

C.S. Lewis, The Discarded Image: An Introduction to Medieval and
>Renaissance Literature (Magdalene College, July 1962; Cambridge: At the
>University Press, 1964), pp. 122-138:

>
>CHAPTER VI

>
>THE LONGAEVI

>
>There is something sinister about putting a leprechaun in the
>workhouse. The only solid comfort is that he certainly will not
>work---CHESTERTON

>
> I have put the Longaevi or longlivers into a separate
>chapter because their place of residence is ambiguous between air
>and-Earth. Whether they are important enough to justify this arrangement
>is another question. In a sense, if I may risk the oxymoron, their
>unimportance is their importance.. They are marginal. fugitive
>creatures. They are perhaps the only creatures to whom the Model does
>not assign, as it were. an official status. Herein lies their
>imaginative value. They soften the classic severity of the huge design.
>They intrude a welcome hint of wildness and uncertainty into a universe
>that is in danger of being a little too self-explanatory, too luminous.

>
> I take for them the name Longaevi from Martianus Capella,
>who mentions 'dancing companies of Longaevi who haunt woods, glades,
>and groves, and lakes and springs and brooks; whose names are Pans,
>Fauns...Satyrs, Silvans, Nymphs. ..'[1] <#_ftn1> Bernardus Silvestris,
>without using the word Longaevi, describes similar
>creatures--'Silvans, Pans, and Nerei'--as having 'a longer life' (than
>ours), though they are not immortal. They are innocent--'of blameless
>conversation'--and have bodies of elemental purity.[2] <#_ftn2> [end p. 122]

>
> [top p. 123] The alternative would have been to call them
>Fairies. But that word, tarnished by pantomime and bad children's books
>with worse illustrations, would have been dangerous as the title of a
>chapter. It might encourage us to bring to the subject some ready-made,
>modern concept of a Fairy and to read the old texts in the light of it.
>Naturally, the proper method is the reverse; we must go to the texts
>with an open mind and learn from them what the word fairy meant to our
>ancestors.

>
> A good point to begin at is provided by three passages from
>Milton:

>
>
>(I) No evil thing that walks by night
>
>In fog or fire, by lake or moorish fen,
>
>Blue meagre Hag or stubborn unlaid ghost-
>
>No goblin or swart Faery of the mine.

>
>(Comus, 432 sq.)

>
>
>(2) Like that Pigeon Race

>
>Beyond the Indian Mount, or Faery Elves,
>
>Whose midnight Revels, by a Forest side
>
>Or Fountain some belated Peasant sees. ..

>
 >(Paradise Lost, I, 780 sq.)
 >
 >
 >(3) And Ladies of th ' Hesperides, that seem' d
 >
 >Fairer than feign'd of old, or fabl'd since
 >
 >Of Fairy Damsels met in Forest wide
 >
 >By Knights of Logres, or of Lyones--
 >
 >(Paradise Regained, II, 357 sq.)
 >
 >

> Milton lived too late to be direct evidence for medieval
 >beliefs. The value of the passages for us is that they show the
 >complexity of the tradition which the Middle Ages had bequeathed to him
 >and his public. The three extracts [pp. 123/124] were probably never
 >connected in Milton's mind. Each serves a different poetic purpose. In
 >each he confidently expects from his readers a different response to the
 >word fairy. They were equally conditioned to all three responses and
 >could be relied on to make the right one at each place. Another, earlier
 >and perhaps more striking, witness to this complexity is that within the
 >same island and the same century Spenser could compliment Elizabeth I by
 >identifying her with the Faerie Queene and a woman could be burned at
 >Edinburgh in 1576 for 'repairing with , the fairies and the 'Queen of
 >Elfame'.[3] <#_ftn3>

>
 > The 'swart Faery' in Comus is classified among horrors.
 >This is one strand in the tradition. Beowulf ranks the elves (ylfe, III)
 >along with ettins and giants as the enemies of God. In the ballad of
 >Isabel and the Elf-Knight, the elf-knight is a sort of Bluebeard. In
 >Gower, the slanderer of Constance says that she is ' of faerie' because
 >she has given birth to a monster (Confessio, II, 964 sq.). The
 >Catholicon Anglicum of 1483 gives lamia and eumenis (fury) as the Latin
 >for elf; Horman's Vulgaria (1519), strix and lamia for fairy. We are
 >inclined to ask ' Why not nympha? But nymph would not have mended
 > matters. It also could be a name of terror to our ancestors. ' What are
 >these so fayre fiendes that cause my hayres to stand upright?' cries
 >Corsites in Lyly's Endymion (IV, iii), 'Hags! Out alas! Nymphs! !'.
 >Drayton 'in Mortimer to Queen Isabel speaks of 'the dishevelled gastly
 >sea-Nymph' (77). Athanasius Kircher says to an apparition ' Aie ! I [pp.
 >124/125] fear ye be one of those daemons whom the ancients called
 >Nymphs,' and receives the reassurance, 'I am no Lilith nor lamia'.[4]
 ><#_ftn4> Reginald Scot mentions fairies (and nymphs) among bugbears used
 >to frighten children: ' Our mothers' maids have so terrified us with
 >bull-beggars[5] <#_ftn5>, spirits, witches, urchins, elves, hags,
 >fairies, satyrs, pans, faunes, sylens, tritons, centaurs, dwarfs,
 >giants, nymphes, Incubus, Robin good fellow, the spoom, the man in the
 >oke, the fire-drake, the puckle, Tom Thombe, Tom tumbler boneles, and
 >such other bugs.'[6] <#_ftn6>

>
 > This dark view of the Fairies gained ground, I think, in the
 >sixteenth and the earlier seventeenth century-an unusually hag-ridden
 >period. Holinshed did not find in Boece but added to him the suggestion
 >that Macbeth's three temptresses might be 'some nymphs or fairies'. Nor
 >has this dread ever since quite disappeared except where belief in the
 >Fairies has also done so. I have myself stayed at a lonely place in
 >Ireland which was said to be haunted both by a ghost and by the
 >(euphemistically so called) 'good people'. But I was given to understand
 >it was the fairies rather than the ghost that induced my neighbours to
 >give it such a wide berth at night.

>
 > Reginald Scot's list of bugbears raises a point which is
 >worth a .short digression. Some studies of folklore are almost entirely
 >concerned with the genealogy of beliefs, with the degeneration of gods
 >into Fairies. It is a very legitimate and most interesting inquiry. But
 >Scot's list [pp. 125/126] shows that when we are asking what furniture
 >our ancestors' minds contained and how they felt about it--always with a
 >view to the better understanding of what they wrote--the question of
 >origins is not very relevant. They might or might not know the sources
 >of the shapes that haunted their imagination: Sometimes they certainly
 >did. Giraldus Cambrensis knew that Morgan had once been a Celtic
 >goddess, dea quaedam phantastica as he says in the Speculum Ecclesiae
 >(II, ix) ; and so, perhaps from him, did the poet of Gawain (2452). And
 >any well-read contemporary of Scot's would have known that his satyrs,
 >Pans, and fauns were classical while his 'Tom thombe' and 'puckle' were
 >not.

>
 > But obviously it makes no difference:.. they all affected
 >the mind in the same way. And if all really came through' our mothers'
 >maids' it is natural they should. The real question. then, would be why
 >they affect us so differently..- For I take it that most of us even
 >today can understand how a man could dread
 >
 >witches or' spirits ' while most of us imagine that a meeting with a
 >nymph or a Triton, if it were possible,
 >
 >would be delightful. The native figures are not, even now. quite so
 >innocuous as the classical. I think the reason is that the classical
 >figures stand further'-certainly in time and perhaps in other ways
 >too--even from our half-beliefs and therefore from even our imagined
 >fears. If Wordsworth found the idea of seeing Proteus' risen from the
 >sea attractive, this was partly because he. felt perfectly certain he
 >never would. He would have felt less certain of never seeing a ghost; in
 >proportion less willing to see one. [end p. 126]

>
 > [top p. 127] The second Miltonic passage introduces us to a
 >different conception of the Fairies. It is more familiar to us because
 >Shakespeare, Drayton, and William Browne made a literary use of it; from
 >their use descend the minute and almost insectal fairies of the debased
 >modern convention with their antennae and gauzy wings. Milton's 'Faery
 >Elves' are compared to the 'Pigmean Race'. So in the ballad of The Wee
 >Wee Man,

>
 >
 >
 >
 > When we came to the stair foot
 >
 > Ladies were dancing jimp and sma.

>
 > Richard Bovet in his Pandaemonium (1684) speaks of the
 >fairies ' appearing like men and women of a stature generally near the
 >smaller size of man'. Burton mentions 'places in Germany where they do
 >usually walk in little coats, some two feet long'.^[7] <#_ftn7> A
 >housemaid we had when I was a boy, who had seen them near Dundrum in
 >County Down, described them as' the size of children {age unspecified}).

>
 > But when we have said 'smaller than men' we can define the
 >size of these Fairies no further. Solemn discussions as to whether they
 >are merely dwarfish, or Lilliputian, or even insectal, are quite out of
 >place; and that for a reason which crossed our path before.^[8] <#_ftn8>
 >As I then said, the visual imagination of medieval and earlier writers

>never for long worked to scale. Indeed I cannot think of any book before
>Gulliver that makes any serious attempt to do so. What are the relative
>sizes of Thor and the Giants in the Prose Edda? There is no answer. In
>cap. XLV a giant's [pp. 127/128] glove seems to the three gods a great
>hall, and the thumb of it a side-chamber which two of them use as a
>bedroom. This would make a god to a giant as a small fly to a man. But
>in the very next chapter Thor is dining with the giants and can lift
>up-though for a special reason he cannot drain-the drinking horn they
>hand him when it was possible to write like that we can expect no
>coherent account of the elves' stature-, And it remained possible for
>centuries. Even in passages whose main point, such as it is, consists of
>scaling things down, the wildest confusion prevails. Drayton in
>Nymphidia makes Oberon big enough to catch a wasp in his arms at line
>201 and small enough to ride on an ant at line 242; he might as well
>have made him able both to lift an elephant and to ride a fox-terrier. I
>do not suggest that such an artificial work could in any case be
>expected to give reliable evidence about popular belief. The point is
>rather that no work written in a period when such inconsistencies were
>acceptable will provide such evidence; and that popular belief was
>probably itself as incurably vague and incoherent as the literature.

>
> In this kind of Fairy the (unspecified) small size is less
>important than some other features. Milton's 'Faery Elves' are 'on thir
>mirth and dance Intent' (I, 786). The peasant has blundered upon them by
>chance. They have nothing to do with him nor he with them. The previous
>kind, the 'swart Faery of the Mine' , might meet you intentionally, and,
>if so, his intentions would certainly be sinister; this kind not. They
>appear--often with no suggestion that they are smaller than men--in
>[pp. 128/129] places where they might have expected no mortal to see them:

>
>>And ofte in forme of womman in moni deorne[9] <#_ftn9> weie
>
>Me sicth[10] <#_ftn10> of hom gret companie bothe hoppe and pleie[11]
><#_ftn11>.
>>

> In the Wife of Bath's Tale we have the dance again, and it
>vanishes at the approach of a human spectator (D 991 sq). Spenser takes
>over the; motif and -makes--his dancing graces vanish when Calidore
>intrudes upon their revels (F.Q. VI, x). Thomson in The Castle of
>Indolence (I, xxx) knows about the vanishing.

>
> It is needless to stress the difference between such Fairies
>and those mentioned in Comus or Reginald Scot's Discouerie. It is true
>that even the second sort may be slightly alarming;-the heart of
>Milton's peasant beats 'at once with joy and fear'. The vision startles
>by its otherness. But there is no horror or aversion on the human
>side:-These creatures flee from man, not man from them; and the mortal
>who observes them (Only so long as he remains unobserved himself)
>feels that he has committed a sort of trespass. His delight is that of
>seeing fortuitously-in a momentary glimpse--a gaiety and daintiness-to
>which our own -laborious life is simply irrelevant.

>
> This kind was taken over, very dully by Drayton, brilliantly
>by Shakespeare, and worked up into a comic device which, from the first,
>has lost nearly all the flavour of popular belief From Shakespeare,
>modified (I think) by Pope's sylphs, they descend with increasing
>prettification [pp. 129/130] and triviality, till we reach the fairies
>whom children are supposed to enjoy; so far as my experience goes,
>erroneously.

>
> With the 'Fairy Damsels.' of our third Miltonic passage we
>reach a kind of :Fairy who is more important for the reader-of medieval
>literature and less familiar to modern imagination.." .And it demands

>from us the most difficult response.

>

> The Fairy Damsels are 'met in forest wide.' Met is the
>important word. The encounter is not accidental. They have come to find
>us, and their intentions are usually (not always) amorous. They are the
>foes of French romance--the fays of our own, the fate of the Italians.
>Launfal's mistress, the lady who carried off Thomas the Rymer, the
>fairies in Orfeo, Bercilak in Gawain (who is called 'an alvish man' at
>line 681), are of this kind. Morgan le Fay in Malory has been humanised;
>her Italian equivalent Fata Morgana is a full Fairy. Merlin--only half
>human by blood and never shown practising magic as an art-- almost
>belongs to this order. They are usually of at least fully human
>stature. The exception is Oberon in Huon of Bordeaux who is dwarfish,
>but in virtue of his beauty, gravity, and almost numinous character,
>must be classified among (let us call them) the High Fairies.

>

> These High Fairies display combination of characteristics
>which. we do not easily digest.

>

> On -the one hand, when they are described we are struck by
>their hard, bright, and vividly material splendour. We may begin, not
>with a real Fairy, but with one who merely looked as though he came 'of
>faerie', from [pp. 130/131] the fairy realm. This is the young
>lady-killer in Gower (V, 7073). He is curled and combed and crowned with
>a garland of green leaves; in a word, 'very well turned out'. But the
>High Fairies themselves are very much more so. Where a modern might
>expect the mysterious and the shadowy he meets a blaze of-wealth and
>luxury. The Fairy King in Sir Orfeo comes with over a hundred knights
>and a hundred ladies, on white horses. His crown consists of a single
>huge gem as bright as the sun (142-52). When we follow him to his own
>country we find there nothing shadowy or insubstantial; we find a castle
>that shines like crystal, a hundred towers, a good moat, buttresses of
>gold, rich carvings (355 sq.). In Thomas the Rymer the Fairy wears green
>silk and a velvet mantle, and her horse's mane jingles with fifty-nine
>silver bells. Bercilak's costly clothes and equipment are described with
>almost fulsome detail in Gawain (151-220). The Fairy in Sir Launfal has
>dressed her waiting women in 'Inde sandel', green velvet embroidered
>with gold, and coronets each containing more than sixty precious stones
>(232-9). Her pavilion is of Saracenic work, the knobs on the tent-poles
>are of crystal, and the whole is surmounted by a golden eagle so
>enriched with enamel and carbuncles that neither Alexander nor Arthur
>had anything so precious (266-76).

>

> In all this one may suspect a certain vulgarity of
>imagination~as if to be a High Fairy were much the same as being a
>millionaire. Nor does it obviously mend matters to remind ourselves that
>Heaven and the saints were often pictured in very similar terms.
>Undoubtedly it is naïf; but [pp. 131/132] the charge of vulgarity
>perhaps involves a misapprehension:.. Luxury and material splendour in
>the modern world need be connected with nothing but money and are also,
>more often than not, very ugly. But what a medieval man saw in royal or
>feudal courts and imagined as being outstripped in 'faerie' and far
>outstripped in Heaven, was not so. The architecture, arms, crowns,
>horses, and music 'were nearly all beautiful They were all symbolical or
>significant-of sanctity, authority, valour, noble lineage or, at the
>very worst, of power. They were associated. as modern luxury is not..with
>graciousness and courtesy. They could therefore be ingenuously
>.admired without degradation for the admirer.

>

> Such, then, is one characteristic of the High Fairies. But
>despite this material splendour;-shown to us in full light and almost
>photographically detailed, they can at any moment be as elusive as those

>'Faerie Elves" who are glimpsed dancing 'by a forest side or fountain.'
 >Orfeo awaits the Fairy King with a guard of a thousand knights, but it
 >is all no use. His wife is carried off, no one sees how-' with fairi
 >forth ynome' and' men wist never wher she was bicomme' (193-4). Before we
 >see the Fairies again, in their own realm, they have faded to a ' dim cri
 >and blowing' heard far off in the woods. Launfal's mistress can be met
 >only in secret, in' deme stede' ; there she will come to him, but no one
 >will see her coming (353 sq.).

>
 > But she is very palpable flesh and blood when she is there.
 >The High Fairies are vital, energetic, wilful, passionate beings.
 >Launfal's Fairy lies in her rich pavilion naked down to the waist, white
 >as a lily, red as a rose. Her [pp. 132/133] first words demand his
 >love. An excellent lunch follows, and then to bed (289-348). Thomas the
 >Rymer's Fairy shows herself, so far as ballad brevity allows, a stirring
 >and sportive creature, ' a lady gay come out to hunt in her follee '
 >.Bercilak is the best of all in his mingled ferocity and geniality , his
 >complete mastery of every situation, his madcap mirth. Two descriptions
 >of fairies, one from a later and one from an earlier period, come far
 >nearer to the High Fairies of the Middle Ages than anything our modern
 >imagination would be likely to produce. A rowdy High Fairy would seem
 >to us a kind of oxymoron. But Robert Kirk in his Secret Commonwealth
 >(1691) calls some of these 'wights like furious hardie men'. And an old
 >Irish poet describes them as routing battalions of enemies, devastating
 >every land they attack, great killers, noisy in the beer-house, makers
 >of songs.[12] <#_ftn12> One can imagine the Fairy King in Sir Orfeo, or
 >Bercilak, feeling at home with these.

>
 > If we are to call the High Fairies in any sense 'spirits',
 >we must take along with us Blake's warning that 'a Spirit and a Vision
 >are not, as the modern philosophy supposes, a cloudy vapour or a
 >nothing; they are organised and minutely articulated beyond all that the
 >mortal and perishing nature can produce'. [13] <#_ftn13> And if we call
 >them "supernatural" we must be clear what-we-mean Their life is, in one
 >sense more 'natural '- stronger, more reckless, less inhibited, more
 >triumphantly and impenitently passionate than ours.-They are liberated
 >both from the [pp. 133/134] beast's perpetual slavery to nutrition,
 >self-protection and procreation, . And also from the responsibilities,
 >shames, scruples. and melancholy of Man.: Perhaps also from death; but
 >of that later.

>
 > Such, very briefly, are the three kinds of Fairies or
 >Longaevi we meet in our older literature. How far. by how many , and how
 >consistently, they were believed in, I do not know. But there was
 >sufficient belief to produce rival theories of their nature; attempts,
 >which never reached finality, to fit even these lawless vagrants into
 >the Model.

>
 > I will. mention four.

>
 > (1)That they are a third rational species distinct from
 >angels and men. This third species can be variously conceived. The
 >'Silvans, Pans and Nerei' of Bernardus, who live longer than we but-not
 >forever, are clearly a rational (and terrestrial) species distinct from
 >our own, and such figures, for all their classical names, could be
 >equated with Fairies. Hence Douglas in his Eneados glosses Virgil's
 >Fauni nymphaeque (VIII, 314) with the line 'Quhilk fair folkis or than
 >elvis cleping we'. The fata in Boiardo who explains that she, like all
 >her kind, cannot die till Doomsday comes, [14] <#_ftn14> implies the same
 >conception. An alternative view could find the required third species
 >among those spirits which, according to the principle of plenitude,
 >existed in every element [15] <#_ftn15>-the ' spirits of every element,
 >in Faustus (151), the 'Tetrarchs of Fire, Air, Flood, and on the Earth'

>in Paradise Regained (IV, 201). Shakespeare's Ariel, a figure
>incomparably more serious than any in the [pp. 134/135] Dream, would be
>a tetrarch of air. The most precise account of the elementals would,
>however, leave only one of their kinds to be strictly identified with
>the Fairies.

>
> Paracelsus[16] <#_ftn16> enumerates: (a) Nymphae or Undinae,
>of water, who are human in stature, and talk. (b) Sylphi or Silvestres,
>of air. They are larger than men and don't speak. (c) Gnomi or Pygmaei,
>of earth: about two spans high and extremely taciturn. (d) Salamandrae
>or Vulcani, of fire. The Nymphs or Undines are clearly Fairies. The
>Gnomes are closer to the Dwarfs of mörchen. Paracelsus would be rather
>too late an author for my purpose if there were not reason to suppose
>that he is, in part anyway, using much earlier folklore. In the
>fourteenth century the family of Lusignan boasted a water-spirit among
>their ancestresses.[17] <#_ftn17> Later still we get the theory of a
>third rational species with no attempt to identify it. The Discourse
>concerning Devils and Spirits, added in 1665 to Scot's Discouerie, says
>'their nature is middle between Heaven and Hell. ..they reign in a third
>kingdom, having no other judgement or doom to expect forever'. Finally,
>Kirk in his Secret Commonwealth identifies them with those aerial people
>whom I have had to mention so often already: 'of a middle nature between
>Man and Angel, as were Daemons thought to be of old '.

>
> (2) That they are angels. but a special class of angels who
>have been. in our jargon, 'demoted'. This view is developed at some
>length in the South English Legendary.[18] <#_ftn18> [pp. 135/136] When
>Lucifer rebelled, he and his followers were cast into Hell. But there
>also angels who 'somdel with him hulde ' : fellow-travellers who did
>not-actually .join the rebellion. These were banished-into the lower and
>more turbulent levels of the airy region. They remain there till
>Doomsday after which they go to Hell. And thirdly there was what I
>suppose we might call a party of the centre; angels who were only'
>somdel in misthought' ; almost, but not quite, guilty of sedition. These
>were banished, some to the higher and calmer levels of air, some to
>various places on earth, including the Earthly Paradise. Both the second
>and the third group sometimes communicate with men in dreams. Of those
>who mortals-have seen dancing and called eluene many will return to
>Heaven at Doomsday.

>
> (3) That they are the dead, or some special class of the
>dead. At the end of the twelfth century , Walter Map in his De Nugis
>Curialium twice[19] <#_ftn19> tells the following story. There was in
>his time a family known as The Dead Woman's Sons (filii mortuae). A
>Breton knight had buried his wife, who was really and truly dead--re
>vera mortuam. Later, by night, passing through a lonely valley, he saw
>her alive amidst a great company of ladies. He was frightened, and
>wondered what was being done' by the Fairies' (a fatis), but he snatched
>her from them and carried her off She lived happily with him for several
>years and bore children. Similarly in Gower's story of Rosiphelee[20]
><#_ftn20> the company of ladies, who are in all respects exactly like
>High Fairies, turn out to be dead women. [end p. 136]

>
> [top p. 137] Boccaccio tells the same story , and Dryden
>borrowed it from him in his Theodore and Honoria. In Thomas the Rymer,
>it will be remembered, the Fairy brings Thomas to a place where the road
>divides into three, leading respectively to Heaven, Hell, and 'fair
>Elfland'. Of those who reach the latter some will finally go to Hell,
>for the Devil has a right to 10 per cent of them every seventh year. In
>Orfeo the poet seems quite unable to make up his mind whether the place
>to which the Fairies have taken Dame Heurodis is or is not the land of
>the dead. At first all seems plain sailing. It is full of people who had

>been supposed dead and weren't (389-90). That is imaginable; some whom
>.we think dead are only 'with the faerie'. But next moment it appears to
>be full of people who had really died; the beheaded, the strangled, the
>drowned, those who died in childbed (391-400). Then we revert to those
>who in their sleep were taken thither by Fairies (401-4).

>
> The identity .or close connection between the Fairies and
>the dead was certainly believed in, for witches confessed to seeing the
>dead among the Fairies.[21] <#_ftn21> Answers to leading questions under
>torture naturally tell us nothing about the beliefs of the accused; but
>they are good evidence for the beliefs of the accusers.

>
> (4) .That they are fallen angels; in other words, devils.
>This becomes almost the official view after the accession of James I.
>'That kinde of Devils conversing in the earth', he says (Daemonologie,
>III, i) , may be divided in foure different kindes. ..the fourth is
>these kinde of spirites [pp. 137/138] that are called vulgarlie the
>Fayrie'. Burton includes among terrestrial devils 'Lares, Genii, Fauns,
>Satyrs, Wood-Nymphs, Foliots, Fairies, Robin Good-fellow, Trulli,
>etc.' [22] <#_ftn22>

>
> This view, which is closely connected with the later
>Renaissance phobia about witches, goes far to explain the degradation of
>the Fairies from their medieval vitality into the kickshaws of Drayton
>or William Browne. A churchyard or a brimstone smell came to hang about
>any treatment of them which was not obviously playful. Shakespeare, may
>.have had practical as well as poetical reasons for making Oberon assure
>us that he and his fellows are ' spirits of another sort' than those who
>have to vanish at daybreak (Dream, III, ii, 388). One might have
>expected the High Fairies to have been expelled by science ; I think
>they were actually expelled by a darkening of superstition.

>
> Such were the efforts to find a socket into which the
>Fairies would fit. No agreement was achieved. As long as the Fairies
>remained at all they remained evasive.

>
>
>
>
>
>
>

>-----
>
>[1] <#_ftnref1>De Nuptiis Mercurii et Philologiae, ed. F. Eyssenhardt
>(Lipsiae, 1866), II, 167, p. 45.

>
>[2] <#_ftnref2>Op. cit. II Pros. VII, p. 50.

>
>[3] <#_ftnref3>1 M. W. Latham, The Elizabethan Fairies (Columbia, 1940),
>p. 16. I am much indebted to this throughout.

>
>
>

>[4] <#_ftnref4>Iter Extaticum II qui et Mundi Subterranei Prodromos
>dicitur (Romae, Typis Mascardi, MDCLVII), II, i.

>
>[5] <#_ftnref5>Bogies.

>
>[6] <#_ftnref6>Discoverie of Witchcraft (1584), VII, xv.

>
>[7] <#_ftnref7>I Pt. I, 2., M. I, subs.

>
>[8] <#_ftnref8>2. See above, pp. 101-102 (Lewis, Discarded Image, pp.

- >101-102, on mediaeval artists' indifference to perspective, scale, and
>foreground-background distinction)
>
>[9] <#_ftnref9> Secret.
>
>[10] <#_ftnref10>One sees.
>
>[11] <#_ftnref11>South English Legendary, ed. cit. vol. II, p. 410.
>
>[12] <#_ftnref12>I See L. Abercrombie, *Romanticism* (1926), p. 53.
>
>[13] <#_ftnref13> *Descriptive Catalogue*, IV.
>
>[14] <#_ftnref14>1. Orlando lnnamorato, II, xxvi, 15.
>
>[15] <#_ftnref15>2. Ficino. *Theologia Platonica de Immortalitate*. IV, i.
>
>[16] <#_ftnref16>I *De Nymphis*, etc., I, 2, 3, 6.
>
>[17] <#_ftnref17> S. Runciman, *History of the Crusades* (1954), vol. n,
>p. 424.
>
>[18] <#_ftnref18>[*South English Legendary*], Vol. II, pp. 408-10.
>
>[19] <#_ftnref19> II, xiii; IV, viii.
>
>[20] <#_ftnref20> IV, 1245 sq.
>
>[21] <#_ftnref21>I Latham, op. cit. [M.W. Latham, *The Elizabethan
>Fairies* (1940)], p. 46.
>
>[22] <#_ftnref22> [Burton] Pt. I, s. 2; M 1, subs. 2.