, while one may expect merchandising to be discussed in the part entitled "Building the Franchise," the majority of that information appears in "Beyond the Movie." Another difficulty to using the book as a reference (and citation) is that there are a number of topics that Thompson does not cover in their entirety in any one chapter, or even section. Discussions of subjects such as fandom, publicity, special effects, audience reception, the worldwide web, and design crop up in various places throughout the book. In addition, Thompson sometimes moves abruptly from subject to subject, even within chapters. That said, I do not believe Thompson meant the book to be used specifically as a reference, and the structure and style actually contributes to making it a dynamic read and therefore was probably carefully considered and planned.

Part One, "The Film," is comprised of three chapters. In the first chapter Thompson provides a detailed history of the movie rights for *The Lord of the Rings*, and how Jackson was finally able to make the films, including the story of the passing of rights from Saul Zaentz to Miramax and finally to New Line Cinema. This is one of the most interesting sections of the book, chronicling the trials and tribulations Jackson went through and describing how the films almost did not get made. The chapter continues, presenting explanations of the how the films were financed, cast, and crewed. Thompson then describes the premiere of the first teaser for distributors at the Cannes Film Festival (screened in a castle with Nazgûl riding on horseback in the mist outside), where she

does an excellent job of capturing the feeling of stress the filmmakers were experiencing and the pressure that New Line was under. Thompson then describes the recent fortunes and misfortunes of the motion picture industry in general, and New Line Cinema in particular, that led up to the production and release of the films, and ends the chapter with *The Return of the King* receiving the Oscar for Best Picture.

The next chapter, "Not Your Father's Tolkien," covers audience reception, adaptation, and genre issues, with some very interesting insights into Jackson's motivations behind making the film and inspirations regarding design, characterizations and even shot selection (camera angles, camera movement, shot size, coverage of action within a shot, and composition).

In the third chapter, "Handcrafting a Blockbuster," Thompson concentrates (mostly) on the production of the films, replete with anecdotes regarding Jackson's non-Hollywood-style working method and tensions between New Line and the filmmakers. Along the way, Thompson provides: insight into the personalities of many of the people involved in the film, from Jackson to actors and many of the crew; a glimpse of what it is like to work as a director for Hollywood; information on how the film industry operates; a description of how Jackson built up his Wellington, New Zealand production complex; interviews with distributors and the co-founder of TheOneRing.net; and an account of the process of digital design.

Part Two, "Building the Franchise," is primarily concerned with branding, the press, and "infotainment." Chapter Four, "Flying Billboards and FAQs," involves brand partnering (cross-promotional tie-ins), the making of documentaries, TV specials, DVD supplements, and a detailed discussion of press kits and press junkets (which includes an informative and entertaining description of what a press junket is all about).

The next two chapters, "Click to View Trailer," and "Fans on the Margins, Pervy Hobbit Fanciers, and Partygoers," concentrate for the most part on the development of web-based marketing and publicity, the internet fan-base, and fandom in general as it pertains to the films, proceeding roughly from that which was controllable by the studio to that which was definitely not. Thompson goes into depth regarding the many related subjects, including: New Line's official *Lord of the Rings* website; independent fansites; the deal with E! Online; Ian McKellen's web posted "diary" (McKellen.com); Ain't It Cool News; TheOneRing.net; the filmmakers' and actors' involvement with the web; individual fans' webpages; "fanfiction" and "fanart"; chatrooms, bulletin boards, and live get-togethers in RL (real life).

Part Three, entitled "Beyond the Movie," is divided into two chapters. Chapter Seven, "Licenses to Print Money," focuses on the range

of ancillary markets that *The Lord of the Rings* became involved in—including merchandising (from toys, costumes, and trading cards to video games, props and books), museum exhibits, and conventions—and concludes with a detailed section on the variety of DVD versions that have been released (including sales statistics).

Chapter Eight, "Interactive Middle-earth," is devoted to a more detailed account of *The Lord of the Rings* and the interactive gaming market, including the deal-making, the production of the games, actors' involvement, marketing, sales, and audience reception.

The fourth (and final) part of the book, "The Lasting Power of the Rings," contains the two concluding chapters, Chapter Nine, "Fantasy Come True," and Chapter Ten, "Right in Your own Backyard." In these chapters Thompson relates the importance of *The Lord of the Rings* due to its powerful influence on many aspects of the motion picture industry around the world as well as its impact on New Zealand and the people involved in its production. Thompson credits these films for many advances: changing the face of independent production and bolstering independent film financing around the world; generating cutting-edge digital effects technology and advancing production communication techniques; significantly boosting the economy in New Zealand, supporting the creation of a self contained state-of the art production facility in Wellington ("Wellywood"), and perhaps saving New Line from being absorbed into Warner Brothers; and, along with the Harry Potter films, raising fantasy films to a new level of popularity and respectability. Throughout the chapters, Thompson explains these effects and contributions (and others) in detail.

Much of this book may sound overly detailed or like an extensive laundry list, but Thompson treats the material with an easy, personal, conversational tone that tells the epic story (complete with heroes, villains, obstacles, and rising action) of the epic film venture that is *The Lord of the Rings*. *The Frodo Franchise* is chock-full of information, interesting and at times even exciting to read, and ultimately satisfying.

<div align="right">

Dyrk Ashton
The University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio

</div>

The History of The Hobbit, by John D. Rateliff. London: HarperCollins, 2007. *Part One: Mr. Baggins*. xl, 468 pp. £20.00 (hardcover) ISBN 9780007235551. *Part Two: Return to Bag End*. vi, 469-905 pp. £20.00 (hardcover) ISBN 9780007250660. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2007. *Part One: Mr. Baggins*. xl, 468 pp. $35.00 (hardcover) ISBN 9780618968473. *Part Two: Return to Bag End*. vi, 469-905 pp. $35.00 (hardcover) ISBN 9780618969197.

"Alas for the lost lore," Tolkien wrote in his 1936 *Beowulf* lecture, "the annals and old poets that Virgil knew, and only used in the making of a new thing!" Tolkien may not have been entirely sincere in his lament, for elsewhere he recommends appreciating the work one has rather than demanding to know where it came from. But in any case he himself has been more fortunate than Virgil, and far more fortunate in this respect than the *Beowulf*-poet. One of the many things these two volumes by John Rateliff do is to lead us into the very engine-room of creation. Some things we can never know, such as how the word "hobbit" came into Tolkien's mind; but against that it can fairly be said that we now know more about the gestation, if not the genesis of *The Hobbit*, than we do about almost any other work of any period.

The best-known version of "the history of *The Hobbit*" was, till now, the one given to us in Humphrey Carpenter's biography. In 1977 Carpenter published the famous story of Tolkien "sitting by the window in the study at Northmoor Road," laboriously marking exam papers, finding a blank sheet, and suddenly and impulsively writing on it "In a hole in the ground there lived a hobbit," without at that stage knowing in the slightest what a "hobbit" might be. Carpenter went on to say, quoting Tolkien, that the study was in number 20 Northmoor Road, not number 22, so that it must have been begun in or after the summer of 1930; that Tolkien "wrote the story fluently and with little hesitation" (178); that it was left unfinished apart from some plot notes, and an impromptu conclusion delivered orally to his children; and that it remained so until Tolkien's student Elaine Griffiths borrowed the incomplete manuscript and passed it on to a friend at Allen & Unwin, who urged him to complete it for publication.

Even this account, however, raises some issues. Tolkien's elder sons, John and Michael, retained clear memories of hearing the story told to them in the study at 22 Northmoor Road, i.e. before the summer of 1930. C.S. Lewis saw and read a version—Carpenter says, "lacking only the final chapters"—in, again according to Carpenter, late 1932. And Carpenter says that the version sent to the publishers was a complete typescript done one-handed by the teenage Michael Tolkien (who had cut himself badly on broken glass), which seems a rather casual arrange-

ment for a notoriously finicky author. One cannot blame Carpenter for any defects in the story, for he was relying on the memories of the author and his family, with what looks like a fairly sketchy survey of some of the manuscript material, much of it already delivered to Marquette University. But in these circumstances, one has to look at the documents, and that is what John Rateliff has done, with immense care, thoroughness, and a great deal of illuminating and often amusing commentary.

To begin with, Rateliff is quite sure that the work was "begun in the summer of 1930 and completed in January 1933" (xx). A letter by C. S. Lewis dated 4th February shows that he had read the whole work, and liked it, apart from the ending, about which he was uncertain (one wonders why). As a result of his study of the materials collected at Marquette, Rateliff furthermore divides Tolkien's work on *The Hobbit* into five "phases." Phase 1 is represented by two texts, a six-page manuscript fragment which Rateliff calls "The Pryftan Fragment," after the name given there for the dragon, and a twelve-page typescript which Rateliff calls "The Bladorthin Typescript," after the name originally given to the wizard (the dwarf-leader, at this stage, being called Gandalf, not Thorin). The "Fragment" starts about half-way through chapter I, and continues almost to its close, while the "Typescript" starts at the beginning and runs on for a couple of pages after the start of the "Fragment."

The texts which Rateliff classes as Phase 2 consist of (a) a manuscript which follows on directly from the "Bladorthin Typescript," consisting of 106 foolscap pages, and (b) a further 49 pages written on pages probably torn from unused examination booklets. Rateliff remarks that Carpenter's well-known portrait of Tolkien plugging on with *The Hobbit* at the end of a long day's work at the university, working into the night and writing for economy's sake on the backs of salvaged examination scripts, is fanciful. It was only when he was writing *The Lord of the Rings*, in the wartime paper shortage, that Tolkien cannibalized students' scripts; and *The Hobbit* was mostly written in short bursts during university vacations. These Phase 2 manuscripts take us past the death of Smaug (chapter XIV in the published version) and on to the emergence of the dwarves from the Lonely Mountain after Smaug's departure (chapter XIII in the published version): Tolkien decided to reverse the order of these two chapters as he came to Phase 3.

Phase 3 texts then consist of (a) a typescript of chapters I through XII, and part of XIV, which closely follows the manuscript version of Phase 2, (b) a manuscript version of chapter XIII, now complete, and (c) a manuscript of the rest of chapter XIV and on to the end. A confusion-factor here is the existence of two typescripts, the one just mentioned which dovetails with further manuscript, labeled by Rateliff as "First Typescript," and a complete typescript which he calls "Second Type-

script." Scholars have long been puzzled by the fact that this "Second Typescript" seems in some respects earlier than "First Typescript," but also contains late additions. The answer, found by Rateliff's colleague the late Taum Santoski, is that "Second Typescript" is the one made one-handed by Michael Tolkien. It incorporated many of the additions and corrections made to "First Typescript" by Tolkien, but because it was done in a hurry by an inexpert and handicapped typist, Tolkien went back to the by this time rather battered "First Typescript," continued to make corrections to that, and sent this composite typescript/manuscript to the printers, retaining "Second Typescript" (with further corrections scrupulously written in) as a final backup.

That takes the story up to first publication in 1937, but as Tolkien worked his way through *The Lord of the Rings* he began to consider the contradictions between that work and the earlier one, especially those in chapter V, the riddle-contest with Gollum which leads to Bilbo's acquisition of the Ring—in the first edition won fair and square, for Gollum put it up as his stake (not knowing that Bilbo had it already), but from the second edition of 1951 on, acquired under more dubious circumstances, with neither party playing absolutely fair. Tolkien drafted a rewrite of this scene in 1944 and sent it to Allen & Unwin in 1947. He meant Allen & Unwin only to make a series of rather minor corrections, but sent them his redrafted chapter as a specimen of what he would like to do, not expecting them to act on it. But by a fortunate misunderstanding Allen & Unwin lumped in the major correction with the minor ones, and did them all, thus giving the world (as Rateliff remarks) possibly the most famous and critical scene in the book.

Rateliff counts the 1947 rewrite as Phase 4, while Phase 5 is a further rewrite, in 1960, of the first two chapters only. As shown by the "Quest of Erebor" section in *Unfinished Tales*, Tolkien had been brooding on how and why Gandalf came to choose such an unlikely candidate as Bilbo, especially at what came later to be seen as a strategically significant moment: his answer was to shift the narration more to the point of view of Gandalf and the dwarves, with the unfortunate effect of making Bilbo seem increasingly ridiculous, someone who has to be jolted into action for his own good, and selected mainly on the grounds of his Tookish and adventurous bloodline. Tolkien showed his revisions to an unknown female friend, who replied cogently with something like, "This is wonderful, but it's not *The Hobbit*" (812), thus putting an end to what would not have been a successful experiment. We can be grateful to her, but Rateliff has no suggestion to offer as to who she was. (Could it have been the notoriously plain-spoken Naomi Mitchison?) Some further corrections were made for the third edition of 1966, and others have been made since, but Rateliff does not think these amount to a "Sixth Phase."

What Rateliff has given us is complete texts of Phases 1, 4 and 5, with in between—and taking up most of the two volumes—a text of the manuscripts of Phases 2 and 3 combined (the Phase 3 typescript being essentially a fair copy of the Phase 2 manuscript). He notes that he has recorded "all revisions to the manuscript page itself" but not "changes between the manuscript and the typescript(s), since these invariably move the story closer to its familiar published form" (xxv) though some especially significant additions are noted from any stage up to page proofs, the longest being an eight-page typed addition to the Mirkwood chapter, "The Enchanted Stream." Rateliff also includes plates of the first map made by Tolkien (frontispiece to volume 1), and of the contract given to Bilbo, written in "tengwar" script (frontispieces to volume 2), with many other illustrations, transcripts of four sets of Phase 2 plot-notes, and four appendices on, respectively, the possible origin of the word "hobbit" in the nineteenth-century *Denham Tracts*, Tolkien's 1938 letter to *The Observer*, the Eddic poem *Dvergatal* from which Tolkien derived his dwarf-names, and his correspondence with the well-known children's author Arthur Ransome. For ease of reference, Rateliff presents the Phase 2/3 text according to the chapters of the published version, though chapter-breaks were not added till the typescript of Phase 3, and follows each chapter with notes on the text, then with extended discussion of particular points, and finally with notes on those extended discussions. As said at the start of this review, it is a process carried out with immense care, and represents what must have been a heroic labor of disentanglement. In the end, though, what do we learn from it?

Any comment here must inevitably represent a small selection of what there is to learn, but some unexpected revelations are these. First, in the "Pryftan Fragment" Tolkien was (if one remembers his later reputation) rather unconcerned about names. The map, when it comes in, is ascribed to Gandalf's grandfather—that is to say, at this stage before the name "Gandalf" was transferred from dwarf-leader to wizard, to Thorin Oakenshield's grandfather—but instead of being called by the appropriately dwarvish name Thror, he is called "Fimbulfambi." This name, like the other dwarf-names, comes from the Old Norse Eddic poems, but as Rateliff points out, it comes from the poem *Hávamál* and means "great fool": *fimbulfambi* is what rude Vikings called poor conversationalists, *sá er fátt kann segja*, "he who can say little." This is mightily inappropriate: Tolkien must just have liked the strange sound of the name. There is no particular point, meanwhile, in the name first given to Smaug, "Pryftan." One could make out an argument for the suitability of the elvish name, Bladorthin, for the wizard—it seems to mean much the same as "Mithrandir"—but it was a better idea to give him an Eddic dwarf-name which seems slightly out of place, as if the product of an

old misunderstanding, giving Thorin another dwarf-name but marking him out by the nickname "Oakenshield." Tolkien's second thoughts were often improvements.

Rateliff notes further that another and rather unexpected problem for Tolkien was keeping the "Silmarillion" out of the story: the "Lay of Leithian," in particular, was fresh in his mind. Beren and Lúthien are mentioned in the first complete version of chapter I, but were deleted. As Rateliff says, Tolkien soon saw that he was creating insuperable problems of chronology. He also toyed with the idea that the Arkenstone was a rediscovered Silmaril, but again and wisely abandoned it. For much of the time, however, the text given runs on without very much deviation from the text as finally printed. The riddles are virtually identical, the finding of the Ring is the same. Beorn appears originally as "Medwed," i.e. Russian *medved*, "honey-eater,"—a word Tolkien probably got from R. W. Chambers's discussion of replacements for the taboo-word "bear," among which he included Beowulf, "bee-wolf"—but otherwise shows little change. The fairly familiar text is however enlivened by Rateliff's continuing discussions of the issues raised, such as, to give only a few, the nature of trolls, giants and goblins, wolves, wargs, eagles and spiders, bears and the Norse hero Bothvar Bjarki, carrocks and Radagast and the Arkenstone, and the motif of "the black arrow." The thoroughness of the research—much of it, as Rateliff notes, the product of fannish industry over the years—can be seen in the comment on the illustration of Beorn's hall. There are two versions of this, as drawn by Tolkien, an earlier and a later one, the latter (slightly simpler) being the one used in the published text. It was realized in 1990 that the earlier one was based on a picture in the 1927 *Introduction to Old Norse* brought out by Tolkien's collaborator E. V. Gordon. But since then further research showed that Gordon got it from an earlier work by Andreas Heusler, who had got it from a German translation of a still earlier work by Axel Olrik, who had taken it from a completely forgotten pamphlet in Icelandic—which does, however, identify the original illustrator, based on a carefully-prepared model of an Icelandic room c. 1000 AD in the National Museum at Copenhagen: all this scrupulously recorded, though I would add that the work by Olrik cannot have been "Denmark's Heroic Songs," as stated, i.e. *Danmarks heltedigtning*, but must have been his less well-known *Nordisk Aandsliv i Vikingetid*, translated into German as Rateliff says as *Danmarks Geistesleben*.

Problems set in for Tolkien as he neared the end, and one can see that, as with *The Lord of the Rings*, Tolkien solved such problems only as he came to them, without a clear initial design. How was Smaug to be killed? In "Plot Notes B," written just before chapter IX, Bilbo "goes in and kills dragon as it sleeps [*added*: exhausted after battle] with a spear" (364). This

does not seem a good solution, for though Bilbo may come to be a hero, he never looks like a Hero. Nevertheless, Tolkien tried again, writing in "Plot Notes C," just before chapter XII, "Bilbo [takes >] plunges in his little magic knife" (496). In the Phase 3 manuscript of chapter XIII (as said above, placed after chapter XIV in Phase 2 and there incomplete), Tolkien suddenly introduced Bard with his black arrow, though having brought him in he almost immediately wrote him out, for Smaug crashes on the town, not into the lake, "And that was the end of Smaug and Esgaroth and Bard." However, Tolkien then immediately thought again and changed the last two words to "but not of Bard"—Rateliff notes, "as significant a change within such a small space of words as he achieved anywhere within the book" (549).

One major effect is that Bard's survival allows the long negotiation-scene in chapter XVI, and this in turn becomes part of the theme of "the dragon-sickness" which affects Thorin, and which Rateliff notes as a Phase III innovation. The "Jem [sic] of Girion" (496) appears in "Plot Notes C," but only in "Plot Notes D" does the idea surface that Bilbo might hand it over to Bard, as a bargaining counter. It has been suggested before that chapters XIII and XV through XIX have a different feel from the rest of the book, more somber and less playful, and this seems to have been a result of major reconsideration at the end of Phase 2. Yet in some ways Tolkien's original conception remained unaltered. One can, for instance, see a steady growth in Bilbo's status through the book, from the timid little "grocer" of the start to the accepted and honored companion of the end. Bilbo shows increasing courage and self confidence in a number of scenes: alone in the dark in the goblin tunnel, emerging and deciding it is his duty to return for the dwarves, killing the giant spider on his own, making himself go on down the tunnel to Smaug on his first raid, and finally showing true "moral courage" when he hands over the Arkenstone. All these scenes are on their first appearance very much as in the published version, with one significant exception. In the published version there is an added irony in that just after Bilbo has decided he must "go back into the horrible, horrible tunnels and look for his friends," he hears one of the dwarves saying, "If we have to go back now into those abominable tunnels to look for him, then drat him, I say" (*H* 137-8). In the Phase 2 manuscript, the dwarves grumble and complain, but agree with Bladorthin that they must return. In brief, one may say that as he wrote on Tolkien downplayed the dwarves as he found plausible ways to elevate Bilbo. It is the more surprising that twenty-odd years later, in Phase 5, he was going in the opposite (and wrong) direction.

Do we now have a final, ultimate text of *The Hobbit*? It took nearly sixty years for Tolkien's slip over the dates of Durin's Day to be corrected. Were there others? In the Phase 2 manuscript Gollum says to Bilbo, af-

ter seeing the sword, "Praps ye sits here and chats with it a bitsy," and this remained all the way through to 1995, when "ye" was corrected to "we." Rateliff thinks the change was unfortunate, as lacking manuscript authority, but it makes a good deal more sense. However, in that section Gollum's idiosyncratic use of pronouns is never quite consistent: he usually refers to Bilbo as "it," but twice says "he." Almost the first thing he says is, in manuscript and in published text, "I guess 'tis [it's] a choice feast. . ." (155; *H* 120). But Gollum thereafter calls himself "we," never (as far as I can tell) "I." Should these pronouns be changed, in the interest of consistency? In which case one might want to go further and tidy up Gollum's idiosyncratic plurals, "handses," "pocketses," but "eggses" only in published text, not in manuscript. "Guesseses" also appears only in published text, but there is never any extension to "riddleses," for instance. The trolls' non-standard language also caused trouble, with Tolkien, in manuscript, wobbling between "you" and "yer," "yourself" and "yerself." In the end he got this right, but all authors who have tried it know that non-standard language is hard to get past copy-editors and proof-readers, all so used to "correcting" authors' English that they do it automatically—even when, if I may speak personally, they know no more about English grammar and the English language than may be derived from faded memories of a low-level course ineptly taught by a reluctant adjunct professor on the basis of old academic folk-belief. Rateliff notes on page 58 Tolkien's brisk reaction to the proof-reader of *Lord of the Rings* who wanted to change "Bob ought to learn his cat the fiddle" to "teach"—"correct," but wrong just the same. Possibly it is now time to leave the text of *The Hobbit* well alone.

As can be seen from the above, Rateliff's work will take a great deal of digesting, but remains, just the same, vital primary evidence for scholarship, as well as (through its notes and discussions) great entertainment for any of Tolkien's legions of fans. One cannot praise sufficiently the dedication with which Rateliff has carried through his difficult and extensive task. It accordingly seems grudging at this stage to note minor slips, but Perth is not "on Scotland's east coast" (860) but well inland. On page 147 *Piers Plowman* was not written by Gower but by Langland (and it remains odd that Tolkien should have paid as little attention as he did to this poem, written in his preferred native English alliterative tradition by a poet from his home county of Worcestershire, though he knew it and even imitated it in a poem now mostly lost: the point deserves further attention).

Finally, Rateliff three times mentions Lewis's use of the Norse word *heimsókn* with reference to the "shift of tone" of the last chapters, and on the third occasion ventures to correct him, page 281, "Lewis's use of the term here is ill-chosen." Rateliff says that *heimsókn* is "the defense

of a hall," whereas Lewis was talking about the attack on Toad Hall by Badger and Company in *The Wind in the Willows*. But actually Lewis got it right, and Rateliff has been misinformed. *Heimsókn*, literally "home-seeking," can just mean "a visit" but more often "an inroad, an attack." In all probability it was Tolkien who taught Lewis the word. Interestingly it survives almost unaltered in the modern Scottish legal term "hamesucken," the crime—so the Four Wise Clerks of Oxenford tell us—"of assaulting a person in his own house or dwelling-place." Tolkien is very likely to have known this, for he thought highly of John Buchan, and the word is used at the climactic moment of Buchan's 1930 novel *Castle Gay*, where the rascally republican Evallonians are faced down by Dickson McCunn, the Glasgow grocer and archetypal *bourgeois*. Ignoring their revolvers, Mc-Cunn reminds the revolutionaries that they are guilty of "hamesucken," and the strange alien syllables cast a daunting chill. Buchan's celebration of *bourgeois* values, and, in the teeth of Marxist "class consciousness," of the essential unity of aristocrats, *bourgeois* and workers (Thorin and Bilbo, Frodo and Sam, one might say), was very congenial to Tolkien, and Mc-Cunn the grocer may have formed one element in the creation of Bilbo. Nor is "hamesucken" the only odd word that may have been borrowed by the Inklings from Buchan: another point that deserves further attention. But of these there are many. Perhaps the very best feature of this remarkable labor of love—beautifully produced, and with many remarkable illustrations—is that it sets the stage, and provides the evidence, for innumerable further discoveries.

<div align="right">

Tom Shippey
Saint Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri

</div>

———————

of a hall," whereas Lewis was talking about the attack on Toad Hall by Badger and Company in *The Wind in the Willows*. But actually Lewis got it right, and Rateliff has been misinformed. *Heimsókn*, literally "home-seeking," can just mean "a visit" but more often "an inroad, an attack." In all probability it was Tolkien who taught Lewis the word. Interestingly it survives almost unaltered in the modern Scottish legal term "hamesucken," the crime—so the Four Wise Clerks of Oxenford tell us—"of assaulting a person in his own house or dwelling-place." Tolkien is very likely to have known this, for he thought highly of John Buchan, and the word is used at the climactic moment of Buchan's 1930 novel *Castle Gay*, where the rascally republican Evallonians are faced down by Dickson McCunn, the Glasgow grocer and archetypal *bourgeois*. Ignoring their revolvers, McCunn reminds the revolutionaries that they are guilty of "hamesucken," and the strange alien syllables cast a daunting chill. Buchan's celebration of *bourgeois* values, and, in the teeth of Marxist "class consciousness," of the essential unity of aristocrats, *bourgeois* and workers (Thorin and Bilbo, Frodo and Sam, one might say), was very congenial to Tolkien, and McCunn the grocer may have formed one element in the creation of Bilbo. Nor is "hamesucken" the only odd word that may have been borrowed by the Inklings from Buchan: another point that deserves further attention. But of these there are many. Perhaps the very best feature of this remarkable labor of love—beautifully produced, and with many remarkable illustrations—is that it sets the stage, and provides the evidence, for innumerable further discoveries.

<div align="right">

Tom Shippey
Saint Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri

</div>

Volume three, 2006 (2007): "Enstehung und Hintergründe einer My-
thologie—Die History of Middle-earth" ["The History of Middle-earth:
The Origin and Background of a Mythology"] 296pp. €23.90 (trade
paperback) ISBN 9783981061215. Interdisziplinäres Seminar der DTG
21-23 April 2006, Mainz.

Hither Shore is the bilingual (German and English) annual journal of
the Deutschen Tolkien Gesellschaft (DTG), the German Tolkien Society.
It is roughly a cross between *Tolkien Studies* and *Mythlore*—like *Tolkien Stud-
ies* because it is an academic annual, but like *Mythlore* because it publishes
papers presented at the annual conference held by the DTG. There have
been three issues thus far, and this review will cover all of them.

The choice of the name *Hither Shore* for the journal is elucidated
soundly in the "Preface to the First Volume" by Marcel Bülles, Chairman
of the DTG, and Thomas Fornet-Ponse, the journal's editor-in-chief.
There they explain the juxtaposition of the meaning given to the term
"Hither Shore" by Tolkien and the meaning that they hope the journal
will bring to it. In Tolkien's legendarium, of course, "Hither Shore" is
"the translation of *Nevrast*, the former seat of Turgon, but also a general
term for Middle-earth as used in the songs about Eärendil and Nimrodel,
as well as by Galadriel." As the title of the journal, "the image of the
shore not only refers to Tolkien proper, but also implies the opening up
for the possibilities of different approaches and, finally, the view of the
horizon that is always present in scientific research" (10).

Hither Shore bills itself as an "Interdisciplinary Journal on Modern
Fantasy Literature." This is explained in the "Preface" to the first volume
as meaning that, while Tolkien is the "center of gravity around which"
Hither Shore articles are arranged, the journal is open to articles about
other authors "of fantasy (and fantastic) fiction" (9). Thus far all the ar-
ticles have been about Tolkien.

Hither Shore is also billed as a "bilingual journal." While the major-
ity of the articles are in German, there are some in English as well,
and—beginning with the second issue—all the German articles have an
abstract in English. Volume three, for example, has four articles in Eng-
lish: "A Mythology for England: The Question of National Identity in
Tolkien's *Legendarium*" by Thomas Honegger; "The Lays of Beleriand:
Epic and Romance" by Allan Turner; "Working with *HoMe*: Its Use in
Researching Shire Place-Names" by Rainer Nagel; and "'More poetical,
less prosaic': The Convergence of Myth and History in Tolkien's Works"
by Judith Klinger. In addition, three of the eleven book reviews are in
English. The English is quite good. I only wish that my written German
read as well.

Hither Shore has, of course, had reviews (in German) of *Tolkien Studies*, and a somewhat more detailed examination of them seems a good way of defining *Hither Shore*'s perspective on the study of Tolkien for the readers of *Tolkien Studies*. Comments from the point of view of another language community always bring out some interesting points in any analysis. In volume one, *Hither Shore* welcomed the first volume of *Tolkien Studies* as a peer-reviewed product of "'the Who's Who' of Tolkien research: Tom Shippey, Douglas Anderson, Verlyn Flieger, Anne Petty, Carl Hostetter, Mark Hooker, Michael Drout, etc." (175). The reviewer, Thomas Honegger—a name that is familiar on this side of the ocean from his work with Walking Tree Publishers—concludes by saying that he views volume one of *Tolkien Studies* as "a very successful start that gives reason to hope that English-language Tolkien studies have finally found a forum that not only demands a high academic standard, but also advances methodological and thematic development" of the field (175).

In volume two of *Hither Shore*, Honegger reviewed the second volume of *Tolkien Studies*. His reception of *Tolkien Studies* is as enthusiastic as before, and he concludes by saying that this volume demonstrates that Tolkien studies have entered the mainstream of academic discourse, with such techniques as Deconstruction and (Post-) Colonialism being applied to Tolkien's legendarium. Honegger cautions, however, that this could lead to increased participation by literary critics "who have little understanding or interest in the nonetheless somewhat special nature of Tolkien's work" (268) and have not looked at the previous work in the field, like Patchen Mortimer, whose article in *Tolkien Studies* volume two disregarded work by Tom Shippey and Brian Rosebury.

Honegger also expresses a sense of disappointment in saying that "what is noticeable, but not surprising, about the volume is its US-American-centricity. Almost all of the sixteen contributors live in the USA, which well reflects the stage of development in which English-language Tolkien studies find themselves worldwide. It is hoped, and perhaps even desirable, that the number of submissions by European Tolkien researchers to *Tolkien Studies* will be increased, even though a small but active publishing community has developed in Europe and is entering into a dialogue and (partially) into competition with *Tolkien Studies*" (266).

In volume three of *Hither Shore*, Honegger once again provides the review of *Tolkien Studies*. He is pleased to note here that the "Flagship of academic research on Tolkien" has made a course correction that addresses his comment in volume two of *Hither Shore*. *Tolkien Studies* volume three has contributors from around the world: Spain, Hungary, South Africa and North America. Honegger feels that the "high hopes" that he had for *Tolkien Studies* when it first came out have come to pass, and that, now in its third year, *Tolkien Studies* has found its place in the academic world.

It is clear that the contributors to *Hither Shore* are abreast of the latest developments in English-language Tolkien research. Their bibliographies are full to overflowing with books and articles by names that are well-known to the readers of *Tolkien Studies*, as are the book reviews found in each volume. The reviews in volume three of *Hither Shore* cover *The Ring of Words* by Peter Gilliver, Jeremy Marshall and Edmund Weiner; *A Tolkienian Mathomium* by Mark T. Hooker; *Tolkien Studies* volume three; *Eine kurze Geschichte des Mythos* [the German translation of *A Short History of Myth*] by Karen Armstrong; *Reading The Lord of the Rings*, edited by Robert Eaglestone; *The Lord of the Rings: A Reader's Companion* by Wayne G. Hammond and Christina Scull; *The Philosophy of Tolkien* by Peter Kreeft; *The Keys of Middle-earth* by Stuart D. Lee and Elizabeth Solopova; *Dritte Zeitalter. J.R.R. Tolkien's Herr der Ringe* [*The Third Age: J.R.R. Tolkien's 'The Lord of the Rings'*], edited by Thomas Le Blanc and Bettina Twrsnick; *The Science of Middle-earth* by Henry Gee; and *El Viaje del Anillo* [*The Journey of the Ring*], by Eduardo Segura.

The proportion of English to non-English works reviewed underscores Honegger's original statement about the "US-American-centricity" of publications about Tolkien. The inclusion of non-English-language publications in the reviews and bibliographies in *Hither Shore* suggests that there are certain perspectives that could enrich current English-language academic thinking about Tolkien.

Hither Shore also has something that I always miss in *Tolkien Studies*: an index.

I will now cover the main essays of each individual volume.

Hither Shore volume one (2004). The theme of this volume is "Interpreting Tolkien."

Marcel Bülles discusses approaches to Tolkien criticism in his article "Tolkien Criticism—Reloaded" (15-24). He recommends a more historical approach to Tolkien that does not try to comprehend Tolkien based on modern criteria, like "publish or perish." He, nevertheless, views Tolkien criticism as being "on the brink of a major leap," as it becomes the focus of "a growing community of international scholars."

Oliver D. Bidlo's article "Verbotene Pfade nach Mittelerde?" ["Forbidden Paths to Middle-earth?"] (25-35) examines Tolkien's statement that he disliked allegory, and how that impinges on literary criticism of Tolkien's work. The title refers to whether or not a statement by an author should be regarded as authoritative, and, therefore, be allowed to prohibit certain approaches to understanding his/her work. The key question that he asks is if social processes, which are in a continual state of flux, have an influence on the interpretation of a work of literature. He concludes that they do.

Thomas Honegger is a full professor of Mediaeval Studies at the Friedrich Schiller University in Jena, and his article, "Die *interpretatio mediaevalia* von Tolkiens Werk" ["The *interpretatio mediaevalia* of Tolkien's Work"] (37-51) demonstrates his academic specialization. He shows cogently that mediaevalists can bring more to a discussion of Tolkien than do modern literary critics.

Thomas Fornet-Ponse applies his academic background in Catholic Theology, Philosophy and Ancient History to the study of Tolkien in his article "The Lord of the Rings is of course a fundamentally religious and Catholic work" (53-70) which despite its English title (a quote from Tolkien's letter to Robert Murray of 2 December 1953) is in German. He asks the question of whether a religious approach to Tolkien is the only valid one, and comes to the conclusion that it is. He includes an impressive bibliography for those who wish to pursue this question further.

Frank Weinreich takes a philosophical approach to Tolkien's work in his article "It was always open to one to reject" (71-83) which is likewise in German despite the Tolkien quote in English that serves as its title. In this article he examines the role of free will as an ethical concept, considering its logical and theological dimensions. He compares Tolkien's concept to that of Erasmus and Martin Luther, concluding that Tolkien's work once again demonstrates how useful it can be to read "fairy tales" as "experiments in thinking about how to live life."

Rainer Nagel, a professor of English and Linguistics at Johannes Gutenberg University in Mainz, compares the German translations of *The Lord of the Rings* with the original in his article "Verschiedene Interpretationen eines Textes als Grundlage von Übersetzungsstrategien" ["Various Interpretations of a Text as the Basis of Translation Strategies"] (85-117). While this article was personally "my cup of tea," it will not be appreciated by mono-lingual readers, either German or English. His forthcoming monograph *Hobbit Place-names: A Linguistic Excursion through the Shire* promises to be accessible to a much larger audience.

Alexandra Velten, a doctoral candidate in English Linguistics at the Johannes Gutenberg University at Mainz, takes a look at the words that accompany the music of the Jackson movies in her article "Die Texte zum Soundtrack der Peter-Jackson-Filme— 'Tolkien's linguistic heresy'—eine legitime Interpretation von Tolkien?" ["The Lyrics of the Soundtrack of Peter Jackson's Movies— "Tolkien's Linguistic Heresy"—A Legitimate Interpretation of Tolkien?"] (119-150). This is not a musicologist's analysis, but a linguistic and literary-analytical search for the answer to the question of whether or not the lyrics reflect Tolkien's vision. The title refers to a statement by Tom Shippey, taken from the first edition of *The Road to Middle-earth* (1982), in which he calls Tolkien's use of untranslated Elvish "Tolkien's major linguistic heresy" (104). Velten concludes that,

when untranslated Elvish is combined with the music of the movie, it does what Shippey thought to be Tolkien's heresy: taking on "a job that English could not." An interesting analysis.

Gregor Raddatz, who holds a Ph.D. in Education, applies Hegel's speculative dialectic along with Adorno's negative dialectic and Lévinas's ethic of the Other (to name but a few) to Frodo's journey in his article "Hin und zurück?—Frodos Reise im Licht dialektischen Denkens und einer Ethik des Anderen" ["There and Back Again?—Frodo's Journey Examined in the Light of the Dialectic and the Ethic of the Other"] (151-171). This essay is just at the edge of accessibility for academics in fields other than philosophy, and then only if you have read Hegel in the original.

Hither Shore volume two (2005). The theme of this volume is "Tolkien's Conception(s) of the World."

Dieter Bachmann and Thomas Honegger, in "Ein Mythos für das 20. Jahrhundert: Blut, Rasse und Erbgedächtnis bei Tolkien" ["A Myth for the Twentieth Century: Blood, Race and Hereditary Memory in Tolkien"] (13-39), compare Tolkien's efforts to create a mythology for the twentieth century with those of Nazi propagandist Alfred Rosenberg. An interesting analysis of a political aspect of Tolkien studies that is becoming more and more sensitive in the present age of political correctness.

Friedhelm Schneidewind explores the biological foundations of Middle-earth, based on Tolkien's assertion that Middle-earth is the planet upon which we live in "Biologie, Genetik und Evolution in Mittelerde" ["Biology, Genetics and Evolution in Middle-earth"] (41-66).

Patrick Brückner, who studied gender-related sociology at the University of Potsdam, examines the character of Éowyn as both a woman and as "no living man" in "Verkleidung und Essenz, Tod und Begehren" ["Masquerade and Essence, Death and Desire: The Construction of 'Correct' Femininity in *The Lord of the Rings*"] (67-88).

Frank Weinreich, who holds a Ph.D. in bio-ethics from Bochum University, uses an analysis of the political organization of the Shire and Gondor to posit a description of the political convictions held by Tolkien himself in "Verfassungen mit und ohne Schwert" ["On Constitutions with and without the Sword: Impressions of Ideal Forms of Political Control in Middle-earth as a Study in the Political Convictions of J.R.R. Tolkien"] (89-104). Weinrich concludes that it is pleasing to see that such a great classic as *The Lord of the Rings* advances the values of freedom and pluralism, while warning of the consequences of unrestrained enthusiasm for political Führers and their systems of control.

Julian Eilmann contemplates the musical structure of Tolkien's universe on the basis of Frodo's music-dream in Rivendell, drawing on the

poetic and philosophical traditions of German Romanticism in "Das Lied bin ich: Lieder, Poesie und Musik in J.R.R. Tolkiens Mittelerde-Mythologie" ["The Song am I: Songs, Poetry and Music in J.R.R. Tolkien's Middle-earth Mythology"] (105-135). The title refers to Sam's comment that he feels like he is inside a song (*FR*, II, vi, 365).

Martin Hopp applies Rudolf Otto's idea of the Holy to the analysis of the religious content of *The Lord of the Rings* in "Das Heilige und das Andere" ["The Holy and the Other: The Religious Dimensions of *The Lord of the Rings*"] (137-155), shifting the focus of attention "from religious practice to religious experience." Hopp's analysis is quite readable.

Thomas Fornet-Ponse compares Tolkien's views on death and immortality with those of Karl Rahner in "Tolkiens Theologie des Todes" ["Tolkien's Theology of Death"] (157-186). An interesting analysis. I would like to see it expanded to include H. Rider Haggard's *She* which appears to have influenced Tolkien's thinking on this topic.

Petra Zimmermann explores how Tolkien's characters react to representatives of other cultures in "Die Begegnung mit dem Fremden in J.R.R. Tolkiens *The Lord of the Rings*" ["The Encounter with the Other in *The Lord of the Rings*"] (195-224). She finds that Tolkien's presentation of *The Lord of the Rings* as a "translation" made with "dynamic equivalence" simultaneously creates and bridges cultural differences.

Gregor Raddatz , in "Ethik oder Ethiken Tolkiens" ["The Ethic or Ethics of Tolkien"] (225-241), investigates *The Lord of the Rings* in search of an answer to the question posed by the title of the article, and comes to the conclusion that Tolkien successfully elaborates a number of different ethical approaches to life rather than "a compact ethical concept."

Hither Shore, volume three (2006). The theme of this volume is "The History of Middle-earth: The Origin and Background of a Mythology."

Thomas Honegger examines the reasons behind why Tolkien felt that he needed to create a mythology of England in "A Mythology for England: The Question of National Identity in Tolkien's *Legendarium*" (13-26), using Jean Bodel's *Chanson des Saisnes* ["Song of the Saxons"] from the late twelfth century as the basis for his analysis. Honegger concludes that Tolkien failed to create a "nationalistically English mythology," but did succeed in creating "an epic that captures some of the best elements of 'Englishness'."

Allan Turner's article "The Lays of Beleriand: Epic and Romance" (27-36) considers the importance of *The Lays of Beleriand* to "Tolkien's literary and stylistic development."

Thomas Fornet-Ponse explores "Die Steigende Präsenz von Philosophie und Theologie" ["The Increasing Presence of Philosophy and

Theology"] (37-50) in Tolkien's thinking as reflected in *The History of Middle-earth*, by watching the development of Tolkien's texts across time.

Christian Schröder searches through *The History of Middle-earth* for an answer to the question of which of Tolkien's writings formed the "conceptual background" of *The Lord of the Rings* in "Von Wilderland nach Middle-earth" ["From Wilderland to Middle-earth"] (51-80).

Michaela Zehetner looks at pieces of the text in *The Lord of the Rings* that appear to be not-entirely intentional leftovers from the early drafts in "Das Erbe der Entwürfe: Ungeplante Qualität(en) im *Herrn der Ringe*" ["The Heritage of Drafts: Unplanned Quality(ies) in *The Lord of the Rings*"] (81-93). She views this not as a flaw in the text, but as an integral part of the book's complexity.

Petra Zimmermann tracks the changes in *The History of Middle-earth* as Trotter evolved into Strider in her article "'Who is Trotter?'—Anmerkungen zum Schaffensprozess bei J.R.R. Tolkien" ["'Who is Trotter?': Remarks on J.R.R. Tolkien's Creative Process"] (94-107).

Rainer Nagel offers a preview of his forthcoming monograph on Shire place-names (see above) in his article "Working with *HoMe*: Its Use in Researching Shire Place-Names" (108-121).

Friedhelm Schneidewind cogently discusses which of Tolkien's writings—those works published while he was alive or those published posthumously—should be considered when trying to delineate Tolkien's thoughts on "Langlebigkeit, Unsterblichkeit und Wiedergeburt in Tolkiens Werk und Welt" ["Longevity, Immortality and Rebirth in Tolkien's Works and World"] (122-136).

Alexandra Wolf seeks to define Tolkien's view of mankind in her article "Die *Athrabeth Finrod ah Andreth* oder Das Menschenbild in Tolkiens Mythologie" ["The *Athrabeth Finrod ah Andreth* or Mankind in Tolkien's Mythology"] (137-150).

Thomas Gießl examines the various versions of "The Ainulindalë," hence the German plural ending given to his article "Ainulindalen" ["The Ainulindalës"] (151-164).

Heidi Krüger looks at how "Die Romanfragmente *The Lost Road* und *The Notion Club Papers*" ["The Novel Fragments *The Lost Road* and *The Notion Club Papers*"] (165-179) impact upon Tolkien's legendarium.

Judith Klinger explores the role of poetry in *The Lost Road* and *The Notion Club Papers* with her article "'More Poetical, less Prosaic': The Convergence of Myth and History in Tolkien's Works" (180-195).

Christian Weichmann considers the modalities of space and time travel as expressed in *The Notion Club Papers* with his article "Raumschiffe und Zeiträume: Wie und warum Tolkien ohne Maschinen reisen wolte" ["Spaceships and Dreams of Time: Why Tolkien Wanted to Travel without Machines"] (196-207).

The "Works in Progress" section describes a joint project by Rainer Nagel and Alexandra Velten (both at the university of Mainz) to produce a textbook of "Altenglisch für Tolkien-Fans" ["Old English for Tolkien Fans"] (220-227). The fact that the project is aimed at German-speaking students should not be a problem for most Tolkien linguists, who often seem to be Germanicists by education.

Hither Shore is recommended for serious students of Tolkien with a better-than-average reading knowledge of German. It is also recommended for research libraries with serious Tolkien collections. Students of Tolkien with no reading knowledge of German should encourage their libraries to get a subscription for access to the English articles.

<div align="right">

Mark T. Hooker
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

</div>

———————

Inside Language: Linguistic and Aesthetic Theory in Tolkien, by Ross Smith. Zollikofen, Switzerland: Walking Tree Publishers, 2007. xii, 156 pp. $16.20 / £8.40 (trade paperback) ISBN 9783905703061. Cormarë Series no. 12.

Tolkien's linguistic inventiveness has equally fascinated and baffled readers and critics alike since the first publication of *The Lord of the Rings*. Many critics have avoided any reference to Tolkien's invented languages, while other scholars have concentrated on the languages alone, studying them in detail as an aspect of Tolkien's writing worthy of research in its own right. Ross Smith's book *Inside Language*, however, does not belong to the scholarly field of "Tolkienian Linguistics" as defined by Carl Hostetter in volume four of *Tolkien Studies*. It rather aspires to bridge the gap between literary criticism of Tolkien's fiction and the study of Tolkien's languages by looking at the interaction and integration of these two fields in Tolkien's creation.

In the first chapter, Smith introduces some of the main concepts and questions that his book addresses, and argues for three levels in terms of which Tolkien's academic knowledge of linguistics and philology influenced his work: his "philological acumen" (which refers to Tolkien's own term "phonetic fitness," discussed in detail in chapter three); his invented languages; and his knowledge of ancient Germanic and Norse languages. This chapter includes an original and thought-provoking comparison of Tolkien's fiction with that of Jorge Luis Borges and Umberto Eco, which forces the reader to think of Tolkien's work outside the "box" of

The "Works in Progress" section describes a joint project by Rainer Nagel and Alexandra Velten (both at the university of Mainz) to produce a textbook of "Altenglisch für Tolkien-Fans" ["Old English for Tolkien Fans"] (220-227). The fact that the project is aimed at German-speaking students should not be a problem for most Tolkien linguists, who often seem to be Germanicists by education.

Hither Shore is recommended for serious students of Tolkien with a better-than-average reading knowledge of German. It is also recommended for research libraries with serious Tolkien collections. Students of Tolkien with no reading knowledge of German should encourage their libraries to get a subscription for access to the English articles.

<div align="right">

Mark T. Hooker
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

</div>

––––––––––––

Inside Language: Linguistic and Aesthetic Theory in Tolkien, by Ross Smith. Zollikofen, Switzerland: Walking Tree Publishers, 2007. xii, 156 pp. $16.20 / £8.40 (trade paperback) ISBN 9783905703061. Cormarë Series no. 12.

Tolkien's linguistic inventiveness has equally fascinated and baffled readers and critics alike since the first publication of *The Lord of the Rings*. Many critics have avoided any reference to Tolkien's invented languages, while other scholars have concentrated on the languages alone, studying them in detail as an aspect of Tolkien's writing worthy of research in its own right. Ross Smith's book *Inside Language*, however, does not belong to the scholarly field of "Tolkienian Linguistics" as defined by Carl Hostetter in volume four of *Tolkien Studies*. It rather aspires to bridge the gap between literary criticism of Tolkien's fiction and the study of Tolkien's languages by looking at the interaction and integration of these two fields in Tolkien's creation.

In the first chapter, Smith introduces some of the main concepts and questions that his book addresses, and argues for three levels in terms of which Tolkien's academic knowledge of linguistics and philology influenced his work: his "philological acumen" (which refers to Tolkien's own term "phonetic fitness," discussed in detail in chapter three); his invented languages; and his knowledge of ancient Germanic and Norse languages. This chapter includes an original and thought-provoking comparison of Tolkien's fiction with that of Jorge Luis Borges and Umberto Eco, which forces the reader to think of Tolkien's work outside the "box" of

medieval literature and mythological sources.

The second chapter seems at foodds with the stated focus of the book, since its only reference to matters of language is a defense of Tolkien's style, which Smith describes as "serious" and even at times "quasi-biblical" (26). Apart from such general observations on Tolkien's stylistics, though, the rest of this chapter embarks on a broad-brush and over-familiar "defense" of Tolkien against a series of other charges (besides those on his style) brought against him by critics from time to time, like his allegedly flat and naively "good" and "bad" characters, the lack of female characters in his work, etc. However, as suggested by Michael D. C. Drout and Hilary Wynne in an excellent recent article, the "defense" of Tolkien's work has become a worn-out topic for Tolkien scholars, as they "point out the same fallacies by the same foolish critics and make the same points in refuting them" (Drout and Wynne 116). Indeed, Smith does not avoid this pitfall. What is more, a great part of this chapter is spent on another over-tired topic: a list of literary sources of Tolkien's work, which—incidentally—focuses disproportionately on Shakespeare, and references only a fraction of the vast amount of relevant previous scholarship.

The third chapter concentrates on Tolkien's "linguistic aesthetic" by relating his views on the beauty of sounds and words to the marginal linguistic notion of sound symbolism. Here, Smith comes close to providing a great analysis of Tolkien's ideas about the aesthetic qualities of different languages. He mentions contemporary philologists and linguists who were equally fascinated by sound symbolism, such as Otto Jespersen and Edward Sapir, and he also points out some of the limitations of Tolkien's claims about the "beauty" of words and sounds. However, the author falls into some of the same traps which—as he claims—Tolkien himself did not avoid. When Smith uses "Withywindle" and "Tom Bombadil" as names that "fit" the places or characters they refer to (57), he is not unaffected by the influence of the signified upon the signifier. It is easy to say that the name "Tom Bombadil" suits a "jolly, rumbustious" personality (57) when for every Tolkien reader the name automatically brings to mind the character. At the same time, Smith describes the Quenya word "wilwarin" (meaning "butterfly") as "a beautiful name for a beautiful creature" (62) but does not offer any insight into why (or judged by what criteria) this word is beautiful. My answer is: because Tolkien tells us so. These pitfalls could have been avoided by referring to the mainstream notion of language attitudes, and the—now widely accepted—idea that our preferences for certain languages (or distaste for others) have nothing to do with their intrinsic beauty but with social connotations and familiarity. In the same way that most Westerners describe French as a "romantic" language because of its popular associations, Tolkien readers

describe the Elvish languages as "beautiful" and "elegant" because of the beauty and awe-inspiring presence of the Elves in Tolkien's invented world. Smith comes close to this realisation when he refers to the fact that the languages of Tolkien's "evil" characters do not sound European and thus automatically qualify as distasteful (21) but he does not explore this idea further.

The following chapter professes to examine the interaction of language and the environment in Tolkien's world, by comparing the writings of David Abram with the ideas of Owen Barfield, and—by proxy—with Tolkien's. Although the comparison of Abram's and Barfield's ideas works quite well, their application to Tolkien's invented world is not as satisfactory. Apart from one concrete example of the language of the Rohirrim and its relation to the landscape of Rohan as spoken in *The Lord of the Rings* by Legolas (74), all of Smith's other examples are rather arguing for the more general idea of the "animate landscape" of Middle-earth and the interaction of characters and places. Valid as some of these arguments might be, they are unrelated to linguistic matters and—again—no previous (once more quite extended) scholarship is acknowledged at any point.

The fifth chapter attempts to place Tolkien's linguistic invention among other similar efforts by comparing the invented languages of Middle-earth to previous, contemporary and later artificial languages, philosophical, auxiliary and poetic. A sample of the vast number of such endeavours is given in this chapter, including the seventeenth-century "ideal" language of John Wilkins, Ludwik Lejzer Zamenhof's Esperanto, and the most recent example, Loglan, devised by Dr. James Brown. The poetic languages of Jorge Luis Borges and Umberto Eco are also discussed, together with Zaum, the project of the Russian futurists. The chapter also includes a largely encyclopaedic examination of Tolkien's writing systems. Although it brings to the foreground neglected topics and ideas, the overall feeling this chapter creates is that there is so much more that could be said: Tolkien's many references to Esperanto and his reactions to it are not investigated (the excellent 2000 article by Arden R. Smith and Patrick Wynne on this topic is not cited at all), and the ideological background of the creation of artificial languages—which would render Tolkien's attraction to them more understandable—remains obscure.

The penultimate chapter discusses the adaptation of Tolkien's invented languages and stylistics for the big screen, as exemplified by Peter Jackson's cinematic trilogy. The main emphasis of the chapter is the different accents used to demonstrate the use of the Common Speech by different peoples of Middle-earth. Smith concludes that the stereotypical Hollywood approach of associating Received Pronunciation with upper-

class, educated characters and regional variations with more rustic ones, was largely observed. The last chapter is an attempt to synthesise and sum up a "Tolkienian Philosophy of Language," which—however—relies heavily on Verlyn Flieger's *Splintered Light* and the influence of the ideas of Owen Barfield on Tolkien.

Although many of Smith's ideas and arguments are interesting and illuminating, the book loses its strength at points because of its incoherent structure and faltering focus. The first four chapters of the book are based on a number of previously published articles by Smith, which have appeared in *English Today* and in the present journal, which is part of the problem: the articles have not been substantially revised to form part of a coherent whole, but are reproduced almost verbatim, and thus create the impression of disconnected and mishmash material brought somewhat artificially together. The second chapter especially is totally unnecessary, as it neither offers new insights into Tolkien's work, nor does it fit with the rest of the book's contents.

Another point of criticism is the fact that the book concentrates too much on *The Lord of the Rings*—for a book on Tolkien's linguistic ideas one would expect to see more references to *The History of Middle-earth*, especially the ideas of linguistic aesthetic as expressed in the unfinished *Lost Road*. Finally, the overall impression is that Smith's book barely scrapes the surface of some very intriguing suggestions on Tolkien's linguistic invention and his views on language aesthetics. Still, this is already a step forward: treating Tolkien's linguistic invention as an integral part of his fiction has been for too long neglected by many students of Tolkien, and Smith's book is a brave beginning.

Dimitra Fimi
Cardiff University
Cardiff, Wales

WORKS CITED

Drout, Michael D.C. and Hilary Wynne. "Tom Shippey's *J.R.R. Tolkien: Author of the Century* and a Look Back at Tolkien Criticism since 1982." *Envoi* 9 no. 2 (2000): 102-134.

Flieger, Verlyn. *Splintered Light: Logos and Language in Tolkien's World, Revised Edition*. Kent: The Kent State University Press, 2002.

Hostetter, Carl F. "Tolkienian Linguistics: The First Fifty Years." *Tolkien Studies* 4 (2007): 1-46.

Smith, Arden R. and Patrick Wynne. "Tolkien and Esperanto." *Seven: An Anglo-American Literary Review* 17 (2000): 27-46.

Smith, Ross. "Fitting Sense to Sound: Linguistic Aesthetics and Phonose-
mantics in the Work of J.R.R. Tolkien." *Tolkien Studies* 3 (2006):
1-20.

———. "Timeless Tolkien" [Part 2]. *English Today*, 21 no. 4 (October
2005): 13-20.

———. "Tolkien the Storyteller" [Part 3]. *English Today*, 22 no. 1 (Janu-
ary 2006): 45-50.

———. "Why the Film Version of *The Lord of the Rings* Betrays Tolkien's
Novel" [Part 1]. *English Today*, 21 no. 3 (July 2005): 3-7.

———————

Roots and Branches: Selected Papers on Tolkien, by Tom Shippey. Zollikofen,
Switzerland: Walking Tree Publishers, 2007. [6], vi, 417 pp. $24.20 /
£12.40 (trade paperback) ISBN 9783905703054. Cormarë Series No.
11.

Tom Shippey's training in philology and medieval literatures and lan-
guages has long served his insights into Tolkien's thought processes and
influences. This volume collects widely scattered essays, mostly papers
published locally by or delivered to Tolkien societies throughout Europe
or to conferences on medievalism or the fantastic. Shippey admits that
he mostly declined to "airbrush" evidence of oral delivery, and the result
is both some inconsistency in tone and documentation but happily also
many readable arguments, conceived for a live audience capable of (and
challenged to) lively response. Five articles are reprints from academic
books or journals, and two from general press books on Tolkien.

The tree imagery that shapes the four sections of this volume would
be appreciated by Tolkien, famously appreciative of trees as he was. Sec-
tion one, "Roots," covers Tolkien and both medieval and nineteenth-
century predecessors. With seven articles, it is the longest section in the
book (over one-third of it) and, in focus and quality, the best. I will as a
result cover each article here in more detail than in other sections, not
least because they also inform the author's points in many of his subse-
quent essays. But they also give weight to his call, in the introduction, for
more work on such topics as the history of "Victorian mythography," the
notes to Tolkien's editions, and his experiments with medieval meters (iii-
iv). Medieval first. In Shippey's persuasive view, Tolkien often identified
with medieval authors and texts out of a personal connection, a shared
approach or life experience or problem. So, in discussing "Tolkien and
the *Beowulf*-poet," he mentions the self-referential quality of Tolkien's

Smith, Ross. "Fitting Sense to Sound: Linguistic Aesthetics and Phonose-
    mantics in the Work of J.R.R. Tolkien." *Tolkien Studies* 3 (2006):
    1-20.

———. "Timeless Tolkien" [Part 2]. *English Today*, 21 no. 4 (October
    2005): 13-20.

———. "Tolkien the Storyteller" [Part 3]. *English Today*, 22 no. 1 (Janu-
    ary 2006): 45-50.

———. "Why the Film Version of *The Lord of the Rings* Betrays Tolkien's
    Novel" [Part 1]. *English Today*, 21 no. 3 (July 2005): 3-7.

———————

Roots and Branches: Selected Papers on Tolkien, by Tom Shippey. Zollikofen,
Switzerland: Walking Tree Publishers, 2007. [6], vi, 417 pp. $24.20 /
£12.40 (trade paperback) ISBN 9783905703054. Cormarë Series No.
11.

Tom Shippey's training in philology and medieval literatures and lan-
guages has long served his insights into Tolkien's thought processes and
influences. This volume collects widely scattered essays, mostly papers
published locally by or delivered to Tolkien societies throughout Europe
or to conferences on medievalism or the fantastic. Shippey admits that
he mostly declined to "airbrush" evidence of oral delivery, and the result
is both some inconsistency in tone and documentation but happily also
many readable arguments, conceived for a live audience capable of (and
challenged to) lively response. Five articles are reprints from academic
books or journals, and two from general press books on Tolkien.

The tree imagery that shapes the four sections of this volume would
be appreciated by Tolkien, famously appreciative of trees as he was. Sec-
tion one, "Roots," covers Tolkien and both medieval and nineteenth-
century predecessors. With seven articles, it is the longest section in the
book (over one-third of it) and, in focus and quality, the best. I will as a
result cover each article here in more detail than in other sections, not
least because they also inform the author's points in many of his subse-
quent essays. But they also give weight to his call, in the introduction, for
more work on such topics as the history of "Victorian mythography," the
notes to Tolkien's editions, and his experiments with medieval meters (iii-
iv). Medieval first. In Shippey's persuasive view, Tolkien often identified
with medieval authors and texts out of a personal connection, a shared
approach or life experience or problem. So, in discussing "Tolkien and
the *Beowulf*-poet," he mentions the self-referential quality of Tolkien's

Beowulf lecture and how Tolkien's belief that this poet and other ancient writers had "sprung from the same soil and talked the same (ancestral) language as himself" gave him a sense of privileged insight (5) as well as a model for solving his own mixed feelings regarding his fiction. Tolkien understood the poet to be simultaneously looking forward to a Christian world and backward to a world passing away yet intensely loved despite its "heathen" ways, a word Shippey argues here and elsewhere is important to both writers and sparingly used. Five other important concepts fill out the article as continuities between ancient and modern, based on Tolkien's meticulous philological knowledge of the poem. Shippey sees the uniquely stressed, alliterated "those" who sent Scyld as a child on a mysterious ship to the Danes as "very like the Valar" for Tolkien (13). He discusses line 3052, where the dragon's hoard is bound by a spell, as a seed for the dragon-sickness of *The Hobbit* and "The Hoard." Related to this illness, the Old English *searu* links both to Saruman and to Sarehole Mill, the older form of our "sere," as in plants dried and dead. This verbal connection between hoarding and damaged nature links back to greed and *Beowulf*. Line 707 of the poem talks of drawing men under shadow (*sceadu*) and line 650 has shadow-helm shapes striding forth, suggesting a mythic presence Tolkien capitalizes as The Shadow. Finally, the Finn episode in the poem creates a nexus of the names Hnæf, Hengest, and Gárulf/Déormód that correlates with Tolkien's aunt Jane Neave, Oxford's Hinksey (Hengest's Island), and Darmston, Worcestershire, Déormód's *tun* and the home of that same aunt. Shippey pointedly sums up: "the conclusion he drew from such continuities . . . is perfectly clear. He thought that the heroes of antiquity *had not gone away*" (18) but lived on, in England's land and people.

The immediacy of the past also informs the next four articles, which cover the *Prose Edda*, the *Kalevala*, medieval poets of the West Midlands, and *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. In "Tolkien and the Appeal of the Pagan: *Edda* and *Kalevala*," Shippey follows the sub-creative urge that drew Tolkien to identify and attempt to emulate the "secret ingredient" that made ancient texts work their magic. Again, the convincing implication is that Tolkien sought out and worked through those authors whose sympathies matched his own, and that he brought back into the world a philosophy and "distinctive literary style" that had been "lost to the world" (29). Shippey identifies Norse understatement, fatalism and good humor as ingredients that electrified those nineteenth-century readers used to classical rules and texts. For Shippey, Snorri Sturluson resembles Tolkien and the *Beowulf* poet in being drawn to a deep and admired past that nevertheless clashed in part with his own religion. The *Kalevala* also restored a lost past through Elias Lönnrot's efforts of gathering songs and producing a national Finnish epic, and again Shippey sees a very personal,

even biographical connection to the pathos of the texts, the sympathy for females, and especially the tale of two brothers in Kullervo's story for Tolkien. In the *Kalevala,* alienation and loss as well as grief and love for one's native land and its beauty gave models for myths fitting England. Shippey makes a case for a deeply personal relationship with these texts and their writers for Tolkien, and I think it is a sound and fruitful one, though it might be mistaken as suggesting a kind of self-absorption that does not apply. Shippey concludes that what gives flavor and depth to both older texts and Tolkien's texts is "the sense of many minds, not just one" on the greatest issues of life and death (37). The comment evoked Tolkien's time travel story of "The Lost Road" for me, where minds of the past and present are linked by language and cyclical peril.

In "Tolkien and the West Midlands: The Roots of Romance" and "Tolkien and the *Gawain*-Poet," Shippey deals with the medieval texts closest to Tolkien's self-identified English roots, those of his mother's family in the West Midlands. He notes Tolkien's groundbreaking proof that, despite the Normans, someone was teaching written English in a Herefordshire school because different hands preserved identical spellings and language. He continues that the "Katherine Group," which included saints' lives and works for and by women, would have appealed to Tolkien both as Christian and as written in a "clear, fluent, unembarrassed, efficient, idiomatic English . . . not matched in prose for at least another three hundred years" (47). Indeed, he reminds us that Tolkien almost single-handedly revised our modern canon of medieval works when he edited *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, arguing the survival (not "revival") of sophisticated native literature well away from London and Chaucer. In delightful detail, he shows how the *Gawain*-poet's dialect provided unique treasures for a philologist: "'þy (n) aunt' bears witness to the naturalisation of French and the survival of living speech. 'Dreped' and 'etaynez' . . . tell us about the relations of Englishmen and Norsemen off the normal historical map; 'etaynez' and 'wodwos' between them hint at a great but lost tradition of story-telling, again off the normal literary and critical map" (70-1). The list of West Midlands texts Shippey rehearses as influential also includes Laȝamon's *Brut,* Shakespeare and his plays of magic, and Langland's *Piers Plowman,* of which Tolkien once wrote a parody "Doworst." Such a list shows how right Tolkien was to look to the west here. Characterizing Tolkien as a "brooder on names," Shippey maps some of his fictional places onto this region, including Shugborough as derived from *scucca*, defined as "goblin," "demon," or even "elf" by Shippey. Not noted is that the same word, usually translated as "devil/demon" there, also occurs multiply in Laȝamon, and in names such as Shuck's Hill. (A shuck also appears in English folklore, though there it seems to refer more to a great hound, which some see as

the source for Conan Doyle's famous tale.)

The last three articles in this long first section focus more on the nineteenth-century contexts that shaped Tolkien, including Germanic philology, folklore, nationalism, and the influence of these areas on historical views of the medieval past. "Grimm, Grundtvig, Tolkien: Nationalisms and the Invention of Mythologies" links the rediscovery of old texts to the perception that epics establish nations. As Shippey argues, "this activity—recovering, or creating, a 'lost unity of belief' from later confusions—seems to have been part of Tolkien's method from the very beginning" (90). So he tracks Tolkien's early efforts to fill in the missing myths of the English with his fiction rather than purely through scholarship: Englishness manifests finally as the Shire and the Mark, yet is embedded in a larger context. Tolkien's "variety of nationalism" is "internationalist," just as the language of English has ceased to be a marker for and claimed by one nation (92), though surely the history of English as a language of empire makes that marker far more complicated. "Internationalist" too seems somewhat forced: "European" is closer, though Tolkien's East makes that too narrow. Shippey seems to suggest a conscious compromise that rejects both Grimm's urge to bring all under the umbrella of German myth and Grundtvig's view of Danish myth as independent. "The Problem of the Rings: Tolkien and Wagner" looks at how both Wagner and Tolkien solved narrative cruxes and what the latter may have taken from the former's work despite perhaps seeing Wagner as "an enthusiastic amateur" (98). Rehearsing the five texts that compose the core of the Nibelung story and especially the quarrel of the queens, Shippey demonstrates how each version tells a different story "*and not one of them makes sense*"(101). Because they did not agree or satisfy, Wagner altered his sources, linking the Nibelung's ring with the tragedy to come. Yet Shippey ends by showing that, as with Shakespeare, Tolkien did take away something from Wagner. The man Regin in the Norse becomes the dwarf Mime in Wagner, "cowardly, treacherous, self-pitying, and incompetent" (110). For Tolkien, such a modern, confused distillation of dwarves might be imagined as the result produced by the petty dwarf Mîm's betrayal of Túrin, just as more modern versions of elves distort the elves of ancient days Tolkien imagined. Further, Wagner's ring gives power while enthralling those who would own it—but as Shippey notes, Wagner sympathizes with the desire for power, while in Tolkien, major characters repeatedly refuse that thralldom. Tolkien could imagine another solution perhaps not least for having seen the uses to which Nazi propaganda could put Wagner's heroes and "subhuman" dwarves.

"Goths and Huns: The Rediscovery of the Northern Cultures in the Nineteenth Century" ends the section by asking two questions of this period: how did philology create images of the past, and why does the

unknown or unknowable "charm" scholars and creative writers (115)? Tolkien and William Morris provide Shippey's case studies. He sums up, ". . . in the nineteenth century men who were not scholars could find inspiration, of a sophisticated kind, in the detailed discoveries of scholarship; . . . the 'reconstructing' processes of philology, with their insidious capacity to stretch from single words to whole histories, could not themselves be anything but intensely romantic" (131). Shippey's evidence ranges widely over how landscape affects culture and history, but one example of historical Anglo-Saxons will suffice here. Shippey comments that the Rohirrim differ from this culture in their love of horses, but Tolkien could recall the cavalry of the Goths and the closeness of that culture to continental ancestors of the Anglo-Saxons. Tolkien's Westemnet and Eastemnet yield Anglo-Saxon *emnet* as a word for "smooth meadow." "Prairie" and "steppe" are non-native and would not suit Tolkien's meticulous vocabulary choices, but "emnet" place names echo those European plains where Goths rode, while other German tribes turned west and left a landscape suited to horses behind. In a further signpost, Tolkien peoples the burial mounds of Rohan with Gothic ancestors. And horses may well have been central to the earliest Anglo-Saxons after all, or at least their elites. We have found more than half a dozen horse burials, not to mention evidence from cremations: the princely burial of mound 17 at Sutton Hoo, found in the 1990s, had buried near him his horse complete with decorative gear. I would add the founders' names Hengest and Horsa, "Stallion" and "Horse," as additional evocative names for Tolkien.

"Heartwood," the book's second section, covers Tolkien and scholarship. Five articles cover philology as a field and a passion for Tolkien, products of that passion in editions of Anglo-Saxon poems, the use of Norse/Icelandic myth to reconstruct lost English myths, and Tolkien's academic reputation at present. The title "Fighting the Long Defeat: Philology in Tolkien's Life and Fiction" sets up themes Shippey sounds in other articles and re-emphasizes in Tolkien's own life. Registering both philology's decline and Tolkien's increasing anger with "misologists" who hate words, Shippey also blames that decline on the failure to define philology itself for those who did not practice it and to make clear that "one of the great advantages of comparative philology was that it could wake romance from almost anything, even from a single word" (149). (Elsewhere he includes Tolkien in that blame.) The hard work of philology instead isolated its practitioners, and the trend to emphasize the modern and current replaced the emphasis on past literatures and languages.

"History in Words: Tolkien's Ruling Passion" and "A Look at *Exodus* and *Finn and Hengest*" examine more closely Tolkien's interests and productions. In the latter review, Shippey cautions that the editions should

appear with an asterisk, the linguist's sign that something is unattested but reconstructed, since they are produced from Tolkien's notes after his death. Yet Shippey usefully outlines how Tolkien's methods of reading are still discernible. He also counters the accusation that Tolkien abandoned his scholarship for his fiction in later career: these two editions demonstrate how wrong that is. First, in *Exodus, sigelwara* becomes "fire-spirits," not the usual translation of "Ethiopians," a suggestive interpretation given Tolkien's mythology. Then three further areas of interest emerge: the poet's eye for actual details of battle (Shippey suggests someone might analyze military signals in Tolkien's fiction and relate them to *Exodus*), the danger of rejected but viable paganism, and the balance of literal and allegorical meanings in vocabulary choices. As for *Finn and Hengest*, Tolkien looked at the conflation of *eoten* (giant) and *Eota* (Jute), myth and history, and came down on the side of history. His theory that Jutes fought on both sides of the "Frisian slaughter" lends excitement to the fragments for Shippey, and, I would think, for any reader. Shippey rehearses the same evidence earlier presented in the first paper here (Neave, Hinksey) and ends by listing three realities Tolkien believed in and exhibited here: the realities of history, of human nature, and of language. The last is central to "History in Words," where Shippey likens Grimm's *Deutsche Grammatik* (1819) to the humanities' equivalent of the *Origin of Species* (160) and discusses several compendia Tolkien would have known and used. *Ninnyhammer*, *noodles*, and the seven appearances of *dwimmer–* in Tolkien's texts all find their sources and richness in discussion here which sees Tolkien's range of vocabulary, characterized as archaic but colloquial, as a main source of his popular appeal. Shippey comments that colloquialism is part of philological tradition—he characterizes philology as "highly democratic." I take him to mean that living language and the survival of old forms in modern speech (as opposed to those merely written) is key to philology and its dictionaries of dialect, for example, since philologists themselves are highly educated and therefore a kind of elite, not always in a social sense but in training.

But the point links to a more persistent one Shippey makes on his own behalf in several pieces here. Time and again, Shippey emphasizes that philology was, and was seen as, a science, something producing facts, though he acknowledges that such perceptions have eroded. That erosion occasions periodic resentfulness on Shippey's part throughout the volume, both against the dissipation of philology as a field of study and against the academy which let it happen and, in Shippey's view, often replaced it with theoretical and critical approaches both unreadable and elitist. The criticisms are quite just in some particulars and excessive in others, but here Shippey shows his staunch support of a popular and populist approach to literature that he detects and appreciates in Tolkien

as well. (He overlooks, however, Tolkien's clear disapproval of those who read only translations, for example; reading "originals" is clearly something only a person *trained* in languages could manage. My students regularly see this as elitist, though perhaps they are also disturbed to find their sense of "well educated" redefined as excluding them.) Paradoxically, Tolkien's "privileged insight" of the book's first essay makes him a champion of "native popular culture, whether *Grimm's Fairy-Tales* or Shakespeare or Tolkien himself" (25), and one can hear that Shippey's championing of Tolkien against his elitist academy has personal overtones. Yet it also feeds the worst in popular anti-intellectualism and seems too narrow, a bit like the flaw of the elves in wanting things to remain the same and not diminish. Surely the threat of universities being run as businesses is greater. I do not think he would disagree with me on that: counting research outputs and how many students sit in which classes comes close to universities as mere factories of marketable knowledge. Philology as part of literary study may have been an early casualty, but the larger issues are still with us.

"Tolkien and Iceland: The Philology of Envy" has been available online since it was delivered at the Icelandic National University, though the URL given is now incorrect (see works cited section of this review). Shippey bases his discussion on the idea that Tolkien could only recreate his lost English myth through the better preserved Icelandic myth (201-2). Norse myth becomes the solution for Tolkien's problem of how to express the ancient, pagan heroic ethic in contemporary idiom without contradicting Christianity (197), a theme by now familiar in this review. Shippey sees the "envy" as productive, and especially relevant for Tolkien in light of two world wars, whence a post-Christian world emerged. The "deeply sad" tone of *The Lord of the Rings* resonates with a revival of the virtuous pagan, the "dearly bought" victory that is always temporary. "Tolkien's Academic Reputation Now" is updated from 1989, and Shippey constructs his judgments as consistently countering those of the "academy," surely never so uniform as his term implies. Being at odds with opinions in one's fields is often productive, but not if it becomes predictable. Here, Shippey tallies Tolkien's publications according to the Humanities Citation Index for references to use of his works, and then, focusing on his three most influential pieces (*Ancrene Wisse*, his *Beowulf* and "Maldon" pieces), records current "general academic views" and his own. Not surprisingly, Tolkien's academic reputation is secure, and also not surprisingly, Shippey disagrees with current assessments. Sometimes it is over the date of *Beowulf* (early versus late), but that date is actively debated, not settled as he suggests. Sometimes, as in his rejection of the "bogus 'ironic/Christianising' approach" (209) to the Maldon poem, he is rejecting opinions reshaped by the influential arguments of Tolkien,

whom he sees as "silver-tongued even when wrong" (209). The same might be said of Shippey: in any case, he is still worth reading even if a reader ends up unconvinced.

Section three, "The Trunk," deals with *The Lord of the Rings* and *The Silmarillion*. "Light-elves, Dark-elves and Others: Tolkien's Elvish Problem" appeared in the inaugural volume of this journal. It tracks the philological and mythological problems of light, dark, and black elves in the two Norse *Eddas* for Tolkien. Shippey's complex contextualization of the issues within C. S. Lewis's work and influence, Grimm's philological study of *elfe*, *elfen/Elb*, *Elbe*, and the story of Eol as explaining how Snorri got the elves wrong is masterful. I agree with him that Tolkien's fictional solution, that the distinctions were not of color but among those who had or had not come to Valinor or seen the Two Trees, was "a brilliant stroke" indeed (228). The remaining five articles cover a somewhat odd range, from indexing to evil, to how Tolkien approached textual problems, to class, and to proverbs. "Indexing and Poetry in *The Lord of the Rings*" makes the useful if minor point that oral and written poetry differ. Tolkien knew that living poetry varied as it was told, changing lines and sometimes languages; indexing, as a "habit of literacy" (241), confronts the problem of whether we have one poem or many in these variations. Skipping ahead, in "Noblesse Oblige: Images of Class in Tolkien," Shippey responds to a barb from Michael Moorcock by arguing that cultural archaism and conservatism can exist alongside self-questioning: Tolkien's values are middle class but not morally bankrupt, nor are they unchallenged by those above and below. Shippey makes these points after a brief but unsatisfying look at class in the Shire and in Gondor, where gaps at the top feature (until the king returns, surely), and in the Riddermark, where the slave class is erased in Tolkien's depiction. (I'd argue that Tolkien displaced that slavery to Mordor and Isengard; tellingly, by his son John's report, Tolkien thought modernity had pushed slavery out of sight into factories.) Defining moral bankruptcy here and where it is contested in Tolkien's writings would have yielded a stronger basis for discussion. "'A Fund of Wise Sayings': Proverbiality in Tolkien" focuses on "survivor genres," Shippey's useful term for ancient, everyday forms. After tracing a hierarchy of proverbs from clichés to those that set scenes, add humor, or indicate cultural difference, Shippey finishes with a nice point: Tolkien creates an original type, proverbs about ignorance or not knowing. He agrees with Tolkien and Grimm and Celeborn that old wives remember things needful for the wise, and encourages further study.

Both "Orcs, Wraiths, Wights: Tolkien's Problem of Evil" and "Heroes and Heroism: Tolkien's Problems, Tolkien's Solutions" show, in the words of the latter paper, how one way Tolkien solved problems was

"to put them into his fiction" (269). In the former, Shippey presents a nuanced counter-argument to those who still see Tolkien's fantasy as morally black and white, but more importantly, he develops the ongoing challenge of evil conceived as "the pursuit of good in the wrong way," as Lewis put it (quoted 246). Orcs emerge as disturbingly moral beings. They are beings who value trust and loyalty even as they cannot practice it, whose humor is triggered by torture or the helpless (reminding me of Abu Ghraib, in a dark reflex of Aristotle's insight that comedy is about those less fortunate than we), and, in a philological touch I found as compelling as the rest of the essay, whose sarcasm degrades language and thus what orcs can express. Shippey finds similar disturbing aspects in the wraiths and barrow-wights. How does one become a wraith, neither dead nor alive? Through despair, or passivity in the face of evil, or being consumed in a cause, as shown in Saruman's grey mist at his death. Tolkien, for Shippey, argues that no one is safe from becoming a wraith, and the fantastic is uniquely suited to showing the danger. And what does it mean to have Merry relive the death of a good man of Westernesse at the hands of an evil wight? Can the good turn to evil after death, hating the living, or is persecution continued after death (262)? The discomfort of these questions makes this paper an especially powerful one in the volume, indeed, for me, the most memorable. Less convincingly, in "Heroes and Heroism," Shippey describes a northern heroic type Tolkien found problematic for its cruelty and heathenism even as he was drawn to it, complicating Tolkien's desire to reintroduce a lost heroic style. I think Shippey overplays cruelty, however, as well as "the horror from which Christianity delivered the pagan" as he reads it in Tolkien, though a note admits problems with his view (282). He abandons the careful nuances used earlier to discuss evil in favor of a more flattened and extreme presentation of pagan and Christian. He chooses a sensationalized example of a double burial from Sewerby (East Yorkshire) to show "what ancient Germanic heathenism was really like" (282), to which the archaeologist in me responds "hardly," even admitting it may have been a harsher time. (Today's many violent outbreaks, torture, and persecutions the world over make it a debatable point.) Many Anglo-Saxon multiple burials have been found, none so dramatic as the one Shippey chooses, and they more often indicate reuse of a grave or the burial of a mother and child, certainly not persistent or vicious sacrifice, if that is what Sewerby even was. I'm reminded of the initial reaction to finds at Sutton Hoo of decapitated and bound bodies. Rumors of Odinic sacrifice flew like ravens until the carbon dates showed they were from a later Christian context, and most likely connected to a site for legal executions of criminals. We still have the same bodies: was Christian law less cruel?

The last section makes the overall organization of the collection seem

somewhat forced: the roots of this tree are strong, but its "Twigs and Branches," arguably its areas of growth, gathers a miscellaneous and weaker group on "Tolkien's minor works." Some papers should have been shifted. Rather than "minor works," surely "The Homecoming of Beorhtnoth" is a major work, earlier argued as one of Tolkien's most influential by Shippey even as he dissents from its views: his essay belongs under "Heartwood: Scholarship." And the paper "Indexing and Poetry in *The Lord of the Rings*" might have moved to this final section, as well as "Tolkien's Academic Reputation Now." "Minor works" might be bettered named "Tolkien's Short Works and Influence on Others," which would then also make Shippey's review of Jackson's movies a better fit. (The movies are neither minor nor Tolkien's.) Best here is the first of five pieces, "Tolkien and 'The Homecoming of Beorhtnoth.'" It illustrates again how Tolkien worked out scholarly and authorial issues by writing fiction. Shippey argues that the piece, in fact, is something Tolkien wrote as authorization, a necessary step before he could write about his doubts regarding the Anglo-Saxon "Battle of Maldon" itself. Disturbed by the focus on "Maldon's" famous heroic ethic and its memorable proverb, Tolkien redirected readers to the poet's criticism of a lord whose desire for glory displaced his responsibilities to his followers and to his king. Shippey argues that Tolkien's play argues *against* his beloved Anglo-Saxon poetry, as inspiring self-aggrandizing heroism rather than the selflessness of the true hero. (The implication is that Beorhtnoth read and lived by such poetry.) But he adds a religious note, seeing Tolkien as disturbed by the poem's "heathen" heroic ethic so late (A.D. 991) and untempered by Christianity: Shippey suggests obliquely that Tolkien reads the heroic emphasis as asking men to die for a lord, not the Lord. Here as elsewhere, the idea that Tolkien is nearly obsessed with the problems a Catholic Christian might have in reading and using "heathen" material is not convincing for me, though I find Shippey's ideas usefully force me to consider why. Tolkien's uniquely personal investment in finding a way back through ancient sources does raise the stakes on such questions. But he was not creating a new religion: did he worry that his love for medieval texts as well as for his own mythology were forms of idolatry, as Shippey implies, or did he hope that he had glimpsed something of a lost Truth, something not idolatrous but reinforcing, as argued in "On Fairy-stories"? I think Tolkien certainly did worry about misplacing his heart and soul, as it were, but Shippey overplays the point for me.

"The Versions of 'The Hoard'" rehearses the two versions of the poem by this name, starting with the 1923 rendition entitled with line 3052 in *Beowulf*, on the ancient gold wound about with a spell. Several points of contact with *Beowulf* ensue, of which the best might be the connection between Wiglaf's burial of the treasure and those who refuse the

One Ring. Wiglaf, unlike his king or those who succumb to a hoard, is no victim of dragon-sickness. The piece, "Allegory versus Bounce: (Half of) an Exchange on *Smith of Wootton Major*" was published in the *Journal for the Fantastic in the Arts* as part of an exchange with Verlyn Flieger. The two scholars debated approaches to this text in light of Roger Lancelyn Green's comment, "To seek for the meaning is to cut open the ball in search of its bounce" (quoted 351). Seeing Shippey's ideas without Flieger's problematizes and takes some of the force from his opinions, since they comment on whether allegorizing the story ruins or enriches but represent the counterargument only by opposing chosen aspects. Shippey characterizes Flieger's approach as holistic, while his is "bit by bit"; hers sees the text's effects as vulnerable if dissected, his sees dissection as necessary to building up understanding. Were I not familiar with Flieger's views, this piece would not encourage me to read hers, not least because Shippey's rhetoric plays too heavily with linking her arguments to the general, the "gossamer," and the insubstantial, in short the lightweight. Surely the argument is better made as it was, with both sides represented. As such, it seems arbitrarily in the collection, though in fairness, Shippey acknowledges this one-sidedness and Professor Flieger's "generously accepting one more one-sided view" (351 n.1). Including, finally, two reviews in the section ends the book on a weak note. A two-page review of *Mr. Bliss* and its blunt English speech was enjoyable if ephemeral, and Shippey's views on Jackson's movies have been included in the third British edition of *The Road to Middle-earth* (2005). He manages both to show how film narrative has to differ from textual narrative and to show how the films nevertheless do not measure up in key areas. Having a love/hate relationship myself with the movies, I found his comments restrained and fairer than many on either extreme.

I look forward to new Shippey work whenever I find it, and this collection presents much to savor and enjoy while also chiding and challenging. Shippey has set himself up as something of a perpetual contrarian, and reading a collection such as this can at times make that wear thin, though of course that is in part a function of its many pieces being in one place. I am sure the rhetoric often went over well with an audience; print makes it less flexible than something which could then be wrangled over on the spot. Nevertheless, most times Shippey has something well worth saying—often many somethings—and for that alone, one can be glad this press made the effort to gather his thoughts.

Kelley M. Wickham-Crowley
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C.

Works Cited

Carver, M.O.H., et al. *Sutton Hoo: a Seventh-century Princely Burial Ground and Its Context*. London: British Museum Press, 2005.

Lucy, Sam. *The Anglo-Saxon Way of Death: Burial Rites in Early England*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2000.

Shippey, Tom. "Tolkien and Iceland: The Philology of Envy." 2002. The Árni Magnússon Institute of Icelandic Studies. http://www.hi.is/Apps/WebObjects/HI.woa/wa/dp?detail=1004508&name=nordals_en_greinar_og_erindi (accessed 5 January 2008).

––––––––––––

Tolkien and Modernity 1, edited by Frank Weinreich and Thomas Honegger. Zollikofen, Switzerland: Walking Tree Publishers, 2006. [6], vi, 246 pp. $19.90 / £10.60 (trade paperback) ISBN 9783905703023. Cormarë Series 9.

Tolkien and Modernity 2, edited by Thomas Honegger and Frank Weinreich. Zollikofen, Switzerland: Walking Tree Publishers, 2006. [6], iv, 279 pp. $19.90 / £10.60 (trade paperback) ISBN 9783905703030. Cormarë Series 10.

As Frank Weinreich and Thomas Honegger point out in their introduction to first volume of this anthology, Tolkien studies are experiencing something of a sea-change. The celebration of Tolkien as the "author of the century" and the resurgence of interest in his work concomitant with the remarkable success of Peter Jackson's film trilogy have begun to rapidly erode the prejudice against Tolkien which has long reigned among the "Pooh-bahs of the canon" in the academic establishment: "Hardcore Tolkienists have to get used to the fact that a critic may not know the difference between light-elves and dark-elves or between Westernesse and Eriador, but that s/he, nevertheless, is able to contribute relevant points to the understanding of the literary quality of Tolkien's work" (1: i). And if Tolkien is being made part of the canon, then one of the important issues to be debated is where exactly does he fit? The sixteen essays in this collection (each volume of which has a comprehensive index) aim at situating Tolkien's work and its concerns squarely in the mainstream of twentieth-century Modernist literature: "The present volume(s) grew out of a wish to further the exploration of Tolkien as a 'contemporary writer', i.e. an author whose literary creations can be seen as a response to the challenges of the modern world" (1: i).

WORKS CITED

Carver, M.O.H., et al. *Sutton Hoo: a Seventh-century Princely Burial Ground and Its Context*. London: British Museum Press, 2005.

Lucy, Sam. *The Anglo-Saxon Way of Death: Burial Rites in Early England*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2000.

Shippey, Tom. "Tolkien and Iceland: The Philology of Envy." 2002. The Árni Magnússon Institute of Icelandic Studies. http://www.hi.is/Apps/WebObjects/HI.woa/wa/dp?detail=1004508&name=nordals_en_greinar_og_erindi (accessed 5 January 2008).

───────────

Tolkien and Modernity 1, edited by Frank Weinreich and Thomas Honegger. Zollikofen, Switzerland: Walking Tree Publishers, 2006. [6], vi, 246 pp. $19.90 / £10.60 (trade paperback) ISBN 9783905703023. Cormarë Series 9.

Tolkien and Modernity 2, edited by Thomas Honegger and Frank Weinreich. Zollikofen, Switzerland: Walking Tree Publishers, 2006. [6], iv, 279 pp. $19.90 / £10.60 (trade paperback) ISBN 9783905703030. Cormarë Series 10.

As Frank Weinreich and Thomas Honegger point out in their introduction to first volume of this anthology, Tolkien studies are experiencing something of a sea-change. The celebration of Tolkien as the "author of the century" and the resurgence of interest in his work concomitant with the remarkable success of Peter Jackson's film trilogy have begun to rapidly erode the prejudice against Tolkien which has long reigned among the "Pooh-bahs of the canon" in the academic establishment: "Hard-core Tolkienists have to get used to the fact that a critic may not know the difference between light-elves and dark-elves or between Westernesse and Eriador, but that s/he, nevertheless, is able to contribute relevant points to the understanding of the literary quality of Tolkien's work" (1: i). And if Tolkien is being made part of the canon, then one of the important issues to be debated is where exactly does he fit? The sixteen essays in this collection (each volume of which has a comprehensive index) aim at situating Tolkien's work and its concerns squarely in the mainstream of twentieth-century Modernist literature: "The present volume(s) grew out of a wish to further the exploration of Tolkien as a 'contemporary writer', i.e. an author whose literary creations can be seen as a response to the challenges of the modern world" (1: i).

As might be expected, numerous essays address the issue of Tolkien's "modernity" head-on, especially Anna Vaninskaya in "Tolkien: A Man of His Time?" (1: 1-30), Bertrand Alliot "J.R.R. Tolkien: A Simplicity Between the 'Truly Earthy' and the 'Absolutely Modern'" (1: 77-110) and Thomas Honegger, "The Passing of the Elves and the Arrival of Modernity: Tolkien's 'Mythical Method'" (2: 211-32). All are concerned with positioning Tolkien in the varying intellectual currents and concerns of his time, particularly those of the interwar period. Vaninskaya covers familiar ground with a discussion of Tolkien's debts to William Morris and G. K. Chesterton, but her discussion of interwar rural nostalgia, "little Englandism," and anti-statism and how these movements find resonance in Tolkien's work is more useful. Alliot addresses some of these same concerns without naming them as such, drawing heavily on Tolkien's published correspondence. Tolkien's unease with the infiltration of technology into all aspects of life (he had after all personally experienced the industrialized warfare of the Western Front) is linked to Martin Heidegger's distrust of *techné* and his praise of the "splendor of the simple" ("Die Pracht der Schlichten," Heidegger 13, see further J. Glenn Gray's essay). But the world Tolkien lived in was anything but "simple," and the autonomy that characterizes the modern individual is at odds with the traditional sense of connectiveness of archaic rural societies. The second half of Alliot's essay is concerned with how Tolkien responded to these dilemmas, for while he set out to recover pre-modern simplicity, his goal was complicated by the further dilemma that "we cannot go back to the earth—or to the truly simple—without at the same time betraying the authenticity of the act of doing so . . . The temptation of the truly simple like that of the absolutely modern does not give any answers . . . it is a refusal to accept our condition and the world as it is" (1: 105-06). Honegger compares Tolkien's use of myth to how it is employed by his contemporaries, particularly T.S. Eliot and James Joyce, coming to the conclusion that *The Lord of the Rings* "is thus a literary myth, yet one that does not join the general development of modernist literature," although at the same time it is concerned with identical themes, "the rupture with tradition and the alienation of modern man" (2: 226).

Three essays from volume two explore Tolkien's work through the insights of modern and postmodern theorists: Margaret Hiley, "*The Lord of the Rings* and 'Late Style': Tolkien, Adorno and Said" (2: 53-73); Martin Simonson, "An Introduction to the Dynamics of the Intertraditional Dialogue in *The Lord of the Rings*: Aragorn's Heroic Evolution" (2: 75-113); and Anna Slack, "Slow-Kindled Courage: A Study of Heroes in the Works of J.R.R. Tolkien" (2: 115-41). Hiley finds that the concept of "late style" as used by Theodor Adorno and Edward Said applies to *The Lord of the Rings* and demonstrates that Tolkien's work is not retroactive

or anomalous but "a representative work of the twentieth century" (2: 71). Simonson sees *The Lord of the Rings* as exemplary of Northrop Frye's "ironic myth" (as defined by Simonson, in an essay in *Reconsidering Tolkien*, 157) and "intertraditional dialogue" (a term borrowed from theology) which he interprets as the way in which characters "move between different narrative traditions" (2: 79). Slack looks at the way in which Tolkien through his concept of Faërie constructs his heroes in the shadow of the "hero-anxiety" engendered by World War I. While the heroes of *The Silmarillion* are caught in the paradoxes of *kleos* (honor), in *The Lord of the Rings*, characters such as Aragorn and Frodo demonstrate *sophrosyne* (temperance), a more Christian virtue.

Maria Raffaella Benvenuto, "Against Stereotype: Éowyn and Lúthien as 20th-Century Women" (1: 31-54) and Laura Michel, "Politically Incorrect: Tolkien, Women, and Feminism" (1: 55-76) tackle once again the perception that exists in some quarters (identified naively by both authors as the "politically correct") that Tolkien has a "woman problem" (the phrase is A.R.D. Fairburn's). Benvenuto sees Tolkien as having little in common with the stereotypes of fantasy fiction, especially "heroic fantasy," with its "more or less graphic sex and violence, larger-than-life characters and clichéd plot lines" (1: 32). She also argues that Tolkien's treatment of women in the legendarium (including *The Lord of the Rings*) is at odds with the statements gleaned from his letters which are frequently used by those who are intent on demonstrating Tolkien's "backwardness" in gender issues or claiming him as a fellow-traveler in their neo-fascist agendas. His treatment is even at odds with what has been identified as the "'majority view' towards women which prevailed in British society throughout the Victorian era up until the mid-1960s" (1: 35, see Alex Lewis and Elizabeth Currie 183-88) without by any means going as far as to claim him as a crypto-feminist. To argue her point, Benvenuto examines the depictions of Éowyn and Lúthien. Despite her martial trappings as a valkyrie-like shieldmaiden, Éowyn suffers under the patriarchal hierarchies of the Mark. Trained as a warrior she is trapped in King Theoden's court in the role of care-giver and subject to the unwanted attentions of Gríma Wormtongue. As Gandalf observes, "who knows what she spoke to the darkness, alone, in the bitter watches of the night, when all her life seemed shrinking, and the walls of her bower closing in about her, a hutch to trammel some wild thing in?" (*RK*, V, viii, 143). The arrival of Aragorn at Edoras had seemed to offer a way out of this dilemma, but when this is closed off she sets off on a venture Benvenuto calls "very much resembling a failed suicide attempt" (1: 45). In a letter to Father Robert Murray, S.J. in 1953, Tolkien called *The Lord of the Rings* "a fundamentally religious and Catholic work."(*Letters* 172). Perhaps nowhere is this more obvious than in his treatment of *wanhope* ("despair"),

the negation of hope and an act of the will (Jessica Burke and Anthony Burdge 124 and the critique by Jason Fisher). Éowyn's predicament can be compared to the situation Denethor finds himself in. He has fully given himself over to despair and as a consequence makes one disastrous decision after another before he finally takes his own life. Éowyn struggles with her despair, but she never lets it interfere with making a morally valid decision, in particular, her decision to protect King Theoden against the Lord of the Nazgûl. While she is subsequently healed of her physical infirmities by Aragorn, he recognizes that her psychological state is one that he can have no influence over. That healing is aided by Faramir (himself an interesting example of the anti-heroic hero). But it is Éowyn who decides to set aside her martial training (what greater glory could she hope to achieve by feats of arms than that which she has already accomplished?) and to forgo any re-emergence in the political life of the Mark. Instead she chooses to take up the role of a healer, to become the wife of Faramir and thereby Lady of Ithilien, that part of Middle-earth that reminded Sam and Frodo most of the Shire—hardly a "baby trap" as it has been characterized (Lewis and Currie 207). Lúthien by contrast does not seem initially to be as complex as Éowyn but she in some ways is even less of a stereotype. Instead of being a passive figure in a Romance narrative, she is empowered and active, taking a major role in the narrative, defying her father, confronting Morgoth in Thangorodrim, pleading her case in the Halls of Mandos. Both Éowyn and Lúthien reveal themselves in the decisions they make and in the use of their powers of creativity to be surprisingly modern under their romance and epic trappings.

While Laura Michel admits that Tolkien is not a feminist, she defends him against charges of chauvinism and mounts her counterclaim through an analysis of Éowyn and Erendis. Unfortunately neither analysis is sufficiently detailed to bear the burden of the weight placed on it. In particular the analysis of Erendis leaves much to be desired. She is the one character in the entire legendarium who becomes what might be termed a "radical feminist." But her path to this position is described with sympathy and understanding and its unfortunate consequences are described dispassionately. Both Aldarion and Erendis make choices which complicate their lives and sour their relationship. But that is their responsibility. The real tragedy is that these ill-chosen decisions affect the next generation in the form of their daughter, Anclimë, who inherits her mother's extreme views, particularly towards men. Michel sees the two women as figures of evil but I find this to be over-reading, as both are figures who are presented in such a way as to invoke our sympathy and compassion.

It seems appropriate at this point to follow with an article of major importance from volume two. Patrick Brückner in "Tolkien on Love:

Concepts of 'Love' in *The Silmarillion* and *The Lord of the Rings*" (2: 1-52), tackles a topic that has drawn surprisingly little specialized attention (see for example the essays by Paul Nolan Hyde and Charles W. Nelson). The subject of "love" is notoriously difficult to delimit, let alone write about successfully. But Brückner does so by the exemplary use of "theory," an approach which has frequently been viewed with suspicion in Tolkien circles. By drawing upon the concept of "love" characterized as "a symbolic medium of communication," propounded by the sociologist Niklas Luhmann, along with additional insights provided by another sociologist, Klaus Theweleit, together with Michel Foucault's concept of "heterotopia," Brückner is able to avoid the anecdotal, the banal, and the reliance on Tolkien's infamous 1941 letter to his son Michael (*Letters*, 48-54) and he warns against the uncritical use of Tolkien's letters as "interpretive tools" (2: 4). There are three couples discussed in the essay, Beren and Lúthien, Arwen and Aragorn and Sam and Frodo, each under the headings, "Falling in Love," "Being in Love," and "The Structure of Love." Brückner demonstrates how in the love story of the first pair, Beren's commitment to the political sphere and Lúthien's to the private, results in a love that can flourish only in death: "Then, and only then, can their relationship be transported into a final lasting heterotopia—a love that outlives death" (2: 22). The love story of Arwen and Aragorn, although it has some echoes of that of Beren and Lúthien, differs from it because Aragorn is able "to 'empathise' with his love(d) object" (2: 25) and because it "seems to point toward the replacement of the alliance type model of family by a kind of 'nuclear family'" (2: 27). More importantly, perhaps, it establishes a relationship that "does not depend absolutely upon a heterotopia and can exist in the world" (2: 29). Finally the love of Sam and Frodo takes us outside the modern heteronormative sphere of love and marriage (2: 1). Brückner argues that the relationship between Sam and Frodo when judged by the criteria used to determine the relationships between Beren and Lúthien (whose story has significant implications for that of Sam and Frodo) and Arwen and Aragorn, must be characterized as love rather than being deflected to the safer realm of "friendship." Even though after the cleansing of the shire Sam gets married, he and Frodo continue to live together and, as Brückner argues, "Rose serves as a vehicle to transmit the[ir] genealogy"(2: 43). Their "[r]eproductive sexuality is 'outsourced', as it is of no consequence to the concept of love as played out in the text" (2: 46). According to the chronology in Appendix B (*RK*, 377-78), Frodo leaves Middle-earth in S.R. 1421. Rose dies in S.R. 1482 at which point Sam leaves Bag End and makes his way to the Grey Havens to pass over the sea "to 'merge' completely in the heterotopia of Valinor" (2: 45). In conclusion Brückner determines that: "'Love' for Tolkien does not serve to first and foremost

produce offspring (children), but to produce story and history" and that this concept "allows for no text-based differentiation between 'heterosexual' and 'homosexual' couples" (2:47). This said, it is the story of Sam and Frodo that "is the most emotional and 'romantic' of all the love stories in Tolkien's œuvre" (2: 49).

Jessica Burke and Anthony Burdge in their essay "The Maker's Will . . . Fulfilled?" (1: 110-33) lament that "all too often in the Americanization of the world, we have found that the notions of Creation and enchantment have been relegated to a tiny corner of the bookshelf, left to stagnate, and be forgotten, especially in our consumer world of progress and mega-marketing" (1: 113). But this is hardly a contemporary phenomenon or a recent complaint. The challenges Tolkien set his readers were challenges as much to his own generation as they have been for those following. Furthermore, in the authors' complaint that the three Peter Jackson films "have been geared for a mindless audience, an audience unable to think for themselves, an audience bred on humiliation, violence, gore, and the grotesqueries of Western Entertainment" (1: 126), Burke and Burdge conveniently overlook the fact that Peter Jackson did not invent the Orcs, the Nazgûl, or the Balrog, and that through viewing the films many in the audience have been moved to read *The Lord of the Rings* for the first time. The authors come off as two of those "Hard-core Tolkienists" mentioned in the preface to the volume, distressed as they are by the ways that fans ("genetically bred", 1: 127) and literary critics have swarmed over their beloved Tolkien and dared to sully his shrine with their unholy interpretations interfering with the true appreciation of Fantasy and the sub-creative arts. And yet after lashing out at the "snobbery of Tolkien's critics and detractors," "the 'literati' or 'marketing elite'" (1: 125), the merchandising strategies of New Line Cinema (1: 127), television (1: 129), and the educational system (1: 129-30), they conclude: "If Tolkien's work is to be viewed by those outside the university as a 'great film,' but too long of a book, or relegated to the same shelf as Dungeons and Dragons, then the true message of unification for our world and with our Maker is lost" (1: 131). I don't get it! Throughout this essay the University has been part of the problem, yet all of a sudden it is identified as the one bearer of the true flame. Tolkien studies are changing and evolving. With change there are always going to be some who will claim that the old way of doing things is the only appropriate one. Burke and Burdge express their frustration at some of the ways Tolkien is viewed in the modern world which they see as a betrayal the "Maker's Will," but there is no return to a pre-Peter-Jackson understanding of Tolkien, and our energies as Tolkien scholars are better served in taking advantage of this new reality rather than railing against it.

There are three essays in the volume which deal with various aspects

of the problem of free will: Frank Weinreich, "Brief Considerations on Determinism in Reality and Fiction" (1: 135-444); Jason Fisher, "'Man does as he is when he may do as he wishes': The Perennial Modernity of Free Will" (1: 145-75); and Thomas Fornet-Ponse, "Freedom and Providence as Anti-Modern Elements" (1: 177-206).

Tolkien's Boethian approach to basic theological questions such as the nature of free will is one very important aspect of the way in which *The Lord of the Rings* is "fundamentally religious and Catholic." Boethius wrote his *De consolatione philosophiae* in prison some shortly before his execution around the year 525 on the orders of Theodoric the Ostrogoth. Even though it is one of the fundamental works of Western Christianity, it, like *The Lord of the Rings*, never mentions Christ or Christianity. It is a work of exquisite and inexorable logic which makes sense only if one begins with the first and fundamental question asked by Lady Philosophy: "Then said she: 'Thinkest thou that this world is governed by haphazard and chance? Or rather doest thou believe it is ruled by reason?'" (Book I, prosa vi, 165) Boethius answers that the universe is governed by reason in the person of God. Everything else in the treatise, from the nature of God, to the definition of evil, from the relationship of God to the time continuum of the created universe, to the relationship of God's foreknowledge to an individual's free will, depends upon the argument developed step by step from this initial response. If asked the same question, there can be no doubt that Tolkien would have responded exactly as Boethius. Even though Tolkien lived at a time when increasing numbers of philosophers were beginning to explore the ramifications of a universe governed not by reason but by hazard and chance, this was not a position which had any interest or appeal to him. In Boethian terms then, Ilúvatar living in the eternal present of the void has foreknowledge of all events in Arda instantaneously, but his foreknowledge does not cause those events to happen (see Boethius Book V, prosæ iii-vi, 373-411).

Weinreich in his essay admits the possibility of determinism working in Middle-earth without in any way compromising the Free Will of its inhabitants while Fisher gives a short history of Free Will with special emphasis on how the matter was discussed among the Inklings. He concludes based on an analysis of characters' actions in the legendarium, that individuals do indeed have Free Will. Fornet-Ponse, like Weinreich, starts from modern discussions of determinism and Free Will before beginning an investigation of Free Will among the races of Middle-earth and then moving on to a consideration of Ilúvatar's foreknowledge perceived in time (Fate or Wyrd) ("[T]his unfolding of temporal order being united into the forethought of God's mind is Providence, and the same uniting, being digested and unfolded in time, is called Fate" [Book IV, prosa vi, 341], see also Hughes 1004). The races of Middle-earth may experience

time differently, yet for all of them time consists of the future turning into the past while the present is only something that can be experienced in mystical union with the Godhead. In the First and Second Age Ilúvatar was moved directly to intervene in the affairs of Middle-earth very much like the God of the Old Testament.

While Tolkien does not use the word "Providence" in the legendarium, he does use terms such as "fate," "chance," "doom" and so on, concepts applied to events which reflect an imperfect understanding of divine foreknowledge (see the discussion in Kathleen E. Dubs). However, it is a mistake to see the use of these terms as implying a universe in which predestination or fate operates, for they can frequently be analyzed as terms used by a story-teller trying to make sense of events during the creation of a narrative sequence. Fornet-Ponce also emphasizes that even though Tolkien created Middle-earth to be consistent with traditional Catholic theological concepts, these philosophical underpinnings are implicit rather than overtly insisted upon with the result that the narratives of the legendarium are "open texts" (1: 204).

While Umberto Eco is the name usually associated with the theorizing about "open texts," the following definition is particularly useful and specifically relevant to Tolkien's work: "Openness refers to the textual conditions created by perceived writing strategies that consciously or unconsciously endow a text with the capacity to allow readers to adopt different subject positions and reading strategies in a cooperative process of reading, with the result that the text becomes multivalent, polysemous, and amenable to different and even conflicting interpretations" (Gu 200-01). Ming Dong Gu provides this definition as part of an extended consideration of how the eighteenth-century novel, *The Dream of the Red Chamber* (*Hongloumeng*) by Cao Xueqin (c. 1724–c. 1764), works as an "open text." Although the details lie outside the scope of this review, the *Hongloumeng*, like *The Lord of the Rings*, is a mixture of the fantastic and the realistic, and within "*Hongxue*," or "Redology," (that is the formal study of the *Hongloumeng*), there has been in recent decades a fierce debate those who champion the novel's realism and those who see its fantastic elements as providing the key to a comprehensive interpretation.

This is not a debate foreign to Tolkien scholars and aspects of it are addressed by Heidi Krueger in her contribution, "The Shaping of 'Reality' in Tolkien's Works: An Aspect of Tolkien and Modernity" (2: 232-72, translated by Heidi Steimel). Krueger finds Tolkien's use of fantasy (the "sub-real" or the "sur-real") to be a modernist phenomenon rooted in similar usage by European literary Romantics (in her case German) of the early nineteenth century. His use of the fantastic is has a "genuinely existential statement behind it, born of our time and able to open our eyes concerning subliminal matters which occur in our time" (2: 244,

263). Tolkien's work is also a response to the rupture in European confidence occasioned by the First World War (in which Tolkien found himself a participant) and which resulted in "the *consciousness crisis* of modernity, which . . . take[s] place through the breaking down and fragility of rationalism, [and which] has its equivalent on an aesthetic level in concepts such as reflexivity, incoherence, fragmentalization, self-representation, experimentalism, etc." (2: 240), reinforcing Brian Rosebury's contention that *The Lord of the Rings* "might indeed be seen in certain respects as the last work of First World War literature, published almost forty years after the war ended" (126; 2nd ed. 140; see the discussion in Hughes, 994). Krueger discusses not only *The Lord of the Rings* but also Tolkien's abandoned *Notion Club Papers* (*Sauron* 143-327) which look forward more to Postmodern "magical realism" (see the essays in *Magical Realism*, edited by Lois Parkinson Zamora and Wendy B. Faris) than it does backwards to Romantic or Modernist models as Krueger suggests (2: 246). But the point Krueger emphasizes is the "[i]magination creates reality" whether in *The Notion Club Papers* or in *The Lord of the Rings*, and these narratives become real in the telling (2: 269). Furthermore because Tolkien was engaging concepts such as time, space, and causality which have proved anything but stable in the modern world, "his life work is to be found active in the centre of modernity," although not necessarily the conclusions he reached as a result of his speculations (2: 269).

Alexander van de Bergh in "Democracy in Middle-earth: J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings* from a Socio-Political Perspective" (1: 207-36) reminds us that the Shire, while in some ways the most idealized region of Middle-earth, succumbs with hardly a murmur to the dictatorship of Sharkey with a disturbing number of Hobbits lining up join the Shirriffs and enforce the new rules and regulations (one who does protest and is imprisoned for her troubles is one of the most under-rated female characters in *The Lord of the Rings*, Lobelia Sackville-Baggins). Also the Throne of Gondor, while it may thrive under the benevolent reign of Aragorn, has no checks and balances that would protect it from being exploited by a less enlightened occupant. Tolkien was certainly aware of this, and while we know little of his plans for a continuation of the story of Middle-earth, the title he gives to the surviving fragment, "The New Shadow" (*Peoples* 409-21), is ominous enough. Gondor awaits its King John and Magna Carta and the slow progression towards representative government. And while the Shire appears able to heal itself after being cleansed, neither it nor Gondor can "be seen as a realistic permanent alternative to governments in the primary world" (1: 217).

The final essay to be discussed, Judith Klinger's "Hidden Paths of Time: March 13th and the Riddles of Shelob's Lair" (2: 143-209), is another major contribution to Tolkien studies. The essay attempts to an-

swer the question: "What happened to Frodo after the end of the Ring-Quest, and why did he leave Middle-earth?" (2: 145). The implications of Klinger's answer to this question, which are not spelled out, are startling: the Ring allows mortals who bear it without desire and who give it up the promise of immortality west in Valinor! Frodo becomes gradually aware of this (Klinger characterizes this as his "transformation"), beginning as early as the dream he has during the second night of their sojourn with Tom Bombadil (*FR*, I, viii, 146) and of which Frodo is reminded as he catches his first glimpse of the Blessed Realm (*RK*, VI, ix, 310). The possibility of immortality becomes the focus of his desire, not the illusion of absolute power which the Ring seems also to promise (on the illusion of power as a source of happiness see Boethius, Book II, prosa vi, 207-11).

After his return to the Shire there are two dates on which Frodo is physically affected by his experiences during the quest: October 6, the anniversary of his wounding on Weathertop, and March 13, the anniversary of his being bitten by Shelob (*RK*, Appendix B, 377). The first causes few problems and is ably analyzed by Klinger (2: 147-48). The second is far more puzzling. Why is Frodo stricken with a terrible sense of loss on March 13, S.R. 1420 and 1421, rather than March 25, the anniversary of the destruction of the ring in the Cracks of Doom (in S.R. 1420, March 25 is the date of Frodo's recovery from his malaise [*RK*, VI, ix, 304] and in S.R. 1421, a day of celebration at the birth of Sam and Rose's first child [*RK*, VI, ix, 306])? On March 13, S.R. 1420, Farmer Cotton finds Frodo lying stricken in bed, clasping a white gem hung around his neck and crying: "It is gone forever . . . and now all is dark and empty" (*RK*, VI, ix, 304) The "it" here is usually interpreted as the Ring (see Wayne G. Hammond and Christina Scull 666), but Klinger sets out to demonstrate that this is not the case and that the clues to solving the puzzle can be found in what appear to be the serious problems with chronology for the passage through Cirith Ungol, March 12-14, S.R. 1419. These problems are reflected in the two major atlases of the places and events in *The Lord of the Rings*: Barbara Strachey, Maps 37-38 (82-85), presents Shelob's lair as being a little more than a mile in length which seems to accord with Tolkien's sketch published in *The War of the Ring* (201) and his description in *Sauron Defeated* (10); Karen Wynn Fonstad measures the direct passage through the Lair at almost fifteen miles (143) in order to account for the amount of time the hobbits spend in it. The distortion of time in Lothlórien, its condensation in effect, has been discussed in detail by scholars. Klinger argues that time in the Lair is also distorted (or "depleted", 2: 182) due to the nature of Shelob, "the last child of Ungoliant to trouble the unhappy world" (*TT*, IV, ix, 332): "Her devouring darkness paralyzes mind and motion and could be likened to a funnel that absorbs time, light, memory and voice" (2: 165). Her

presence also distorts space indicated by the reversal of east and west on the compass rose accompanying Tolkien's sketch. The one counter to Shelob's influence over time and space is Galadriel's Phial which not only "reflects the original light of Valinor, but [is] also . . . a manifestation of history, or fulfilled time" (2: 161).

But Shelob is not the only problem facing the hobbits as they make their way towards Cirith Ungol. They face the enormous practical problem of passing over into Mordor, especially since the Orc guards have, unknown to them, been put on alert. The temporal and spatial paradoxes occasioned by Shelob's presence in the Lair lead to another paradox, elegantly formulated by Klinger, which in effect facilitates their entry through the pass: "the Ring-bearer is both dead and alive, accompanied by the Ring, yet no longer in possession of it" (2: 170-72). These paradoxes remind Klinger of Grimm's Fairy Tale #94. "Die kluge Bauerntochter" ("The Clever Farmer's Daughter") (see also the tale-types associated with it under Antti Aarne and Stith Thompson #875 "The Clever Peasant Girl," 293-95—now superseded by Hans-Jörg Uther #875, "The Clever Farmgirl," 1: 494-500) and the "riddle test" associated with it. The steps Sam takes to resolve these paradoxes are crucial to the success of the quest. On the stairs of Cirith Ungol, he had perceived himself as part of a story that was linked to Beren's quest for the Silmaril (*TT*, IV, viii, 321-22) and in the Tower of Cirith Ungol he continues the tale by singing extemporaneous verses which lead him to Frodo (*RK*, VI, i, 185), replaying Lúthien's role when she rescued Beren from Sauron's pits (*S* 174) (2: 193-94): "The Cirith Ungol crisis unfolds a theme of an improbable passage through death, set against the backdrop of an ongoing tale that traces the history of time across an unbroken continuum of light . . . [and which] is resolved . . . when a third alternative appears: Frodo's suspension between life and death . . . ultimately points to a timeless present which in turn foreshadows Frodo's journey to the Immortal Realm" (2: 198-99). Frodo's first and immediate reaction in the tower when he realizes that he does not have the Ring is a cry of despair not for the Ring, but for the failure of the quest. If Sauron has the Ring, only elves can "escape" (*RK*, VI, i, 187-88).

Later when Frodo departs from Aragorn and Arwen, she offers him her place at the Grey Havens "if you then desire it" and gives him a white gem which she was wearing around her neck (the one he is clutching on March 13, S.R. 1420), saying to him: "When the memory of the fear and the darkness troubles you . . . this will bring you aid" (*RK*, VI, vi, 252-53). The "it," therefore, in his despairing cry to Farmer Cotton, refers not to the Ring, but to a future hope of immortality, that is, "the westward path" Frodo sees connected with it, foreclosed by his non-dead death in the utter darkness of Shelob's Lair and its associated temporal stasis (2:

204). This is the memory that is so traumatic. Even though Frodo at the last moment wishes to hold on to the Ring, it is destroyed, and therefore March 25th is a date of healing and future promise. Frodo will be able to "escape" to the West (along with Bilbo and eventually Sam), but it is not a decision to be taken "lightly or quickly," nor "is it portrayed as a pleasant escape from the burdens of mortality" (2: 205). Klinger sees the end of the novel as not expressing some "vague universal hope," but rather a confirmation of Sam's "ability to reinterpret ultimate separation [death] as a hope for reunion [see Sam's "one wish," (*TT,* IV, x, 434)]" (2: 207).

In investigating Tolkien and the concerns of Modernism, these essays affirm that Tolkien is very much a canonical Modernist, one working right at the center of the movement and engaging issues as weighty as those tackled by Eliot and Joyce. At the same time, they confirm the "openness" of Tolkien's work: *The Lord of the Rings*, for example, is not only very much a work of the time in which it was written, it also looks both back to nineteenth-century Medievalism while at the same time engaging with twenty-first-century Postmodern agendas. The research that makes us aware of this, like the volumes under review, serves to broaden and deepen our understanding of Tolkien's contribution to our culture, ensuring that the attribution "Author of the Century" is not some sort of publicity stunt, but an accolade richly deserved.

<div align="right">

Shaun F. D. Hughes
Purdue University
West Lafayette, Indiana

</div>

Works Cited

Aarne, Antti and Stith Thompson. *The Types of the Folktale: A Classification and Bibliography.* 2nd rev. Helsinki Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1981. FF Communications 184.

Boethius. *The Consolation of Philosophy.* London: Heinemann, 1918. Loeb Classical Library 74.

Burdge, Anthony S. and Jessica Burke. "Despair (Wanhope)." In *The J.R.R. Tolkien Encyclopedia*, ed. Michael D. C. Drout. New York: Routledge, 2006: 124-25.

Dubs, Kathleen E. "Providence, Fate, and Chance: Boethian Philosophy in *The Lord of the Rings*." In *Tolkien and the Invention of Myth: A Reader,* ed. Jane Chance. Lexington: University of Press of Kentucky, 2004: 133-42. First published *Twentieth-Century Literature* 27.1 (1981): 34-42.

Fairburn, A. R. D. "The Woman Problem." In *The Woman Problem and other Prose,* ed. Denis Glover and Geoffrey Fairburn. Auckland: Blackwood and Janet Paul, 1967: 11-43.

Fisher, Jason. "Despair (Wanhope)—Anthony S. Burdge and Jessica Burke." In John F. G. Magoun (a.k.a. "Squire"), J. R. R. Tolkien Encyclopedia - A Reader's Diary. http://users.bestweb.net/~jfgm/EncyclopediaDiary/DiaryPagesAlphabetic/encyclopedia_diary__d_articles.htm (Accessed 12.27.2007).

Fonstad, Karen Wynn. *The Atlas of Middle-earth,* rev. ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1991.

Gray, J. Glenn. "Splendor of the Simple." *Philosophy East and West* 20 no. 2 (1970): 227-40.

Gu, Ming Dong. *Chinese Strategies of Fiction: A Non-Western Narrative System.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006.

Hammond, Wayne G., and Christina Scull. *The Lord of the Rings: A Reader's Companion.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2005.

Heidegger, Martin. *Aus der Erfahrung des Denkens*. Pfullingen: Günther Neske, 1954.

Hughes, Shaun F. D. "Tolkien Worldwide," *Modern Fiction Studies* 50 no. 4 (Winter 2004): 980-1014.

Hyde, Paul Nolan. "Emotion with Dignity: J.R.R. Tolkien and Love." *Mythlore* 17 no. 1 (whole no. 63; 1990): 14-19.

Lewis, Alex and Elizabeth Currie. *The Uncharted Realms of Tolkien.* Weston Rhyn, Oswestry: Medea Publishing, 2002.

Luhmann, Niklas. *Love as Passion: The Codification of Intimacy.* Trans. Jeremy Gaines and Doris L. Jones. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986. First published in German: *Liebe als Passion.* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1982.

Nelson, Charles W. "But Who is Rose Cotton? Love and Romance in *The Lord of the Rings.*" *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts* 3 no. 3 (1994): 6–20.

Rosebury, Brian. *Tolkien: A Critical Assessment.* Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992; 2nd ed. *Tolkien: A Cultural Phenomenon*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Simonson, Martin. "*The Lord of the Rings* in the Wake of the Great War: War, Poetry, Modernism, and Ironic Myth." *Reconsidering Tolkien.*

Ed. Thomas Honegger. Zollikofen, Switzerland: Walking Tree Publishers, 2005. 153-70. Cormarë Series 8.

Strachey, Barbara. *Journey's of Frodo. An Atlas of J. R. R. Tolkien's "The Lord of the Rings."* New York: Ballantine, 1981.

Theweleit, Klaus. *Object-Choice (All you need is love …): On Mating Strategies and a Fragment of a Freud Biography,* trans. Malcolm Green. London: Verso, 1994. First published in German: *Objektwahl.* Frankfurt: Stroemfeld, 1990.

Uther, Hans-Jörg. *The Types of International Folktales: A Classification and Bibliography. Based on the System of Antti Aarne and Stith Thompson.* 3 vols. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 2004. FF Communications 284-86.

Zamora, Lois Parkinson, and Wendy B. Faris, eds. *Magical Realism: Theory, History, Community.* Duke University Press, 1995.

———————

Croft, Janet Brennan, ed. *Tolkien and Shakespeare: Essays on Shared Themes and Language*. Jefferson, NC, and London: McFarland & Company, 2007. viii, 327 pp. $35.00 (trade paperback) ISBN 9780786428274. Critical Explorations in Science Fiction and Fantasy, 2.

Tolkien's rather mixed views on Shakespeare's plays are well-known, at least among Tolkien scholars, and Janet Brennan Croft conveniently summarizes them in her introduction: on the one hand, his youthful dislike of the remnants of Shakespeare's Warwickshire life, his contempt for Shakespeare's "Pigwiggenry" and *Macbeth*'s Weird Sisters, his curriculum reforms that reduced emphasis on such "Moderns" as Shakespeare and Milton; on the other, perhaps, his lecturing on Shakespeare along with other younger members of the English Faculty at Oxford (he lectured on *Hamlet*), his enjoyment of a performance of *Hamlet* (in 1944), his references to *Lear* in his *Beowulf* lecture, his thoughtful claim in "On Fairy-stories" that Shakespeare would have been better off if he could have written *Macbeth* as a story rather than a play. Even if Tolkien made rather a point of not caring for Shakespeare, as the editor points out, he knew Shakepseare's works well—and as the editor also points out, he was fully cognizant of the problems of writing fantastic or Faërie drama: "In this essay Tolkien illustrates his point about the inability of Drama to represent Faërie by describing how depicting the witches through stage trickery detracts from the power of their portrayal in the reader's imagination" (2-3).

Ed. Thomas Honegger. Zollikofen, Switzerland: Walking Tree Publishers, 2005. 153-70. Cormarë Series 8.

Strachey, Barbara. *Journey's of Frodo. An Atlas of J. R. R. Tolkien's "The Lord of the Rings."* New York: Ballantine, 1981.

Theweleit, Klaus. *Object-Choice (All you need is love …): On Mating Strategies and a Fragment of a Freud Biography,* trans. Malcolm Green. London: Verso, 1994. First published in German: *Objektwahl.* Frankfurt: Stroemfeld, 1990.

Uther, Hans-Jörg. *The Types of International Folktales: A Classification and Bibliography. Based on the System of Antti Aarne and Stith Thompson.* 3 vols. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 2004. FF Communications 284-86.

Zamora, Lois Parkinson, and Wendy B. Faris, eds. *Magical Realism: Theory, History, Community.* Duke University Press, 1995.

———————

Croft, Janet Brennan, ed. *Tolkien and Shakespeare: Essays on Shared Themes and Language.* Jefferson, NC, and London: McFarland & Company, 2007. viii, 327 pp. $35.00 (trade paperback) ISBN 9780786428274. Critical Explorations in Science Fiction and Fantasy, 2.

Tolkien's rather mixed views on Shakespeare's plays are well-known, at least among Tolkien scholars, and Janet Brennan Croft conveniently summarizes them in her introduction: on the one hand, his youthful dislike of the remnants of Shakespeare's Warwickshire life, his contempt for Shakespeare's "Pigwiggenry" and *Macbeth*'s Weird Sisters, his curriculum reforms that reduced emphasis on such "Moderns" as Shakespeare and Milton; on the other, perhaps, his lecturing on Shakespeare along with other younger members of the English Faculty at Oxford (he lectured on *Hamlet*), his enjoyment of a performance of *Hamlet* (in 1944), his references to *Lear* in his *Beowulf* lecture, his thoughtful claim in "On Fairy-stories" that Shakespeare would have been better off if he could have written *Macbeth* as a story rather than a play. Even if Tolkien made rather a point of not caring for Shakespeare, as the editor points out, he knew Shakespeare's works well—and as the editor also points out, he was fully cognizant of the problems of writing fantastic or Faërie drama: "In this essay Tolkien illustrates his point about the inability of Drama to represent Faërie by describing how depicting the witches through stage trickery detracts from the power of their portrayal in the reader's imagination" (2-3).

The essays following the Introduction are arranged thematically "according to the broad themes and motifs which concerned both authors: Faërie, Power, Magic, and The Other (there is of course a great deal of overlap between these categories; they are all interrelated)" (3). The ideas implicit in this would seem to be that in some way Shakespeare influenced Tolkien (which is an explicit claim in a couple of the essays) and, more often, that seeing how these two authors addressed these themes will help us understand both of them—or at least Tolkien—better. I am not entirely convinced, but let us see. In fact, the essays pretty much resolve themselves into those looking at *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *The Tempest*, *Henry V*, *Macbeth*, *Othello*, and *Lear* (not much on *Hamlet*). From the fact that I made the comparison with *Henry V* myself several years ago (though much more allusively and in less detail), it may correctly be inferred that this is the place where I am most sympathetic to looking at Shakespeare to understand Tolkien, but I hope I am fair-minded about the others. There are, however, two caveats to be entered here.

First, when the distinguished Shakespearean Nevill Coghill contributed to the festschrift *English and Medieval Studies Presented to J. R. R. Tolkien on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday* (1962), his contribution was the brilliantly *à propos* "God's Wenches and the Light That Spoke (Some Notes on Langland's Kind of Poetry)"—with its implicit personification of Tolkien as Langland. We need to keep this in mind when we look at Tolkien's appreciation of the common man (and we might remember the figure of John Bunyan as well). Second, though we can (and I have) traced a literary connection between Shakespeare and Tolkien, it runs not from Shakespeare as we know him now (or even Shakespeare as Tolkien knew him "then"—whenever "then" was), but from Shakespeare through the Eighteenth Century, into Sir Walter Scott and James Fenimore Cooper, thence to Tolkien—very much not the Shakespeare we know now. Just as we must keep in mind what Anne Hathaway's Cottage looked like in 1908 when viewing Tolkien's remarks on Shakespeare in 1908, so we must remember, when searching for Shakespeare's influence on Tolkien, that, if it does exist, it isn't the influence of Shakespeare as we know him now. But that of course does not preclude our looking at the way Shakespeare treats a theme to illuminate the way Tolkien treats that theme—quite another thing from looking at Shakespeare's "influence" on Tolkien—though I'm still not sure Shakespeare is the best lens through which to view Tolkien, or *vice versa*.

The opening essay in the first section ("Faërie") is by Allegra Johnston, "Clashing Mythologies: The Elves of Tolkien and Shakespeare." This is followed by a paper by Jessica Burke with the (descriptive) subtitle, "Diminution: The Shakespearean Misconception and the Tolkienian Ideal of Faërie." Both the Johnston and Burke papers seem to me

to be solid, straightforward, and enjoyable summaries, by enthusiastic young scholars, of the difference between the Shakespearean elfin and the Tolkienian Elven worlds, with Johnston paying more attention to the comparison between Shakespeare and Tolkien and Burke to putting that comparison in historical context (though she might well have looked at Bishop Corbett, "Fare Well! Rewards and Fairies!"). The essays complement each other.

The other two essays in this opening section are Rebecca-Anne C. Do Rozario's "Just a Little Bit Fey: What's at the Bottom of *The Lord of the Rings* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*?" and Romuald I. Lakowski's "'Perilously Fair': Titania, Galadriel, and the Fairy Queen of Medieval Romance." Do Rozario's essay is particularly welcome for its return to William Hazlitt's true appreciation of Nick Bottom, thus, by implication, conveying a greater similarity than we had expected between Shakespeare's "mechanicals" and Tolkien's hobbits. Lakowski's essay—like a number of the others in this book—has a real mouthful as a title and subtitle: it also has a thought-provoking opening line: "The two most famous representations of the figure of the Fairy Queen in English literature today are undoubtedly Shakespeare's Titania and Tolkien's Galadriel" (60). It all depends, I suppose, on what we mean by *literature* and what we mean by *today*. If he means English literature (restrictive sense) that is *read* today, he may be right. It should perhaps be noted that the primary medieval romance considered is *Thomas of Erceldoune*—with some attention to *Lanval*. This seems to me to be in danger of trivializing the figure of the Queen, though Lakowski does refer us to C. S. Lewis's chapter of the *Longaevi* in *The Discarded Image* (1964). On the whole, while the Titania-Galadriel comparison seems a trifle strained, there's a good deal of useful material in the essay, and it's well-presented. But isn't there something a trifle odd about considering the Fairy Queen of Shakespeare's day without considering Spenser?

The next section is on "Power," and the Shakespearean plays selected for comparison are *Henry V*, in the late Daniel Timmons's brief essay "'We Few, We Happy Few': War and Glory in *Henry V* and *The Lord of the Rings*"; *Hamlet* in Kayla McKinney Wiggins's "The Person of a Prince: Echoes of *Hamlet* in J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*"; *Henry V* in Judith Kollmann's essay on "How 'All That Glisters Is Not Gold' Became 'All That Is Gold Does Not Glitter': Aragorn's Debt to Shakespeare"; *Henry V* in "'The Shadow of Succession': Shakespeare, Tolkien, and the Conception of History" by Annalisa Castaldo; *Lear* in Leigh Smith's "'The Rack of This Tough World': The Influence of *King Lear* on *Lord of the Rings*"; and *Macbeth*, *King Lear*, and (very briefly) *Hamlet* and *Richard III* in "Shakespearean Catharsis in the Fiction of J.R.R. Tolkien" by Anne C. Petty. The best of these six in my view (though with the oddest title) is

Judith Kollmann's—odd because the essay is primarily on *Henry V*, and the title is from *Merchant of Venice*, which is quite another kind of story.

Daniel Timmons died from a progressive motor neuron disease in 2005 at the age of 44. I suspect his essay may have been a first draft—the statement "In the end, *The Lord of the Rings* does give us a vision of a world without war" (89) may seem unnecessarily controversial—but first draft or no, it is a perceptive and stimulating piece of work.

Kayla McKinney Wiggins is appreciative of Tolkien's fundamental objection to visual narrative representation (by theatre or film) as inimical to the quality of fantasy. And she has other good things to say as well. I think, if I were writing on this topic, I would have mentioned the connection between Eärendel and Hamlet in Saxo Grammaticus, and I certainly would have looked at Lewis's essay "Hamlet, the Prince or the Poem?"—but then, quite honestly, though this essay is well-written and says a lot of good things, it doesn't seem to me that the comparison between Aragorn and Hamlet (on whom very few people agree) is particularly useful in understanding Aragorn—or Tolkien—or, for that matter, Hamlet. But I enjoyed the essay and I intend to read more of Wiggins's work.

Aside from my sensing a disjunction between the title quotation and the actual subject of Judith Kollman's paper (though she tackles this on pages 116-117), I believe this to be a good solid work aimed in a proper direction (after all, I aimed in the same direction in my postscript to my *World of the Rings*), and saying good and useful things well—though I am (perhaps unduly) skeptical in this context of appeals to Joseph Campbell's psychological (or even psychiatric) views of the hero. But it is a considerable pleasure to see a wide-ranging and very knowledgeable scholar at work here. I would note (and this ties in with my disquiet at a few passages in Leigh Smith's essay, reviewed below) that I do not agree that Arwen, in any usual sense of the word, died "of grief for losses of husband, father, and the High Elves of Lothlórien" (125).

Annalisa Castaldo's essay is good, but I have one caveat: I do not think she can reasonably argue by elimination of all other alternatives for Shakespeare as Tolkien's "model for centering a heroic tale on the most unlikely, unheroic character" (135). First (as Castaldo admits), Shakespeare didn't do that. Second, as we noted early on in this review, Nevill Coghill adumbrated the identity of the model in his essay in the volume presented to Tolkien: the model is Piers (and Bunyan's Christian will do for another). True, *Piers Plowman* isn't precisely a medieval epic as we generally understand the term—but neither is *The Lord of the Rings*: as Richard West pointed out long ago, it's a romance, complete with interlace technique.

Leigh Smith's argument for Aragorn as parallel to Lear is, I think, a trifle tendentious, though she recognizes that even the parallels do not prove *Lear* as source or Shakespeare as influence. There are points in this essay, despite the author's knowledge and enthusiasm, where I am conscious of a kind of disquiet in my reaction: let me note three. She says: "This same sense of heaviness, of 'weight,' lies over what should be the happy ending of *LotR*" (151) (The quotation marks around *weight* refer to the "weight of this sad time" in Edgar's final speech in *Lear*.) Now, apart from the editor's decision to abbreviate *The Lord of the Rings* as *LotR* (a decision with which I disagree, not least on aesthetic grounds—it's not as though we were Tolkien writing a letter), what does she mean by "what should be the happy ending"? If the great stories have no end, why should this have a happy ending? And, in any case, is there not happiness in plenty? And if we're referring to the story of Arwen and Aragorn, what greater happiness is there than to know, in dying, that we are not bound forever to the circles of this world, and beyond them is more than memory? Arwen's death brings her closer to rejoining Aragorn. Or, to take another case, she says on the same page "the greatest evil Tolkien knew: war" (153) and then "There should be no question that Tolkien saw war as one of the greatest evils of the fallen world" (153). I'm not sure either holds (damnation is a greater evil than war), but certainly the second would be more likely to be true than the first. They are emphatically not the same—indeed they implicitly contradict one another. On another page there is another statement that rings warning bells in my mind. "As other critics have shown, he [Tolkien] defines evil in two ways: as a failed attempt at good and therefore dependent upon good for its meaning (the Boethian view) and as an independent force that exists separately from good and must be actively resisted (Manichean view)" (155). Admittedly, the "he" could refer to Shakespeare, but the next sentence begins "This dual view is also present in *Lear* . . . "—so it makes more sense if it refers to Tolkien. I am innately skeptical of any statement beginning with the generality (without footnotes) that *critics* have shown anything. The only Tolkien critic cited in the bibliography is Tom Shippey, and I don't recall his claiming that Tolkien was or is either Boethian or Manichean, both being either heterodox or heretical views. I guess my disquiet comes partly from a sense that the Tolkien Smith sees is not the Tolkien I have been reading for more than half a century. And yet, much of what she says is good, and I think she must be an excellent and enthusiastic teacher.

The last essay in this section is by Anne C. Petty. It is in this essay, I think (with one or two in the last section), that the goal of using Shakespeare and Tolkien for cross-illumination is best achieved, though I must admit that, unlike Petty, when I read in *The Silmarillion* that "before 'the

Valar were aware, the peace of Valinor was poisoned'" (169), I am not immediately reminded of Marcellus's opening line in *Hamlet* that "Something is rotten in the state of Denmark." Nor will I say with her that "Tolkien . . . absorbed these truths [of the nature of the tragic hero] from his encounters with Shakespeare" (174). Her examples, by the way, are Thorin, Denethor, and Fëanor. I might almost give her some Shakespearean feeling with Denethor (a highly dramatic situation and a character from Mediterranean latitudes), but I find I am otherwise unconvinced. And her stated goal of determining whether Tolkien created (her word) "plots and characters that produce catharsis of a Shakespearean magnitude" and whether there is evidence of Tolkien's "inspiration for this tragic sensibility from the plays themselves"(159)—that is not accomplished and perhaps not to be accomplished so briefly. But this is obviously a wide-ranging and stimulating essay.

The next section of the book, on "Magic," contains three essays, two centering on Prospero in *The Tempest*, one on *Macbeth*. First is Nicholas Ozment's "Prospero's Books, Gandalf's Staff: The Ethics of Magic in Shakespeare and Tolkien," then Frank Riga's "Merlin, Prospero, Saruman, and Gandalf: Corrosive Uses of Power in Shakespeare and Tolkien," and then a paper by editor Janet Brennan Croft, " 'Bid the Tree Unfix His Earthbound Root': Motifs from *Macbeth* in J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*," an earlier version of which was published in issue 21 of the journal *Seven* in 2004. The second essay might, of course, have appeared in the "Power" section, and the first and third in the final section on "The Other," but I can see why the editor wanted to have a section on "Magic."

Nicholas Ozment's contribution is apparently a chapter from his Master's thesis (it is referred to as "this chapter" on page 177)—though there is in it a kind of cognitive dissonance, possibly traceable to its thesis origins, when he quotes (on page 180), first C. S. Lewis from his *Oxford History of English Literature* volume, and then Michael D. Bailey (fifty years later) from a volume in the recent Penn State series on magic, without distinguishing between their respective values for a discussion of Tolkien (or indeed Shakespeare). The point he is making (about magic in the Sixteenth Century) needed only the Lewis reference, which is entirely apposite, especially here—but a thesis-writer must show his knowledge of the "literature." It's a minor flaw, if flaw at all, but he would be better off—and is better off—writing from his heart.

Frank Riga's reading on Prospero is both wide and deep: there is so much to read on Merlin that I am unable to draw that same conclusion on his Merlin reading, but it looks good to me. And the whole essay suggests a scholar pretty much in control of his sources and his ideas: it also suggests that concentration on the single comparison between Tolkien

and Shakespeare may be too narrow a conception for the book—but, again, it is a unifying principle and it is not good to quarrel with an author or editor for writing or putting together their existing book when you would rather have them do another. In any case, this seems to me a very good essay.

The editor's own essay is a well-considered and solid piece of work. I hope she will publish more of her own scholarly work, as well as putting together more collections.

This brings us to the last and second longest section of the book, on "The Other." This contains five variegated essays, beginning with Maureen Thum's "Hidden in Plain View: Strategizing Unconventionality in Shakespeare's and Tolkien's Portraits of Women," followed by Robert Gehl's "Something Is Stirring in the East: Racial Identity, Confronting the 'Other,' and Miscegenation in *Othello* and *The Lord of the Rings*," Anna Fåhraeus' "Self-Cursed, Night-fearers, and Usurpers: Tolkien's Atani and Shakespeare's Men," Lisa Hopkins' "Gollum and Caliban: Evolution and Design," and Charles Keim's "Of Two Minds: Gollum and Othello." (One could begin to get tired of "colonized" titles: the last two are at least shorter.)

In the second paragraph of Maureen Thum's essay we find these words: "Like all well-educated Englishmen of his time, Tolkien was closely acquainted with Shakespeare's plays. But there is no indication of a direct connection between his work and Shakespeare's plays, so I therefore wish to refrain from making the case for a one-on-one comparison which would suggest direct influence" (229). Brava! Thum then goes on to use the role-reversal implicit in Bakhtinian *carnival* as a focal point for her discussion (particularly of gender roles) in Tolkien and Shakespeare. Having made the Bakhtinian appeal myself (in a paper delivered in 1987 and finally published in *The Rise of Tolkienian Fantasy* in 2005), I am obviously sympathetic here—very much so. I might suggest that the appeal might be made stronger here by emphasizing Bakhtin's point that *carnival* demands history and tradition (Bakhtin 101). But this is pretty much a model paper, by a scholar who has worked in German Romanticism and the Victorian novel—both properly associated with Tolkien—as well as in parts of English literary history more usually associated with him. I'm not sure I agree in all the details, but I am sure that this is a very good paper indeed.

Robert Gehl's paper on views of racism (and "the other") in Shakespeare and Tolkien reminds me a little of the paper by the late Robert Plank ("The Scouring of the Shire: Tolkien's View of Fascism") in *A Tolkien Compass* (1975). What he says (despite the too-long title) is interesting, even sometimes persuasive, though not (to me) compelling. I would have thought a comparison between Othello and Gollum a little off (as I

thought Plank's choice of the word "fascism" a little off), but I think it's well done. But I don't think I'm buying the implications and connotations of the author's view that in being appointed to destroy the ring, Frodo "is an agent of the state" (262), particularly given Tolkien's views on the use of "the word State" (*Letters* 63). Besides problems with some of the details here, I'm wondering if it would be better to look more at Shakespeare's and—particularly—Tolkien's own views, and perhaps a little less at the general views of the time. And I would suggest that the models for the Orc physiognomy include the Huns (Attila's, not the German "Huns" of British propaganda in the World Wars)—there is something of the "Battle between the Goths and the Huns" here—good Goths, I would suggest. And I do not agree that "race is at the heart of both Tolkien's and Shakespeare's works" (264)—certainly not, for Tolkien, "race" as we ordinarily use the word. But I do agree that *The Lord of the Rings* "presents to its audience a complex vision of how race is constructed as two cultures collide" (265)—which is the more important point.

Anna Fåhraeus argues that both Shakespeare and Tolkien separate the issue of death from the issue of decay, that both confront the alternative of death or nothingness, and that in creating the conditions of mortality in *The Silmarillion*, Tolkien echoes and by echoing alludes to certain of Shakespeare's history plays, particularly *Richard II* and *Richard III* (which open and close the Lancastrian—should I say?—usurpation, 1399-1485, that brought us the "Wars of the Roses"). Despite a host of minor quibbles—a split infinitive or two, that sort of thing—this is an enjoyable paper. On a slightly less minor point, perhaps, there is (in connection with talking about Hobbits and Men together) the statement that "Frodo and Sam are Hobbits, not Men, but . . . [they] are passing into the part of Middle-earth dominated by Men" (272)—an argument the author did not need make, for we all know Hobbits are a "Mannish" race with "Mannish" attributes (viz the "Prologue" to *The Fellowship of the Ring*). Surface parallels between Shakespeare and Tolkien (at least in the characters and stories of Richard II and Ar-Pharazôn) "are mostly superficial, but the connections between the deeper issues are not" (279). Would we have expected otherwise?

Lisa Hopkins' paper on Gollum and Caliban ranges from the epic *translatio imperii* of Vergil to Caliban as a player in Darwin's theory. The comparison between Gollum and Caliban has, in a way, Tolkien's own authority (*Letters* 77), and Hopkins makes good use of it. She also looks at Tolkien in his relationship to Kipling (indirect, at best, though intriguing), to Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (which seems to me well-taken), to H. Rider Haggard (adding a few instances I have not seen pointed out before), and to John Buchan (including his 1922 novel *Huntingtower*). Aside from Stoker, these are scarcely recent discoveries. But that's unimport-

ant—what is important is that it is good to see Tolkien placed in proper context. If considering the question of "Evolution" has brought Hopkins to this point, then I am strongly in favor of her considering that question. And it may not be far astray to think of writers like Kipling and Haggard and Buchan (and A. Conan Doyle would be another) as replying, in various ways, to Darwin or at least "popular Darwin." This Caliban-Gollum pairing is illuminating.

So, though not perhaps to the same extent, is the Othello-Gollum pairing in Charles Keim's essay, the last in the book. Frankly, I prefer Keim's comparison of the fall of Gollum to Lucifer's fall in *Paradise Lost* (307—remember C. S. Lewis on that fall in his *Preface to Paradise Lost*) to his comparison of Gollum and Othello, on which he doubtless says some good things, but which still seems to me forced. And I'm not sure I'd say "Gollum loses his balance and falls into the river of lava" (308)—say into the fires of the mountain itself, the source of the lava. Nor will I agree that Tolkien found instruction from Shakespeare in how to present a complex character. I do welcome Keim's investigation of Gollum's complexity. On the other hand, I don't see the point, in context, of his statement that Othello is "a type of war god" (299). I don't even particularly think it's true.

On the whole, I enjoyed—and found my thinking stimulated by—this book, though I still think the Tolkien-Shakespeare comparisons generally forced. Was there a need for this book? I think not. Still, now that we have it, I will go back to it—or at least to parts of it—from time to time. Of course, I will go back, more often, to the classic essays on Tolkien (Richard West's, for example), or books (Humphrey Carpenter's biography; the *J. R. R. Tolkien Encyclopedia*, for all its publishing flaws; the Wayne G. Hammond and Christina Scull volumes; the great bibliography; Tom Shippey's books), still more to the *History of Middle-earth*, to *The Silmarillion* and *The Hobbit*, to Tolkien's lesser works, and most of all to the six books of *The Lord of the Rings*. And without unduly casting myself as *laudator temporis acti*, I find myself regretting the days when enthusiasm rather than organization (as here) was the hallmark of Tolkien scholarship. But I will keep the book accessible on my shelves, and I will look forward to new work from its authors, including its editor.

<div style="text-align: right">

Jared Lobdell
Elizabethtown, Pennsylvania

</div>

———————

Hart, Trevor and Ivan Khovacs, eds. *Tree of Tales: Tolkien, Literature, and Theology*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007. xii, 132 pp. $29.95 (trade paperback) ISBN 9781932792645.

This new collection of essays is gathered from a conference held at the University of St. Andrews on 8 March 2004 to celebrate the sixty-fifth anniversary of Tolkien's Andrew Lang Lecture, "On Fairy-stories." Comprising seven essays, it is interdisciplinary and focuses upon Tolkien's creative process and its relationship to "On Fairy-stories." A further theme, developed in the later essays, concerns itself with the theological implications of *The Lord of the Rings*. The initial chapters are broad enough to appeal to a generalist audience, and could be used to introduce undergraduates to some of the major themes in Tolkien scholarship. The later essays are more involved with the recent critical conversations and will appeal to those critics familiar with Tolkien's reception and the study of his writings.

The first chapter, "Tolkien, St. Andrews, and Dragons" by Rachel Hart, is less an essay than it is a presentation. As befits Hart's profession as the muniments archivist for St. Andrew's Special Collections, she illuminates the process by which Tolkien was chosen to deliver the 1939 Lang lecture, the publication history of the lectures, and Lang's influence on Tolkien's imagination. Hart discusses the delays in publishing the lecture, in part because of World War II and Tolkien's revisionist tendencies, but much of the material here is common ground for scholars well-versed in Tolkien's lecture and its relationship to his writing.

Colin Duriez, author of several books on the Inklings, provides the next piece, "The Fairy Story: J.R.R. Tolkien and C. S. Lewis," which explores Tolkien and Lewis's "focus upon their preoccupation with rehabilitating fantasy and fairy story" (13). This is a fitting subject for a collection inspired by "On Fairy-stories" and Duriez briefly compares the two authors' approaches to fantasy. He first establishes their mutual bond in the September 1931 late night chat about myth that converted Lewis, and then discusses the state of each author's writings in the late 1930s, with a broader inclusion of *The Lord of the Rings* and *The Chronicles of Narnia*. The essay has an interesting thesis, but is limited by its conference paper length and needs expansion, particularly the pointed comparison between "learning" and "a modernist overemphasis on 'training,'" a point that might yield an important insight, but has only a single paragraph dedicated to it (21). Duriez also relies heavily upon Humphrey Carpenter's *The Inklings* (1978) for both historical details and analysis, which suggests a need for more direct engagement with the authors' novels and drafts, rather than relying upon secondary sources.

The third essay, "Tolkien's Mythopoesis" by Kirstin Johnson, deals with Tolkien's poem "Mythopoeia" and "the concept that lies behind the poem and within its title" (26). Johnson does not engage directly with the poem, but instead dwells upon the significance of the mythopoetic as "myth-making" or "literary myth," a definition she rightly judges "not very helpful" (30). She makes use of Owen Barfield's theory of language and myth, and Tolkien's appreciation of it, to leverage a view that "myth has a central place in language, literature and the history of thought" (30). The term mythopoeia becomes connected with Tolkien's concept of sub-creation, at which point Johnson turns to *The Lord of the Rings*, providing a handful of close readings to support her thesis that Tolkien wrote within a specific theoretical frame based on mythopoeia. Johnson's use of Barfield is an uncommon enough analytic approach in Tolkien studies to make it worthwhile, and an interesting direction to follow.

Chapter four, Trevor Hart's essay "Tolkien, Creation, and Creativity," considers the theological views inherent in Tolkien's creative process. Hart acknowledges that the heart of Tolkien's methods lies in "On Fairy-stories," but "forays into the same territory, bearing weapons and wearing armor of a different sort" in order to argue that "sub-creation . . . [was] already present in all but name in the beginning" of Tolkien's writings on Middle-earth. Hart deals at length with *The Silmarillion* and fruitfully examines creation and Fall stories of the First Age of Middle-earth (44-48). Tolkien's Andrew Lang lecture serves as a kind of confirmation of Tolkien's pre-existing practice, rather than an indication of his transition from the author of *The Hobbit* to the author of *The Lord of the Rings*. Hart also discusses the way *The Silmarillion* serves as an allegory for Biblical themes, a subject less important to *The Lord of the Rings*. I would suggest that the turn away from direct allegory may be the result of the more confident concept of sub-creation as stated in "On Fairy-stories," a possible argument that builds upon Hart's work.

The fifth piece, David Lyle Jeffrey's "Tolkien and the Future of Literary Studies," is intended to be a centerpiece essay for the collection, as it was also the Andrew Lang lecture of the 2004 conference. Jeffrey's essay, something of a call-to-arms speech, ranges over wide literary territory. It is concerned with rehabilitating fantasy as a genre and religion as a subject of study (56), providing a moment of intratextual reference to Duriez's argument in chapter two. It is also a reflection on what-is-next-to-come for literary studies and has a broad appeal to many readers on those grounds. Warmly composed, with moments of humor found in Jeffrey's anxieties about providing a contextualizing lecture for a heavily (and bizarrely) adapted version of *Doctor Faustus*, this piece is a bridge between the Tolkien-specific chapters of the book and the humanities as a whole.

The book's sixth essay, "Tolkien and the Surrendering of Power" by Loren Wilkinson, is the result of her "being asked to say some things comparing Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings* story with Peter Jackson's *Lord of the Rings* film" (71). She is careful not to deny the films their success, but is hardly ambivalent about the changes made from Tolkien's text. Wilkinson rightly acknowledges Tolkien's willingness for a filmed version of his novel, and his concerns about such a thing, and her main complaint is over the way the films recast the heroes of the novel. In Wilkinson's view, "there are two kinds of story in *The Lord of the Rings*: the hero story and the gardener story" (82). Jackson's films center around the hero story because it "is much easier to tell in film" (82). Wilkinson finds great fault at the failure of the movie trilogy to explore suffering as a Christian virtue, and she places great emphasis upon "the medium of film" (83) and its inability to convey this message, a point of argument that appears to mean well, but would do with more exploration. Wilkinson writes: "The whole Christian story undercuts this concept of lordship: it too is about giving up power. Thus it is ironic today that an avowed enemy of Christianity like Philip Pullman in his 'Dark Materials' trilogy calls the Christian God 'the authority' and has its two child heroes destroy God as the Fellowship of the Ring destroys Sauron" (83). Given the recent film version of Pullman's *The Golden Compass* and the excision of its religious themes, I would suggest that the concerns of producers and marketing departments, as well as the norms of the adventure genre, are more of a concern for filmmakers and hold a great deal of influence over writers and directors.

The final chapter, Ralph Wood's "Tolkien's Augustinian Understanding of Good and Evil: Why *The Lord of the Rings* is not Manichean," is the liveliest in the collection. A sustained polemic against Tom Shippey's judgment that evil in *The Lord of the Rings* is both Augustinian and Manichean, it is a well-structured and well-written piece of critical response. As one might surmise from the title, Wood denies the possibility of Manichaeism in the novel, insisting that Tolkien's model of evil is wholly Augustinian. In doing so, he provides a very interesting reading of the One Ring and its influence upon Frodo's failure, demonstrating "that temptation and compulsion are not opposite but complimentary operations of evil" (92). Wood is careful not to make a straw man out of Shippey, and affords the discussion of evil in *J.R.R. Tolkien: Author of the Century* (2001) great respect. Wood's essay does not diminish the brilliance of Shippey's reading, but does add nuance to its quality. One hopes that Shippey may reply in some form, adding more to this potentially fruitful debate.

While not all of the essays in *Tree of Tales* add new insight to Tolkien's work, the majority are strong contributions to the field. Certain of them may be suitable for specific teaching goals, though the collection is not

broad enough to serve as a general course text. Instead, *Tree of Tales* supplements current discussions of Tolkien well, offering an energetic and sincere concern for the artist and his work.

Michael J. Brisbois
University of Calgary
Calgary, Canada

Book Notes

It may interest some readers of *Tolkien Studies* to know that, about six months after the release of the original trade and limited editions of *The Children of Húrin*, HarperCollins announced a sumptuous deluxe edition, bound in real Italian leather and limited to 500 copies, all signed and hand-numbered by Christopher Tolkien and Alan Lee. Each book comes in a custom-built clamshell traycase. Price £350.00, ISBN 9780007252244.

Coinciding with the above announcement, HarperCollins also released an 8 CD audiobook of *The Children of Húrin*, with Christopher Tolkien reading the preface and introduction, and Christopher Lee reading the unabridged novel. Price £29.99 / $49.95, ISBN 9780007263455.

Earlier in 2007, Tolkien's short illustrated children's story *Mr. Bliss* was reissued by HarperCollins in a reformatted, slipcased facsimile edition, newly reproduced from the author's original manuscript held in the Special Collections and Archives at Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Price £16.99, ISBN 9780007255337.

Janet Brennan Croft and Edith Crowe have produced *An Index to Mythlore: Issues 1-100*, published by the Mythopoeic Press. This is a much more extensive undertaking than might appear from the title alone. A trade paperback of 314 pages, it has two main sections, indexing articles in one section and book reviews in the other. The articles are indexed three ways—alphabetically by author (with short abstracts of each article), by title, and by subject. The book reviews are indexed by the name of the author of the review, and separately by the item reviewed (sorted by author). An introduction by Janet Brennan Croft opens the book, and it closes with a welcome checklist of the 100 issues, giving side-by-side the whole number of each issue along with the date and the corresponding volume and issue number (the twenty-six volumes have anywhere from two to four single issues per volume), making it easier to find specific issues and their correct bibliographical citations. Price $25.00, ISBN 9781887726122.

Douglas A. Anderson

Project MUSE®
Scholarly journals online

broad enough to serve as a general course text. Instead, *Tree of Tales* supplements current discussions of Tolkien well, offering an energetic and sincere concern for the artist and his work.

<div align="right">

Michael J. Brisbois
University of Calgary
Calgary, Canada

</div>

———————

Book Notes

It may interest some readers of *Tolkien Studies* to know that, about six months after the release of the original trade and limited editions of *The Children of Húrin*, HarperCollins announced a sumptuous deluxe edition, bound in real Italian leather and limited to 500 copies, all signed and hand-numbered by Christopher Tolkien and Alan Lee. Each book comes in a custom-built clamshell traycase. Price £350.00, ISBN 9780007252244.

Coinciding with the above announcement, HarperCollins also released an 8 CD audiobook of *The Children of Húrin*, with Christopher Tolkien reading the preface and introduction, and Christopher Lee reading the unabridged novel. Price £29.99 / $49.95, ISBN 9780007263455.

Earlier in 2007, Tolkien's short illustrated children's story *Mr. Bliss* was reissued by HarperCollins in a reformatted, slipcased facsimile edition, newly reproduced from the author's original manuscript held in the Special Collections and Archives at Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Price £16.99, ISBN 9780007255337.

Janet Brennan Croft and Edith Crowe have produced *An Index to Mythlore: Issues 1-100*, published by the Mythopoeic Press. This is a much more extensive undertaking than might appear from the title alone. A trade paperback of 314 pages, it has two main sections, indexing articles in one section and book reviews in the other. The articles are indexed three ways—alphabetically by author (with short abstracts of each article), by title, and by subject. The book reviews are indexed by the name of the author of the review, and separately by the item reviewed (sorted by author). An introduction by Janet Brennan Croft opens the book, and it closes with a welcome checklist of the 100 issues, giving side-by-side the whole number of each issue along with the date and the corresponding volume and issue number (the twenty-six volumes have anywhere from two to four single issues per volume), making it easier to find specific issues and their correct bibliographical citations. Price $25.00, ISBN 9781887726122.

<div align="right">

Douglas A. Anderson

</div>

Project
MUSE®
Scholarly journals online

The Year's Work in Tolkien Studies 2005

David Bratman

Tolkien studies in 2005 retrenched into *Lord of the Rings* studies. Not many of the published items were primarily concerned with any other work by Tolkien, and a few which could have benefited from consideration of other work failed to do so. Some writers still need to watch out for the fallacious assumption that Tolkien wrote nothing else of importance.

The keynote publication of the year was *The Lord of the Rings: A Reader's Companion* by Wayne G. Hammond and Christina Scull. This is essentially an enormous spinoff project of *Rings*-related material from the authors' even larger *The J.R.R. Tolkien Companion & Guide* which appeared the following year. The works together may be considered as a core dump of these very learned scholars' knowledge about Tolkien up to the time of writing. They received the Mythopoeic Scholarship Award in Inklings Studies in successive years, 2006 and 2007.

The Hammond and Scull works are encyclopedic in form. The outstanding monograph of the year was not typical of the year in subject: it felt either like a relic of earlier, broader years or a harbinger of times to come. This was *Interrupted Music* by Verlyn Flieger, a consideration of Tolkien's *legendarium* as a whole and perforce largely concerned with *The History of Middle-earth*. Flieger also was responsible for editing an important primary source, Tolkien's drafts and supplementary essays to *Smith of Wootton Major*. As this appeared in the U.K. only, American scholars may be slow to appreciate the value of this material in understanding both the nature and the discrimination of Tolkien's imagination.

Mythological and medieval studies of Tolkien remained alive and well with three important volumes, *The Keys of Middle-earth* by Stuart D. Lee and Elizabeth Solopova, *Perilous Realms* by Marjorie Burns, and the anthology *Tolkien's Modern Middle Ages* edited by Jane Chance and Alfred K. Siewers. Most of the contents of this anthology are described together below, as are those of *Reading The Lord of the Rings* edited by Robert Eaglestone, a collection of essays employing postmodern critical theory. Images of square pegs and round holes come to mind when considering this book. The remaining scholarly anthology of the year, *Reconsidering Tolkien* edited by Thomas Honegger (Zollikofen, Switzerland: Walking Tree Press, 2005), collects theoretical essays mostly of a frustrating miscellaneous vagueness. They are described, to the best of this annotator's ability, separately.

Source and comparative studies also continue to thrive, divided into

those which declare they have found Tolkien's source and those which are merely interested in making the comparison, source or not. Post-classical literature was a particular field of interest in 2005, which also saw the arrival of comparisons with J.K. Rowling and Philip Pullman by enthusiasts of the younger authors who consider the best way to boost their favorites is to bash their predecessor. But the works most often compared with Tolkien are, of course, the *Lord of the Rings* films directed and co-authored by Peter Jackson. Relative comparisons are still made, but some of this year's material pursues the healthy course of treating the films as totally independent works of art.

Outstanding individual essays of the year included Richard C. West on the morality of honesty in Tolkien, Hilary Longstaff's character study of Merry Brandybuck, Adam Roberts' analysis of the One Ring, and Joseph Ripp's large survey of 1960s Tolkien commentary. Other essays ranged through the thoughtful and useful to the inaccurate or thoroughly wrongheaded. Comments on the last group may leave the impression that the reviewer wants only worshipful or admiring essays on Tolkien. But while it remains true that authors who admire Tolkien have a better chance of understanding him usefully, even a fundamental criticism of Tolkien's premises is praiseworthy if it is actually insightful and significant—and such work is likely also to come from admirers. Two such essays are notable this year: Scott Kleinman on Sam Gamgee's servility, an often maltreated topic, and Adam Rosman arguing that Gandalf acts immorally. Both are in the tradition of Verlyn Flieger's "Taking the Part of Trees" (in *J.R.R. Tolkien and His Literary Resonances*, 2000) as bold critiques that honor Tolkien by taking his morality seriously enough to point out flaws in it.

Journal publications devoted to Tolkien of the year included Volume 2 of the journal in hand, *Tolkien Studies: An Annual Scholarly Review*, *Mallorn* issue 43 from The Tolkien Society, and two issues of the linguistic publication *Vinyar Tengwar* from the Elvish Linguistic Fellowship, issues 47 and 48. The Mythopoeic Society did not produce an issue of *Mythlore* in 2005.

WORKS BY TOLKIEN

The "Extended Edition" of Tolkien's story *Smith of Wootton Major*, edited by Verlyn Flieger (London: HarperCollins, 2005), may be seen as a pair with the 50th anniversary edition of *Farmer Giles of Ham* edited by Wayne G. Hammond and Christina Scull (1999). Each offers commentaries and supplementary material to a classic short Tolkien story set in early medieval England. But the type of material offered by each is very different. *Smith* is much lighter than *Giles* in points calling for objective annotation. Accordingly, Flieger's editorial commentary is limited to a

brief history of the story's composition and reception, plus some notes mostly etymological and mostly not directly on the story. However, *Smith* is much richer than *Giles* in ancillary material by Tolkien himself, and the vast majority of this is printed here for the first time. Besides two early drafts, given in both facsimile and transcription, this includes the original unfinished introduction to MacDonald's *The Golden Key* that led Tolkien to write the story, plus a long supplementary essay and an associated time scheme. These not only clarify the dates which are so strikingly emphasized in the story itself, but also provide a vast amount of background information, on such matters as the journeys of the earlier Master Cook (Smith's grandfather) to Faery, and the question of why its King came to Wootton Major at all. The overall impression is that this is the sort of background information which the reader of *Smith* half-realized all along. It's nice to know, and a superb example of Tolkien's creativity, but the story itself is vastly the better for leaving it to the side.

"*Eldarin Hands, Fingers & Numerals*, and Related Writings," linguistic writings by Tolkien edited by Patrick H. Wynne, began publication in two issues of the journal *Vinyar Tengwar* from 2005: Part One in no. 47: 3-42, and Part Two in no. 48: 4-34. The final Part Three appeared in 2007 in no. 49: 3-37. These essays, short and somewhat fragmentary, dating from 1967-70, describe the historical philology of the Elvish languages, in particular focusing on number-names and their relation to finger-counting. They also discuss place names. Although Elves are stated to have preferred to reckon in sixes and twelves, most of the numbering systems here are decimal. The writings, being somewhat scattered, are sometimes mutually contradictory. Part One includes the title essay (5-14) and an untitled essay on the words *neter*, *kanat*, and *enek* (14-17). Part Two includes a "Synopsis of Pengoloð's Eldarinwe Leperi are Notessi," so titled by the editor, and two appendices to this (4-14), "Variation D/L in Common Eldarin" (22-26), and "The Problem of Lhûn" (26-29). Extensive notes by the editor take up the remainder of each publication.

Two important Tolkien publications are buried inside *The Lord of the Rings: A Reader's Companion* by Wayne G. Hammond and Christina Scull (London: HarperCollins, 2005). "Nomenclature of *The Lord of the Rings*" (750-82) is a newly transcribed text, with more of Tolkien's original abbreviations retained, of the work published as "Guide to the Names in *The Lord of the Rings*" in 1975. It is a guide for translators that reveals much of Tolkien's intent behind choosing particular names, especially those of English origin, in the first place. Hammond and Scull also print (742-49) a summary of the story of *The Lord of the Rings* from Tolkien's ca. 1951 letter to Milton Waldman outlining his entire *legendarium*. The summary had been omitted, for space reasons, from the Waldman letter as given in Tolkien's published *Letters* (see page 160 of that book).

A Middle English Reader and Vocabulary by Kenneth Sisam and J.R.R. Tolkien (New York: Dover, 2005) reproduces in facsimile Sisam's collection of *Fourteenth Century Verse & Prose* (1921)—here retitled *A Middle English Reader*—as combined with *A Middle English Vocabulary* (1922) that Tolkien compiled for it.

General Works, Biography, and Reference

The Lord of the Rings: A Reader's Companion by Wayne G. Hammond and Christina Scull (London: HarperCollins, 2005) is essentially the annotations for a hypothetical annotated *Lord of the Rings*. Even by itself, this monument is 976 pages long, approaching the length of the work it comments on, and to include the text of Tolkien's book would have been impractical. Entries are tied to the paginations of two common editions of *The Lord of the Rings*, and headwords enable the *Companion* to be used with other editions as well. Hammond and Scull's commentary is extremely full, particularly so on internal references in the story (places where the narrative alludes to other events in the tale) and textual matters (significant changes made in the text after publication, and why they were made). The *Companion* is particularly useful in this respect as a gloss on the textual changes made for the 50th anniversary edition of *The Lord of the Rings* in 2004 and the revised text of this in 2005. Many of these changes were based on manuscript sources not previously used to establish the text. Of other subjects treated in the *Companion*, the most definitively handled is onomastics, with much citation of the "Nomenclature," even though that is given in full elsewhere in the book. The annotators offer authoritative opinions on various inextricable sub-creational questions, provide definitions of unusual words, offer some light and selective literary interpretations from several major critics, and provide source notes, more tied to points of wording than to themes and events. Primary-world proverbs, nursery rhymes, historical events, and authors from Shakespeare to William Morris are cited in this context.

More People's Guide to J.R.R. Tolkien (Cold Spring Harbor, N.Y.: Cold Spring Press, 2005) is the awkwardly-titled follow-up to *The People's Guide to J.R.R. Tolkien*, from the same publisher in 2003. Both are collections of informal essays mostly from a web site, TheOneRing.net. The authors' names are given on the title page, but they are identified in the book by their online bylines: Cliff Broadway (Quickbeam), Erica Challis (Tehanu), Cynthia L. McNew (Anwyn), Dave Smith (Turgon), and Michael Urban (Ostadan). The essays have a breezy confidence, but the command of facts and the ability to explain Tolkien seem to be on a slightly lesser level than in the previous book. Many of these essays exist on the borderline between internal study of the sub-creation and external consideration of its literary or moral significance. The authors show great

patience in the Q&A section when responding to submitted questions on the order of, "Why didn't Gandalf just beat up the bad guys?" Scholars may find this volume most interesting for the collection of interviews with Anne C. Petty, Verlyn Flieger, Douglas A. Anderson, Jane Chance, Karen Wynn Fonstad, and Bradley J. Birzer, primarily discussing how they came to write and publish their books on Tolkien.

J.R.R. Tolkien: Master of Fantasy by David R. Collins (Minneapolis: Lerner, 1992) was a relatively successful juvenile biography of Tolkien, factually accurate and workmanlike if uninspired. A new edition (Minneapolis: Lerner, 2005) omits the subtitle and adds a credit line, "In Consultation with Martha Cosgrove, M.A. and Reading Specialist." Cosgrove's contribution seems to have been a thorough rewriting of the main text, which is unchanged in content (apart from a new introduction and conclusion framing Tolkien's story in terms of the Jackson films) but pervasively dumbed-down in wording and reading level. This makes a worthy but already dull book duller. New sidebar boxes labeled "It's a Fact!" present what "may have" or "probably" inspired Tolkien or which "remind some readers," leading one to wonder what the publishers think the word "fact" means. The maps and the ugly chapter heading illustrations of the original edition are gone, but the photograph of a page from the Nov. 1909 *King Edward's School Chronicle* Debating Society report is still there, in a smaller reproduction (38).

The Tolkien Society Guide to Oxford, edited by Richard Crawshaw, Ian Collier, and Andrew Butler (Cheltenham: Tolkien Society, 2005), is a useful pamphlet for visitors familiar with the details of Tolkien's biography. With maps and many color snapshots, it walks through Tolkien-related sites in the university and the city. Special sections give more detail on Merton College and the University Parks. A biographical sketch by David Doughan introduces the text.

"The Birthplace of J.R.R. Tolkien" by Beth Russell (*Tolkien Studies* 2: 225-29) is not a description of the building, but a reminder that the political unit of Tolkien's birth in 1892 was the Orange Free State, not the yet-uncreated Union of South Africa. As English folk, the Tolkiens were aliens in a Boer republic.

"Elves on the Avon" by Lynn Forest-Hill (*Times Literary Supplement* 8 July 2005: 12-13), quite detailed and learned for a newspaper article, discusses the city of Warwick as an inspiration for Tolkien, even quoting from two versions of the poem "Kortirion Among the Trees" to demonstrate and explain Warwick's association with the Elven city. Warwick's historical place in the medieval civilizations evoked in Rohan and Gondor, and its role in Tolkien's life, are also discussed, in detail and with subtlety.

Kate de Goldi's "Blaming Tolkien" (*New Zealand Books* 15.1: 22-23)

is a short polemic barely citing Tolkien's work or much of anyone else's. After assuring the reader that there is adventure fantasy she likes, she redefines fantasy as "bad fantasy" and proceeds to bash it as unimaginative action-adventure fiction.

The chapter on Tolkien (118-35) in K.V. Johansen's *Quests and Kingdoms: A Grown-Up's Guide to Children's Fantasy Literature* (Sackville, New Brunswick: Sybertooth, 2005) is unusually long even for this very thorough survey of the field. Though Johansen's emphasis is on books specifically for older children, she describes everything by Tolkien that she thinks might be read by children and teens, discussing books ranging from *Bilbo's Last Song* to *The Lays of Beleriand*. The bulk of the chapter is brisk and accurate plot descriptions, but Johansen also offers a cogent defense of Tolkien against the charge of derivativeness, and she carefully distinguishes *The Lord of the Rings* from its movies.

"The Oxford Fantasists: J.R.R. Tolkien and C.S. Lewis" by Peter J. Schakel (*A Companion to the British and Irish Novel, 1945-2000*, edited by Brian W. Shaffer (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005): 354-66) is a basic encyclopedic article briefly discussing the authors' lives, their theories of fantasy, and—at greater length—their practice. For Tolkien, this means just *The Hobbit* and *The Lord of the Rings*. Schakel notes themes of facing evil and of unlikely heroism, and provides unusually lucid, thematically-based plot summaries.

The short entry on Tolkien (557-62) in *100 Most Popular Genre Fiction Authors: Biographical Studies and Bibliographies* by Bernard A. Drew (Westport, Conn.: Libraries Unlimited, 2005) quotes authorities to confirm his significance in fantasy and children's literature, but otherwise says nothing about his status as a genre author. A biographical sketch is followed by an incomplete and wayward primary and secondary bibliography.

Brief entries on two Tolkien works appear in *The Greenwood Encyclopedia of Science Fiction and Fantasy: Themes, Works, and Wonders*, edited by Gary Westfahl (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2005). The entry for *The Hobbit* by Theodore James Sherman (1082-84) emphasizes Bilbo's personal growth, and is notable for the persistent spelling "dwarfs," which in this post-Tolkien era always looks wrong. The entry for *The Lord of the Rings* by Darrell Schweitzer (1150-52) addresses the seriousness and depth of the sub-creation. The brevity of the entries may be conveyed by Schweitzer's summary of half the action of the book in a single sentence: "Epic struggles ensue, against the backdrop of the War of the Ring, as Sauron strives to conquer Middle-earth" (1151).

General Literary Criticism

Verlyn Flieger is a learned and perceptive scholar who has always aimed her books at the advanced Tolkien student. *Interrupted Music: The*

Making of Tolkien's Mythology (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 2005) is the most advanced of all: it is addressed at an audience with intimate command of Tolkien's posthumous work (and who will quibble with some fortunately minor and insignificant questions of fact). Any other readers are likely to be dazed by the complexity of the material being discussed, and the sophistication of the argument. The subject is the framing of Tolkien's mythology: if we're pretending that this is real, who wrote it down?, and how did it get into our hands? These are questions that go beyond the simple matter of sub-creational authenticity, through narrators, point of view, and frame devices, erupting into their reception in the primary world. Flieger discusses primary-world mythologies such as the Eddas and *Kalevala*, whose transmission forms an important process that significantly shapes the work as we know it. Tolkien wanted his fictional mythology to have the same feel. Flieger shows how he attempted this, in a book that's almost more a meditation on the subject than a study, though monumentally detailed.

Reading The Lord of the Rings: New Writings on Tolkien's Classic, edited by Robert Eaglestone (London: Continuum, 2005) is an assemblage of purpose-written essays stuffing aspects of Tolkien's work into postmodernist critical theory to see whether it fits, on the grounds that not enough of this had previously been done (see Eaglestone's "Introduction," 1-11). Most of the essays fall into the general literary criticism category. Michael D.C. Drout begins by questing "Towards a Better Tolkien Criticism" (15-29), by which he means one that would not take Tolkien's statements in his published letters at face value. Drout has a point, as it is fallacious to use an author's intent as evidence of his achievement, and authors are not always reliable guides to their own intent. But authors' comments on their own work are still a starting point, a reality check against critical interpretations that reveal nothing except the state of the critics' minds. In a footnote (176), Drout complains about interpretations of Tolkien by folk etymology (meanings based on what a word happens to sound like to the critic), but that is what you get when critics fail to pay attention to the author's intent.

Eaglestone's own essay on "Invisibility" (73-84) gives some excellent examples of this kind of misreading. While trying to interpret the Ring's power as a metaphor for personal separation as opposed to community, Eaglestone makes Peter Jackson's error of assuming the synecdoche "The Eye of Sauron" means that Sauron is physically only an eye. He even more strangely misreads Frodo's offer of the Ring to Galadriel as "revenge and enactment of his power as Ringbearer over her, leaving her 'shrunken'" (83). Apparently Eaglestone thinks it is Frodo who shrinks her when she rejects the Ring's temptation.

But this essay is balanced by one on "The One Ring" itself by Adam

Roberts (59-70). Roberts insightfully asks why Tolkien should use an unadorned band of gold, physically resembling a wedding ring, as a symbol of ultimate evil, particularly as he had no aversion to or fear of marriage. (A critic who had failed to study Tolkien's biography might assume that he had.) Roberts's cautious suggestion is that Tolkien sees the binding power of the Ring "as embodying a sort of malign anti-marriage, the photographic negative, as it were, of a blessed sacrament" (69).

Another pair of essays matching wrongheadedness with insight are those by Esther Saxey on "Homoeroticism" (124-37) and Scott Kleinman on "Service" (138-48). Saxey, noting that every possible homosexual pairing in *The Lord of the Rings* has been drafted by one fan writer or another, stoutly asserts that "they are potentially *all* lovers" (137). Certainly this is possible if one totally ignores what the author is likely to have thought on the subject, but it is unfalsifiable. They're potentially anything, at least until one tries to tie this speculation to textual evidence. First mistaking stereotypical homosexual trappings for homoeroticism, and then mistaking innocent congruency for the trappings, Saxey supplies a fine bouquet of misreadings, including a catalog of Tolkien's uses of the word "queer" (127). Most of Saxey's examples point directly at Frodo and Sam, so she keeps unconvincingly insisting that she is not claiming that pair to be homosexuals any more than any other two male characters.

Kleinman, however, correctly reads Sam's love for Frodo as a servant's love for a kind master, and then asks some penetrating questions about where this comes from, for Sam does not begin the story as Frodo's personal manservant, and by the end of the quest they share adversity as equals. Kleinman also contrasts Théoden's and Denethor's styles of leadership. He observes that Éowyn mistakes her own love for Aragorn the great captain as a phantom romantic love. He does not comment that Éowyn's error is the same kind of misreading made by Saxey.

Jennifer Neville on "Women" (101-10) uses the paucity of female characters in the novel as the starting point for a claim that Tolkien inherited a critical view, now held to be factually wrong, of the insignificance of women in Anglo-Saxon culture. This argument becomes productive when Neville points out that if Tolkien had not made Éowyn a powerless figure in Théoden's court, her subsequent heroism would not be so outstanding.

Holly A. Crocker on "Masculinity" (111-23) reinforces an additional point of Neville's, that the hobbits, though male, are remarkably weak and feminized for the heroes of a heroic war tale. (A citation of "The Feminine Principle in Tolkien" by Melanie Rawls (*Mythlore* no. 38 (1984): 5-13), which made this point first and extensively, would have been suitable here, but is absent.) Crocker usefully discusses the good and bad sides of her subject, but seems to confuse men, the sex, with Men, the

race. Barry Langford on "Time" (29-46) contrasts Tolkien's slow unfolding with the hurry-up style of the Jackson films, and addresses Tolkien's evocation of secondary-world history and the depths of time. Simon Malpas on "Home" (85-98) uses writings of Martin Heidegger to frame his discussion of Tolkien's use of themes of home, homelessness, and the threat of technological development.

The Eaglestone contributors' attempts at re-envisaging Tolkien are outclassed by "Gandalf as Torturer: The Ticking Bomb Terrorist and Due Process in J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*" by Adam Rosman (*Mallorn* 43: 38-42), the most arresting article of the year. Despite beginning with a dubious claim that Jackson's films capture Tolkien's moral clarity, Rosman zeroes in on that moral clarity and argues that Tolkien violates it. Gandalf, by being "harsh" with Gollum and "put[ting] the fear of fire on him," has by modern standards tortured him—and, Rosman argues, does so unnecessarily, merely to confirm information Gandalf already has and does not immediately act upon. Thus, even the "ticking bomb" thought experiment for justifying torture does not apply. Though the arguments can be loose (the Elves imprison Gollum though "he had broken no Elvish law" (39n)—how does Rosman know what Elvish law is?), the article is most usefully provocative.

In interesting contrast to Rosman is "'And She Named Her Own Name': Being True to One's Word in Tolkien's Middle-earth" by Richard C. West (*Tolkien Studies* 2: 1-10). West shows truthfulness and honor to be so deeply embedded in Tolkien's morality that even extraordinary instances pass almost without comment. In his earliest stories, Tolkien tried excusing prevarication, but both author and characters found this did not work: honesty is not only nobler, but better policy, as with Lúthien deceiving Morgoth by disarming him with the truth.

"Merry in Focus: On Ring Fever, Having Adventures, Being Overlooked, and Not Getting Left Behind" by Hilary Longstaff (*Mallorn* 43: 43-48) is a careful character study in the form of a biography of Merry drawn from a close reading of his appearances in *The Lord of the Rings*. Merry is a capable and conscientious hobbit who learns from experience, maturing from cocksure into a capable leader and, finally, a seasoned warrior. He bears striking resemblances to Tolkien, in his love of history and pipeweed, and in spending the climax of his war frustratingly stuck in a sickbed.

"Tolkien: The Road to Getting It Right" by Paula Persoleo (*The Image of the Road in Literature, Media, and Society*, ed. Will Wright and Steven Kaplan [Pueblo, CO: Society for the Interdisciplinary Study of Social Imagery, 2005]: 170-75) is a comparative study of three characters: Fëanor, Bilbo, and Frodo. Each goes on a quest, each fails to complete it fully (Persoleo believes that Bilbo should have been the dragon-slayer), and

each quest has unexpected repercussions. The books in which these characters appear have one other thing in common, according to Persoleo: they're all flawed. *The Silmarillion* is disjointed, *The Hobbit* has a hero who's insufficiently heroic, and the plot of *The Lord of the Rings* has too many fortuitous events in it.

"The Road Goes Ever On: Tolkien's Use of the 'Journey' Motive in Constructing *The Lord of the Rings*" by John Ellison (*Mallorn* 43: 15-19) discusses Tolkien's control of narrative flow and tension in the very long journey sequences that occupy so much of the story. The long journeys in volume one, punctuated by stopping places and shorter travels, are described leisurely but build up great descriptive power. The rest of the book alternates fast-paced activity in the West with the ever more slow and halting progress of Frodo and Sam. By the end of the book, the journey has become a spiritual pilgrimage as well.

In "'Tricksy Lights': Literary and Folkloric Elements in Tolkien's Passage of the Dead Marshes" (*Tolkien Studies* 2: 93-112), Margaret Sinex presents a narrative reading of this part of *The Lord of the Rings* almost as a medieval horror story. Tolkien combines World War I battlefield imagery with corpse-lights and related gruesome themes from Icelandic sagas and European folklore. Readers of this essay will learn more than they want to know about the "Hand of Glory."

As the title suggests, "Poem as Sign in *The Lord of the Rings*" by Rebecca Ankeny (*Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts* 16: 86-95) is a study of the semiotics of the work's poetry. Ankeny discusses the significance of the presence of poetry in the story, the patterns of its occurrences, and the demographics of its reciters. Unlike many commentators, she finds Bombadil's songs familiarizing and comforting. She raises an interesting point of framing by imagining how different *The Lord of the Rings* would feel if the Old Walking Song, rather than the Ring-Verse, appeared on its frontispiece.

Two more specific poetic studies on *The Lord of the Rings* appeared this year. "Gilraen's *Linnod*: Function, Genre, Prototypes" by Sandra Ballif Straubhaar (*Tolkien Studies* 2: 235-44) identifies the alliterative epigram uttered by Aragorn's mother in Appendix A as a form of Norse *kvidhlingar* or "speechlets." Straubhaar also offers a general defense of Tolkien's verse as essential to and deeply integrated into the text. "A History of Song: The Transmission of Memory in Middle-earth" by Michael Cunningham (*Mallorn* 43: 27-29) describes the Lament of the Rohirrim from Book 3, Chapter 6 as simultaneously a lament for lost days, a funerary hymn, and a call to arms.

John Wm. Houghton and Neal K. Keesee take a stab at defining Tolkien's view of evil in "Tolkien, King Alfred, and Boethius: Platonist Views of Evil in *The Lord of the Rings*" (*Tolkien Studies* 2: 131-59). Where

Tom Shippey describes Tolkien as balancing two opposing views of evil, Houghton and Keesee are able to subsume it all within the Platonist view that evil is a nothingness, an absence of good rather than an active force. This, they say, does not contradict the view that evil must be actively resisted. They note imagery suggesting that Tolkien's evil characters are tending towards a condition of nothingness.

"Love: 'The Gift of Death'" by Linda Greenwood (*Tolkien Studies* 2: 171-95) discusses various thematic oppositions and ironies in *The Lord of the Rings*: going forward without hope, the exalting of the humble, the weakness of the hero (Boromir, the most traditionally heroic character), love towards one's enemies, fantasy as a flight to reality, flexibility amid rigid social roles, the eucatastrophe of sadness in the happy ending, and finally death as a gift. All this is classed as deconstruction of the text.

"Tolkien's Imaginary Nature: An Analysis of the Structure of Middle-earth" by Michael J. Brisbois (*Tolkien Studies* 2: 197-216) is a study of nature as a character in *The Lord of the Rings*. The intense realism of Tolkien's natural descriptions help ground the story, yet nature expresses the morality of Middle-earth in quite explicit ways. (Brisbois calls this Ambient nature, and it is sometimes literally ambient, when characters find themselves surrounded by trees that weren't there before.) Natural features and creatures are marked by their activity or passivity in the face of good and evil, and by their hostility or benevolence towards the representatives of these forces.

"Perspectives on Reality in *The Lord of the Rings*" by Gerardo Barajas Garrido (*Mallorn* 43: 53-59) is the conclusion of a two-part article, begun in *Mallorn* 42 (2004): 51-59. This part is headed "Nature, Beauty, and Death." The article gives a philosophical perspective on the beauty of nature, in which Tolkien's Elves come closest to perceiving the reality of nature as an approach to a Platonic ideal. Death can be a comfort for humans, whose immortal spirits live on, but is more problematic and limiting for the immortal Elves. Garrido concludes by describing Tolkien's view of good and evil as complex, despite critical depictions of it as oversimple. Throughout, Garrido discusses the tension between change and stasis: nature grows and needs to be tended, and death is the essence of change.

Paul E. Kerry's "Thoughts on J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings* and History" (Honegger 67-85) concern the presentation of the story as history, with dates and facts, and as a historical novel comparable in presentation to those of Scott and Tolstoy. Thus, even though they write in story form, all these authors are mimetic, and equally so whether the history they draw on is true or feigned. Tolkien's treatment of history as a narrative is similar to the practice of classic historians.

Natasa Tucev presents a Jungian analysis in "The Knife, the Sting and

the Tooth: Manifestations of Shadow in *The Lord of the Rings*" (Honegger 87-105). Tucev sees the Ringwraiths as the shadow of Númenóreans and Shelob as a shadow queen. The essay is particularly notable for its comments on Gollum as Frodo's shadow.

Donald Raiche in "Making the Darkness Conscious: J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*" (*Parabola* 29.3: 95-101) rather remarkably argues that the book's theme is "the need to shun the use of power *for any reason*" (95). Instead, Frodo embraces his Jungian dark side by taking Gollum for his guide.

Jean-Christophe Defau makes an interesting beginning in "Mythic Space in Tolkien's Work" (Honegger 107-28) to a study of the use of often-repeated motifs in his fiction. Defau takes three examples—the tree, the labyrinth, and the town—and shows them bearing symbolic significance through Tolkien's careful use of language to describe them.

Dirk Vanderbeke in "Language, Lore and Learning in *The Lord of the Rings*" (Honegger 129-51) observes that for Tolkien's characters, "magic" is a word referring to specialized knowledge and craft, not to the openly supernatural as in fairy tales, and that "lore" evokes knowledge that has been lost or is dwindling.

In "Tolkien and Modernism" (*Tolkien Studies* 2: 113-29), Patchen Mortimer declares that Tolkien is a modernist. Tolkien's depiction of artistic creativity reveals his belief in "art for art's sake" and his whole *legendarium* project is an example of modernist reinvention from the roots. Mortimer is particularly interested in Tolkien's depiction of war. This is hidden in *The Hobbit* (the kinds of hole a hobbit-hole isn't must be foxholes), but bursts out in *The Lord of the Rings*; Mortimer finds this of significance in the development of Tolkien's art, but does not consider the earlier and even more explicit depiction of war in *The Book of Lost Tales*.

"*The Lord of the Rings* in the Wake of the Great War: War, Poetry, Modernism, and Ironic Myth" by Martin Simonson (Honegger 153-70) is a fragment from what ought to be a very large study of Tolkien's place in the literature of his generation. Tolkien employs the shift from Edwardian jollity to Georgian seriousness in the course of his story, integrates narrative and historical traditions where other authors maintain distance from them, and eschews irony from the interior of his story, placing it at the contrast between his story and the environment of the reader. This last idea contrasts interestingly with Verlyn Flieger's description of Tolkien putting his postmodern textual comments inside the story rather than outside.

"Geo- and Biopolitics of Middle-earth: A German Reading of Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*" by Niels Werber (*New Literary History* 36: 227-46) is a Sauron's-eye view of the book which the reader peruses with a dawning realization that the author is not kidding. Werber proves to his

satisfaction that *The Lord of the Rings* is purely a novel of racial politics, promoting extermination of the inferior and the right to racial homelands. He even expresses indignation at the poor Nazgûl being defeated by a mere river. How unfair! With this view, it is hardly surprising that Werber considers the book's popularity in Germany as a disturbing sign that Nazism is not dead. On the same reading, its popularity in New Zealand is a relic of the conquest of the Maori, and so forth. Tolkien is excused from actually being a Nazi on the grounds that he was not German.

The premise of *Return of the Hero* by Christopher Wrigley (Lewes: Book Guild Publishing, 2005) is that Tolkien, J.K. Rowling, and Philip Pullman have revived the heroic romance in the form of fully rich stories for adolescents. His chapter on Tolkien, "The Tale of Middle-earth" (35-72), mostly on *The Lord of the Rings*, does not pursue this line, however. Wrigley finds coded autobiography and veiled eroticism of the crudest type in the story, does not believe that any readers like Bombadil, and sets a new record in highly-strained symbolism by explaining that a Pippin is a kind of apple and so is a Granny Smith, and that therefore Pippin the hobbit is really Geoffrey Bache Smith, Tolkien's friend who died in World War I, as Smith's forename also starts with G. (though Wrigley calls him George).

Fantasy Fiction: An Introduction by Lucie Armitt (New York: Continuum, 2005) refers to *The Lord of the Rings* frequently. Armitt looks at fantasy literature through the lens of Todorovian structuralist theory; as Brian Attebery could have told her (see his *Strategies of Fantasy* [Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992]: 20), this is not a useful tool for understanding Tolkien. Every time Armitt mentions Tolkien she makes clumsy errors, whether confusing Shire Reckoning with A.D. dates (18), claiming that Middle-earth is bordered by the edge of its map (61; of no other sub-created world is this less true); calling the book "a trilogy of novels" (71), using Jackson's films to explicate Tolkien's intent (79), and, of course, reading Sam as Frodo's lover and his mother-figure as well (92-94).

Elizabeth Massa Hoiem applies post-colonial theory to *Unfinished Tales* in "World Creation as Colonization: British Imperialism in 'Aldarion and Erendis'" (*Tolkien Studies* 2: 75-92). Hoiem separates Tolkien from the high colonialism of Haggard (and from Conrad's obsession with the Other). She approves his detached critique of colonialism in the form of Erendis's little-Númenórean politics, but concludes that the mere act of creating the *legendarium* allies Tolkien with Aldarion's expansionism. The possibility that Aldarion and Erendis might both be right, and that in this lies the tragedy of Númenor, seems outside the purview of post-colonial theory.

TOLKIEN's LITERARY THEORY

"Tolkien's Elvish England" by Stratford Caldecott (*Chesterton Review* 31.3-4: 109-23) is a study in the question of how the Silmarillion is a mythology for England. Caldecott does not consider the ultimately discarded historical connection between Eressëa and England to be important; what is important is that Tolkien's sub-creation expresses the imaginative life of England, capturing the distinctive national character as G.K. Chesterton described it. Caldecott sees the landscapes of Tolkien's stories as expressing a longing for the true inner beauty of England, and the Elves of both sexes as embodying his ideal feminine spirit.

"Tolkien and Coleridge: An Encounter" by Lee Oser (*ALSC Newsletter* 11.4: 14-15) distinguishes Tolkien's description, in "On Fairy-Stories," of primary and secondary worlds from Coleridge's original use of "primary" and "secondary" to describe types of imagination. Oser considers Tolkien more concrete than Coleridge (he does not address Tolkien's discussion of primary and secondary belief), and attributes this to his Catholicism.

Ross Smith in "Timeless Tolkien" (*English Today* 21.4: 13-20) finds Tolkien's world-creation to be comparable to that of Jorge Luis Borges, but more expansive and completed. The references that Tolkien makes to long-past events are really there, and this shows in the writing. Smith admires Tolkien's strong linguistic aesthetics in both English and the invented tongues, but notes this opinion is not universally shared. The words "Part 2" attached to the title of this essay refer to its being a follow-up to Smith's entirely separate essay on the films in the previous issue of *English Today* (see below).

Mark Sinker is described as a "film expert and Tolkien enthusiast," but "Talking Tolkien: The Elvish Craft of CGI" (*Children's Literature in Education* 36.1: 41-54), a transcribed conversation between himself and an unidentified interviewer, is primarily about Tolkien rather than the films. Sinker summarizes Tolkien's creative credo from "On Fairy-Stories," suggests that Gollum is the true title character of *The Lord of the Rings*, and ties dwarvish and elvish pride in craftsmanship to Tolkien's inheritance from William Morris. This last brings up the titular allusion to the idea that Faërian Drama is the elvish equivalent of computer-graphics animation. Sinker doubts that Tolkien would accept this equation.

"What Good is Fantasy?" by Verlyn Flieger (*Chesterton Review* 31.3-4: 217-21) is a brief screed citing "On Fairy-Stories" to argue that the craving for fantasy as a mirror for truth is so strong in the human breast that people will read even bad fantasies. (Insert some robust denunciation of formulaic fantasy here.) But readers prefer good fantasies when they can get them, which explains the continued popularity of Tolkien and some other writers of quality whom Flieger names.

Mythological and Medieval Studies

Marjorie Burns casts her *Perilous Realms: Celtic and Norse in Tolkien's Middle-earth* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005) as a study of Tolkien's use of these two contrasting forms of northernness. It's less about the actual cultures than on their received images in the English imagination, and Tolkien's employment of this to provide contrast in his imagined world: the Norse masculine, hard-headed, Dwarven; the Celtic feminine, dreamy and ethereal, Elven. The book is not an integrated text for its thesis, but a collection of separate essays on various aspects of *The Lord of the Rings* and *The Hobbit*—there's little on Tolkien's other work—that happened to strike Burns as interesting: skin-changing, gateways, the role of women, the role of food. Some of these are relevant to the cultural contrast, but in other essays the thesis gets put on hold. The analysis is sometimes superficial or scanted, but Burns grasps the facts and implications of Tolkien's sub-creation and both of the mythologies. She has carefully researched her sources and commands a wide variety of examples for her points. This book shows Tolkien transmuting and adapting his source material in creative ways.

Tolkien's Modern Middle Ages, edited by Jane Chance and Alfred K. Siewers (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), is the third collection of papers on Tolkien to come out of the International Congress on Medieval Studies. As with the previous two, the papers in this one are so close in subject as to make the volume seem interwoven. The general thesis, which meshes well with Verlyn Flieger's in *Interrupted Music*, is that Tolkien presented medieval concepts and themes in a modern and even postmodern context. The papers, which unlike Flieger's book concentrate on *The Lord of the Rings*, discuss parallels and exemplars in medieval literature without concerning themselves with industrious searches for Tolkien's sources.

Flieger herself begins the collection with "A Postmodern Medievalist?" (17-28), detecting Tolkien's subtle postmodernism in putting his comments on the text as text *inside* the story (Frodo and Sam discussing the tale that they're part of) instead of the cruder common practice of breaking the frame. For Flieger, Tolkien is an eclectic mix: postmodernist, medievalist, and many other things at once. Gergely Nagy presents a more abstruse discussion in "The Medievalist('s) Fiction: Textuality and Historicity as Aspects of Tolkien's Medievalist Cultural Theory in a Postmodernist Context" (29-41). Nagy explains that historicity, the placement of a text in its fictionalized historic context, is rich in Tolkien but tends to be ignored by postmodern literary theory. John R. Holmes asks a question in "Tolkien, *Dustsceawung*, and the Gnomic Tense: Is Timelessness Medieval or Victorian?" (43-58). *Dustsceawung*, the contemplation of

dust, is an Anglo-Saxon elegiac technique. Holmes depicts Tolkien trying to cut through Victorian ideas of medievalism in writing passages that find depths of time in the contemplation of historically resonant objects, such as the sword with which Merry wounds the Witch-King.

A second section of *Tolkien's Modern Middle Ages* looks specifically at parallels in medievalizing literature of the 19th century. John Hunter, in "The Reanimation of Antiquity and the Resistance to History: Macpherson—Scott—Tolkien" (61-75), discusses the ways each author created a romantic mythologizing historicism, finding in Tolkien a fusion of techniques. Deidre Dawson compares Tolkien and Macpherson more closely in "English, Welsh, and Elvish: Language, Loss, and Cultural Recovery in J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*" (105-20). Both authors presented epics as mythologies to their countries, and both employed Celtic languages while doing so: Scots Gaelic for Macpherson, Welsh for Tolkien. Chester N. Scoville, in "Pastoralia and Perfectability in William Morris and J.R.R. Tolkien" (93-103), finds that Tolkien's skeptical apolitical attitude enabled him to take close inspiration from Morris's openly socialist *News from Nowhere* without accepting the political baggage. Andrew Lynch, in "Archaism, Nostalgia, and Tennysonian War in *The Lord of the Rings*" (77-92), proposes that, while World War I inspired Tolkien to write about war, his literary approach to describing it derives more from *The Idylls of the King* than from more recent literature.

A third section turns to Tolkien's treatment of topical issues in his medievalization. Rebekah Long offers a different perspective on Lynch's war study in her "Fantastic Medievalism and the Great War in J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*" (123-37). She brings up the poem *In Parenthesis* by David Jones. Jones had comparable World War I experience to Tolkien's, and medievalized the war in his work, drawing particularly on Chaucer, in similar ways. Alfred K. Siewers, in "Tolkien's Cosmic-Christian Ecology: The Medieval Underpinnings" (138-53), attempts to find sources for Tolkien's awareness of and respect for nature in medieval Celtic literature. Brian McFadden and Jane Chance both pen essays insisting that Tolkien did not practice racial superiority in his work. This becomes of medieval relevance with comparison of the Haradrim with the *Sigelwara* or Ethiopians in Anglo-Saxon literature, on whose name Tolkien wrote a philological essay. McFadden, in "Fear of Difference, Fear of Death: The *Sigelwara*, Tolkien's Swertings, and Racial Difference" (155-69), writes of Tolkien's humanization of the Haradrim and of the sensitivity he shows for the relationship among Men, Elves, and Ainur as separate races. Chance, in "Tolkien and the Other: Race and Gender in Middle-earth" (171-86), emphasizes Tolkien's hatred of *apartheid* and studies the ethnic range of hobbits in this context.

"*Beowulf*'s Boast Words" by Marie Nelson (*Neophilologus* 89: 299-310) belongs here because Nelson concludes (308-10) by citing three passages from *The Lord of the Rings* that she sees as similar in form to Beowulf's and Wiglaf's boasts. These characters are not bragging, but simply undertaking to fulfill a duty or die in the attempt. Frodo taking the Ring to Mordor, Faramir refusing to touch it, and Pippin swearing loyalty to Denethor all reflect the Northern sense of courage and honor shown in *Beowulf*.

Thomas Honegger in "Tolkien Through the Eyes of a Medievalist" (Honegger 45-66) reviews some of the critical literature on Tolkien by medievalists and offers examples of how a knowledge of medieval literature can shed light on plots, themes, and stylistic expression in Tolkien's work.

SOURCES AND COMPARATIVE STUDIES

The purpose of *The Keys of Middle-earth: Discovering Medieval Literature through the Fiction of J.R.R. Tolkien* by Stuart D. Lee and Elizabeth Solopova (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005) is clearly conveyed by its subtitle. Rather than an exploration of Tolkien's sources and inspirations in medieval literature, this is an introduction to medieval literature using Tolkien as a lure. Lee and Solopova are thus less interested in performing the job left undone by Ruth S. Noel's *The Mythology of Middle-earth* than in pursuing more rigorously the same agenda as *The Tolkien Fan's Medieval Reader*. Their coverage is deeper but also narrower than in the *Reader*. Eighteen selections, most of them short, from medieval English literature and the Eddas are tied to events in *The Lord of the Rings* and *The Hobbit*. Lee and Solopova clearly distinguish among specific sources, general inspirations, and thematic resemblances, but their interest is less in Tolkien's work than in detailed explanations of the nature and context of the medieval works being quoted. All the selections are given in the original language as well as the compilers' own facing-page translation, as they believe with Tolkien that an encounter with the original words is vital to understanding the written human imagination. The introduction bristles with anxiety over the worth of the project, but the bulk of the text shows confidence in both fields of study.

The Rise of Tolkienian Fantasy by Jared Lobdell (Chicago: Open Court, 2005) is a more backward-looking book than one might infer from its title. Lobdell's topic is the stylistic and thematic roots of *The Lord of the Rings* in Victorian and Edwardian literature. This is a topic Lobdell pursued in his *England and Always* in 1981 and in its revised edition, *The World of the Rings*, in 2004, but here it is considerably expanded. He finds Tolkien echoing material in feigned history (James Macpherson and William Morris), nonsense writers (Edward Lear and Lewis Carroll), adventure

romance (John Buchan and S.R. Crockett), light children's fantasy (E. Nesbit and Andrew Lang), George MacDonald, and Arcadian pastoral (Kipling and G.A. Henty). Having done this, Lobdell devotes a final chapter to considering whether the resulting mixed stream has any coherence beyond the tastes of a single author, and to whether Tolkien can be considered a major contributor to the streams making up *his* successors. Often it is easier to determine Lobdell's subject from his announcements of what his subject will be than from the bulk of the text, because once he launches in, Lobdell darts off in so many directions at once that his arguments can be difficult to follow.

The Forsaken Realm of Tolkien: Tolkien and the Medieval Tradition by Alex Lewis and Elizabeth Currie ([Oswestry]: Medea Publishing, 2005) bears a certain resemblance to *J.R.R. Tolkien: The Shores of Middle-earth* by Robert Giddings and Elizabeth Holland in its dogged insistence that the authors have found the one true creative template for Tolkien's *legendarium* that nobody else ever has, the citation of parallels (often strained and dubious) to prove this, and a determination to find Tolkien's "real" intent in studied ignorance of any external evidence. Stripped of their assumption that it's all a conscious secret code, however, Lewis and Currie make some interesting comparisons of the Silmarillion, in particular, with the little-known medieval legends of Troy which are their subject. The most difficult moment comes at the end, not so much with the attempt to prove that the Elvish language Quenya is a close copy of Ancient Greek, but the presentation of an easily dismissed claim that it bears no discernable resemblance to Finnish, its well-documented inspiration, at all.

Two more sober writers attempt humbler classical or post-classical parallels. Miryam Librán-Moreno, in "Parallel Lives: The Sons of Denethor and the Sons of Telamon" (*Tolkien Studies* 2: 15-52), finds Tolkien's story of Boromir, Faramir, and their father to have structural similarity to the Greek story of Ajax, Teucer, and their father. She uses the published drafts to show this was not an original feature of *The Lord of the Rings*. Judy Ann Ford, in "The White City: *The Lord of the Rings* as an Early Medieval Myth of the Restoration of the Roman Empire" (*Tolkien Studies* 2: 53-73) sees a resemblance between the hobbits contemplating Minas Tirith and the 6th-century Goth Jordanes contemplating the history of Rome; she also finds general parallels between the histories of Gondor and the Roman Empire. (Lewis and Currie do not address these parallels, but their object of study is primarily the Silmarillion, and their interest in *The Lord of the Rings* is chiefly to prove that Minas Tirith, like Gondolin, is Troy.) Ford does not address Tolkien's intent; Librán-Moreno declares that Tolkien was more familiar with classical literature than the common stereotype would have it, but she does not get hot and bothered about this.

"'I Much Prefer History, True or Feigned': Tolkien and Literary History" by Ronald D. Morrison (*Kentucky Philological Review* 19: 36-42) addresses Tolkien's creation of a believable secondary world by way of literary allusion. Reminiscences of other works of literature—the Bible and *Paradise Lost* in *The Silmarillion*, Victorian adventure in *The Lord of the Rings*, classic children's literature in *The Hobbit*—create a sense of familiarity which grounds the sub-created world. Tolkien also uses allusions within his sub-creation—by way of songs, proverbs, and so on—to give literary and cultural depth to his invented peoples.

Kristine Larsen contributes two articles on Tolkien's astronomy. "Tolkien's Burning Briar: An Astronomical Explanation" (*Mallorn* 43: 49-52) discusses this name, found in some of the *History of Middle-earth* papers, for the Plough or Big Dipper. Larsen suggests the name derives from appearances of the aurora borealis in the Dipper, references the Biblical burning bush, and also notes the Dipper's resemblance in shape to a briar pipe. "A Definitive Identification of Tolkien's 'Borgil': An Astronomical and Literary Approach" (*Tolkien Studies* 2: 161-70) is, despite the title, only fairly confident that this star name in *The Lord of the Rings* refers to Aldebaran. Larsen summarizes many predecessors' varied identifications and their translations of its name.

"Arthur and Aragorn: Arthurian Influence in *The Lord of the Rings*" by Richard J. Finn (*Mallorn* 43: 23-26) discusses more than the kings: Gandalf as Merlin, Andúril as Excalibur, and Eressëa as Avalon are also considered, as is Tolkien's problematic relationship with the Arthurian mythos. Finn concludes with the idea that Tolkien was suggesting his mythology as the "real" origin of the Arthurian idea.

Sue Zlosnik writes on "Gothic Echoes" in *The Lord of the Rings* (Eaglestone 47-58), distancing herself from her subject by assuring the reader, and repeating it, that she's only read Tolkien twice and may never do so again. Between these assurances she interestingly cites tropes from a variety of 19th-century Gothic fiction, particularly Bram Stoker's *Dracula*, that appear in Tolkien.

"Little Nell and Frodo the Halfling" by Dale Nelson (*Tolkien Studies* 2: 245-48) is a brief suggestion that Frodo's journey through Mordor could have been inspired by Nell's travel to an unnamed industrial town (possibly Tolkien's own Birmingham) in *The Old Curiosity Shop* by Charles Dickens.

"Narnia and Middle-earth: When Two Worlds Collude" by Joseph Pearce (*Revisiting Narnia: Fantasy, Myth and Religion in C.S. Lewis's Chronicles*, edited by Shanna Caughey [Dallas: Benbella Books, 2005]: 113-27) is not the expected query into what Tolkien had against Narnia, though Pearce addresses the point, but is primarily an essay on allegory. Pearce extensively distinguishes formal from loose or informal allegory, arguing

that both Tolkien and Lewis were suspicious of the one but practiced the other. He considers Tolkien's conscious awareness of the religious themes in *The Lord of the Rings* to be informal allegory, and classes Lewis's use of Christ figures in the same category. Nothing is said of Tolkien's heroes as Christ figures, though this has been a common critical theme as far back as Gracia-Fay Ellwood in 1970.

"Pullman's *His Dark Materials*, A Challenge to the Fantasies of J.R.R. Tolkien and C.S. Lewis" by Burton Hatlen (*His Dark Materials Illuminated: Critical Essays on Philip Pullman's Trilogy*, edited by Millicent Lenz and Carole Scott [Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2005]: 75-94) presents Pullman's worldview as an advance on those tired old Inklings. Where Tolkien's world is medieval and thus self-evidently obsolete, Pullman's is contemporary and hence relevant; where Tolkien is theological and hierarchical, Pullman is secular and republican (why, some of his characters are even non-aristocratic, and not a happily subordinate Sam Gamgee in the bunch); where Tolkien's characters, with some exceptions, are either Good or Evil, Pullman's veer randomly and inexplicably between the moral poles. Halten evidently considers that this unpredictable unexpectedness constitutes superior storytelling.

RELIGIOUS AND DEVOTIONAL

The Philosophy of Tolkien: The Worldview Behind The Lord of the Rings by Peter Kreeft (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005) claims to offer Tolkien's views on fifty important philosophical questions, and they are of course Christian views. (Nothing is said of Tolkien's inheritance from Nordic paganism.) But although there is a concordance to relevant passages in Tolkien's fiction, the tiny pop essays constituting the text quote little from the fiction, concentrating more on "On Fairy-Stories" and the *Letters*, and even more on C.S. Lewis. Kreeft considers the two men's views interchangeable, even postulating a "Tolkielewis monster" (12). But their styles are very different. Tolkien, though he flourished on contrasts, lacked Lewis's flair for the reductionist binary argument. Kreeft follows Lewis, echoing his aggressive rigid clarity where Tolkien prefers subtlety and flexibility. Though many of Kreeft's points are important, he often teases out Tolkien's views in an oversimplified way, and in some essays hardly discusses Tolkien at all. Judgments and facts are often questionable.

Many devotional guides have been published based on *The Lord of the Rings*, but *Walking with Bilbo: A Devotional Adventure through The Hobbit* by Sarah Arthur (Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House, 2005) is the first one based on this less religiously-fraught Tolkien work. Using themes like being the non-professional chosen for a task (like the Apostles!), and the importance of resisting vengeance and greed, Arthur walks through *The Hobbit*

in a series of short essays, giving Biblical references and questions for further study. The emphasis throughout is on Bilbo's having been chosen rather than on making choices himself.

The latest warning against J.K. Rowling for concerned Christian parents is *Harry Potter, Narnia, and The Lord of the Rings* by Richard Abanes (Eugene: Harvest House, 2005). Despite its title, the book addresses the works of neither Tolkien nor Lewis, though it brings in their created worlds to contrast with Rowling's. Abanes considers Rowling's fiction amoral. His principal evidence that this is corrupting is a claimed tendency of Harry Potter fans to turn to Wicca, regardless of whether the author intends this, so it's fortunate that he doesn't address the question of whether any Tolkien fans do the same thing. Abanes excuses the presence of magic in Tolkien less by Tolkien's moral sense and spiritual integration than by the fact that *The Lord of the Rings*, unlike the Harry Potter books, takes place a long time ago.

Talking of Dragons: The Children's Books of J.R.R. Tolkien and C.S. Lewis by William Chad Newsom (Fearn, U.K.: Christian Focus, 2005) is considerably more soothing. Unlike Abanes's book, Newsom's really is about Tolkien and Lewis. He puts both authors in their context as Inklings as well as in that as Christians, and he is knowledgeable about the Silmarillion. He ties Tolkien's books—his topics are *Roverandom*, *Mr. Bliss*, *The Father Christmas Letters* (he uses the 1976 edition), and *The Hobbit*, in that order—into the larger context when possible, and makes the expected connections. But an implication that *Roverandom*'s wizards are Maiar and an emphasis on the passing reference to a Gaffer Gamgee in *Mr. Bliss* may seem a bit retroactive in significance. Newsom is a bit wizardly himself in the moral lessons he pulls out of these two innocuous stories; he carries more confidence in discussing the unexpected consequences of Bilbo's luck. Participatory "Family Activities" conclude each chapter.

Tolkien's Mighty Pen: How God Rules Middle-earth by C.N. Crum (Bloomington, Ind.: AuthorHouse, 2005) is less a Christian's study of Tolkien than an enthusiast's. The subject is *The Lord of the Rings* and a bit of *The Silmarillion*; the topics include mortality, human nature, religious and public morals, character studies, and descriptive style; the depth is at most moderate; and the tone is one of superlative praise. *The Lord of the Rings* is "completely flawless in style" (xii) and "the greatest piece of literature ever written" (ix); Aragorn is "the greatest fictional character ever created" (xvii). Praise is increased by contrast, so occasional swipes against leftists (convenient anti-Tolkien punching bags) litter the book, through not heavily. Crum's own style is somewhat bumptious. He does not seem to have put in an order for enough possessive apostrophes, and, in the course of praising Tolkien's skill as a natural, untaught author, he unintentionally charms the reader by saying, "Professor Tolkien was

not a professional writer, he probably broke every rule they teach a new writer in school" (93)—every rule except the one about run-on sentences, perhaps.

Joseph Pearce's book *Literary Giants, Literary Catholics* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005) is a collection of short separate essays, most of them previously published, grouped into general topics. Part four, "J.R.R. Tolkien and the Inklings" (229-332) includes eighteen essays, eleven of which are directly focused on Tolkien, principally *The Lord of the Rings*. Though a number of his essays do not discuss Catholicism at all, Pearce's principal thesis is a presentation of an aggressively proselytizing Catholic view of Tolkien's work, claiming that "Tolkien … states unequivocally that the religious element is more important than the linguistic" (314) as if one has to trump the other. Pearce is interesting on perceived Catholic literary influences on Tolkien, including Newman and Belloc as well as Chesterton. Some of his essays form book reviews or surveys of Tolkien secondary literature. Pearce likes the Jackson films, though he doesn't find anything particularly Catholic about them.

The Power of the Ring: The Spiritual Vision Behind The Lord of the Rings by Stratford Caldecott (New York: Crossroad, 2005) is the American edition of *Secret Fire: The Spiritual Vision of J.R.R. Tolkien* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 2003). The text is slightly revised and expanded. Additions consist of longer quotations from Tolkien's *Letters*, fuller plot summary of *The Silmarillion*, several long endnotes especially on paganism, and a new appendix in the form of a lengthy review of the Jackson films (125-32). In either form, Caldecott's subject is Tolkien's incorporation of Catholic moral teachings and teleology into the aesthetic of his work, concentrating more on *The Silmarillion* and *The Notion Club Papers* than on *The Lord of the Rings*, despite the subtitle of the present edition.

Jeffrey L. Morrow in "J.R.R. Tolkien as a Christian for Our Times" (*Evangelical Review of Theology* 29: 164-77) presents Tolkien as performing Christian witness in his academic work as well as his fiction. He cites Tolkien arguing that the Beowulf-poet was a Christian, as if this were in doubt, and says that Tolkien translated the Book of Job, as if that were not in doubt. The brief section on Tolkien's fiction cites the presence of God in *The Silmarillion* and lists Christ-figures in *The Lord of the Rings*.

TOLKIEN'S SUB-CREATION

"Arnor: The Numenorean Inheritance" by Marjorie Willetts (*Mallorn* 43: 3-10) is a mock-historical account of the political, social, and economic effects of Aragorn's reunion of the Númenórean kingdoms in the Fourth Age. It is written in the form of a textbook chapter and contains data invented by Willetts which is stated with firm authority and comes across as believable.

Beth Russell brings together material from *The Lord of the Rings* and several posthumous books to produce "Botanical Notes on the Mallorn" (*Mallorn* 43: 20-22). She describes the tree, notes its history, and concludes that the information available is only sufficient to class it at the broadest level botanically. It is unlikely to be closely related to any primary-world tree.

TRANSLATION STUDIES AND PHILOLOGY

Translating Tolkien: Philological Elements in The Lord of the Rings by Allan Turner (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2005) contains much more theoretical discussion than most of the essays on translating Tolkien published in previous years. The specific translation study in this book, though lengthy, is relatively superficial, considering names (from the Shire, Bree, and Rohan), some poetry, and some of Tolkien's grammatical devices for giving an archaic flavor to the narrative, as presented in six Germanic and Romance language translations. Grammar is given little additional treatment, and literary style, a major focus of other studies, virtually none. Turner's real focus is revealed when he finds it equally significant if a translator chooses not to translate a name at all. The heart of the book is a great expansion of his 2003 article, "A Theoretical Model for Tolkien Translation Criticism" (*Tolkien in Translation*, ed. Thomas Honegger [Zurich: Walking Tree, 2003]: 1-30), discussing the problems for translators of Tolkien's pose as a pseudo-translator himself, and of the various devices he uses to code for cultural familiarity and alienation in the narrative. Translators variously convert these into terms for their own home audience, or leave them unassimilated. Turner raises the point that the Shire, intended to be read for cozy homely Englishness, may seem more alien to an American reader, for whom no translation is necessary, than to a continental European. This could use more pursuit in future studies.

Susanne Stopfel, by contrast, writing on "Traitors and Translators: Three German Versions of *The Lord of the Rings*" (*Mallorn* 43: 11-14), is purely concerned with literary effect. The Margaret Carroux translation is highly literary but flat in affect and contains some mistranslations; a revision by Roswith Krege-Mayer corrects some of these but adds in many more. A newer translation by Wolfgang Krege is more varied, but at the cost of being so literarily free as to be more of an adaptation than a translation. Stopfel gives examples only retranslated back into English.

"Reconsidering the Linguistics of Middle-earth: Invented Languages and Other Linguistic Features in J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*" by Marion Gymnich (Honegger 7-30) is primarily a discussion of linguistic aesthetics. The beauty and ugliness reported in descriptions of various tongues, the dialects and idiolects of particular characters, and the incan-

tatory power of words all contribute to the realism, the morality, and the mystery of the story.

Eduardo Segura and Guillermo Peris briefly discuss Tolkien's love for words in "Tolkien as Philo-Logist" (Honegger 31-43). Language was his starting point and helped him both shape his sub-creation and create its myths. This deep unity explains much of the quality of his work.

"J.R.R. Tolkien and W. Rhys Roberts's 'Gerald of Wales on the Survival of Welsh'" by Douglas A. Anderson (*Tolkien Studies* 2: 230-34) records the existence of a bit of linguistic scholarship by Tolkien in a 1923 paper by Roberts on Gerald's 12th-century *Journey through Wales*. Gerald records in Latin a prophecy by a Welsh wise man to Henry II. Tolkien translates this for Roberts into 12th-century West Midlands English, and suggests that the Welsh word *henddyn* for wise man may be identified with a traditional proverb-giver named Hending. The translation is printed here on page 233.

"Six Cruces in the Finnsburg Fragment and Episode" by R.D. Fulk (*Medium Ævum* 74: 191-204) discusses some philological and metrical problems in these Anglo-Saxon texts, citing Tolkien's opinions as given in his posthumously published lectures on *Finn and Hengest*. Fulk writes that "Tolkien's reconstruction of the events, especially, is brilliant, but … it assumes a great deal that is speculative" (100).

RECEPTION STUDIES AND CRITICISM OF SECONDARY LITERATURE

Lembas for the Soul: How The Lord of the Rings Enriches Everyday Life (Yellville, Ark.: White Tree Press, 2005) is less like one of the *Chicken Soup* books than the title implies. Catherine Kohman, listed as author on the title page, is actually the compiler of some fifty testimonies, including her own, of love for *The Lord of the Rings*. Kohman states that Tolkien's book and Jackson's films are "entirely different" (13), but her contributors do not agree: some read the book before seeing the movies, some the other way around, but just about all love both, not just indiscriminately but interchangeably, if they don't love the films more. A few contributors testify that the example of the story's characters helped them in personal difficulties, or that *The Lord of the Rings* reinforced their religious faith, but the primary impression given by this book is an inchoate devotion. Rather than show *how* the story enriches their lives, most of the writers combine an eagerness to demonstrate their addiction with an inability to explain it. Tolkien's own description of his *cultus* seems the most appropriate summary of this book: "Art moves them and they don't know what they've been moved by" (*Biography* 231).

"Middle America Meets Middle-earth: American Discussion and Readership of J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*, 1965-1969" by Joseph Ripp (*Book History* 8: 245-86) begins with a detailed account of the

copyright controversy over the 1965 Ace paperback edition. Ripp notes that Ace's editors were ignorant of the complexities of copyright law, but agrees with them that the controversy at least brought the book to mass public attention. The rest of the article is not a sociological study of Tolkien's readership, but a thorough historical survey of articles written in the American popular press during and immediately after the "campus craze" Tolkien boom. Some of these writers tried to analyze the reasons for Tolkien's popularity; others focused more on the book and showed an awareness of the literary theory in "On Fairy-Stories." Ripp notes the lonely struggle of critics who detest *The Lord of the Rings* and cannot understand its popularity.

Nina Mikkelsen's *Powerful Magic: Learning from Children's Responses to Fantasy Literature* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2005) is a reader-response study concentrating on how children, with less education and different life experiences than adults, actually respond to the books they read in ways that adults might not expect. Mikkelsen approaches this through semiotic theory. She includes a chapter on Tolkien, "Fighting the Dragon—and Winning: *The Hobbit*" (113-42). Here she describes and quotes her 12-year-old son Vinny on his reactions to reading *The Hobbit*. Vinny draws real-world parallels, empathizes with Bilbo and the dwarves, and (like Paula Persoleo) feels disappointment that Bilbo doesn't kill the dragon. He then composes a Tolkienesque quest fantasy of his own, using similar narrative and plotting strategies.

Robert Eaglestone's anthology *Reading The Lord of the Rings* concludes with a section on "Tolkien's Futures," meaning works influenced by his. This consists of two essays. Barry Atkins on "Games" (151-61), meaning video games, discusses the appeal of games to players as a way to put themselves into an admired story, but is skeptical of boosters' claims that video games are somehow unique in this and critical of the actual aesthetic value of many such games. "In the Tradition …" by Roz Kaveney (162-75) examines Tolkien-influenced fiction. Kaveney coolly analyzes Michael Moorcock's criticisms of Tolkien and points out that Moorcock's fiction does not always follow his own advice. A favorable analysis of Ursula Le Guin's Earthsea depicts it as affected by but fundamentally different from Tolkien. The essay's final section is a sweeping survey of genuinely imitative epics by a variety of authors. The distinctive characteristics of each, and their weaknesses and occasional strengths, are briskly and entertainingly potted. Tad Williams is the most favorably recommended.

Douglas A. Anderson writes an obituary of Humphrey Carpenter (*Tolkien Studies* 2: 217-224). He outlines how the then-inexperienced Carpenter came to write a biography of Tolkien notable for its keen understanding of the subject, and how Carpenter later drifted away into hostil-

ity towards and incomprehension of Tolkien. Anderson also compiles a checklist of scholarship by Richard C. West (*Tolkien Studies* 2: 11-14), the first major Tolkien bibliographer (*Tolkien Criticism: An Annotated Checklist*, first edition 1970) and author of notable essays including "The Interlace Structure of *The Lord of the Rings*" and this year's "And She Named Her Own Name."

The most comprehensive Tolkien secondary literature review essay of the year is "Following the Many Roads of Recent Tolkien Scholarship" by Ralph C. Wood (*Christianity and Literature* 54: 587-608). Wood looks particularly for examination of Tolkien's moral and Christian elements in the books he covers. John Garth's clear descriptive review of two volumes of Tolkien linguistic publications (*Tolkien Studies* 2: 249-53) is also of particular note and value for its evaluation of the aesthetic significance of the work.

This year saw the publication of the first survey in the present author's series, covering the years 2001 and 2002 (*Tolkien Studies* 2: 289-315).

Film Studies

Lynnette R. Porter promises to study *Unsung Heroes of The Lord of the Rings: From the Page to the Screen* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2005), but from the perspective of Tolkien studies it's mostly screen. Porter's subject is the secondary heroes of the story: Merry, Pippin, Legolas, Gimli, Éowyn, Galadriel, and Arwen. She argues that each is a "modern hero," defined as a character who thinks and plans, loves family and home, and whose heroic qualities are dormant until called upon (20). For each character, Porter discusses his or her portrayal in Tolkien and in the films, and the differences between the two. The discussion of Tolkien's characters is workmanlike but not ground-breaking, but this is a major sober, analytical contribution to *Lord of the Rings* film studies. Porter treats the films as separate works of art whose relationship to the book is no more than an interesting topic of study; this enables her to analyze film changes from the book without having to evaluate them.

Connie Veugen, in "'A Man, Lean, Dark, Tall': Aragorn Seen through Different Media" (Honegger 171-209), presents a comparative study of five Aragorns: Tolkien's, those of two films (Jackson's and Ralph Bakshi's), that of the Sibley-Bakewell BBC radio series, and a computer game's. Veuglen notes that an understanding of Tolkien's character must incorporate a reading of his appearances in the Appendices, and a feeling for mythic characters such as Sigurd on whom he is to some degree based. Media Aragorns are limited or distorted by what is cut or cannot be shown. Veuglen describes the Bree scenes in each version, noting how changes in Aragorn's bona fides alter the meaning of Frodo's decision to

trust him.

"*The Lord of the Rings* and 'Identification': A Critical Encounter" by Martin J. Barker (*European Journal of Communication* 20: 353-78) is a detailed reader-response study on the films of sufficient note and sufficient relevance to Tolkien readership to be worth covering here. Barker uses his large database of questionnaires and interviews with viewers of Jackson to dispute a critical assumption that film audiences personally identify with their favorite characters. In Barker's interviews, fans' stated reasons for choosing favorite characters tend towards external perceptions of the characters' qualities rather than personal identification with them.

"Why the Film Version of *The Lord of the Rings* Betrays Tolkien's Novel" by Ross Smith (*English Today* 21.3: 3-7) is as robust as its title, but only covers a small part of this vast subject. Smith's principal concern is bad casting and character development. He loathes the transmutation of Tolkien's serene and ethereal Elves into Jackson's spiteful Elrond and samurai-warrior Legolas. The films proceed at too frenetic a pace, and insert gratuitous and meaningless extra scenes.

Dana Wilde in "This Moral Core: J.R.R. Tolkien's Books and Peter Jackson's Films" (*Xavier Review* 25: 66-76) expresses mixed feelings, embedding some criticisms of Jackson's Frodo, Faramir, and Treebeard in a general sea of goodwill towards the films. Wilde says these departures violate the moral core of the story, but doesn't explain quite how.

"Tolkien's Women (and Men): The Films and the Book" by Jane Chance (*Mallorn* 43: 30-37) was originally published in 2004. As described in these pages on that publication, Chance "finds that Jackson tells a story more characteristic of Tolkien's broader mythology than the 'hobbito-centric' (Tolkien's word) book is."

Michael N. Stanton's "Tolkien in New Zealand: Man, Myth, and Movie" (Chance and Siewers 205-11) is a short tribute to the country's suitability to play Middle-earth in a movie, with a nod to the shared anti-industrialism of Tolkien and New Zealand author Samuel Butler.

Art studies are closely related to film studies and may be considered here. Ted Nasmith contributes a rare discussion of Tolkien-inspired art by discussing his own work. "Similar but Not Similar: Appropriate Anachronism in My Paintings of Middle-earth" (Chance and Siewers 189-204) is largely autobiographical, identifying some influences on his style, and showing how he developed his technique of representing what he sees as 19th-century-style epic adventure fiction by creating art in the style of 19th-century epic landscape painting.

Bibliography (in English) for 2006

Compiled by Michael D.C. Drout, Jason Rea, Rebecca Epstein, and Lauren Provost

PRIMARY SOURCES

Tolkien, J. R. R. *Early Elvish Poetry and Pre-Fëanorian Alphabets*, edited by Christopher Gilson, Arden R. Smith, Patrick H. Wynne, Carl F. Hostetter, and Bill Welden. Cupertino, CA: [*Parma Eldalamberon*], 2006. *Parma Eldalamberon* no. 16.

BOOKS

Dickerson, Matthew and Jonathan Evans. *Ents, Elves, and Eriador: The Environmental Vision of J. R. R. Tolkien.* Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2006.

Drout, Michael D. C., ed. *J. R. R. Tolkien Encyclopedia: Scholarship and Critical Assessment.* London and New York: Routledge, 2007. [Published 2006.]

Gilliver, Peter, Jeremy Marshall and Edmund Weiner. *The Ring of Words: Tolkien and the Oxford English Dictionary.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Hammond, Wayne G. and Christina Scull, eds. *The Lord of the Rings 1954-2004: Scholarship in Honor of Richard E. Blackwelder.* Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 2006.

Hazell, Dinah. *The Plants of Middle-Earth: Botany and Sub-creation.* Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 2006.

Honegger, Thomas and Frank Weinrich, eds. *Tolkien and Modernity 2*. Zollikofen: Walking Tree Publishers, 2006.

Hooker, Mark T. *A Tolkienian Mathomium: A Collection of Articles on J. R. R. Tolkien and His Legendarium*. [Morrisville, NC]: Llyfrawr [Lulu], 2006.

Kohman, Catherine. *Lembas for the Soul: How The Lord of the Rings Enriches Everyday Life*. Yellville, AR: Whitehall, 2006.

Lee, Stuart and Elizabeth Solopova. *The Keys of Middle-earth: Discovering Medieval Literature through the Fiction of J.R.R. Tolkien*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Mathijs, Ernest, ed. *The Lord of the Rings: Popular Culture in Global Context.*

London: Wallflower Press, 2006.

——— and Murray Pomerance, eds. *From Hobbits to Hollywood: Essays on Peter Jackson's Lord of the Rings*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2006.

Parker, Vic. *J.R.R. Tolkien.* Chicago: Heinemann Library, 2006.

Purtill, Richard L. *Lord of Elves and Eldils: Fantasy And Philosophy in C. S. Lewis And J.R.R. Tolkien.* San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2006. [Reprint of 1974 edition with some additional material.]

Reilly, R.J. *Romantic Religion: A Study of Owen Barfield, C. S. Lewis, Charles Williams and J.R.R. Tolkien.* Great Barrington, MA: Lindisfarne Books, 2006. [Reprint, with new introduction, of 1971 edition.]

Russell, Gary. *The Art of the Lord of the Rings Stage Production.* London: HarperCollins, 2006.

———. *The Lord of the Rings: The Official Stage Companion.* London: HarperCollins, 2006.

Scull, Christina and Wayne G. Hammond. *The J.R.R. Tolkien Companion and Guide, Volume 1: Chronology; Volume 2: Reader's Guide.* London: HarperCollins, 2006.

———. *The J.R.R. Tolkien Companion and Guide, Volume 2: Reader's Guide.* London: HarperCollins, 2006.

Ware, Jim. *Finding God in the Hobbit.* Carol Stream, IL: Saltriver / Tyndale House Publishers, 2006.

Weinreich, Frank and Thomas Honegger, eds. *Tolkien and Modernity 1*. Zollikofen: Walking Tree Publishers, 2006.

Williams, Donald T. *Mere Humanity: G. K. Chesterton, C. S. Lewis, and J. R. R. Tolkien on the Human Condition*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2006.

Articles and Book Chapters

Alliot, Bertrand. "J.R.R. Tolkien: A Simplicity Between the 'Truly Earthy' and the 'Absolutely Modern'." In Weinrich and Honegger, eds.: 77-110.

Amendt-Raduege, Amy M. "Dream Visions in J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings." Tolkien Studies 3* (2006): 45-55.

Amison, Anne. "An Unexpected Guest." *Mythlore* 25:1-2 (Fall-Winter 2006): 127-136.

Anderson, Douglas A. "R. W. Chambers and *The Hobbit*." *Tolkien Studies 3* (2006): 137-147.

———. "The Mainstreaming of Fantasy and the Legacy of *The Lord of the Rings*." In Hammond and Scull, eds.: 301-315.

Arvidsson, Håken. "Aragorn: Tales of the Heir of Isildur. Part 1—the Evolution of the Man." *Mallorn: The Journal of the Tolkien Society* 44 (August 2006): 47-59.

Barnett, Catherine. "Tolkien, MacDonald, and the Cauldron of Story." In *Inklings Forever, Volume V: A Collections of Essays Presented at the Fifth Frances White Ewbank Colloquium on C. S. Lewis and Friends*. Upland, IN: Taylor University, 2006: 111-114.

Benvenuto, Maria Raffaella. "Against Stereotype: Éowyn and Lúthien as 20th-Century Women." In Weinrich and Honegger, eds.: 31-54.

Bossert, A. R. "'Surely You Don't Disbelieve': Tolkien and Pius X: Anti-Modernism in Middle-earth." *Mythlore* 25:1-2 (Fall-Winter 2006): 53-76.

Bowman, Mary R. "The Story Was Already Written: Narrative Theory in *The Lord of the Rings*." *Narrative* 14:3 (October 2006): 272-293.

Bratman, David. "The Artistry of Omissions and Revisions in *The Lord of the Rings.*" In Hammond and Scull, eds.: 113-138.

Brown, Devin. "From Isolation to Community: Frodo's Incomplete Personal Quest in *The Lord of the Rings*." *Mythlore* 25:1-2 (Fall-Winter 2006): 163-173.

Brückner, Patrick. "Tolkien on Love: Concepts of 'Love' in *The Silmarillion* and *The Lord of the Rings*." In Honegger and Weinrich, eds.: 1-52.

Burke, Jessica, and Anthony Burdge. "The Maker's Will . . . Fulfilled?" In Weinrich and Honegger, eds.: 111-133.

Burns, Marjorie. "King and Hobbit: The Exalted and Lowly in Tolkien's Created Worlds." In Hammond and Scull, eds.: 139-151.

Caesar, Judith. "Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings* and Dante's *Inferno*." *Explicator* 64:3 (Spring 2006): 162-166.

Chance, Jane. "Subversive Fantasist: Tolkien on Class Difference." In Hammond and Scull, eds.: 153-168.

Cramer, Zack. "Jewish Influences in Middle-Earth." *Mallorn: The Journal of the Tolkien Society* 44 (August 2006): 9-16.

Cunningham, Michael. "In the Shadow of the Tree: A Study of the Motif of the White Tree in the Context of J. R. R. Tolkien's Middle-earth." *Mallorn: The Journal of the Tolkien Society* 44 (August 2006): 3-8.

Drout, Michael D. C. "A Spliced Old English Quotation in *Beowulf: The Monsters and the Critics*." *Tolkien Studies 3* (2006): 149-152.

———. "The Rhetorical Evolution of *Beowulf: The Monsters and the Critics*." In Hammond and Scull, eds.: 183-215.

Ellison, John. "Tolkien-on-Sea: The View from the Shores of Middle-Earth." *Mallorn: The Journal of the Tolkien Society* 44 (August 2006): 17-21.

Fehrenbacher, Richard W. "*Beowulf* as Fairy-Story: Enchanting the Elegiac in *The Two Towers*." *Tolkien Studies 3* (2006): 101-115.

Fife, Ernelle. "Wise Warriors in Tolkien, Lewis, and Rowling." *Mythlore* 25:1-2 (Fall-Winter 2006): 147-162.

Fimi, Dimitra. "'Mad' Elves and 'Elusive Beauty': Some Celtic Strands of Tolkien's Mythology." *Folklore* 117:2 (August 2006): 156-170.

Fisher, Jason. "'Man does as he is when he may do as he wishes': The Perennial Modernity of Free Will." In Weinrich and Honegger, eds.: 145-175.

———. "Reluctantly Inspired: George MacDonald and the Genesis of J.R.R. Tolkien's *Smith of Wootton Major*." *North Wind: A Journal of George MacDonald Studies* 25 (2006): 113-120.

Fisher, Matthew A. "Working at the Crossroads: Tolkien, St. Augustine, and the *Beowulf*-Poet." In Hammond and Scull, eds.: 217-230.

Flieger, Verlyn. "Tolkien and the Idea of the Book." In Hammond and Scull, eds.: 283-299.

Fonstad, Karen Wynn. "Writing 'TO' the Map." *Tolkien Studies 3* (2006): 133-136.

Fornet-Ponse, Thomas. "Freedom and Providence as Anti-Modern Elements?" In Weinrich and Honegger, eds.: 177-206.

Foster, Mike. "Teaching Tolkien." In Hammond and Scull, eds.: 257-266.

Garth, John. "Frodo and the Great War." In Hammond and Scull, eds.: 41-56.

Goldberg, Robert. "Frodo as Beowulf: Tolkien Reshapes the Anglo-Saxon Heroic Ideal." *Mallorn: The Journal of the Tolkien Society* 44 (August

2006): 29-34.

Hall, Mark F. "The Theory and Practice of Alliterative Verse in the Work of J. R. R. Tolkien." *Mythlore* 25:1-2 (Fall-Winter 2006): 41-52.

Hammond, Wayne G. "Special Collections in the Service of Tolkien Studies." In Hammond and Scull, eds.: 331-340.

Hiley, Margaret. "*The Lord of the Rings* and 'Late Style': Tolkien, Adorno and Said." In Honegger and Weinrich, eds.: 53-73.

Honegger, Jana and Thomas Honegger. "Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*: Beyond the Printed Text." In *Cultural Studies in the EFL Classroom*, edited by Werner Delanoy and Laurenz Volkmann. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2006: 323-325.

Honegger, Thomas. "A Mythology for England—the Question of National Identity in Tolkien's Legendarium." *Hither Shore* 3 (2006): 13-26.

———. "The Passing of the Elves and the Arrival of Modernity: Tolkien's 'Mythical Method'." In Honegger and Weinrich, eds.: 211-232.

Hostetter, Carl F. "'Elvish as She Is Spoke'." In Hammond and Scull, eds.: 231-255.

Hunnewell, Sumner G. "Naysayers in the Works of Tolkien." In Hammond and Scull, eds.: 169-181.

Hunter, John C. "The Evidence of Things Not Seen: Critical Mythology and *The Lord of the Rings*." *Journal of Modern Literature* 29:2 (Winter 2006): 128-147.

Jensen, Klaus and Ruairidh MacDonald. "On Tom Bombadil: The Function of Tom Bombadil." *Mallorn: The Journal of the Tolkien Society* 44 (August 2006): 37-42.

Kightley, Michael R. "Heorot or Meduseld? Tolkien's Use of *Beowulf* in 'The King of the Golden Hall.'" *Mythlore* 24:3-4 (Winter-Spring 2006): 119-134.

Klinger, Judith. "Hidden Paths of Time: March 13th and the Riddles of Shelob's Lair." In Honegger and Weinrich, eds.: 143-209.

———. "'More poetical, less prosaic': The Convergence of Myth and History in Tolkien's Work." *Hither Shore* 3 (2006): 180-195.

Krueger, Heidi (translated by Heidi Steimel). "The Shaping of 'Reality' in Tolkien's Works: An Aspect of Tolkien and Modernity." In Honeg-

ger and Weinrich, eds.: 233-272.

Larsen, Kristine. "Swords and Sky Stones: Meteoric Iron in *The Silmaril-lion*." *Mallorn: The Journal of the Tolkien Society* 44 (August 2006): 22-26.

Livingston, Michael. "The Shell-Shocked Hobbit: The First World War and Tolkien's Trauma of the Ring." *Mythlore* 25:1-2 (Fall-Winter 2006): 77-92.

McNelis, James I. "'The tree took me up from ground and carried me off': A Source for Tolkien's Ents in Ludvig Holberg's *Journey of Niels Klim to the World*." *Tolkien Studies 3* (2006): 153-156.

Michel, Laura. "Politically Incorrect: Tolkien, Women, and Feminism." In Weinrich and Honegger, eds.: 55-76.

Nagel, Rainer. "Working with HoMe: Its Use in Researching Shire Place-Names." *Hither Shore* 3 (2006): 108-121.

Nagy, Gergely. "The 'Lost' Subject of Middle-Earth: The Constitution of the Subject in the Figure of Gollum in *The Lord of the Rings*." *Tolkien Studies 3* (2006): 57-79.

Nelson, Dale. "'Queer, Exciting and Debatable': Tolkien and Short-house's *John Inglesant*." *Mallorn: The Journal of the Tolkien Society* 44 (August 2006): 27-28.

Nelson, Marie. "Phonology, Morphology, Syntax: Reading *The Lord of the Rings* from a Linguistics Perspective." *Germanic Notes and Reviews* 37:1 (Spring 2006): 29-34.

Obertino, James. "Barbarians and Imperialism in Tacitus and *The Lord of the Rings*." *Tolkien Studies 3* (2006): 117-131.

Prozesky, Maria. "The Text Tale of Frodo the Nine-Fingered: Residual Oral Patterning in *The Lord of the Rings*." *Tolkien Studies 3* (2006): 21-43.

Rateliff, John D. "'And All the Days of Her Life Are Forgotten': *The Lord of the Rings* as Mythic Prehistory." In Hammond and Scull, eds.: 67-100.

Scull, Christina. "What Did He Know and When Did He Know It? Planning, Inspiration, and *The Lord of the Rings*." In Hammond and Scull, eds.: 101-112.

Seland, John. "Dante and Tolkien: Their Ideas about Evil." In *Inklings Forever, Volume V: A Collections of Essays Presented at the Fifth Frances White*

Ewbank Colloquium on C. S. Lewis and Friends. Upland, IN: Taylor University, 2006: 147-155.

Shefrin, Elana. "Lord of the Rings, Star Wars, and Participatory Fandom: Mapping New Congruencies Between the Internet and Media Entertainment Culture." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 21.3 (2004): 261-281.

Shippey, T.A. "History in Words: Tolkien's Ruling Passion." In Hammond and Scull, eds.: 25-39.

Simonson, Martin. "An Introduction to the Dynamics of the Intertraditional Dialogue in *The Lord of the Rings*: Aragorn's Heroic Evolution." In Honegger and Weinrich, eds.: 75-113.

Simonson, Martin. "Three is Company: Novel, Fairy Tale, and Romance on the Journey through the Shire." *Tolkien Studies 3* (2006): 81-100.

Slack, Anna. "Slow-Kindled Courage: A Study of Heroes in the Works of J.R.R. Tolkien." In Honegger and Weinrich, eds.: 115-141.

Smith, Arden R. "Tolkienian Gothic." In Hammond and Scull, eds.: 267-281.

Smith, Leigh. "'I Have Looked the Last on That Which Is Fairest': Elegy in *Beowulf* and Tolkien's Lothlorien." *Mallorn: The Journal of the Tolkien Society* 44 (August 2006): 43-46.

Smith, Ross. "Fitting Sense to Sound: Linguistic Aesthetics and Phonosemantics in the Work of J.R.R. Tolkien." *Tolkien Studies 3* (2006): 1-20.

———. "Tolkien the Storyteller." *English Today: The International Review of the English Language* 22:1 (January 2006): 45-50.

Steele, Felicia Jean. "Dreaming of Dragons: Tolkien's Impact on Heaney's *Beowulf.*" *Mythlore* 25:1-2 (Fall-Winter 2006): 137-146.

Sturgis, Amy H. "Reimagining Rose: Portrayals of Tolkien's Rosie Cotton in Twenty-First Century Fan Fiction." *Mythlore* 24:3-4 (Winter-Spring 2006): 165-187.

Thomas, Paul Edmund. "Towards Quite Unforeseen Goals." In Hammond and Scull, eds.: 57-65.

Treschow, Michael and Mark Duckworth. "Bombadil's Role in *The Lord of the Rings.*" *Mythlore* 25:1-2 (Fall-Winter 2006): 175-196.

Turner, Allan. "*The Lays of Beleriand*: Epic and Romance." *Hither Shore* 3 (2006): 27-36.

———. "Translation and Criticism: The Stylistic Mirror." *Yearbook of English Studies* 36:1 (2006): 168-176.

van de Bergh, Alexander. "Democracy in Middle-earth: J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings* from a Socio-Political Perspective." In Weinrich and Honegger, eds.: 207-236.

Vaninskaya, Anna. "Tolkien: A Man of his Time?" In Weinrich and Honegger, eds.: 1-30.

Ward, Graham. "Narrative and Ethics: The Structures of Believing and the Practices of Hope." *Literature & Theology: An International Journal of Religion, Theory, and Culture* 20:4 (Dec 2006): 438-461.

Waugh, Robert H. "The Surreal and the Organic Imaginations: The Argument between Lewis and Tolkien." *Studies in Fantasy Literature* 4 (2006): 19-29.

Weinreich, Frank. "Brief Considerations on Determinism in Reality and Fiction." In Weinrich and Honegger, eds.: 135-144.

Wendling, Woody. "The Quest for Pity and Mercy in Tolkien's Middle Earth [sic]." In *Inklings Forever, Volume V: A Collections of Essays Presented at the Fifth Frances White Ewbank Colloquium on C. S. Lewis and Friends*. Upland, IN: Taylor University, 2006: 79-84.

West, Richard C. "'Her Choice Was Made and Her Doom Appointed': Tragedy and Divine Comedy in the Tale of Aragorn and Arwen." In Hammond and Scull, eds.: 317-329.

Whetter, K. S. and R. Andrew McDonald. "'In the Hilt Is Fame': Resonances of Medieval Swords and Sword-Lore in J. R. R. Tolkien's *The Hobbit* and *The Lord of the Rings.*" *Mythlore* 25:1-2 (Fall-Winter 2006): 5-28.

Wood, Ralph C. "J. R. R. Tolkien: Postmodern Visionary of Hope." In Griesinger and Eaton, eds.: 333-355.

Zemmour, Corinne. "Tolkien in the Land of Arthur: The Old Forest Episode from *The Lord of the Rings.*" *Mythlore* 24:3-4 (Winter-Spring 2006): 135-163.

Zettersten, Arne. "The AB Language Lives." In Hammond and Scull, eds.: 13-24.

SELECTED REVIEWS

Amendt-Raduege, Amy. Rev. of *The Science of Middle-earth*, by Henry Gee.

Tolkien Studies 3 (2006): 194-196.

Bratman, David. Rev. of *The Lord of the Rings: A Reader's Companion*, by Wayne G. Hammond and Christina Scull. *Tolkien Studies* 3 (2006): 182-187.

———. Rev. of *Reading The Lord of the Rings: New Writings on Tolkien's Trilogy*, ed. Robert Eaglestone. *Mythprint* 43: 10-11 (October/November 2006): 10-12.

———. Rev. of *Smith of Wootton Major: Extended Edition*, ed. Verlyn Flieger. *Mythprint* 43: 3 (March 2006): 14.

Croft, Janet Brennan. Rev. of *Reconsidering Tolkien*, ed. Thomas Honegger. *Tolkien Studies* 3 (2006): 190-193.

Doughan, David. Rev. of *Tolkien in Translation*, ed. Thomas Honegger, and *Translating Tolkien: Text and Film*, ed. Thomas Honegger. *Tolkien Studies* 3 (2006): 218-222.

Drout, Michael D. C. Rev. of *The Keys of Middle-earth: Discovering Medieval Literature Through the Fiction of J. R. R. Tolkien*, by Stuart D. Lee and Elizabeth Solopova. *Notes and Queries* 53:4 (2006): 555-556.

Dunlap, Ruby. Rev. of *Mere Humanity: G. K. Chesterton, C. S. Lewis, and J. R. R. Tolkien on the Human Condition*, by Donald T. Williams. *Mythprint* 43:5/6 (2006): 13-14.

Engbers, Chad. Rev. of *Tolkien and the invention of myth: a reader*, edited by Jane Chance. *The Lion and the Unicorn: a critical journal of children's literature* 30:1 (2006): 134-138.

Fimi, Dimitra. Rev. of *Perilous Realms*, by Marjorie Burns. *Tolkien Studies* 3 (2006): 187-190.

Garth, John. Rev. of *The J. R. R. Tolkien Companion: Vol. 1, Chronology; Vol. 2, Reader's Guide*, by Christina Scull and Wayne G. Hammond; *J. R. R. Tolkien Encyclopedia: Scholarship and Critical Assessment*, edited by Michael D. C. Drout. *Times Literary Supplement* (22 & 29 Dec. 2006): 34.

———. Rev. of *The Ring of Words: Tolkien and the Oxford English Dictionary*, by Peter Gilliver, Jeremy Marshall, and Edmund Weiner. *Times Literary Supplement* (23 June 2006): 28.

———. Rev. of *Sí Qente Feanor & Other Elvish Writings*, by J.R.R. Tolkien. *Tolkien Studies* 3 (2006): 157-160.

———. Rev. of *War in the Works of J.R.R. Tolkien*, by Janet Brennan Croft. *Tolkien Studies* 3 (2006): 234-238.

Hughes, Shaun F. D. Rev of *Tolkien, les racines du légendaire*, ed. Michaël Devaux, and *Tolkien, trente ans après (1973-2003)*, ed. Vincent Ferré. *Tolkien Studies* 3 (2006): 196-205.

Nagel, Rainer. Rev. of *The Lord of the Rings: A Reader's Companion*, by Wayne G. Hammond and Christina Scull, *Hither Shore* 3 (2006): 269-272.

———. Rev. of *A Tolkien Mathomium*, by Mark T. Hooker, *Hither Shore* 3 (2006): 262-263.

Nagy, Gergely. Rev. of *Interrupted Music*, by Verlyn Flieger. *Tolkien Studies* 3 (2006): 173-177.

Reid, Robin Anne. Rev. of "J.R.R. Tolkien Special Issue," *Mfs: Modern Fiction Studies* (Winter 2004), guest ed. Shaun F. D. Hughes. *Tolkien Studies* 3 (2006): 178-182.

Sinex, Margaret. Rev. of *Tolkien and the Invention of Myth: A Reader*, ed. Jane Chance. *Tolkien Studies* 3 (2006): 205-217.

Smith, Arden R. Rev. of *Translating Tolkien: Philological Elements in "The Lord of the Rings,"* by Allan Turner. *Tolkien Studies* 3 (2006): 228-231.

Straubhaar, Sandra Ballif. Rev. of *Gateway to Sindarin*, by David Salo. *Tolkien Studies* 3 (2006): 166-173.

Thomas, Paul Edmund. Rev. of *Smith of Wootton Major: Extended Edition*, ed. Verlyn Flieger. *Tolkien Studies* 3 (2006): 160-165.

Thompson, Kristin. Rev. of *Tolkien on Film: Essays on Peter Jackson's "The Lord of the Rings,"* ed. Janet Brennan Croft. *Tolkien Studies* 3 (2006): 222-228.

Velten, Alexandra. Rev. of *Ring of Words: Tolkien and the Oxford English Dictionary*, by Peter Gilliver, Jeremy Marshall, and Edmund Weiner, *Hither Shore* 3 (2006): 260-262.

West, Richard C. Rev. of *Unsung Heroes of "The Lord of the Rings": From Page to Screen*, by Lynnette R. Porter. *Tolkien Studies* 3 (2006): 232-234.

Notes on Contributors

Douglas A. Anderson is co-editor of *Tolkien Studies*.

David Bratman reviews books on Tolkien for *Mythprint*, the monthly bulletin of The Mythopoeic Society, for which he served as editor from 1980-1995. He has edited *The Masques of Amen House* by Charles Williams, compiled the authorized bibliography of Ursula K. Le Guin, and contributed articles on Tolkien to the journals *Mallorn* and *Mythlore* and the book *Tolkien's Legendarium* (ed. Verlyn Flieger and Carl F. Hostetter). His documentary chronology of the Inklings is published as an appendix to *The Company They Keep: C.S. Lewis and J.R.R. Tolkien as Writers in Community* by Diana Pavlac Glyer. He holds an M.L.S. from the University of Washington and has worked as a librarian at Stanford University and elsewhere.

James G. Davis is an Assistant Professor in the English Department at Troy University in Alabama. Holder of an MFA in fiction writing, he specialized in American literature, but all of his presentations and publications in the last decade have been in the field of science fiction. This is his first professional journey into the world of Tolkien.

Jason Fisher is an independent scholar living in Dallas, Texas. Recent publications include entries in the *J.R.R. Tolkien Encyclopedia: Scholarship and Critical Assessment* (Routledge, 2006) and *Women in Science Fiction and Fantasy: An Encyclopedia* (Greenwood, 2008), as well as chapters in *Tolkien and Modernity* (Walking Tree, 2006), *The Silmarillion: Thirty Years On* (Walking Tree, 2007), and *Truths Breathed Through Silver: The Inklings' Moral and Mythopoeic Legacy* (Cambridge Scholars Press, 2008). In addition, he has presented papers on J.R.R. Tolkien and the Inklings in a variety of academic settings and conferences. His blog, Lingwë—Musings of a Fish can be found at http://lingwe.blogspot.com.

Lynn Forest-Hill is a former tutor in medieval and renaissance studies at the University of Southampton, UK and King Alfred's College, Winchester, UK. She is now a Fellow of the Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Culture at the University of Southampton and is currently the Education Officer for the Tolkien Society. Besides regular contributions to the publications of the Society, she has published articles on Tolkien's work and influence in the *Times Literary Supplement* and on the web, as well as publishing a number of short stories. Her medieval and renaissance

research has included a book: *Transgressive Language in Medieval English Drama*, (Ashgate 2000), articles on *The Tempest* (*Shakespeare Survey* 59), and the performance of gender in early Tudor drama (in *Interludes and Early Modern Society*, Rodopi [2007]). She currently runs Reading groups on Tolkien, Shakespeare, Poetry, and is about to launch a series of short courses for adults on early English literature.

Corey Olsen is an Assistant Professor of English at Washington College in Chestertown, Maryland, where he teaches Tolkien and medieval literature. His other research interests include Geoffrey Chaucer and Sir Thomas Malory. His article entitled "Adulterated Love: The Tragedy of Malory's Lancelot and Guinevere" will appear in *Malory and Christianity*, forthcoming from the Medieval Institute Press in May 2008.

Carl Phelpstead is a Senior Lecturer in English Literature at Cardiff University, Wales. His teaching and research interests are primarily in Old Norse-Icelandic and medieval English literature, and in twentieth-century medievalism. He has published several articles on Icelandic sagas and on modern medievalism, and he is the author of *Holy Vikings: Saints' Lives in the Old Icelandic Kings' Sagas* (2007), editor of *A History of Norway and the Passion and Miracles of the Blessed Óláfr* (2001), and co-editor of *Old Norse Made New: Essays on the Post-Medieval Reception of Old Norse Literature and Culture* (2007).

Brian Rosebury, Principal Lecturer in Humanities at the University of Central Lancashire, is a literary critic and philosopher. In addition to his published writings on Tolkien, he has delivered invited lectures in Belgium, Poland, and Korea, and teaches an undergraduate course devoted to Tolkien's work. His wider interests are reflected in a book on the aesthetics of fiction, *Art and Desire* (St Martin's Press, 1988) and in articles in journals including *Victorian Poetry*, *Philosophical Review*, the *British Journal of Aesthetics*, *Political Quarterly* and *Ratio Juris*. His main current research project is a study of revenge, retribution and reciprocity as concepts in criminal justice and in moral and political philosophy.

Ross Smith is head of the translation department at the Madrid offices of PricewaterhouseCoopers. A graduate of Edinburgh University, he is an *intérprete jurado* (sworn legal translator) and a member of the Chartered Institute of Linguists. He is a regular contributor to specialized language journals, including *The Linguist* and *English Today*, writing on aspects of translation, computerized translation resources and Global English, as well as on certain language-related issues in Tolkien's work. He is the author of *Inside Language: Linguistic and Aesthetic Theory in Tolkien*.