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To one who said that myths were lies and therefore worthless,
even though „breathed through silver”.

John Ronald Reuel Tolkien, Mythopoeia, dedication

It is not they that have forgot the Night,
or bid us flee to organized delight,
in lotus-isles of economic bliss,
forswearing souls to gain a Circe-kiss
(and counterfeit at that, machine-produced,
bogus seduction of the twice-seduced).

John Ronald Reuel Tolkien, Mythopoeia

The shaft of truth I trow,
And boundless is my theme.

Pindar, Nemean Ode I, 25–26,
trans. Dawson A. Turner, Abraham Moore
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Introduction — a Megaron

The scene was as follows: at the pub named The Eagle and Child (The Bird and Baby) a group of friends was sitting and listening to one of their company, the one who was reading out a passage from a book he was working on. All are drinking beer, smoking their pipes and making casual remarks. If we go back by as little as two thousand and seven hundred years, the scene will probably be the same — there is a megaron, a group of men sitting around a campfire and listening to somebody who is playing the lyre (or rather the phorminx or kithara) and singing about the Trojan War, Odysseus’ homeward wanderings, the expedition of the Seven against Thebes or other deeds. What he is singing about is what we today hastily call an epos, and the plot on which an epos is woven — a myth or mythical tale.

And after all the aoidos’s, or singer’s, narrator’s tale is only about what we would call a tale of the order of the world. His tale was about the world that all knew, but he also shows the rules that underlie or should underlie it. This is because an epos describes the world but also often shows its moral and ethical order, suggests certain conduct for people who are usually entangled in a net of conflicting duties. Like Achilles who has to kill Hector, Priam’s son, to avenge Patroclus’ death, thus inviting Troy’s defeat and his own end; like Orestes, Agamemnon’s son, who is forced to kill his mother to avenge his father’s death and condemns the whole line to a terrible fate, or like Arjuna who has to fight in the Kuru field.

Did the aoidos create any myths or did he merely re-tell those already known, or did he reveal their hidden meaning? What I think is that he re-told known myths, instructed the audience how to understand them, showed the system of precepts and values, suggested how to find the ways leading not only to Good and

---

1 This is an account of the scene given by David C. Downing on the basis of a diary; cf. by the same author W poszukiwaniu króla. Powieść o Inklingach (Looking for the King), trans. A. Szurek, Kraków 2011, pp. 129–146.
3 Cf. C.S. Lewis, Odrzucony obraz (The Discarded Image: An Introduction to Medieval and Renaissance Literature), trans. W. Orłowski, Warszawa 1986, p. 135; it deals with the Middle Ages but I think that this judgement also holds true for older literatures.
5 This view on the philosophy of eposes is not only Adam Krośkiewicz’s but also e.g. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan’s, cf. id., Filozofia indyjska (Indian Philosophy), trans. Z. Wrzeszcz, introduction by E. Słuszkiewicz, vol. 1–2, Warszawa 1958, vol. 1, pp. 445–546 (chapter: Filozofia eposów, Teizm Bhagawadgity [Epic Philosophy; The Teizm of the Bhagavadgita]).
Beauty but to gods, or rather to God. And how he viewed and presented gods and God was always as a concrete Person or persons. For the aoidos and his audience relations with the spiritual world did not rest on any abstract ideas but a personal relationship. Why is that? Because the whole world has two dimensions that permeate and condition each other; we encounter messengers of gods or God, angels or elves. For the aoidos and his audience, the whole world is an animated world, the world in which death, viewed as complete destruction, is the fate of only the one who deliberately defies gods, destiny or the One.

John Ronald Reuel Tolkien reflects on those issues in the following way (in a letter to Milton Waldman):

Myth and fairy-story must, as all art, reflect and contain in solution elements of moral and religious truth (or error), but not explicit, not in the known form of primary “real” world. [...] anyway all this stuff (it is, I suppose, fundamentally concerned with the problem of the relation of Art (and Sub-creation) and Primary Reality) is mainly concerned with Fall, Mortality, and the Machine.6

Myth — a Depiction Of The World

Can a myth, or rather a mythical tale, provide an accurate and reliable description of the world (it is beyond doubt that it can, but in a spiritual or, as some prefer, allegorical or metaphorical sense)? The question thus asked seems to be sheer nonsense, particularly today at the time of postmodernism, that is a contemporary tide of scepticism. The problem involves the so-called degradation of myth, addressed in the Polish literature by Bogdan Trocha, who also presented the status of the research in the field.7 We should agree with the author that what is most problematic in e.g. the fantasy literature is that a myth manifests itself there in an exceptionally complex way; from serious attempts to “re-tell” it anew to trivialisation or even infantilisation.8 Yet degradation of myth, whatever the way we try to depict it or oppose it, is reality, and on this point the cited author is absolutely right; the question might be whether this affects every writer who touches upon the theme.9 Is it then worth re-examining the issues that, regardless of how we view them, are a serious hypothesis?

7 Cf. B. Trocha, Degradacja mitu w literaturze fantasy, Zielona Góra 2009, passim.
9 Let us refer to the writings of Hermann Broch who seeks to show degradation of myth and the need to re-establish it, both in his fiction and essayistic/philosophical writings. So does Christoph Ransmayr, or Clive Staples Lewis or Ernst Schnabel who came before him. A Polish writer who can be safely cited here is e.g. Konstanty Ildefons Galezynski. Naturally, examples showing degradation are far easier to provide!
Yet I would venture to ask a question about the value and importance of myth again (and about how it is told), and if I corroborate my submission with examples taken from John Ronald Reuel Tolkien, I do not expect any opposition from readers in general or those reading this paper. So the question is: can a mythical tale portray the world? I think yes, so long as what we understand by a depiction of our world is not a galaxy guide but a work that helps us understand the peculiar logic that rules the world, which on the one hand is the one depicted and on the other hand our own world. This is because both these worlds are one; the aoidos’s tale, an epos, refers to the real world and mirrors, through the composition of the story, the cosmic order. Like the Ents’ song, which names all beings inhabiting the world.

For me, John Ronald Reuel Tolkien’s works that attempt to depict the order of the Universe are *Mythopoeia* and *Quenta Silmarillion*. The former is neither a work of prominence in the history of English literature nor the object of any special research, not to mention its reception by readers overall. Yet it is now dealt with in three extensive comments, one in English, one in Polish and one in German. The poem seems to be one of the fundamental literary works in the 20th century.
Let me also stress that the plots spun in the poem also appear in *The Letters* and the writer’s *opus magnum*, i.e. *Quenta Silmarillion*. The latter has ample literature and is probably the most frequently cited work of the author of *The Hobbit*.

The weight of the poem derives from the (weight of the) issues it addresses; it can be said to reveal not only Tolkien’s view on the world and its destiny, but the writer’s peculiar philosophical and literary program and additionally seeks to give answers to the so-called eschatological questions (the ultimate destiny of the world and humankind, evil and death, the Last Judgment, the afterlife). However, Tolkien shows some of those very complex problems in a simple and yet distinct and expressive way. He refers to the simplest examples and poetic images, or rather topoi; some of them require great effort on the part of the reader who wants to fully grasp the abstract ideas hidden under visible representations. A peculiar “expanded version” of the ideas unfolded in the poem is what we find in the cited epos, i.e. *Quenta Silmarillion*.

A brief methodological excursion is necessary at this point. I will present selected issues taken from the current body of research into the poem only and will pass over the epos, knowing though that I should do otherwise. Yet I will stay with this choice for two reasons: first, a review of the research into *Quenta Silmarillion* would need a separate study, which is not the goal of this paper (in Polish an analysis of that type comes, at least in part, from Andrzej Szyjewski cited above and also Jolanta Łaba, and in foreign sources from among others Tom Shippey)\(^\text{16}\). Second, I wish to show the motifs that are common to the poem and the epos; as I have already explained elsewhere, the relation lies in the philosophical and theological concept that underlies the poem. And this is why I consider the poem more important.

Still, I will begin with another issue, namely a scene that, as it turns out, carries more weight than merely an impressive account of some exceptionally dramatic event.

---


\(^{17}\) Cf. A. Szyjewski, op. cit.; T. Shippey, *J.R.R. Tolkien. Pisarz stulecia*, op. cit.; J. Łaba, *Idee religijne w literaturze fantasy. Studium fenomenologiczne*, Gdańsk: Gdańsk Klub Fantastyki, 2010, passim. Let me point out that articles published in periodicals such as “Aiglos” in Poland or “Inklings. Ein Jahrbuch” in Germany raise newer and newer problems and to discuss the status of the research in the field proves difficult if not altogether impossible. The weight of *Mythopoeia*, as a peculiar manifesto, has hardly been expressed by researchers (with the three exceptions cited above).
Myth — Hope

This scene is fairly well implanted in my mind: fugitives from the burning Gondolin encounter the orcs and a Balrog in Kirith Thoronath (Żleb Orłów). They win and flee as far as Nan-tathren in the south of Beleriand, fairly close to the Sirion delta. Why have I chosen this particular scene? Because despite its profound fear it carries great hope; Evil is triumphant, but apparently only, as the moment of Thurin’s passing shows. Destiny can be heard to be coming and although there is still much to do before Morgoth can be defeated, he is doomed to failure.

The greatest thing in both *Quenta Silmarillion* and *Mythopoeia* is hope for the final victory of Good and Beauty. The price we have to pay is seemingly heavy, but this victory rests on our unwavering faith, our determination to fight to the end and, as Pippin declares during the Minas Tirith battle: “a jak będziesz trzeba, to przetrwamy na kolanach” (“We may stand, if only on one leg, or at least be left still upon our knees”). And this is not surrender and passive resistance but the determination to fight to the end for the values and ideas which must not be betrayed.

But why is the Kirith Thoronath passage fixed in my mind so firmly? Because I have walked along treacherous paths and passes in the mountains several times, sometimes all by myself and sometimes accompanied by others, and I fully understand both the fatigue and the terror they bring; although the only thing I had to fight with was fog, I did experience joy when I could feel a safe valley under my feet. An epos makes us get involved in a tale and take it as our own, just as Odysseus did it when he cried on hearing the aoidos sing at Alcinous’ court about the siege and fall of Troy, and Aeneas when he recalled, deeply moved, as he was fleeing from the burning Troy (ordered by gods and forced by destiny), with his father on his back and a few friends.

This is because an epos tells us our own history, though stripped of fortuitousness and everyday dull moments. We can be more straightforward in expression and say that an epos shows the essence and finds meaning in seemingly nonsense or seemingly vain hopes. This is what Plato must have meant when he said:

> whenever you meet with any of the eulogists of Homer declaring that he has been the educator of Hellas, and that he is profitable for education and for the ordering of human things, and that you should take him up again and again and regulate your whole life according to him.

---

Thus an epos governs our entire social relations and behaviour and serves as a peculiar “set of admonitions”. As Denis de Rougemont put it:

The myth is a story describing and showing the dramatized form of some deep structure of reality. Myths are symbolic formulas that remind us, or reveal the meaning of these emerging structures — the Platonic Ideas, the Kantian Category, Mother of Goethe, Jung’s Archetypes.  

So a myth and, consequently, an epos, which is merely a myth forged into a tale, describe the “order of the Universum” (as this is what I understand by Rougemont’s profound structures of reality). Just as in the tale referred to in Tolkien’s Mythopoeia: the meeting with Circe.

Circe

Let me start with the view that our attitude must rest on faith, even if there is no evidence available to us that this faith has any tangible proof (tenth stanza of the poem). At the same time, what seems to follow from the earlier stanzas is that Tolkien is close to accepting the ancient Greeks’ faith in heimarméne — universal fate, destiny, fortune (first stanza), challenged already by Cicero and the Church Fathers. We fail to notice that the poet clearly points to free will, which is our ability to choose between faith and what he calls bogus seduction of the twice-seduced, which enslaves us in lotus-isles of economic bliss // forswoeing souls to gain a Circe-kiss (ninth stanza). Tolkien offers us an excellent interpretation of Circe’s famous scene where Odysseus’ fellows are turned into swine; according to Mythopoeia’s author, this scene makes us realise that if we follow only earthly desires, we may lose our human dignity. Faith can save us from such misfortune, yet it is only our choice, as in the case of Odysseus’ fellows.

Let us have a closer look at the scene.

The quotation “a Circe-kiss” is an allusion to the famous scene in Odyssey: “[...] i oboje wejdźmy do naszej łożnicy” (“let us go to bed”). The problem with the kiss is, let me cite Homer, that we must rely on gods, as it is only their care that can protect us, and without it we would be destined to destruction. Let me also remind you that Odysseus and his friends are tempted by Circe twice; they are saved from another danger by their longing for homeland. The only shield against the sorceress’s fetishes and phantasmata is staying true to the tradition, norms and

24 HOM., Od., X.210 sqq.
values. Even if this plunges us into loneliness and at times despair and the feeling of failure\(^2^6\). Resisting the Circe’s temptation is something more; I oppose the rule of the cold *heimarméne* = fate. I know I am a captive but what captive am I? As the poet says (third stanza): “free captives undermining shadowy bars, // digging the foreknown from experience // and panning the vein of spirit out of sense”.

The allusion to Plato’s vision here is self-evident; I mention it here not to remind the reader of this obvious link but to draw his attention to the phrase: *free captives* (wolni jeńcy). It is a reference to yet another source, that is among others the Epistles of St Paul and first and foremost the *Galatians (Ep. to the Gal.)*; important is also the *Gospel of Luke*\(^2^7\) and Isaiah\(^2^8\). An interesting comment on e.g. this passage comes from Gergely Nagy, who pointed out deeper links between Tolkien and Homer, and not only between Tolkien and Plato\(^2^9\). Still, he omitted to mention relations with the Bible, which seems to me, in the light of the research carried on by e.g. Raymond Nighan, somewhat surprising.

What is important to us is the conclusion that as long as we look at the world through *heimarméne* = fatum, we remain captives. Our action, that is undermining shadowy bars, is an explanation of what being a sub-creator or the little maker is. But this is assured by freedom, freedom from the feeling of being a captive. This freedom is bestowed on us by the Person who is a lord unseen for many, yet we enjoy it only as long as we stay true to Him (even at the time of greatest despair).

### Faith, Hope, Freedom

Will our faith and hope not be impaired? After all, were Achilles’, Odysseus’, Agamemnon’s, Hector’s heroism and faithfulness to their values of any use? Did they not pass away and were their ashes not scattered in the wind? It is true, but they are remembered in song and accorded glory that will never fade; this is also Feanor’s answer to Eonwe when the latter tries to persuade him and the Noldor he was leading, to the order of the Valar, not to give in to the szaleństwu ucieczki. The answer that the creator of the Silmarils gives echoes Pindar’s ode:

\(^{2^6}\) Importantly, Stanisław Lem pointed out that the heroes of e.g. Philip K. Dick behaved in a similar way; cf. S. Lem, *Fantastyka i futurologia*, vol. 1–2, Kraków: WL, 1973, vol. 1, pp. 174–177, here: 176 („jego ludzie pozostają normalni wewnątrznie wbrew światu, co ich otacza, ponieważ ten świat jest rażony obłędem”). The motif alone of a hero who has nobody to rely on but himself in a changing world is older; it can be found in medieval epic (cf. Parsifal, and often in subsequent literature, e.g. William Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*).


\(^{2^8}\) *Isaiah*, 42.7; 51.14

But when Success Adventures crowns,
The lyre’s mellifluous strain,
To spread th’ eternal blazon, and assever
On Fame’s unfailing oath, that Virtue lives for ever\textsuperscript{30}.

But is this enough? I do not know the answer and I do not intend to be cleverer than Homer, from whom we inherit the dilemma. When Achilles lost his armour and shield, they fell, after Patroclus’ death, into the hands of Hector, who obtained a new weapon; but portrayed in the centre of the new shield was not a warrior but a farmer\textsuperscript{31}. Why did the god of fire and metalworking Hephaestus do it that way? Achilles’ shield that he forged in five layers represented the cosmic order, an allegory of war and peace, and as many as two pictures represent a farmer’s chores. It might be that fighting is one of the things that are unavoidable, yet our destiny is something different — \textit{eirene}, peace and the chores of everyday life that do not add up to triumphs but give us this picture:

\begin{verbatim}
Tobie k’woli rozliczne kwiatki Wiosna rodzi,
Tobie k’woli w kłosianym wieńcu Lato chodzi,
Wino Jesień i jabłka rozmaite dawa,
Potyim do gotowego gnuśna Zima wstawa\textsuperscript{32}.
\end{verbatim}

This scene, which evokes tranquillity and, apparently, boredom conveys what amounts to the centrepiece of the epic outlook on the world. This world is well-arranged and yielded to the will of the One, and we are only, like the hobbits towards the Numenoreans, tenants in the Lord’s vineyard.

This picture will be seen in John Ronald Reuel Tolkien’s both works. In \textit{Mythopoeia} the poet suggests a representation of Paradise that awaits us, yet only if we stay true, even against hope. In \textit{Quenta Silmarillion}, the Garden of Eden is abandoned voluntarily to later become the longed-for land to which everybody wants to return (possibly with the exception of the servants of Evil, which long for it but are also afraid of it; this is how Ungolianta looks at Valinor).

At the same time, Tolkien suggests something more, particularly in \textit{Quenta Silmarillion}; I do not know whether he does so deliberately or not. The flight of the Noldor, fratricide and all that happened afterwards turn out to be parts of Iluvatar’s plan. I do not think that Iluvatar’s meant to release the misfortunes that struck the elves and men and the whole world following the war with Morgoth. War and destruction may ensue from the desires of one party only, with the other party being forced to fight, against his will, a rather trivial remark.

\textsuperscript{30} \textit{Olimp.}, XI,3–6; transl. by D.W. Turner, A. Moore.
\textsuperscript{31} HOM., \textit{Ill.}, XVIII.
Thus Tolkien shows us certain mechanisms of history on which men or even gods have little or no influence at all. Important is the will which leads to specified solutions and also far effects of the events we usually cannot even imagine. The tale of Turin is one of such tales about the farthest consequences of apparently trifle events. After all, most of the tales in *Quenta Silmarillion* are evidence of how decisions, apparently insignificant and trifle, bring about absolutely unforeseen consequences (e.g. Thingol’s condition that Beren is to fulfil leads to the fall of Doriath).

In his epos the author of *The Hobbit* seems to remind us of the old truth to which the authors of similar ancient tales made references. Most frequently, it is us to inflict misfortunes upon ourselves or our closest relatives, and sometimes our homeland. This truth is also, and very often, the subject of a Greek tragedy, just to mention Sophocles, Euripides or Aeschylus. This is also what happens in *The Mahabharata*; breaching a rule entails the fall of a civilisation. The Ancient Greeks noted that it was exactly a breaching of a rule that set in motion Destiny and sometimes the Eumenides. And nobody was spared the consequences of breaking a law. In *Niebelungenlied* Siegfried says that “The law stands whether over the gods”; a similar view is expressed by Homer’s Zeus.

Is it not that there is more fear than love in such faith and hope? I dare say that fear must give way, if not to love or faith, to hope. Hope opens before us the prospect of a spiritual structure of the world. Let me refer at this point to the great scene in Clive Staples Lewis’s *The Last Battle*, in which Emeth, a Calormene, guided by his hope to meet Tash God encounters Aslan and chooses to stay in his land. Hope also leads the heroes of both *The Lord of the Rings* and *Quenta Silmarillion* to action. It is true indeed that faith and love are very important but it is hope that lets those virtues ripen, as they are the theological virtues.

**In Praise of Philology**

For me, the greatest feature of Tolkien’s eposes is their philological layer. Its foundation is what is referred to as mythopoeia (derived from Greek μυθο-ποιία “myth-making”) and what substantially means “processing of well

---

33 HOM., II., XXII.170–188.
known myths”\(^37\); this concept is distinct from “mythoplasia (creating new poetic myths)”\(^38\). Yet myths are embedded in language, as they must be told and stored in language.

Why is the question about the philological tradition important? Not only because the author was a philologist but also because language is, unlike excavations, a peculiar fossil that each of us can come to know\(^39\). Particularly if we accept the view, in a sense against the structuralists, that some linguistic signs not only refer to specific objects but point to them in a peculiar way. We may assume therefore that we have a word, or rather a name, but also the referent. This is the author’s preoccupation in *Mythopoeia*.

Even if we give the poem a cursory reading, it is clear that its sources are the Bible (either *The Vulgate*, or the authorised King James version) and the Christian tradition, including the patristic one (e.g. Gregory Nazianzen), the Anglo-Saxon culture, *Odyssey*, Plato’s and Hesiod’s writings, but also Ptolemy’s *Almagest*, and the influence of such English poets as Samuel Taylor Coleridge, John Keats, Percy Bysshe Shelley, William Wordsworth\(^40\). Researchers agree that “whole poem is, with the help of poetic art, concise presentation of the theory of knowledge according to (Plato’s dialogues) Phaedo and the Republic. Mythopoeia is also back to the romantic perception of the sky”\(^41\) but the poem also touches on epistemological issues. When Tolkien brings up the ORIGO, which is shared by all living creatures, he refers to the ancient and at the same time Judaeo-Christian concepts that the whole creation comes from some creative force or, to put it more simply, from God. However, there is another more important remark that the poet makes; he adverts to the weighty problem of language as an echo of the ancient image of the world, it is in language that memory of the past which seems to be lost irretrievably is stored\(^42\).

And it is there, in language, that we find e.g. the elves. They emerge not only in known texts of the Scandinavian and Celtic but also the Hindu mythologies. If we examine the etymology of the word ‘elf’ (=OldNorse „alfar”), this will lead us to the *Sanskrit* word ‘ribhu’, and before we get there we will encounter the *Greek*...
"orphee". However, the so-called longaevi (= the long-lived) are also present in our European tradition, first in Martianus Capella’s; at a later time similar issues will be addressed by John of Gaza, a Byzantine poet of the 6th cent., and then Bernardus Silvestris, a Neo-Platonic philosopher of the 12th cent. All of them claimed that the world has two dimensions, i.e. the physical and the spiritual. And what I mean here is not any unclear and opaque representations, which are typical of the late 19th cent., but representations, strange yet not deprived of a peculiar search for truth, which have the late Middle Ages as their end.

It is the time of the Neo-Platonists that brings back the idea of the existence of other forms of intelligent life with which we may communicate. But the development of experimental sciences completely marginalised these considerations confining them to the outer limits of science, to relegate them at the end of the 18th cent. to a store with out-of-print books, not to say to the lumber room of science. And it is only epic that could tell us something about this world that had sunk into oblivion; this is what Quenta Silmarillion does.

Contrary to what many readers and admirers of the work probably feel, the term mythopoeia also applies to this epos. This is because Tolkien does not create new poetic myths but rewrites those known to all. This has been addressed on numerous occasions and I will refer to the literature of the subject only. As the authors of Tolkien and the Invention of Myth write, they are: antiquity (Greece and Rome), myths and Old Norse sagas, the Old English tradition and, naturally, Finnish tales. Obviously, we should add the Bible; the issue that remains open is whether Tolkien knew Slavonic and Indo-European sources. As he was a philologist, the answer may be that he did know them. Still, some researchers are of the opinion that Quenta Silmarillion is the work in which myth is created. I do not think that this view is correct. The sources of the myth, as I show above, are quite easy to identify.

Yet the question about the sources from which Tolkien drew is complicated because the answer will be much longer than that applying to Mythopoeia. In addition to those already named, these will also be medieval epics and sagas but


46 Cf. Tolkien and the Invention of Myth: A Reader, passim.
also *Kalevala*, Greek eposes and English literature, albeit hard to definitely name (certainly Chaucer, fairy-tales and legends edited by e.g. Andrew Lang, Elizabethan literature including Shakespeare and most probably John Milton). This is supplemented by ample literature in areas of philology, philosophy, theory of literature, still more difficult to identify. Completing the set are the English language and other languages, both real and those conceived by Tolkien.

Let me digress for a moment to talk about something apparently irrelevant, namely two constructional features of *Quenta Silmarillion*. Their detailed account was provided by among others Maria E. Pobieżyńska in her study *Wtórna oralność jako narzędzie badań literackich na podstawie Quenta Silmarillion J.R.R. Tolkiena*. I mean *entrelacement*, or *alternation* and the narrators in *Quenta*. The former term implies the use of a technique of composition typical of medieval epic; the researcher sums up her comment on this aspect in the following way:

> Parallel narratives, cutting the plots, broken relationships by comments from a compiler or from another time (later or even earlier) — all are evidence of the use of Tolkien’s one of the most popular medieval European compositional techniques.

The other problem, i.e. narrators and narration, has turned out to be much more complex. Narration is extremely complex (at least three layers should be distinguished) and there are as many as sixty-two narrators. How are these assertions relevant to the issues I address? In *Quenta Silmarillion* not only do we feel that this tale not only comes back to the sacred time but, owing to the first feature, it always points out to us, while we read it, “things already known”, as the feeling (that we are amidst the sacred time) is embedded in the very construction of an epos. This is why we do not have the impression that it is merely a literary work but another version of the mythical tales that we know. This situation clearly argues a mytho-poetic approach, not the creation of any new myths. This is why, although the tale gives an account of new events, it is really planted in “realities” known from other mythical tales. Tom Shippey cites Christopher Tolkien’s opinion which is an excellent summary of the earlier remarks: the Silmarillion is

---

48 Ibid., p. 156.
49 Ibid., pp. 122–131.
to be a “compendium of legends”. And Guy G. Kay suggests that J.R.R. Tolkien saw the Silmarillion “as a book of images”\(^{52}\). It can be said that his friends rightly named him a “storyteller”; I would prefer to call him an aoidos.

**God, Faith, Cosmos**

Both Nighan and I ask about the place of God and faith in *Mythopoeia*. The answer is quite simple: it is Personal God of Christians and we are tied to Him through this shared source, *origo* in the second stanza\(^{53}\). Yet the epistemological problem posed by the poem is neither easy to name nor to clearly identify. It seems that when Tolkien refers to Personal God, he resolves the issue definitively. What is then the position of the *Elves* who emerged at the dawn of our history (third stanza)? And also, what is my position as a *little maker* (eleventh stanza) and a *sub-creator* at the same time (fifth stanza) in the world? Particularly that it is exactly in the eleventh stanza that Tolkien says: “I will not walk with your progressive apes”. Or, as Nighan suggests, is it only Tolkien to “strongly repudiate technological Darwinism”?\(^{54}\). Most probably yes; this kind of thinking can be found in C.S. Lewis’s *Space Trilogy*, which opposes not so much “technological Darwinism” but the attitude that involves a negation of the spiritual dimension of the Universum. If we accept this spiritual dimension *ipso facto*, we admit the existence of God, and Personal God at that\(^{55}\).

As I have already noted a few times, Tolkien presumes the existence of the spiritual dimension of the Universum along with the physical dimension, and the existence of Personal God\(^{56}\). Whether we should perceive the Person in the physic-
al or spiritual sense I will not inquire into it now; it is irrelevant to my present considerations. I would rather follow the tradition of the Fathers of the Council of Chalcedon convoked in 451, who voted to accept the following formula:

Following, then, the holy fathers, we unite in teaching all men to confess the one and only Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. This selfsame one is perfect both in deity and in humanness; this selfsame one is also actually God and actually man, with a rational soul (meaning human soul) and a body. He is of the same reality as God as far as his deity is concerned and of the same reality as we ourselves as far as his humanness is concerned; thus like us in all respects, sin only excepted. Before time began he was begotten of the Father, in respect of his deity, and now in these „last days,” for us and behalf of our salvation, this selfsame one was born of Mary the virgin, who is God-bearer in respect of his humanness.

We also teach that we apprehend this one and only Christ-Son, Lord, only-begotten — in two natures; and we do this without confusing the two natures, without transmuting one nature into the other, without dividing them into two separate categories, without contrasting them according to area or function. The distinctiveness of each nature is not nullified by the union. Instead, the „properties” of each nature are conserved and both natures concur in one „person” and in one reality (hypostasis). They are not divided or cut into two persons, but are together the one and only and only-begotten Word (Logos) of God, the Lord Jesus Christ. Thus have the prophets of old testified; thus the Lord Jesus Christ himself taught us; thus the Symbol of Fathers has handed down to us57.

The writer said something similar rather straightforwardly in the cited letter to Milton Waldman written in 1951. I will return to what I have already raised, which is also the issue repeatedly invoked in The Lord of the Rings and Quenta Silmarillion. The vision of the world divided into two spheres: the purely physical, tellurian one (second stanza of the poem) and the sphere of the spirit (seventh to tenth and twelfth stanzas).

Support for this issue can be found, surprisingly, in Thomism; Etienne Gilson points out that:

This leads to the recognition of the obviousness of existence of the external world [telluric sphere], which is expressed abstractly and directly in reason […]. Thought is possible only where there is knowledge before […] in the order of existential judgments sensory perception has a nature and value of the principle of cognition […] As Kant says, if there are symptoms, there must be things that are manifested [spiritual life]58.

---


58 E. Gilson, Realizm tomistyczny, team trans., Warszawa 1968, pp. 31, 52, 148, 163.
The second sphere entails among others language because, as inter alia Adalbert Kuhn and Owen Barfield showed, linguistic signs do not refer only to extra-language realities (which is a trivial observation) but to existing objects. As regards epistemological issues, the poet seems to suggest that our power to create derives from the Power that made itself known to us at the time of the Creation; this is why we have the terms “the little maker” (eleventh stanza) and “the sub-creator” (fifth stanza).

The considerations in the poem found their practical realisation in the epos named Quenta Silmarillion. As we can easily notice, it is in this work that the poet gives concrete form to the motifs employed in the poem. The epos shows the order of the world in which staying true to certain values and the conviction that in addition to the world perceptible to our senses there exists, and sometimes becomes visible to us, the world that is extra- or rather supra-sensuous. Both are truly real; let us not ask why this order does not exist anymore, the world has changed.

Let me cite several facts from the history of world literature and Polish literature. In 1922 James Joyce’s Ulysses is released, from 1913 until 1927 Marcel Proust creates the particular parts of his monumental literary cycle, and in the years 1930-1932 Hermann Broch writes The Sleepwalkers, one of the most important literary works in the 20th century. We should ensure enough space to house Thomas Mann, Thomas S. Eliot, John Dos Passos, Jan Parandowski, Mikhail Bulgakov, not to mention Lovecraft, Howard and the fledgling SF literature (which eagerly draws on the patterns of popular literature, already available at that time).

---

59 Cf. A. Kuhn, Mythologische Studien, Bertelsmann, Gütersloh 1886; idem, Über Entwicklungsstufen der Mythenbildung, Dümmer in Komm, Berlin 1874; O. Barfield, Poetic Diction, passim. Similar problems were addressed by e.g. Thomas Aquinas, cf. id., O substancjach czystych, [in:] id., Dzieła wybrane, trans., ed. J. Salij OP, Warszawa 1964, pp. 295–337.

60 Some issues addressed here briefly only are expanded on in: Karen Armstrong, Spór o Boga. Czym naprawdę jest religia?, trans. B. Cendrowska, Warszawa 2011. Cf. also Breviarium Fidei. Wybór doktrynalnych wypowiedzi Kościoła, V, pp. 173–207 (Dzieło Stworzenia), VII.2, pp. 573–590 (Praca człowieka). A beautiful example in The Lords of the Rings is the scene of Sam reviving the Shire trees using Galadriel’s gift. Similar scenes in Quenta Silmarillion are too many to mention, so I will cite only one: the Valar, endowed with Iluvatar’s vision, may create Arda. This skill is bestowed on Elves to be later inherited by Men.
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The heroes of those novels most often include “the Quester Hero”, as Thomas Mann named this type of literary hero in a famous lecture for Princeton University students. But what are they looking for, or what are they afraid of? Perhaps what Gustav Flaubert, who was one generation older, named “smell of mildew”. I guess all of them share one thing, namely some fear that the reader and at the same time the hero of their novels is a boor living in the world of fetishes and phantasmata (as Hermann Broch names him), namely the one for whom, as Broch forthrightly says in The Sleepwalkers, only the merchant’s triad (profit, loss, balance) is what counts. It is also, as Thomas Mann put it, “idea of man, the concept of the future of humanism, which grows out of the deepest knowledge of disease and death”. This hero is, like his predecessors (among others Faust), a man of contradictions.

Another question refers to progress and uncontrolled growth of civilisation; this great yet totally utopian vision was also eventually called into question by one of its most ardent supporters, Stanisław Lem.

Yet let me remind you of this tone and the great vision of the new world, which Aldous Huxley slightly spoilit quite a long ago in his well-known book (Brave New World was written in 1931 and published in 1932, and its essayistic supplement was released in 1958; however, some argue that we should rather cite Joseph Conrad’s Heart of Darkness), was given its most concrete form in SF literature rather than the so-called mainstream literature. This judgement is not entirely apt, as for example the literature of Socialist Realism attempted to create this vision.

However, it was already in Thea von Harbou’s Metropolis (1927) that the prospect of the future turns into something close to a nightmare, just as it did in Herbert G. Wells’s The Time Machine, more than 25 years older (1895). So we might say that attempts to seriously describe the great future in which progress and development of civilization are triumphant (let us mention at least Stefan Żeromski’s glass houses) have suffered a resounding defeat. We should be keen to learn the reasons of that failure.

I think the answer can be found in the two cited novels, i.e. Aldous Huxley’s and Stefan Żeromski’s, if I am to mention rather accidental though representative works. This is what Clive Staples Lewis sought to definitively describe in his The Funeral of a great Myth (and so various other critics of progress and development of civilization probably did). This critical tone can also be heard in SF literature.

---


65 Ibid., p. 399.


As Immanuel Kant put it in the Preface to the second edition of his *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*:

> Reason only perceives that which it produces after its own design; that it must not be content to follow, as it were, in the leading-strings of nature, but must proceed in advance with principles of judgement according to unvarying laws, and compel nature to reply its questions.

It is us to create what we later believe in, as facts and rules, but there are some permanent rules beyond us and beyond nature. Yet the very essence of what we are trying to capture always escapes us. The reason may be that we ask wrong questions or interpret answers wrongly. The best example is the problem of how we should interpret popular literature — is it the result/manifestation of a crisis, globalisation or the consequence of the universal acceptance of the patterns of the so-called dominant culture? It could be a mere consequence of the development of the type of literature that is derived not from a novel, but a romance in the Anglo-Saxon tradition. These issues are discussed elsewhere, so I will not inquire into them here.

**Epic and The Place of Man in the Universum**

However, in such considerations we omit a tradition that is even older, the one that reaches out back to the epic. It is of importance insofar as it shows the place of man in the Universum in a completely different way. It turns out that Tolkien’s poem, not to mention *Quenta Silmarillion*, apparently shows man’s limitations, but is in fact a praise of our freedom of choice — neither God nor faith curbs that freedom in any way. What is more, it is them to show us the remarkable richness of the Universum, and they do that through myths or rather mythical tales. Their

---
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power, like that of the classical tradition, resides in whether they are still alive\(^72\). As Father Joachim Badeni points out\(^73\), what Tolkien offers in his writings is this type of „living myth”: “This very vividly described mythical concrete exists in the imagination of the reader — so vividly, as existed in the imagination of Tolkien”\(^74\). This is what we have already talked about, i.e. noticing not only the tellurian but also the spiritual dimension of reality.

Tolkien’s poem and *Quenta Silmarillion* are a clear contemporary manifestation of faith and faith in Personal God, a beautiful tradition dating back to the Fathers of the Church. He is like Eru in *The Lord of the Rings*, watching and supporting those who fight evil sincerely. Yet he gives us freedom of choice which Frodo (and also Sam and Gollum-Smeagol) makes on Mount Doom. Similar choices are to be made by the heroes of *Quenta Silmarillion*, and we can also see far-reaching consequences of various decisions. The choice they make determines the future of not only men but sometimes the whole world.

The end of the two epics, i.e. *Quenta Silmarillion* and *The Lord of the Rings* is similar; the heroes are bound to leave. In *Quenta Silmarillion* we additionally have a “prophecy” of the destruction of Arda (heralded by the fall of Numenor). It is rather obvious because, as Tolkien underlines, until Arda is renewed, the Fall (as he wrote in 1958 in a letter to Rhona Beare)\(^75\) „was a possibility if not inevitable”.

Why then does the poem close with a vision of the splendour of Truth that hurts your eyes to make you almost blind? “In Paradise perchance the eye May stray // from gazing upon everlasting Day // to see the Day-illumined, and renew // from mirrored truth the likeness of the True”? This refers us to the words of St Paul in the *First Epistle to the Corinthians* (*I Ep. ad Cor.*, 13.12): “For now we see through a glass, darkly...” and the second *Epistle to the Corinthians* (*II Ep. ad Cor.*, 3.18): “But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord...”. But it is also a reference to various other passages from the Bible where both God and Jesus Christ are identified with light (cf. *Ps.*, CIV.2, *Ec. Sc. Matth.*, 17.2, *Ap.*, 22.5).

This vision will persistently re-emerge in Tolkien’s writings. Let me remind the reader that the last and maybe the first thing that Frodo saw was “white shores and beyond them a far green country under a swift sunrise”\(^76\). A vision somewhat
similar is to be found in *Quenta Silmarillion*; the time when Earendil arrives in Valinor: “gazing from afar upon the light of the Silmaril, and it was very great ... and the dust upon his raiment and his shoes was a dust of diamonds, and he shone and glistened as he climbed the long white stairs”\(^{77}\).

This light comes from the Person, it is not some abstract blaze but the glory that surrounds God. The Silmarils are, though indirectly, His creation, like the diamonds scattered along the roads of Valinor. As Evelyn Underhill, author of one of few fundamental writings on mysticism, reminds us, light is the symbol of pure Being and for mystics it is a visible sign of Personal God who makes Himself known to us.\(^{78}\) Let me point out that a vision almost identical with Tolkien’s is to be found in Canto XXXIII of Dante’s *Divine Comedy (Paradise)*, which lauds God’s greatness in “the abyss// Of radiance, clear and lofty”\(^{79}\).

Let us put it clearly, it is not enough to say that God, faith and freedom are not exclusive; they supplement one another and provide a foundation for us to find our place in the *Universum. Mythopoeia* shows how to do it; let us follow the advice and the returning King (an excellent representation of the Second Coming) will appreciate our effort. We should not forget that when the King returns the world that we know will no longer be. Although the Second Coming is not expressly referred to in the poem, its inevitability is present there and the words “there each shall choose for ever from the All” clearly show it. This also holds true for the following words: “…upon a clumsy loom//weave tissues gilded by the far-off day// hoped and believed in under Shadow’s sway”.

Why then does *Quenta Silmarillion*, unlike *The Lord of the Rings* or the *Chronicles of Narnia* or even *The Cosmic Trilogy*, end with a fall? I guess because it is *Quenta*... to tell us about the future of the world, which — without God’s interference, slowly plunges into chaos. It might be because the scar of fratricide has proven to be too heavy a burden for the humankind to bear; it is not our material greatness that will save or condemn us, but morality and ethics.

Importantly, we can find the so-called second prophecy of Mandos in the writer’s draft, which tells us both about the final battle and the Second Coming\(^{80}\). We might say that these passages should have been included in the ver-


sion of *Quenta Silmarillion* that was released in 1977. The reason might have been simple; there is no place in the epos for inserting the prophecy. Tadeusz A. Olszański’s remark that this passage could have been included, rather mechanically, in the 1977 text before the final paragraph is not correct, insofar as this would have been contrary to the assumption that the world of gods is, to some extent, separated from the world of men. Another reason might have been more serious: the writer noticed an important error not in the composition but the meaning, as the exclusion of men from the Renewal of the World would have been inconsistent with the generally Christian vision of the Second Coming in the poem (which must have been dear to the writer’s heart). Let us point out that Light will also play an important role in the Second Prophecy of Mandos: “and the Mountains of Valinor shall be levelled, so that the Light shall go out over all the world”.

Yet even this vision is not satisfactory enough to be included it in the final version of the work. What is more important for the writer is, as he points out in the essay named *On Fairy-Stories*, a coherent and comprehensive vision. This passage, albeit an interesting one, is contrary to the concept of *eucatastrophe*, and is also too unequivocal to satisfy the author of *The Hobbit*. So not everything must be unravelled; after all Tolkien had expressly stated that not all of Iluvatar’s plans had been revealed⁸¹. Let us then take the Second Prophecy of Mandos as a mystery, mentioned by the writer in *Mythopoeia*, and also as a harbinger of hope.

## The Second Coming

God, faith and freedom are indisputably crucial topoi in John Ronald Reuel Tolkien’s writings, and they are also endowed with individualised characteristics, particularly in *Mythopoeia* and *Quenta Silmarillion*. Among them is also the topos of the Second Coming, employed there in a rather surprising fashion.

In *Mythopoeia* it is referred to expressly; I mean the passage with the returning King. A reference to *St John’s Revelations* in this passage is also obvious; it is so evident that no more detailed analysis of the passage is needed. As for the earlier version of *Quenta Silmarillion*, the topos is employed there in a surprising mode; it is more like the Last Battle in the Scandinavian mythology than the Christian vision. Let us compare the two passages:

---

When the world is old and the Powers grow weary, then Morgoth, seeing that the guard sleepeth, shall come back through the Door of Night out of the Timeless Void; and he shall destroy the Sun and Moon. But Eärendel shall descend upon him as a white and searing flame and drive him from the airs. Then shall the Last Battle be gathered on the fields of Valinor. In that day Tulkas shall strive with Morgoth, and his right hand shall be Fionwe, and on his left Turin Turambar, son of Hurin, coming from the halls of Mandos; and the black sword of Turin shall deal unto Morgoth his death and final end; and so shall the children of Hurin and all Men be avenged. Thereafter shall Earth be broken and re-made, and the Silmarils shall be recovered out of Air and Earth and sea; for Earendel shall descend and surrender that flame which he hath had in keeping. Then Feanor shall take the Three Jewels and bear them to Yavanna Palurien; and she will break them and with their fire rekindle the Two Trees, and a great light shall come forth. And the Mountains of Valinor shall be levelled, so that Light shall go out over all the world.

And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. [...] And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS. [...] And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, And shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them. And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever. [...] And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea.

A comment, albeit a brief one is necessary here. Tadeusz A. Olszański is right when he associates Tolkien’s text with the Nordic Ragnarök and argues that this vision is rather remote from the Christian tradition. For me, an important element of this artistic vision is light; and yet some elements overlap with those in St John’s vision. Namely, Evil will be defeated by fire that will descend from heaven, and also the renewal of the world, which will ensue from the Last Battle. Moreover, later in the Revelations (Ap., XXI.23) we read: “And the city [the New Jerusalem] had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof”. So the two visions, St John’s and Tolkien’s, converge here and the new light that will flood in AFTER the Last Battle will not be the light as we know it today.

---

82 T.A. Olszański, Zarys teologii Śródziemia, p. 62.
Yet the two visions differ, and not negligibly. The Second Coming certainly requires one thing — the return of the King who has the power to rule the world. In the Christian tradition, the King is Jesus Christ, son of the living God. It is now clear why the so-called Second Prophecy of Mandos was not included in the final version of *Quenta Silmarillion*. The world created there, like the world of *The Lord of the Rings*, is a world before the Redemption and the Second Coming according to our understanding is not possible there. It may be something expected but first requires appropriate conditions; this is where the essential difference lies.

But there is the other one, namely the absence of men in the Prophecy of Mandos. This issue is more serious because, as in *The Lord of the Rings*, men are no further than at the dawn of history. Not only is Redemption unknown, even the Covenant is not established yet! This posed a serious compositional problem; we might guess that Tolkien „presented” the history of the world up to more or less the eighth or ninth chapter of *Genesis*.

So Mandos is right and wrong at the same time; he is right because Evil has been finally defeated, he is wrong because this can be achieved with the King present but the Prophecy makes no mention of Him. The King must be Iluvatar himself or…; no mention of the future of men is a serious fault, too. I guess that the writer was not sure how to (artistically) resolve the situation outlined in the two eposes (which can be clearly seen from *The Lord of the Rings*).

Yet this passage of Tolkien’s epos was never written. A trace of belief in the Second Coming can be found only in *Mythopoeia* and we must be content with it.

**Conclusions — Questions and Answers**

Did Tolkien intend, as we might infer from the closing section of the preceding chapter, to weave something into the story unfolded in the first nine chapters of *Genesis*? Obviously not, but such analogies are somehow inevitable. This is because the writer forces us, in the poem and mainly in *Quenta Silmarillion*, to answer questions about God, faith, freedom and the Second Coming. The answers that the writer himself gives deal with the fundamental ontological, epistemological or existential problems that each of us must resolve not in any but in concrete terms.

Tolkien’s attitude is close to that of Hermann Broch, who pointed out that:

> In the mythical element reveals indeed the core of the human soul, and exposes in front of her, when the soul recognizes it back and converts into the action in the events of the world, in the events of nature, it is the same process as that in which the human spirit understands that his core is a logic element, and finds him back in the causal events of the outside world — which is thus dominates.\(^{83}\)

---

Broch and Tolkien are of the opinion that a myth, or rather a mythical tale, including an epos, is an excellent form of artistic expression, as it makes it easier to present the “mechanisms” of history and the place and role of men. At the same time, God or gods play an important part in this story, as it inevitably deals with cosmological issues, often treated from the axiological perspective. The question that invariably arises is the one about faith and freedom; it often seems that the two are mutually exclusive. As it turns out, Tolkien shows us, they are not mutually exclusive but complementary.

This standpoint is close to Broch’s; in his preface to Rachel Bespaloff’s book on *The Iliad* he wrote:

> When the myth by being enacted has come to be religion, then art (along with other aspects of existence) becomes of necessity the handmaid of the central religious values, its function being to resymbolize these values which symbolize the world.

We may therefore say that literature that disregards the task of upholding our faith in values and ideals defies its role and becomes, as J.R.R. Tolkien suggests, something that leads to a *double seduction*. The first is the uncritical submission to the vision of “lotus isles of economic bliss” (this is how we accept Circe’s proposal), the other one is acceptance of the view that this vision is a *DEPICTION* of the world. Yet our conduct is our choice and nobody, as C.S. Lewis showed in *The Chronicles of Narnia*, will release us from the duty to make this PERSONAL choice.

We may choose to stay with Circe, or sail on in our search for Ithaca. We may, as Aeneas did, stay with Dido or keep searching for a *new Troy*, in other words submit ourselves to gods’ will and fortune. However, today we find it very difficult to reconcile ourselves with the fact that staying with Circe or Dido is nothing but the choice of fetishes and phantasmata. And until we realise it, we will cherish the false belief that we have gained an understanding of the world. The truth is that, as Tolkien says in both *Quenta Silmarillion* and *The Lord of the Rings* — “Here we have realize the intentions of Iluvatar”, but “We are not forever chained to this world”. The writer may be said to have put it most straightforwardly and clearly in his *Leaf by Niggle*:

> Before him stood the Tree, his Tree, finished. If you could say that of a Tree that was alive, its leaves opening, its branches growing and bending in the wind that Niggle had so often felt or guessed, and had so often failed to catch. He gazed at the Tree, and slowly he lifted his arms and opened them wide.

---

84 This was clearly expounded in the Austrian writer’s *Śmierć Wergilego*, yet for obvious reasons I will not analyse it here.
86 This approach to myth, also in our times, was noted by Rasipuram K. Narayan, *Ramajana*, trans. K. Wojciechowska, Warszawa 1984, p. 7.
“It’s a gift!” he said. He was referring to his art, and also to the result; but he was using the word quite literally.\(^{87}\)

This is what a myth becomes — a depiction of the world, which — even if a dream only — may become a living thing. An epos is then a depiction of the world, one that is detailed enough to make us believe, as e.g. Heinrich Schliemann did, that it indicates the places where the plot is set, and in the case of Niggle — that it creates them (or that it reminds us of those places and shows them as places that are living places). Let us not forget about it — John Ronald Reuel Tolkien also describes the world. It may have been swept away by a wave of time but this does not mean that it has never existed or is nowhere to be found. So a myth or the form in which it is expressed, i.e. an epos, is a gift: my dream is to become endowed with such grace and joy that were bestowed on Niggle.\(^{88}\)

### Mythopoeia and Quenta Silmarillion
by J.R.R. Tolkien — God, Faith, Freedom, and the Second Coming

Summary

The aim of the study is to describe how such categories as: God, faith, freedom, Second Coming are presented in the works of J.R. R. Tolkien, mainly in the poem Mythopoeia and in the epos Quenta Silmarillion. The author referring to the achievements of the writer, and also literature and tries to show how specified categories are introduced to the aforementioned literary works and what a role they play. The myth that in Tolkien’s work plays an important role, is an expression of hope; analysis also shows that faith and expectation of the Second Coming do not restrict the freedom of heroes. On the contrary — they are its full expression.

Another problem is the issue of “kiss of Circe”, which symbolizes Tolkien’s “seduction economic delusion of happiness” and that deprives us of the gift of being free. The thesis of the author coincides with Hermann Brochs note that our hope lies in remaining faithful „Platonic ideas”, which is close conjunction with Christian hope. Otherwise — we will fight in barbarism. Tolkien’s work shows us the essence of said Hope. As said Stefan Lichański “in the process of exploring this love works in a latent, we delude ourselves that everything we get, we owe yourself while here we need the inspirational power of God’s love”.

---


\(^{88}\) These issues were remarkably, albeit briefly, presented by Stefan Lichański in his draft *Uwagi do Władcy Pierścieni J.R.R. Tolkiena*, [in:] *J.R.R. Tolkien: recepcja polska. Studia i eseje*, ed. J.Z. Lichański, Warszawa 1996, pp. 41–43. In the closing section the author wrote: „w procesie poznawania ta miłość działa w sposób utajony, ludzimy się, że wszystko, co zdobywamy, zawdzięczamy sobie, podczas gdy i tutaj potrzebna nam jest inspirująca siła bożej miłości” („in the process of exploring this love works in a latent, we delude ourselves that everything we get, we owe yourself while here we need the inspirational power of God’s love”).
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