

**The Antagonists of God:
Ideologies, Gender, and Christianity in C. S. Lewis's Novels**

by
Yuriko Noda

A Dissertation Presented to
the Graduate School of Letters, Doshisha University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement
for the Degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy
in English Literature

March 2023

Contents

Acknowledgements.....	viii
Declarations.....	ix
Introduction.....	1
Chapter I:	
Good, Evil, and Dualism: The Relationship between God and the Lewisian Antagonists	8
I-1. The History of “God in the Dock”	9
I-2. The Divine Goodness and the Law of Nature	12
I-3. Evil and Pride	17
I-4 The Collapsed Dualism	21
Chapter II:	
The Allegory of Nazism:	
The Representation of Savage and the Dwarfs in <i>The Pilgrim’s Regress</i> ...	28
II-1. The Origin of Savage and the Dwarfs:	
The Rise and Fall of Nazi Germany	30
II-2. Savage and the Dwarfs: Philosophy and Political Movements	34
II-3. The Landlord vs. Savage: The Substitute of God	37
II-4. The Dwarfs, or the Reversion of Humankind	40

Chapter III:

The Blaspheming Scientist:

The Representation of Weston in *Out of the Silent Planet* and *Perelandra* ... 43

III-1. The Origin of Weston:

Lewis as an Anti-Scientific Science Fiction Writer 47

III-2. Weston and “Scientism” 52

III-3. God vs. Weston: Weston’s Planetary Colonization56

III-4. The “Un-Man”:

Weston’s Belief in Emergent Evolution and the Life-Force 60

Chapter IV:

The Homosexuals without “Chests”:

The Representation of N.I.C.E. in *That Hideous Strength* 65

IV-1. The Origin of N.I.C.E.: Lewis’s Three Lectures on Philosophy

Compiled in *The Abolition of Man* 67

IV-2. N.I.C.E., “The Inner Ring” of the Homosexuals 73

IV-3. St. Anne’s vs. N.I.C.E.: The Meaning of the “Head” 77

IV-4. The Abolition of N.I.C.E. 80

Chapter V:

Gender Interchangeability:

The Representation of the White Witch, Jadis,

in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* and *The Magician's Nephew* ... 85

V-1. The Origin of the White Witch, Jadis:

Wan Jadis in "The Quest of Bleheris" 88

V-2. The White Witch, Jadis: The Descendent of Lilith 92

V-3. Aslan vs. the White Witch: Diversity and Monotony 96

V-4. The Defeat of the White Witch: The Resurrection of Divine Masculinity ...100

Chapter VI:

The Ungodly Love:

The Representation of Orual in *Till We Have Faces* 105

VI-1. The Origin of Orual: Love in Paganism and Christianity..... 108

VI-2. *Storge*, *Philia*, and *Eros*:

Orual's Loves for Psyche, the Fox, and Bardia.....112

VI-3. God vs. Orual: *Agape* and *Storge*115

VI-4. Orual's Conversion119

Conclusion:124

Notes 130

Bibliography140

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Masami Usui, of Doshisha University. Without her careful reading, all-round instruction, and countless advice, this dissertation would have never come to fruition.

I sincerely thank Professor David John Chandler and Professor Masumichi Kanaya for giving me a variety of comments on this dissertation. Additionally, I am indebted to many other professors, especially Professor Katsuhiko Engetsu and Professor Masaya Shimokusu for providing me with a great deal of advice in English Literature. My deep appreciation goes to my friend, Laura Schmidt for giving me a wonderful insight into the life and works of C. S. Lewis as an archivist at Marion E. Wade Center, Wheaton College.

I dedicate this dissertation to my parents, Toshimasa Noda and Kyoko Noda, for supporting me, especially during the difficult period of the COVID-19 pandemic. This dissertation was completed thanks to their kindness, encouragement, and trust.

Declarations

Chapter II of this dissertation is based on my English article “Into the World of Destruction: The Allegory of Nazism in C. S. Lewis’s *The Pilgrim’s Regress*” (*Doshisha Literature* 61 (2018): 1-22). Chapter V is based on my Japanese article “‘Woman’ in the Guise of a Lion: Sexuality and Evil in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* and *The Magician’s Nephew*” (*Studies in Literature and Christianity* 37 (2020): 86-97). Chapter VI is based on my master’s thesis “C. S. Lewis’s Anatomy of Love in *Till We Have Faces*” (2017). The chapters of this dissertation are revised substantially.

The author uses the following abbreviations for C. S. Lewis’s works, including letters, essays, and lectures, largely in accordance with Walter Hooper’s *C. S. Lewis: A Companion and Guide*.

AGO *A Grief Observed.*

AOL *The Allegory of Love.*

AOM *The Abolition of Man.*

AMRBM *All My Road Before Me.*

AT *Arthurian Torso.*

CL *The Collected Letters of C. S. Lewis.*

CR *Christian Reflections.*

FL *The Four Loves.*

GD *The Great Divorce.*

GID *God in the Dock: Essays on Theology and Ethics.*

L *Letters of C. S. Lewis.*

- LB* *The Last Battle.*
- LWW* *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe.*
- MC* *Mere Christianity.*
- MN* *The Magician's Nephew.*
- OOW* *Of Other Worlds: Essays and Stories.*
- OSP* *Out of the Silent Planet.*
- PER* *Perelandra.*
- PP* *The Problem of Pain.*
- PPL* *A Preface to Paradise Lost.*
- PR* *The Pilgrim's Regress.*
- PRCON* *Present Concerns: Journalistic Essays.*
- RP* *Reflections on the Psalms*
- SL* *The Screwtape Letters.*
- SIW* *Studies in Words.*
- SBJ* *Surprised by Joy.*
- THS* *That Hideous Strength.*
- TWHF* *Till We Have Faces.*
- WLN* *The World's Last Night and Other Essays.*
- WG* *The Weight of Glory.*

Introduction

“But you and I must be clear. There is but one good; that is God.
Everything else is good when it looks to Him and bad when it turns from Him.”

(The Great Divorce 106)

This dissertation focuses on C. S. Lewis’s representations of adversaries in his works. Lewis, known as a lay theologian, wrote numerous Christian apologetic works and Christian-themed novels, which still exert a profound influence on Christians worldwide. Lewis depicts battles between Good and Evil in many of his Christian novels. While the protagonists pursue or restore faith in the Omniscient, the adversaries turn their back on Him and plan to control humans, nature, and even the universe. By focusing on these Lewisian antagonists, especially their ideologies and thoughts, this dissertation aims to elucidate the author’s conceptual framework of Evil.

Studies and analyses of C. S. Lewis, including biographies, have been published. Most Lewis scholars are indebted to Walter Hooper, who compiled all of Lewis’s letters, lectures, and diaries, and wrote *C. S. Lewis: A Companion and Guide*. The most authorized biography, *C. S. Lewis*, whose writing was suggested by Lewis himself, was also published by Hooper and Roger Lancelyn Green. The life of Lewis inspired many biographers, such as Alan Jacobs, George Sayer, Michael White, and A. N. Wilson to write their own versions of his biography. The other biographers, Humphrey Carpenter, Colin Duriez, and Philip and Carol Zaleski authored books on the Inklings by featuring Lewis’s closest friends in Oxford. Lewis’s Christian ideas were brought into focus by Clyde S. Kilby, Alister E. McGrath, and Chad Walsh. These scholars elucidate the Christian themes in Lewis’s writings, including his novels. Furthermore, other researchers have contributed to *The Cambridge Companion to C. S. Lewis*, Harold Bloom’s *C. S. Lewis*, and Bruce L. Edwards’s multivolume scholarly works, *C. S. Lewis: Life, Works, and Legacy*.

Following their studies, it is essential to provide a short sketch of Lewis's life, chiefly emphasizing how he abjured and readopted the Christian faith. Clive Staples Lewis, who was later called Jack by his friends, was born on November 29, 1898, in Belfast, Northern Ireland. He had an elder brother named Warren Hamilton ("Warnie"), and their ties of brotherhood continued to influence his writings. Their father, Albert James Lewis, was a police court solicitor. Their mother, Florence Augusta Hamilton, who specialized in mathematics and logic at Queen's College, was the daughter of a Church of Ireland rector. Florence succumbed to cancer when Lewis was nine. As a child, Lewis attended various schools, such as Wynyard School, Campbell College, Cherbourg House, and Malvern College. Subsequently, his father decided to send Lewis to a private tutor, Mr. William Thompson Kirkpatrick. Kirkpatrick was living in semi-retirement so he could offer several pupils private lessons. His influence was so profound that Lewis would later mention that he was indebted to him for his academic career. Lewis eventually abandoned his Christian faith completely around that time. In 1917, Lewis won a scholarship to University College, Oxford; however, the outbreak of the First World War shortly thereafter prevented him from studying classics. In 1925, Lewis was elected to a fellowship in English at Magdalen College, where he met his congenial friends and colleagues, J. R. R. Tolkien, Hugo Dyson, and Owen Barfield. Arguments and discussions with them eventually led him to convert from atheism to theism in 1929, and Christianity in 1931. These people, whom Lewis met at the time, are also known for being members of the Inklings, an informal literary society based in Oxford. It is also well known that Lewis and Tolkien first introduced their most famous fantasy novels, *The Chronicles of Narnia* (1950-56) and *The Lord of the Rings* (1954-55), respectively, to the members of the Inklings. After his spiritual awakening, Lewis started working on Christian apologetic works and various novels, and consequently gained popularity among the masses. One of his American admirers, Helen Joy Davidman, had a great influence on his life as his friend, companion, and wife. However, Lewis's marriage was short-lived because of Joy's cancer. Three years after Joy's death,

Lewis died from kidney failure on November 22, 1963.¹

After his conversion to Christianity, Lewis's depiction of proud antagonists in many of his books represented dualistic conflict between Good and Evil. The most obvious conflict is the one between Aslan and the White Witch in *The Chronicles of Narnia*. Moreover, the conflict between St. Anne's and N.I.C.E. in *That Hideous Strength*, the final volume of *The Space Trilogy*, is vividly depicted as a battle between two powers. Furthermore, Weston, an evil scientist in two of *The Space Trilogy* books, and Savage, the half-giant in *The Pilgrim's Regress*, are also depicted as opponents of God because they believe in their own omnipotence and even regard themselves as gods. Regardless of whether they recognize it, what these characters have in common is the "enmity to God," followed by the sin of Pride.² In *Mere Christianity*, a collection of his radio lectures on Christianity, Lewis spends an entire chapter talking about Pride. He states that Pride is the most abominable sin as it is "the complete anti-God state of mind" (MC 122), and that a proud man fails to recognize God because "[a] proud man is always looking down on things and people: and, of course, as long as you are looking down, you cannot see something that is above you" (MC 124). Pride is what all of Lewis's antagonists share because they deny God's superiority and their own inferiority. It is possible to assume that Lewis portrayed those proud antagonists as being opposed to God to highlight a dualistic conflict between Good and Evil in his works.

Lewis's portrayals of antagonists in his works of various types, including allegory, science fiction, fairy tale, and mythological story, are considered flat, oversimplified, and stereotypical by some researchers. For example, Kath Filmer, a feminist scholar, roughly describes the evil or unredeemed characters in Lewis's works as "self-centred and selfish," and further states that Lewis "[...] arms them with a variety of excuses by which they attempt to veil the truth about themselves" (*The Fiction of C. S. Lewis* 37). David C. Downing summarizes the characteristics of antagonists in Lewis's science fiction trilogy as follows: (1) denouncing morality for the sake of humankind; (2) disregarding the sanctity of life; (3) being progressive to ignore history, tradition, or

classics; (4) preferring scientific, artificial, and industrial to the simple and natural; (5) using language to conceal or distort reality. While these characteristics are particularly discernable in *The Space Trilogy*, Downing mentions that they also apply to the villains in *The Chronicles of Narnia (Planets in Peril 84)*. While most of their studies discuss these villains separately, Jerry Root's study on Evil in C. S. Lewis's works is considered distinguished. Root claims that these tendencies Downing highlights reveal that Lewis related them to subjectivism: "One could say that Lewis's evil characters espouse a rhetoric of subjectivism, and his good characters, by contrast, employ a rhetoric of objectivism" (188). Although their studies are an essential contribution to the overview of Lewis's thoughts on Good and Evil, Lewis's idea of the Dualism of Good and Evil is rarely highlighted in order to define Evil in his works.

As will be discussed in the following chapters, Lewis stated that in Christianity, Evil is originally rooted in Good, so Good and Evil cannot be opposites of each other. Evil, in a sense, has a self-existential contradiction ("Evil and God" *GID 5-7*). Martha C. Sammons explains that religious fantasy is characterized by a war between Good and Evil: "The predominant plot of religious fantasy is the war between good and evil. By portraying evil, fantasy exposes readers to the inevitability of sin and death" (*A Guide Through Narnia 60*). Following this, Sammons also mentions the imperfection of Evil in *The Chronicles of Narnia* as follows:

Evil is usually depicted as not originally bad but a perversion, mockery, or absence of good. It is often associated with blackness and inability to create, cooperate, and trust. The Narnia tales contrast courtesy, courage, community, selflessness, and respect for animals and nature with cowardice, isolation, selfishness, and abuse of animals and nature. (*A Guide Through Narnia 60-61*)

Sammons clearly recognizes the nature of Evil in *The Chronicles of Narnia*, and this definition of Evil can be applied to all of Lewis's fictions. Heavily influenced by these traditional Christian doctrines, Lewis seems to demonstrate Evil in a unique way through his portrayal of the antagonists. Considering the fact that Lewis rejected the idea of

Dualism, it is worth analyzing his representations of God's adversaries, especially their ideologies and statements, in order to redefine his conceptual framework of Evil.

This dissertation chronologically surveys the ideas and beliefs of the antagonists in seven of his works: Savage and the Dwarfs in *The Pilgrim's Regress* (1933), Weston in *Out of the Silent Planet* (1938) and *Perelandra* (1943), N.I.C.E. in *That Hideous Strength* (1945), the White Witch (Jadis) in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* (1950) and *The Magician's Nephew* (1955), and Orual in *Till We Have Faces* (1956). In discussing the dualistic opposition of Good and Evil, this dissertation regards Orual in *Till We Have Faces* as an antagonist along with the other villains. Orual is rarely discussed as one of Lewis's typical antagonists because she is a protagonist with internal conflict and moral development, who is redeemed in the end. Although these features highlight the difference between Orual and the other antagonists, it is possible to claim that her intense hatred and enmity toward God makes her a Lewisian antagonist. In the analysis of the adversaries of God in Lewis's works, Orual needs to be placed alongside other antagonists.

This dissertation comprises six chapters.

Chapter I, entitled "Good, Evil, and Dualism: The Relationship between God and the Lewisian Antagonists," discusses Good, Evil, and Dualism from philosophical and theological perspectives. The theme of Good and Evil is essential because Lewis, who once believed that Good and Evil are two independent powers opposing each other, recognized the absoluteness of Good and imperfection of Evil after his conversion to Christianity. Before analyzing each antagonist in his works, this chapter elaborates the framework of the Dualism of Good and Evil from his Christian perspective.

Chapter II, entitled "The Allegory of Nazism: The Representations of Savage and the Dwarfs in *The Pilgrim's Regress*," deals with Nazism, allegorically embodied by Savage and the Dwarfs in Lewis's first published prose work, *The Pilgrim's Regress*. Lewis, influenced by the rise of Nazism around the time of the book's composition, allegorically represents Nazi philosophy, Heroic Nihilism, as an evil ideology that possibly makes Christians abjure faith in God. By referring to some letters revealing

Lewis's political position as an anti-fascist, this chapter mainly analyzes the dualistic conflict of Good and Evil and Lewis's attempt to dismantle Evil during the interwar period.

Chapter III, entitled "The Blaspheming Scientist: The Representation of Weston in *Out of the Silent Planet* and *Perelandra*," investigates the scientific idealism of the antagonist, Weston, in the first two volumes of the science fiction series, *The Space Trilogy* (1938-45). Lewis's perspective as a Christian science fiction writer is unique because of his negative view of scientific progress and civilization. In light of Lewis's peculiar idea, this chapter mainly deals with Weston's scientism, planetary colonization, and Emergent Evolution (the Life-Force), which imply the dualistic opposition between God and Weston.

Chapter IV, entitled "The Homosexuals without 'Chests': The Representation of N.I.C.E. in *That Hideous Strength*," examines the implication of the homosexuality of the members of N.I.C.E. in *That Hideous Strength*, the final volume of *The Space Trilogy*. It is obvious that a dualistic framework of Good and Evil is depicted in the novel as the conflict of heterosexuality and homosexuality. Homosexuality is represented as the symbol of self-love and self-deification. Referring to Lewis's philosophical commentary on *That Hideous Strength*, *The Abolition of Man*, this chapter aims to prove that the homosexual preference of N.I.C.E. actually antagonizes God and eventually leads to their self-demolition.

Chapter V, entitled "Gender Interchangeability: The Representation of the White Witch, Jadis, in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* and *The Magician's Nephew*," studies the masculine features of the White Witch, Jadis, in the children's fantasy series, *The Chronicles of Narnia* (1950-56). The representation of the White Witch implies gender interchangeability, which nullifies the difference between men and women. Lewis, who regarded genders as a God-given quality, seems to demonstrate that the White Witch's masculinity makes her antagonize God. Exploring Wan Jadis in Lewis's earlier heroic poem and the Lilith stereotype, this chapter demonstrates that the White Witch's

violation of gender places her into a framework of Dualism of Good and Evil, which is to be collapsed.

Chapter VI, entitled “The Ungodly Love: The Representation of Orual in *Till We Have Faces*,” analyzes Orual’s pagan love in Lewis’s final novel, *Till We Have Faces*. The novel is considered a combination of both Greek and Christian concepts of love: *Storge*, *Philia*, *Eros*, and *Agape*. Orual’s love for others changes into jealousy and hatred because she regards the gods as her enemy. The conflict between Orual’s distorted loves and God’s divine love is depicted in the novel; in other words, Lewis seems to demonstrate another type of battlefield between Good and Evil in the framework of love. Exploring the theme of love, the final chapter of this dissertation shows how the battlefield between God and Orual is destroyed.

Chapter I. Good, Evil, and Dualism:

The Relationship between God and the Lewisian Antagonists

As mentioned earlier, all of Lewis's fictions have a certain framework of dualistic opposition. Some characters regard themselves as alternatives or antagonists of God, such as Savage in *The Pilgrim's Regress* and Orual in *Till We Have Faces*, while others have a direct confrontation with the protagonist who takes the side of God, such as Weston in *Out of the Silent Planet* and Perelandra, N.I.C.E. in *That Hideous Strength*, and the White Witch in *The Chronicles of Narnia*. It seems a dualistic opposition between two powers, Good and Evil, is at the root of Lewis's fictions; however, as Dualism is not considered a Christian doctrine, Lewis employed Augustine's idea of Evil, which is "privation or perversion of the good" (Williams 94). Since Good and Evil, or God and the Devil, cannot be legitimate adversaries to each other, Lewis's description of a battlefield between two powers, especially the characterizations of antagonists, should be redefined. In reconsidering the antagonists of his various works, this chapter mainly summarizes Lewis's concept of Good, Evil, and Dualism.

This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section explores the philosophical, theological, and historical background of Lewis's Christian works in terms of Good and Evil. Following the investigation of Lewis's source of Christian imagination, the second section focuses on Good: the source of the Law of Nature. Then, the third section discusses Evil, especially the sin of Pride. Following these sections on Good and Evil, the fourth section demonstrates the collapsed Dualism of Good and Evil in Christian doctrines. The purpose of this chapter is to clarify the framework for the discussion in the subsequent chapters concerning the antagonists of God.

1. The History of “God in the Dock”

Before his conversion, Lewis thought that if God, the ultimate Goodness, created this universe, it is unreasonable that the world is filled with injustice and evil. Lewis drew three possible inferences: (1) there is nothing behind the universe; (2) if something does exist, it is unconcerned with Good and Evil; (3) it is simply Evil (*PP* 2-3). The question “why does Evil exist in a world created by God Himself?” is a traditional question formulated in Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz’s theodicy, known as the defense of God in the Christian tradition (Uemura 197). To begin this dissertation, this section focuses on Lewis’s essay “God in the Dock” and presents an overview of the issue of God and Evil from ancient times to the present day to explore the theological, philosophical, and historical background of Lewis’s Christian writings. First, this section discusses the theme of faith in the Book of Job in the Old Testament, which discusses the problem of suffering. Second, the definition of Leibniz’s theodicy is examined to compare the two portrayals of God between ancient times and the Age of Enlightenment. By comparing the two concepts of God mentioned above, this section clarifies Lewis’s faith. Third, in light of the contemporary philosophers’ arguments on Evil, this section discusses Lewis’s concern regarding the difficulty of restoring faith in the twentieth century.

In ancient times, God was portrayed as the supreme one that transcends human understanding. An example can be seen in the Book of Job in the Old Testament, known for depicting the suffering of a righteous man. Job is a pure, righteous, and honest man, blessed with seven sons, three daughters, and a great deal of wealth. Although he fears God and resists Evil, God takes everything away from him to test his faith. To Job’s lament, God responds as follows: “Who *is* this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge? / Gird up now thy loins like a man; for I will demand of thee, and answer thou me / Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? / declare, if thou hast understanding” (Job 38:2-4). This extract shows that God’s purpose is beyond humankind’s control and that we cannot possibly grasp His plan. Furthermore, God

continues as follows: “Wilt thou also disannul my judgment? wilt thou condemn me, that thou mayst be righteous? / Hast thou an arm like God? or canst thou thunder with a voice like him?” (Job 40:8-9). The metaphor of a trial portrays God as the judge and humans as the defendant in the dock. As is revealed, God does not bear the burden of human suffering, and humans are unable to judge God’s justice.

The relative position of God and humans was reversed after the Age of Enlightenment. The seventeenth century German philosopher Leibniz formulated the answer to the traditional Christian question about Good and Evil: “Why does Evil exist in a world created by a good and omnipotent God?” Leibniz, following the tradition of Augustine, insisted that God created a perfect world and Evil is partly acceptable as long as the world itself is Good (Uemura 197). The perfect world mentioned above is defined as a world in which diversity is achieved as much as possible (Nagatsuna 85). Within that perfect world, partial Evil is tolerated to achieve the Good of the whole (Nagatsuna 109). In a way, Evil exists in the world to enhance Good, and God tolerates sin to magnify goodness (Suzuki 42). Unlike the Book of Job in the Old Testament, Leibniz’s theodicy is a defense of God, bringing God into the human court and attempting to judge God’s justice through human reason (Uemura 197-98).

In light of these two images of God, Lewis seems to reject Leibniz’s defense of God and encourages people to return to faith as it should be. In his essay, entitled “God in the Dock,” Lewis criticizes the image of God being judged by humans:

The ancient man approached God (or even gods) as the accused person approaches his judge. For the modern man the roles are reversed. He is the judge: God is in the dock. He is quite a kindly judge: if God should have a reasonable defence for being the god who permits war, poverty and disease, he is ready to listen to it. The trial may even end in God’s acquittal. But the important thing is that Man is on the Bench and God in the Dock. (“God in the Dock” *GID* 268)³

In discussing the difficulty of recovering faith in the modern era, Lewis points out

humankind's tendency to assess and accuse God by human reason. Even though he defends humans for being kind judges, Lewis considered defending God, as Leibniz did, an act of placing God on the same field as humankind.

In the twentieth century, the recognition of theodicy greatly transformed. Theodicy in the Age of Enlightenment used to be an argument for the justice of God because the existence of God was evident (Uemura 198). This is the reason pre-nineteenth century philosophers, such as Leibniz and Kant, were concerned with the question, "Why is there Evil in the world?" In the twentieth century, on the other hand, philosophers dealt with the question, "What is Evil?" (Koemon 20). Theodicy in the twentieth century was no longer a defense of God but an attempt to prove that God exists in a world where Evil prevails (Uemura 198). Some philosophers, such as Emmanuel Lévinas, Hannah Arendt, and Paul Ricoeur, defined Evil as actions, institutions, and events that cause human suffering. They are unique for their focus on the victim of Evil, not the agent of Evil, and the relationships between victim and agent, and between them and those who are not related with Evil (Koemon 20). Levinas declared that theodicy that justifies Evil in the world ended because no one could justify the great Evil of the Holocaust (Uemura 199). For the people who witnessed the ultimate act of violence, horror, and pain in the twentieth century, the existence of God was not indubitable; nevertheless, these philosophers brought God into the human court so that they could judge God permitting the Holocaust through their reasons. This is considered what Lewis calls a "post-Christian world" (*MC* xix). In effect, it can be said that Lewis's intention as a Christian apologist was to restore faith in God as He used to be.

In summary, Lewis's idea of Good and Evil can be characterized as a commitment to traditional faith in God and a rejection of theodicy. After witnessing violence and destruction in the twentieth century, some philosophers posed questions about the definition of Evil and the existence of God. Lewis, however, insisted that human reason cannot measure the greatness of God, since God is the Creator and the root of human existence. As a defender of Christian orthodoxy, regarding himself as "a dogmatic

Christian untinged with Modernist reservations and committed to supernaturalism in its full rigor” (qtd. in Hooper 293), Lewis attempted to restore the recognition of God as Good beyond human knowledge and understanding. In order to restore Christian belief to people in modern society, it was necessary for him to present an image of God as the one who transcends everything.

2. The Divine Goodness and the Law of Nature

As is fully explained in *Mere Christianity*, Lewis’s recognition of God was greatly transformed after his realization of a moral standard installed in oneself: the Law of Nature, originated from the Divine Goodness (38-39). In order to examine the nature of Evil, this section mainly investigates Good by focusing on the Law of Nature. In light of the difference between Lewis’s and Thomas Hobbes’s theories, this section first explains the definition of the Law of Nature. Subsequently, the relationship between the Law of Nature and the Divine Goodness is investigated. Finally, to reveal the absoluteness and severity of the Divine Goodness, it is important to focus on Lewis’s metaphorical representation of the Divine Goodness as a merciless “Physician” by examining its linguistic root: “*phusis*.”

Rooted in the Divine Goodness, the Law of Nature is a moral standard present in every human being in every country and era. As an atheist, Lewis was confronted with the following contradiction of atheism: “How can one determine that this universe is filled with injustice and evil in the first place?” The fact that one knows what Evil is means that one knows what Good is beforehand. By knowing goodness, one can recognize badness, just as one can recognize a crooked road by knowing a straight road, or darkness by knowing a light (*MC* 38-39). One can determine Good or Evil because a moral standard, the Law of Nature, is inherent in humans. According to Lewis’s academic work entitled *Studies in Words*, the Law of Nature is “an absolute moral standard against which the laws of all nations must be judged and to which they ought to confirm” (61).

Following Thomas Aquinas and Hugo Grotius, Lewis defined it in his theological and philosophical arguments as “the Law of Human Nature” or “the Law or Rule about Right and Wrong” (*MC* 4), which encourages humans to control their instincts in order to act altruistically rather than selfishly (*MC* 10).⁴ The Law of Nature, which helped Lewis know what Good and Evil are, made him realize that atheism is too simple to grasp the complexity of the world.

In fact, this definition of the Law of Nature differs from the Hobbesian definition of justification of cruelty and violence. Thomas Hobbes, the seventeenth century English philosopher, claimed that human beings tend to feel a sense of self-conceit or superiority toward others, even though the Creator originally made them equal. When two people want the same thing that cannot be shared, they become enemies to each other. If it were for the purpose of self-preservation, they would murder or disqualify the other without hesitation (Hobbes 212-14). In other words, human nature is endowed with the causes of conflict, such as enmity, suspicion, and pride (Hobbes 216). Hobbes also wrote that the natural state of humankind is nothing but this “war of all against all” so that we can exercise our natural right, the right to treat everything, including the bodies of others, for the sake of survival (Hobbes 224-25). Exploring the word “Nature,” Lewis explained that Hobbes’s concept of the Law of Nature is not the absolute moral standard espoused by Thomas Aquinas and Hugo Grotius. From Hobbes’s perspective, such moral standard is artificial and unnatural (*SIW* 60-61). Lewis summarized Hobbes’s concept of the Law of Nature as follows:

The ‘laws of *Nature*’ on this view are inferred from the way in which non-human agents always behave, and human agents behave until they are trained not to. Thus what Aquinas or Hooker would call ‘the law of *Nature*’ now becomes in its turn the convention; it is something artificially imposed, in opposition to the true law of *nature*, the way we all spontaneously behave if we dare (or don’t interfere with ourselves), the way all the other creatures behave, the way that comes ‘naturally’ to us. The prime law of *nature*, thus conceived, is self-preservation

and self-aggrandisement, pursued by whatever trickeries or cruelties may prove to be advisable. This is Hobbes's *Natural Law*. (*SIW* 61-62)

Hobbes's definition of natural law, in which all atrocities are justified as long as they are for the sake of self-preservation, rests on the premise that humans are inherently evil and self-centered. Therefore, Hobbes's focus on the inhuman aspects of human nature is completely different from the Law of Nature claimed by Lewis and other theologians.

Since the Law of Nature is based on the Divine Goodness, Lewis exhibits one of the most unshakable facts in his Christian apologetic works: God is Good. According to Lewis, Good is the name of God so even Christ did not call himself Good:

And it will become even plainer if we consider how Our Lord (though, in our belief, one with His Father and co-eternal with Him as no earthly son is with an earthly father) regards His own Sonship, surrendering His will wholly to the paternal will and not even allowing Himself to be called 'good' because Good is the name of the Father. (*PP* 37)

Even though the Divine Goodness implied in this paragraph is so sacred and exclusive, he also mentions that humankind's goodness is actually molded by the Divine Goodness as follows:

The Divine 'goodness' differs from ours, but it is not sheerly different: it differs from ours not as white from black but as a perfect circle from a child's first attempt to draw a wheel. But when the child has learned to draw, it will know that the circle it then makes is what it was trying to make from the very beginning. (*PP* 30)

In this paragraph, Lewis metaphorically describes the Divine Goodness as a perfect circle, an archetypal and original Goodness. Although our goodness is an imitation of the real Goodness, humans are not required to change the moral standards, but to reorient themselves to something better as they employ the divine ethics (*PP* 30). The Law of Nature is, therefore, treated as a proof of God since humankind's goodness is created by and based on the Divine Goodness.

In discussing the Divine Goodness, Lewis, following the biblical tradition, employs the biblical metaphor of God as a merciless “Physician” to emphasize God as the ultimate Good. The phrase “Physician” is taken from the New Testament as “And Jesus answering said unto them, They [sic.] that are whole need not a physician” (Luke 5:31). In *A Grief Observed*, his reflections on the loss of his wife Joy Davidman, Lewis describes his wife and him as “two of God’s patients, not yet cured” (42). Following this, he describes God as a surgeon who mercilessly cuts up a patient: “But suppose that what you are up against is a surgeon whose intentions are wholly good. The kinder and more conscientious he is, the more inexorably he will go on cutting” (*AGO* 43). Lewis succinctly describes one’s fear of the absolute and severe Good in this paragraph. God is metaphorically expressed as “Physician” in another essay entitled “Religion and Rocketry,” in which Lewis attempts to answer some questions related to rational species on other planets.⁵ In this essay, Lewis considers a question: “if there are rational species other than men, are any or all of them fallen like us?” To answer this question, he claims that a creature does not need Redemption if it does not need to be redeemed, just as “[t]hey that are whole need not the physician” (“Religion and Rocketry” *WLN* 90). In a subsequent paragraph, Lewis calls God “the great Physician,” implying Incarnation as a remedy for humanity (*WLN* 92). Lewis, who regarded human nature as fallen, used disease as a metaphor for depravity and physician as a metaphor for God. The same phrase has also been repeated in another essay as “[t]hey that are whole need not the physician” (“The Seeing Eye” *CR* 216).⁶ These paragraphs indicate that Lewis followed biblical tradition and considered the Divine Goodness to be a “Physician” who mercilessly cures humankind.

The term “physician” is related to the Greek word for nature (*phusis*). In the ancient world, the pre-Socratic Greek philosophers chose *phusis* as the word for everything that they knew or believed, such as gods, humankind, plants, and animals (*SIW* 35). This is what the Chinese call “the ten thousand things.” After some philosophers proposed that there were other beings besides *phusis*, its meaning was truncated and

demoted by some philosophers, such as Plato, Aristotle, and Christian theologians (*SIW* 37). Plato regarded this world, *phusis*, as a mere imitation of the archetypal forms. While the value of *phusis* was greatly undermined by Plato, Aristotle regarded *phusis* as a being containing the principle of change. Aristotle believed in a thing that is unchanging and independent from anything outside of *phusis*: God (*SIW* 38-39). Following Aristotle's idea, some Christians added the concept of God as the maker of *phusis*: "*Nature [...] demoted* is now both distinct from God and also related to him as artifact to artist, or as servant to master" (*SIW* 39). Some words were derived from this demoted *phusis*, such as *phusike*, which means "natural science." People studying *phusike* knew how to relieve pain and sustain life, and they were called "physicians" (*SIW* 68-69). Therefore, when God is referred to as a "Physician" in Lewis's Christian writings, two meanings are possibly implied: the Creator who employs and exploits *phusis*, and the Doctor who cures the patient's injuries and illnesses. By employing the metaphor of "Physician," Lewis depicts the absoluteness and severity of the Divine Goodness.

In summary, recognizing the Law of Nature made Lewis aware of God's Goodness. While humanity's goodness is a mere imitation, the Divine Goodness is archetypal and original. From Lewis's usage of the word "Physician" and his understanding of the term *phusis*, it is implied in his writings that God is not only the absolute Creator of *phusis* but also the merciless Doctor of the fallen humans. This belief in the Divine Goodness, both omnipotent and relentless, consolidates the foundation of the collapsed Dualism of Good and Evil in his novels.

3. Evil and Pride

In *The Screwtape Letters*, an epistolary novel that vividly unravels human nature from a devil's perspective, devils play God by calling a man "Patient." This unique book consists of Screwtape's thirty-one letters addressed to his nephew, Wormwood, a junior demon who is responsible for corrupting a man.⁷ As a senior demon, Screwtape teaches Wormwood his various methods of using prayers, friends, mother, fear for war, love, and others in order to persuade the man. As Lewis portrays Satan as a "Godlike imitated state" (*PPL* 75), devils indeed play physicians because they think they "cure" humanity like God. The devils' attempt to "cure" (or, corrupt) men is important because they employ the means of Pride as follows: "the devil loves 'curing' a small fault by giving you a great one [Pride]" (*MC* 127). As mentioned in the Introduction, Lewis regarded Pride as the utmost evil because it converts angels into demons, corrupts humans, and creates adversaries of God. Therefore, this section mainly examines the nature of Evil: the sin of Pride. First, Lewis's view of Pride is investigated from a biographical aspect. Then, this section examines Pride, the sin of self-obsession, from the biblical and theological context. Lastly, the importance of self-renunciation, which is considered the core of Christian doctrine, is studied.

In discussing the importance of Pride, it is essential to recognize the fact that Lewis himself regarded Pride as his own personal obstacle. After conversion from atheism to theism and eventually to Christianity, Lewis started to regard Pride as his own sin preventing him from leading a better life (Green and Hooper 104). In a letter addressed to Arthur Greeves on January 30, 1930, Lewis states his spiritual weakness with frankness and plainness as follows:

I have found out ludicrous and terrible things about my own character. Sitting by, watching the rising thoughts to break their necks as they pop up, one learns to know the sort of thoughts that do come. And, will you believe it, one out of every three is a thought of self-admiration: when everything else fails, having had

its neck broken, up comes the thought ‘What an admirable fellow I am to have broken their necks!’ I catch myself posturing before the mirror, so to speak, all day long. I pretend I am carefully thinking out what to say to the next pupil (for *his* good, of course) and then suddenly realize I am really thinking how frightfully clever I’m going to be and how he will admire me... And then when you face yourself to stop it, you admire yourself for doing *that*. It’s like fighting hydra... There seems to be no end to it. Depth under depth of self-love and self-admiration. (qtd. in Green and Hooper 104-05)

This letter is an example that demonstrates Lewis’s capability to describe his own spiritual state, for he humorously wrote about the sin of self-admiration in which he fell. Following this, in a letter addressed to Greeves on February 10, Lewis implies that while Greeves’s sin of indolence is tolerable, his Pride is not because of its diabolical nature:

[Pride is] the mother of *all* sins, and the original sin of Lucifer – so you are rather better off than I am. You at your worst are an instrument unstrung: I am an instrument strung but preferring to play itself because it thinks it knows the tune better than the Musician. (qtd. in Green and Hooper 105)

As can be seen, Pride is often referred to as Lewis’s personal obstacle and he was fully aware of its danger. In addition to these letters, Walter Hooper has described the conversation with Lewis in retrospect as follows: “[...] when Walter Hooper asked if he set much store by his growing fame, Lewis answered, ‘One cannot be too careful *not* to think of it!’” (Green and Hooper 105). These letters and conversations suggest that Lewis was constantly confronted with his own weaknesses when discussing Pride; in a sense, the depictions of the proud antagonists of God reflect Lewis’s own weaknesses.

Pride, the primal sin of humankind, can be defined as self-obsession. Lewis argues that there are two ways of viewing the self as follows:

On the one hand, it is God’s creature, an occasion of love and rejoicing; now, indeed, hateful in condition, but to be pitied and healed. On the other hand, it is that one self of all others which is called *I* and *me*, and which on that ground puts

forward an irrational claim to preference. (“Two Ways with the Self” *GID* 210-11)

Obviously, while the former is the ideal Christian way of facing the self, the latter is not because it is self-obsession without faith in the superior Being. In the Old Testament, the idea of placing the self before God appears in the third chapter of the Book of Genesis, in which the Devil, in the form of a serpent, entices Eve to eat the forbidden fruit, furnishing her with the lie that God is trying to monopolize everything through prohibition. These words successfully undermine Eve’s love of God, make her ignore her own position as His creature, and trigger her desire to be like God (Tarrant 1-2). It is also mentioned in the Book of Job that God has no mercy for those who are “proud” for God Himself states, “Cast abroad the rage of thy wrath: and behold every one *that is* proud, and abase him. / Look on every one *that is* proud, *and* bring him low; and tread down the wicked in their place. / Hide them in the dust together; and bind their faces in secret” (Job 40:11-13). Since God is the Omniscience who judges humankind, God dislikes human arrogance the most. Thomas Aquinas once said that Pride is called *superbia* in Latin because it is a desire to go higher (*supra*), and that anyone who wants to go beyond one’s position is proud (Reed 26). Therefore, Pride can be expressed as the sin of neglecting God, the Creator, by placing emphasis on one’s own self. The idea of going higher than one’s own position, as Lewis argues, brings tragedies to human history as follows:

What Satan put into the heads of our remote ancestors was the idea that they could “be like gods” – could set up on their own as if they had created themselves – be their own masters – invent some sort of happiness for themselves outside God, apart from God. And out of that hopeless attempt has come nearly all that we call human history – money, poverty, ambition, war, prostitution, classes, empires, slavery – the long terrible story of man trying to find something other than God which will make him happy. (*MC* 49)

What is apparent in this extract is that all the problems in human history are caused by the idea of becoming like God, which is grounded in Pride. Pride, therefore, can be

defined as the sin of obsession with self, such as self-importance, self-admiration, self-exaltation, and self-worship.

Contrary to the obsession with self, self-renunciation is considered a virtue. Lewis constantly deals with the Christian concept of self-renunciation, which is universally acknowledged as the core of Christian ethics (“Two Ways with the Self” *GID* 209). As Lewis emphasizes, self-renunciation, or giving up the self, is essential in Christianity because it actually means gaining a true personality: “There are no real personalities anywhere else. Until you have given up your self to Him you will not have a real self” (*MC* 226). Lewis explains that to attain a real self, people should renounce the self to the truly original and unique Being, from which we are all derived. A similar theme is discussed in his other essay entitled “Membership”: “To say this is to repeat what everyone here admits already – that we are saved by grace, that in our flesh dwells no good thing, that we are, through and through, creatures not creators, derived beings, living not of ourselves but from Christ” (*WG* 175). Lewis highlights that all creatures attain their true selves by surrendering themselves to their maker, the source of their existence. As the theme of self-renunciation was Lewis’s main concern as a Christian apologist, his work *Mere Christianity* is concluded with the following words:

Give up yourself, and you will find your real self. Lose your life and you will save it. Submit to death, death of your ambitions and favourite wishes every day and death of your whole body in the end: submit with every fibre of your being, and you will find eternal life. Keep back nothing. Nothing that you have not given away will be really yours. Nothing in you that has not died will ever be raised from the dead. Look for yourself, and you will find in the long run only hatred, loneliness, despair, rage, ruin, and decay. But look for Christ and you will find Him, and with Him everything else thrown in. (*MC* 226-27)

As this suggests, by pursuing oneself, one fails to attain one’s true self. By accepting the death of oneself, on the other hand, one can attain eternal life. Most Lewisian antagonists fail to attain their true self and eternal life; the only one who successfully

manages to redirect oneself from self-obsession to self-renunciation is Orual in *Till We Have Faces*. With all his representations of antagonists, including Orual, Lewis depicts the fact that how one handles oneself is equivalent to how one views God.

4. The Collapsed Dualism

In *The Screwtape Letters*, Screwtape refers to God as “the Enemy” because the devil thinks the relation between God and devils is hostile; Screwtape regards himself as a legitimate adversary of God. Within a dualistic framework, it is certainly possible to assume that God and the Devil, or Good and Evil, are adversaries. However, Lewis clearly shows that a dualistic opposition between God and the Devil is not a Christian doctrine. This section discusses the collapsed Dualism of Good and Evil in Christianity. In the beginning, this section analyzes the influence of Lewis’s conversion on his concept of Dualism. Following this, Dualism is defined by analyzing the similarities and differences between Christianity and Zoroastrianism. Finally, this section analyzes Lewis’s metaphorical and biblical explanation of Satan, “the fallen angel,” which reveals the nature of Evil as “spoiled goodness.”

Lewis realized the falsity of the Dualism of Good and Evil after his conversion to Christianity. Before his conversion, Lewis held a pessimistic view of humankind, namely, that humans have a tendency to seek out Evil merely for the sake of its evilness. In a diary entry dated February 5, 1923, Lewis reveals his honest opinion as follows: “[...] most of us could find positive Satanic badness down there somewhere, the desire for evil not because it was pleasant but because it was evil” (*AMRBM* 191). As an atheist, Lewis once believed in the existence of Evil completely independent from Good. However, as the following excerpt demonstrates, Lewis started to claim that humans cannot pursue Evil merely for the sake of its evilness after his spiritual rebirth:

If Dualism is true, then the bad Power must be a being who likes badness for its own sake. But in reality we have no experience of anyone liking badness just

because it is bad. The nearest we can get to it is in cruelty. But in real life people are cruel for one of two reasons – either because they are sadists, that is, because they have a sexual perversion which makes cruelty a cause of sensual pleasure to them, or else for the sake of something they are going to get out of it – money, or power, or safety. But pleasure, money, power, and safety are all, as far as they go, good things. The badness consists in pursuing them by the wrong method, or in the wrong way, or too much. I do not mean, of course, that the people who do this are not desperately wicked. I do mean that wickedness, when you examine it, turns out to be the pursuit of some good in the wrong way. You can be good for the mere sake of goodness: you cannot be bad for the mere sake of badness. You can do a kind action when you are not feeling kind and when it gives you no pleasure, simply because kindness is right; but no one ever did a cruelty simply because cruelty is wrong – only because cruelty was pleasant or useful to him. In other words badness cannot succeed even in being bad in the same way in which goodness is good. Goodness is, so to speak, itself: badness is only spoiled goodness. And there must be something good first before it can be spoiled. (*MC* 43-44)

When we compare this excerpt with the statements in his diary during his youth, it is obvious Lewis's view had fundamentally changed. He argues that humans do not pursue Evil because of its evilness. Evil, from his Christian perspective, comprises seeking what is inherently Good in the wrong way, by the wrong means, or too much. No one dares to seek Evil for its own sake because Evil cannot be independent from Good, although Good is an independent being from Evil. Lewis's conversion to Christianity dismantled and undermined his conception of Evil; it can be rephrased that his conversion led him to reject the Dualism of Good and Evil.

Dualism, a theory that posits Evil as God's formidable foe, is espoused by one of the most prehistoric religions in human history: Zoroastrianism. Dualism is defined by Lewis as "the belief that there are two equal and independent powers at the back of

everything, one of them good and the other bad, and that this universe is the battlefield in which they fight out an endless war” (*MC* 42). Zoroastrianism, which is presumed to be the origin of Dualism, illustrates a battlefield between two gods, Ahura Mazda (Ormuzd) and Angra Mainyu (Ahriman). Ahura Mazda embodies light and goodness, while the main adversary Angra Mainyu, darkness and evilness. According to Lewis, Christianity and Zoroastrianism share a similar worldview of Dualism because they both conceive that this universe is the battlefield of Good (Angels) and Evil (Demons): “As far as this world is concerned, a Christian can share most of the Zoroastrian outlook; we all live between the ‘fell, incensed points’ of Michael and Satan” (“Evil and God” *GID* 6-7). In this essay, Lewis equates the spiritual battlefield of Ahura Mazda and Angra Mainyu to that of Michael and Satan. Lewis’s remarks clarify that Christianity has some essence of the Dualism of Good and Evil.

The difference between Zoroastrianism and Christianity is that Christianity explains the source of the battlefield between Good and Evil. Although he observes that Zoroastrianism is “the sensible creed” (*MC* 42), Lewis stresses that Zoroastrian Dualism lacks an explanation of the source of the universe as follows: “Dualism has not yet reached the ground of being. You cannot accept two conditioned and mutually independent beings as the self-grounded, self-comprehending Absolute” (“Evil and God” *GID* 5). This extract shows that Dualism fails to conceive “the ground of being” on which both Good and Evil rely. Christianity, according to Lewis, recognizes that their existences are dependent on the Divine Goodness, the source of existence:

The difference [between Dualism and Christianity] is that Christianity thinks this Dark Power was created by God, and was good when he was created, and went wrong. Christianity agrees with Dualism that this universe is at war. But it does not think this is a war between independent powers. It thinks it is a civil war, a rebellion, and that we are living in a part of the universe occupied by the rebel. (*MC* 45)

Evil, which was derived from Good, had originally been Good before it went wrong.

The imperfectness of Evil is also explained through this quote: “Goodness is, so to speak, itself: badness is only spoiled goodness. And there must be something good first before it can be spoiled” (*MC* 44). The dualistic conflict between Good and Evil is actually a conflict between Good and “spoiled goodness,” and as the Divine Goodness is at the root of that conflict, “spoiled goodness” cannot be an independent antagonist of God. The following excerpt clearly shows that Evil is nothing but a parasite:

A sound theory of value demands something different. It demands that good should be original and evil a mere perversion; that good should be the tree and evil the ivy; that good should be able to see all round evil (as when sane men understand lunacy) while evil cannot retaliate in kind; that good should be able to exist on its own while evil requires the good on which it is parasitic in order to continue its parasitic existence. (“Evil and God” *GID* 5)

Since Evil is a being derived from the Divine Goodness, it never stands on an equal footing with its own origin; in a sense, all odds are against it. Thus, from a Christian dualistic framework of Good and Evil, Evil is defined as an incompetent and imperfect being that dares to fight against its source, without realizing that this fight could kill itself.

The definition of Evil as “spoiled goodness” is explained by the biblical metaphor of tree and branch. In Lewis’s scholarly work on John Milton’s *Paradise Lost* entitled *A Preface to Paradise Lost*, he felicitously describes Satan’s rebellion against God as “sawing off the branch he is sitting on” (72). This metaphor of tree and branch, which represents God and His creature, is obviously taken from this passage in the Gospel according to John:

I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. / Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away: and every *branch* that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit. / Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you. / Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. / I am the vine, ye *are* the branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the

same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing. / If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast *them* into the fire, and they are burned. (John 15:1-6)

Christ's metaphor of the relationship between tree and branch implies the one between God and humanity. It suggests that humanity should be connected with God, the consistent, omnipotent, and permanent tree. Without the tree, humans will have nothing, just like branches disconnected from the tree bear no fruit and are eventually cast into the fire. Interestingly, the same metaphor of tree and branch is employed in Lewis's *The Abolition of Man* as follows:

The rebellion of new ideologies against the *Tao* is a rebellion of the branches against the tree: if the rebels could succeed they would find that they had destroyed themselves. The human mind has no more power of inventing a new value than of imagining a new primary colour, or, indeed, of creating a new sun and a new sky for it to move in. (*AOM* 44)

Tao, or what some philosophers call the Law of Nature, Traditional Morality, the First Principles of Practical Reason, or the First Platitude, is, according to Lewis, "the sole source of all value judgements" (*AOM* 43).⁸ The denial of *Tao* means the denial of all values; hence, one's effort to create a new value system to replace *Tao* is self-contradictory. Lewis also says that any ideology consists of some fragments of *Tao* (*AOM* 43). This metaphorical representation of the relationship between the Law of Nature and ideologies is repeated in an essay, "Bulverism or, the Foundation of 20th Century Thought."⁹ It is explained that Marxists and Freudians are both "ideologically tainted" at the source before commencing their critical thoughts, and that their systems of thoughts hardly differ from Christian theology: "The Freudian and the Marxian are in the same boat with all the rest of us, and cannot criticize us from outside. They have sawn off the branch they were sitting on" (*GID* 300). Considering all these factors, Lewis uses this biblical metaphor of tree and branch to describe the relationships of God and Satan and that of *Tao* and ideologies. Just as ideologies are meaningless like a cut-off branch, in front of

Tao, Satan falls into self-contradiction in front of God. The biblical metaphor of tree and branch, therefore, effectively and fundamentally denies the Dualism of Good and Evil as it undermines Evil.

Conclusion

To conclude this section, considering the philosophical, theological, and biblical background that has been presented, Lewis's concept of Good, Evil, and the Dualism of Good and Evil is definitely at the root of his works examined in the subsequent chapters. As a Christian apologist, Lewis attempts to present God as the Divine Goodness beyond human understanding in his Christian writings. While the goodness of God is proved by the Law of Nature inherent in us, humans are easily tempted to commit the original sin of Pride. Viewed in this light, Good and Evil seem to have an adversarial relationship; however, as Lewis explains, Christian doctrines do not acknowledge Dualism. As already mentioned, Good is independent by itself while Evil is merely "spoiled goodness." Following this Christian conception, the conflict between Good and Evil is easily collapsed. Given the Christian backbone, the Lewisian antagonists attempt to be like God without realizing that this is self-contradictory. Although their sin of Pride transforms the world into a dualistic battlefield of Good and Evil, whether it is Puritania, Malacandra (Mars), Perelandra (Venus), Thulcandra (Earth), Narnia, or Glome, they are neutralized, nullified, and eventually defeated. Through his representation of the collapsed Dualism of Good and Evil, Lewis, as a Christian living in the post-Christian Britain of the twentieth century, demonstrates the ultimate Goodness beyond everything.

In light of the rejection of Dualism, the subsequent chapters discuss the antagonists of God in each work using the following process. The first part of each Chapter investigates the origin of the antagonist by pursuing its historical, ideological, or philosophical background. The second part examines its characterization, including its

appearance, attitude, and statements. The third part demonstrates the dualistic conflict of Good and Evil in the novel. The final part studies how the Dualism of Good and Evil, especially Evil, is nullified. By focusing on each antagonist depicted by Lewis, the following chapters aim to reveal Lewis's intention to highlight Good and debunk Evil in its disguise of various ideologies and thoughts.

Chapter II. The Allegory of Nazism:

The Representation of Savage and the Dwarfs in *The Pilgrim's Regress*

This chapter focuses on the representation of Savage and the Dwarfs in an allegorical tale, *The Pilgrim's Regress* (1933), which is Lewis's first published work written in prose. As suggested by the title, which evokes *The Pilgrim's Progress* by John Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Regress* is indeed an allegorical tale in which the protagonist makes a spiritual journey in the form of a dream. Even though they appear briefly in the sixth chapter, "Furthest North," of Book Six, "Northward along the Canyon," Savage and the Dwarfs are represented as the most intimidating villains. Examining Lewis's political standpoint, this chapter aims to prove that the allegorical representations of Savage and the Dwarfs highlight their typical features as antagonists of God.¹⁰

Although this chapter focuses on only one chapter of the novel, it is important to grasp the entire context of *The Pilgrim's Regress*. The protagonist, John, lives in a city called Puritania. John, tired of the harsh rules set by the Landlord, who is an allegorical representation of God, is attracted to the vision of the Island. In order to pursue this vision, he begins his journey to the West, leaving the Landlord and the eastern mountains. On his way to the West, he meets various characters that embody political movements, thoughts, and theories prevalent at the beginning of the twentieth century. These characters try to answer John's questions related to the Landlord and the Island from their own perspectives. However, John is not fully satisfied with them. John finally reaches the West with his companion, Vertue, an allegory of John's conscience. After accomplishing this, John realizes that the truth lies in the East, and he starts to "regress" to the eastern mountains.

Even though *The Pilgrim's Regress* is an allegory that explores various ideas of the twentieth century, few studies have paid sufficient attention to the fact that it manifests an allegory of Nazism, which was emerging at the time of its publication, as one of the most important ideologies that hinder the protagonist's faith. Mona Dunckel has pointed

out that *The Pilgrim's Regress* is invaluable not only as Lewis's autobiography but also as a depiction of the social history of the post-World War I period ("C. S. Lewis as Allegorist: *The Pilgrim's Regress*" 47). Kath Filmer has stated that Lewis developed his political ideas in *The Pilgrim's Regress* (*The Fiction of C. S. Lewis* 57). Kathryn Lindskoog has clearly pointed out the relationship between *The Pilgrim's Regress* and the rise of Nazism in her book, *Finding the Landlord*. Lindskoog links the publication year and the rise of Nazism as follows: "Hitler had just been elected chancellor of Germany when Lewis wrote this" (64-65). Although Lindskoog's attention to the novel's background is significant, no research indicates the importance of Lewis's embodiment of Nazism in the book. Lewis had a strong opinion against the Nazi invasion so he later served in the Home Guard in Oxford, took up a position as a broadcaster on BBC radio, gave speeches to RAF soldiers, and accepted some evacuees in his house during wartime because Nazi Germany, from his perspective, was a great enemy not only to the British but also to the Christian faith. Providing an overview of the historical background of the publication, this chapter investigates the allegory of Nazism to show Lewis's attempt to condemn Evil in the collapsed Dualism in *The Pilgrim's Regress*.

This chapter consists of four sections. To start, the first section discusses the publication background of the novel in order to pursue the origin of Savage and the Dwarfs. The second section then analyzes the representation of Savage, the allegory of the Heroic Nihilism mainly espoused by the Nazis. After presenting Heroic Nihilism as the foundation of the Nazi principle, the third section investigates the dualistic conflict between the Landlord and Savage, referring to the religious elements of Nazism. The final section clarifies Savage as a false master by focusing on his followers, the Dwarfs.

1. The Origin of *Savage and the Dwarfs*: The Rise and Fall of Nazi Germany

Clearly, *The Pilgrim's Regress* reflects the political situation surrounding the time of its composition. As Lewis left a letter clarifying that Europe's historical background shapes the novel, its importance should be highlighted. This section examines the situation in Europe around the time of the publication of *The Pilgrim's Regress* and thus considers Lewis's stance on Nazi Germany from his letters, essays, lectures, and works. First, the rise of the new political movements from the 1920s to the 1930s is highlighted. Second, referring to Germany and Britain's historical background, this section explains how the fascist movement correlates with Lewis's writing and publishing of *The Pilgrim's Regress*. Third, Lewis's attitude toward fascism, especially Hitler's Nazism, is investigated using Lewis's letters and lectures. Fourth, this section introduces the essay written by Lewis that demonstrates his criticism of the Nazi principle of exclusivism.

Considering the years before and after *The Pilgrim's Regress* was published, it is important to examine how the surrounding political situation affected the novel. After the Russian Revolution and the First World War, the established order in Europe began to disintegrate. Therefore, many people started seeking new means to transform the world. This significant change led them to espouse the new political movements: Communism and Fascism (including Italian Fascism and German Nazism). The Communist movement began to develop in Britain when the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB) was founded in 1920. Following the establishment of the CPGB, the Soviet Union was founded to prove the validity of the new regime. The CPGB never became a mass party in Britain, and another movement started flourishing at the beginning of the 1930s. In Germany, the National Socialist German Workers' Party, commonly referred to as the Nazi Party, began to extend its power. Heavily influenced by Hitler and Mussolini, Sir Oswald Mosley became the leader of the British Union of Fascists (BUF) in October 1932. Although Mosley's fascist political party could not seize power, wariness of the rise of fascism in Britain started arising among certain British citizens.

Only a month before the formation of the BUF, Lewis wrote the first draft of *The Pilgrim's Regress* while visiting Arthur Greeves's house in Belfast August 15 to 29, 1932 (Green et al. 127)¹¹. A few months later, Lewis sent the revised manuscript of *The Pilgrim's Regress* to J. M. Dent and Sons, and it was published on May 25, 1933 (Green et al. 131)¹². Meanwhile, Adolf Hitler was appointed as Chancellor of Germany in January 1933. *The Pilgrim's Regress*, accordingly, was written and published when the Nazi political movement began to affect European countries.

Lewis was conscious of the rise of Nazism around the time of the publication of *The Pilgrim's Regress*. His attitude toward Nazism is partly embodied in a letter to Greeves dated November 5, 1933, which was written six months after the publication of *The Pilgrim's Regress*. Lewis explains the reason for his anger against Nazism as follows:

I might agree that the Allies are partly to blame, but nothing can fully excuse the iniquity of Hitler's persecution of the Jews, or the absurdity of his theoretical position. Did you see that he said "The Jews have *made no contribution to human culture* and in crushing them I am doing *the will [sic.] of the Lord*." Now as the whole idea of the "Will of the Lord" is precisely what the world owes to the Jews, the blaspheming tyrant has just fixed his absurdity for all to see in a single sentence, and shown that he is as contemptible for his stupidity as he is detestable for his cruelty. (CL vol. 2 128)

By calling Hitler "the blaspheming tyrant," Lewis demonstrates his attitude from his position as a Christian. In the same letter, Lewis also indicates that his idea about Nazism is depicted in *The Pilgrim's Regress*. Following the descriptions of his resentment against Hitler's political position in the letter, Lewis states "read the chapter about Mr. Savage in the *Regress* and you have my views" (CL vol. 2 128). This letter suggests that Lewis linked the novel to the contemporary political situation. Clearly, the fascist movement had some influence on the writing of *The Pilgrim's Regress*.

Although he does not mention much about *The Pilgrim's Regress*, other letters,

papers, and publications also imply that Lewis often set himself in direct opposition to Nazi Germany. On April 16, 1940, Lewis sent a letter to Bede Griffiths, theologian and his lifelong friend, discussing the difficulty of prayers for Hitler and Stalin: “The practical problem about charity (in our prayers) is very hard work, isn’t it? When you pray for Hitler and Stalin, how do you actually teach yourself to make the prayer real?” (*CL* vol. 2 391). In a letter to his brother dated May 4, 1940, he also implies that he is tempted to hate Stalin and Hitler (*CL* vol. 2 408). It is obvious from these letters that Lewis regarded them not only as the enemy of Britain but also of Christianity. In 1942, Lewis once offered religious talks and surprised people with his ideological speech as the following excerpt shows:

[Lewis] had no doubt that Hitler was an evil genius and that we were right to fight. He also detested Stalin as a sadistic tyrant: he felt that our best hope was that Germany and Russia would systematically destroy each other. I was not prepared for this blunt expression of the philosophy of power politics from the lips of a professing Christian, and I was profoundly shocked. (qtd. in Chapman 11)

This episode demonstrates his political view, and Lewis frequently employed the names of Stalin and Hitler even when he argued about Christianity. After the war, Lewis wrote to Don Giovanni Calabria, founder of the Congregation of the Poor Servants of Divine Providence, on September 20, 1947, as follows:

Even now we see more charity, or certainly less hatred, between separated Christians than there was a century ago. The chief cause of this (under God) seems to me to be the swelling pride and barbarity of the unbelievers. Hitler, unknowingly and unwillingly, greatly benefited the Church! (*CL* vol. 2 804)

By the end of the war, Lewis, even humorously, described Hitler’s role to be that of uniting separated Christians. These writings and lectures in the 1940s suggest that Lewis’s aversion toward Hitler’s Nazi regime was based on his position as a Christian apologist.

Even after the Second World War, he never ceased to criticize the principles of Nazi Germany. One of the principles Lewis was particularly opposed to was its exclusivism, which is criticized in his 1948 paper, "Vivisection." In this paper, which discussed the problem of the vivisection of animals, he claims that people have a particular sentiment for humankind, which justifies the vivisection of animals; however, he suggests that this sentiment for humankind is easily transformed into a sentiment for a particular race, class, or political party. He uses examples of the sentiment of the white people against the black people and that of progressive people against savage people (*GID* 247-48). Obviously, Lewis was conscious of the fact that utter exclusivism leads us to justify the massacre of other humans. Lewis also says as follows:

Once the old Christian idea of a total difference in kind between man and beast has been abandoned, then no argument for experiments on animals can be found which is not also an argument for experiments on inferior men. If we cut up beasts simply because they cannot prevent us and because we are backing our own side in the struggle for existence, it is only logical to cut up imbeciles, criminals, enemies, or capitalists for the same reasons. We all hear that Nazi scientists have done them. We all suspect that our own scientists may begin to do so, in secret, at any moment. (*GID* 248)

This means that not only animals but also people, stigmatized as different species, can easily become victims of a group that despises them. In terms of Nazism, Lewis uses the example of a sentiment for the master race (*Herrenvolk*) against the non-Aryans (*GID* 248). As implied in this essay, Nazi Germany indeed justified the holocaust of Jews, homosexuals, and physically or mentally handicapped people. Adopting Ernest Haeckel's theory, which was derived from Darwinism, Nazi Germany claimed that the Aryans are the fittest and emphasized the inferiority of other species (Sherratt 87-91). Lewis's concern about vivisection as the elimination of different species is clearly associated with his criticism of Nazi Germany's justification of cruelty and violence. Lewis's letters, lectures, and papers, indicate that the doctrines and ideologies of Nazi

Germany were the focus of his concern from the 1930s to 1940s. Published before the Second World War, *The Pilgrim's Regress* seems to mirror the upcoming horror, terror, and confusion of the British society.

2. Savage and the Dwarfs: Philosophy and Political Movements

In *The Allegory of Love*, Lewis's scholastic work on medieval allegorical methods, Lewis defines allegory as follows: "Allegory, in some sense, belongs not to medieval man but to man, or even to mind, in general. It is of the very nature of thought and language to represent what is immaterial in picturable terms" (*AL* 55). As it suggests, allegory is regarded as a general method to reveal substantial ideas and thoughts.¹³ Assuming that Nazism affected Lewis's composition of *The Pilgrim's Regress*, it is particularly important to analyze its allegorical characters, Savage and the Dwarfs. This section mainly examines Savage and the Dwarfs, Lewis's allegorical descriptions of Heroic Nihilism and the political movements. Referring to Lewis's captions, this section begins with the examination of the characterizations of Savage and the Dwarfs. Following this, the history of Heroic Nihilism is studied by focusing on Nietzsche, Jünger, Heidegger, and Baeumler. Finally, this section reveals Savage as an allegorical representation of Heroic Nihilism.

Clearly, Savage and the Dwarfs are an allegory of Fascism, Nazism, and Communism. In the novel, Vertue heads for the furthest north with his companion, Drudge. As his name implies, Drudge undertakes dull and laborious tasks for Mr. Sensible, an allegory of "a scatterbrain who hides his ignorance behind a cascade of seemingly erudite quotations" (*Lindskoog Finding the Landlord* 49). Drudge later joins the group of red dwarfs called Marxomanni, abandoning his master. It is allegorically indicated that Drudge's purpose in going North is to be a part of the Communist community. The fierce, argumentative Dwarfs are especially an allegory of political movements such as Fascism, Nazism, and Communism. The Communists are referred

to as dwarf warriors called “Marxomanni,” while the Italian Fascists are “Mussolimini,” the German Nazis, “Swastici,” and other gangsters, “Gangomanni.” Lewis’s writing here evokes words and names that remind us of these movements, such as Marx, Mussolini, and Swastika.¹⁴ Lewis, realizing that readers had found it difficult to understand the story’s implications, inserted captions on each page to explain what the story was about in the revised edition published by Geoffrey Bles of London in 1943 (Hooper 801-02). All the captions in the scene of Savage and the Dwarfs are expressed as follows: “The revolutionary sub-men / Whether of the Left or the Right / Who are all alike vassals of cruelty / Heroic Nihilism laughs / At the less thoroughgoing forms of Tough-Mindness / And they have no answer to it” (*PR* 111-17). What is apparent from these captions is that Savage embodies an abstract concept called Heroic Nihilism, while the Dwarfs represent concrete revolutionary movements. These descriptions suggest that the German Nazis, Italian Fascists, and the Communists are the ugly siblings espousing the same philosophy.

Heroic Nihilism embodied by Savage is a doctrine that had a great impact on the German thinkers and philosophers who affected Nazism. The relationship between nihilism and Nazism can be traced back to Nietzsche’s theory. Nietzsche proposed that European societies encounter a purposeless state in the age of nihilism, following the death of God (Gillespie 80). Referring to Nietzsche’s views, Ernst Jünger established a theory derived from his experience as a German soldier. Jünger observed that a heroic act is manifested in the meaningless fulfillment of one’s duty (Kitchen 8). His nihilistic vision of war was admired by German people, such as Martin Heidegger, who attached himself to the Nazi Party. Heidegger imagined that this doctrine would produce a heroic community infused with fearless dynamism (Kitchen 9). Heroic Nihilism was adopted in order to legitimate Nazism and foster extreme nationalism by some philosophers; for example, Alfred Baeumler insisted that Heroic Nihilism would make the German people conscious of their rootedness in the German earth (Bambach 275). Based on the thoughts provided by these philosophers, the Heroic Nihilism espoused by the Nazi

regime can be characterized by two features: resignation of the current situation (nihilism) and fearlessness of the new one (heroism). Hence, Lewis, as one of the witnesses to the rise of Nazism at the time, incorporated a violent philosophy and its political consequence into these characters.

The two features of the Heroic Nihilism mentioned above, nihilism and heroism, are portrayed in Savage's attitude in the novel. Clarifying his position, Savage declares how he perceives the world as follows:

'The rot in the world is too deep and the leak in the world is too wide. They may patch and tinker as they please, they will not save it. Better give in. Better cut the wood with the grain. If I am to live in a world of destruction let me be its agent and not its patient.' (*PR* 116)

In this extract, Savage's lament over the rotten world is palpable. His statement is derived from his perception that nothing can redeem this situation. To put it precisely, this description indicates Savage's resignation regarding the existing world (nihilism). Savage, however, does not end up enduring deterioration. He is confident, aggressive, and arrogant because of his fearlessness of the new order he would build (heroism). Through Savage's abovementioned statement, one can realize that he embodies significant features of Heroic Nihilism.

3. The Landlord vs. Savage: The Substitute of God

It is possible to assume that *The Pilgrim's Regress* suggests Savage's perilous attraction as a new god, making Puritania a battlefield of the Landlord and Savage. The representation of Savage explains how Nazism could be so enticing and attractive that one could easily choose him as a substitute of one's religious belief. This section mainly examines the religious elements of Savage, creating a dualistic opposition between the Landlord and Savage. First, this section focuses on the representation of Savage's confrontation with the Landlord. Second, Nazism as a political religion, including its fatal defect, is investigated. Third, Vertue's doubt concerning the Landlord and attraction toward Savage are discussed to reveal the aspect of Heroic Nihilism that makes it an enemy of Christianity.

Savage confronts the Landlord as His adversary since he demands of people to choose either the old world (the Landlord) or the new one (Savage). The following excerpt is from the scene in which Savage clarifies his opinion about the Landlord and His followers:

He [Savage] said that he could understand old-fashioned people who believed in the Landlord and kept the rules and hoped to go up and live in the Landlord's castle when they had to leave this country. "They have something to live for," he said. "And if their belief was true, their behaviour would be perfectly sensible. But as their belief is not true, there remains only one way of life fit for a man." This other way of life was something called Heroism, or Master-Morality, or Violence. "All the other people in between," he said, "are ploughing the sand."
(PR 115)

Although Savage says that people's faith for the Landlord is suitable and understandable, he maintains that it should be abandoned and replaced by him. It is obvious that Savage insists that the world should be reigned over by either the Landlord or him. As he criticizes people in Claptrap and Mr. Sensible, he says "Can they not see that the law of

the world is against them?” (*PR* 115). In this scene, Savage implies that he himself should be the new law after the old one is demolished. Heroic Nihilism, therefore, is described as a new religious object to be worshipped instead of God.

Savage’s desire for the power to substitute God implies Nazi Germany’s characteristics of political religion. In the early twentieth century, the Nazi system was considered perilous because it united people as religion did. The sacralization of politics was originally recognized by Jean-Jacques Rousseau in the eighteenth century, and the religious aspect in the totalitarian system has been studied by researchers since the 1930s (Augusteijn et al. 2-3). The German people admired Hitler as their Messiah, and the Nazi regime obviously succeeded in maintaining its hold over society (Augusteijn et al. 3). Hence, Nazism was considered a grave threat because of the German people’s feelings of national and religious unity strengthened by Hitler’s charismatic leadership. However, the religious elements of Nazism were dangerous because of its dependence on its forms, not its contents. The following remark by Steigmann-Gall indicates this as follows: “The political religion thesis presumes the attraction to Nazism was based on emotion instead of idea, on form instead of content [...] The ‘religion’ of political religion theory becomes the act of believing, not that which is believed” (“Nazism and the Revival of Political Religion Theory” 86). It is suggested that people believed in the Nazi system even though it has no reasonable political doctrine because the act of believing became more important to them. Hermann Rauschning, who once attached himself to the Nazi Party, suggested that Nazism was a political system that attained power without concrete ideas:

The movement was without even vague general ideas on the subject; all it had was boundless confidence: things would smooth themselves out one way or another. Give rein to the revolutionary impulse, and the problems would find their own solution. [...] that was what enabled National Socialism to win through in its own way with its practical problems. Its strength lay in incessant activity and in embarking on anything so long as it kept things moving. (23)

Nazism, even though it was a mere shell of a system with violence, extreme nationalism and exclusivism, gained power because the German people's worship of the Führer as God played an important role. Thus, the pseudo-religious elements of Nazism supported its dictatorship.

In *The Pilgrim's Regress*, Nazism as a political religion is portrayed as an enemy of Christianity because Savage offers himself as an escape from Christianity. Vertue, John's conscience who goes to see Savage with Drudge, once believed himself to be the supreme guide. He states, "I cannot put myself under anyone's orders. I must be the captain of my soul and the master of my fate" (PR 84). Paraphrasing William Ernest Henley's "Invictus," Vertue seems to insist that he should be placed above the Landlord. After seeing Savage, Vertue is confused by Savage's powerful declaration. Vertue confesses his attraction toward Savage, revealing to John that he was about to stay with Savage: "Do you know that I nearly decided to stay with Savage? [...] It sounds like raving, but think it over. Supposing there is no Landlord, no mountains in the East, no Island in the West, nothing but this country" (PR 121). In this scene, Vertue is about to choose Savage instead of the Landlord; in other words, Vertue's obsession with self, the prime sin of Pride, nearly makes him choose the wrong master. Since Vertue represents John's conscience, Vertue's blindness in the following chapters indicates the lack of John's faith and ability to choose truth. As Vertue indicates a sign of precariousness of John's ability, Nazism is described as a power overwhelming Christian faith.

4. The Dwarfs, or the Reversion of Humankind

Although Savage is alluring enough to lead one to abandon God, Lewis fundamentally subverts Savage's arguments with his description of God as "the Landlord" to place Savage in the position of a mere "tenant" as well as the other allegorical thoughts and ideas. As the metaphor of "the Landlord" implies that He is the owner of Puritania, Savage is merely one of the inhabitants; in other words, Savage is only one of the Landlord's creations though he is derived from Him. The Christian idea that men cannot truly own anything is rhetorically employed to overthrow political philosophy and political religion.¹⁵ As shown with the clarification of the relationship between Good and Evil in Chapter I, Savage, who attempts to become an alternative to God, is not on an equal footing with the Landlord. The fact that Savage is a fake god is implied in the representation of his worshippers: The Dwarfs. The final section investigates the representation of those worshippers, which debunks faith in Savage. In discussing the nullification of Evil in *The Pilgrim's Regress*, this section first analyzes Vertue's impression of the Dwarfs as "sub-man" by focusing on their physical state. This section then analyzes Lewis's essay, "First and Second Things," in which he describes the Germans as "sub-man."¹⁶

Although the Dwarfs are seen as animals from Vertue's point of view, they are actually the reversion of humankind. Vertue's discovery of the relationship between humankind and the Dwarfs indicates that "It is hard to understand it without being a biologist. These dwarfs are a different species and an older species than ours. But, then, the specific variation is always liable to reappear in human children. They revert to the dwarf" (*PR* 114). It surprises Vertue that the Dwarfs are more or less related to humans because they seem to be completely distinct from humans. Although they could talk and walk like humans, their structure is different: "I felt all the time that if they killed me it wouldn't be murder, any more than if a crocodile or gorilla killed me. It is a different species – however it came there. Different faces" (*PR* 111). Since Vertue

clearly classifies the Dwarfs as animals, not humans, this scene is presumably one of Lewis's most severe criticisms of those political movements: it represents that people related to those movements are mere beasts. These extracts clearly show that the Dwarfs are relegated from humans to animals because of their faith in Heroic Nihilism.

Lewis's representation of the Dwarfs indicates that humans occasionally misjudge the object of faith, place the second thing above the first, and revert to "sub-men." The expression of Germans as the reversion of humans is seen in the essay "First and Second Things," published after *The Pilgrim's Regress*. According to this essay, Lewis once read an article about the Nazis admiring Hagen, the murderer of Siegfried in both *The Song of the Nibelungs* and Richard Wagner's *The Ring of the Nibelung*. Lewis emphasizes the fact that the Germans chose Hagen instead of Siegfried as their national hero, which represents how they fail to understand the essence of the Northern myth (*GID* 307-09). Some German people who sacrifice the greater good (Siegfried) for the lesser (Hagen) are described as "a full-grown man reverted to the *ethos* of his preparatory school" (*GID* 308). This metaphor is obviously linked with the representation of humans reverting to Dwarfs in *The Pilgrim's Regress*. The physical features of Savage and the Dwarfs are indeed inspired by Norse mythology, especially Arthur Rackham's illustration of Hagen and Alberich in *Siegfried and the Twilight of the Gods*.¹⁷ Like Hagen, Savage is described as a big man sitting on a high chair, wearing an iron helmet similar to Hagen's, surrounded by the Dwarfs (*PR* 112). The Dwarfs, presumably influenced by Alberich, worship Savage instead of the Landlord. Although the theme of putting first things first constantly appears in some of his other writings, it is his first attempt to describe it in a form of allegory by employing Norse mythology.¹⁸ As a Christian, Lewis was concerned that something truly important should not be neglected. The Dwarfs with political names lose their human nature and degenerate into animal-like beings, as they regard Heroic Nihilism as an alternative philosophy to God; in other words, Lewis believes that only the Landlord, God, makes humans truly human. Through the description of the Dwarfs as "sub-men," Lewis emphasizes what makes humanity mere beasts.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it can be said that *The Pilgrim's Regress* fundamentally dismantles the threat of Nazism, which was overwhelming Europe at the time the book was being written. Lewis's criticism of the Nazi regime is seen in the representations of Savage and the Dwarfs, an allegory of Heroic Nihilism and the Nazis. In the novel, Heroic Nihilism is portrayed as a philosophy that justifies overthrowing the old world and building a new one. Lewis, therefore, demonstrates Savage as a half-giant who regards himself as equivalent to the Landlord. Considering the fact that Nazism was regarded as a political religion, it is possible to assume that Lewis dared to depict Savage as an enticing substitute of the Landlord. As can be seen, the conflict between Good and Evil, God and the Devil, is portrayed in the conflict between the Landlord and Savage in the novel. However, Heroic Nihilism is demoted and the Dualism of Good and Evil is demolished not only by the identification of God as "the Landlord" and Savage merely as a tenant but by the representation of the followers, the Dwarfs. By depicting Savage's subjects as "sub-man," a deteriorated state of humankind, Lewis implies that humans cannot truly be human without placing the first thing first. In a sense, Savage (Heroic Nihilism) is a branch separated from a tree, and the Dwarfs (political movements espousing Heroic Nihilism) are those who foolishly mistake a branch for a tree. By showing Savage as a false master and the Dwarfs as his followers, Lewis demotes and eventually dismantles the philosophy of Nazism. Hence, it can be said that *The Pilgrim's Regress* is Lewis's first attempt to neutralize Evil as a Christian by undermining a political ideology.

Chapter III. The Blaspheming Scientist:

The Representation of Weston in *Out of the Silent Planet* and *Perelandra*

This chapter mainly analyzes the representation of Weston, an evil scientist in *Out of the Silent Planet* (1938) and *Perelandra* (1943). During the Second World War, Lewis published a science fiction trilogy known as *The Ransom Trilogy* or *The Space Trilogy* (1938-45), which comprises three novels: *Out of the Silent Planet*, *Perelandra*, and *That Hideous Strength*. As a Christian science fiction writer, Lewis dares to portray the development of science in a negative light in this trilogy. Weston, who is incorporated into the collapsed Dualism of Good and Evil, is particularly considered one of the Lewisian antagonists fundamentally and intentionally subverted in the first two novels.

Since *Out of the Silent Planet* and *Perelandra* are linked with regard to Weston, it is important to summarize these two works. *Out of the Silent Planet*, Lewis's first science fiction set in Malacandra (Mars), is his first attempt to narrate a Christian doctrine of the Fall from an extraterrestrial perspective.¹⁹ The story begins with a scene in which Dr. Elwin Ransom is kidnapped by Devine and Weston. Ransom understands that he is to be sacrificed to creatures named "sorn," tall creatures devoted to scientific research. After arriving in Malacandra, he manages to escape and finds another species, "hross," seal-like creatures leading a simple agricultural life. As a philologist, Ransom gradually learns their language, culture, religion, and lifestyle. He learns from them that the world is created by Maleldil the young.²⁰ Apart from the "sorn" and "hross," there is another rational species called "pfiltriggi," frog-like creatures working as miners and artisans. On his way to see Oyarsa, the ruler of Malacandra, one of Ransom's hross friends named Hyo-i is killed by Weston and Devine. At the meeting with Oyarsa, Ransom hears about the story of Thulcandra (Earth), which used to have its own Oyarsa, like Malacandra does. The Oyarsa in Thulcandra, however, has been "bent" and driven away from heaven. In the middle of their meeting, Weston and Devine are brought before Oyarsa. Weston considers the Malcandrians so unprogressive that he foolishly acts superior to them.

When Weston claims his right to occupy the planet for the human race in bold fashion, he reveals that he himself is “bent” as well as the “bent” Oyarsa of Thulcandra. In the end, Ransom, Weston, and Devine return to Thulcandra following Oyarsa’s instruction.

Perelandra, the second science fiction set in Perelandra (Venus), is Lewis’s own retelling of John Milton’s *Paradise Lost*. Receiving an unknown mission from Oyarsa, Ransom is taken to Perelandra, a paradisiacal planet with a golden sky, warm ocean, and raft-like islands. As Ransom explores this world, he meets the Queen of Perelandra, Tinidril (The Green Lady), an open-minded and carefree lady who does not know anything related to evil or sin. She lives on the floating raft-islands, and she is not allowed to sleep on the fixed lands. While they are conversing, Ransom finds out that his old enemy, Weston, has also come to Perelandra. Instead of the planetary imperialism he claimed in *Out of the Silent Planet*, Weston is obsessed with the idea of Emergent Evolution and the Life-Force. His worship of the Life-Force, however, turns him into the demoniac “Un-Man.” The Un-man, or what used to be Weston, encourages the Green Lady to sleep on the fixed lands and ignore Maleldil’s instruction. Witnessing the scene of temptation, Ransom realizes that his own mission is to prevent Perelandra from the Fall. After a lengthy struggle, Ransom finally wins the battle against Weston. He sees that the king and queen of Perelandra are blessed by the two Oyéresu of Mars and Venus. Spared from the Fall, Perelandra is reborn as a new utopia thanks to Ransom’s contribution. After completing his mission, Ransom is allowed to return to Earth.

Although Weston’s characterization has a certain development in these two works, some critics analyze the antagonists of the trilogy from a negative perspective. David C. Downing and Doris T. Myers share a similar idea regarding Lewis’s antagonist in the trilogy. Downing thinks that Weston and Devine are, along with the other antagonists in the trilogy, undeveloped and oversimplified:

No aspect of the trilogy has attracted more negative commentary than Lewis’s portrayal of his bad characters. Let it be admitted at the outset that his villains

are two-dimensional; most of them can be described in a single phrase, and they show no capacity for moral growth or change. Weston is a ruthless visionary; Devine is a cynical opportunist [...] It is also clear that Lewis's good characters are generally associated with Christianity and with the humanities and that his evil characters are associated with modernism, in its various forms, and with the sciences." (*Planets in Peril* 84)

Doris T. Myers has also claimed that "It might be argued that in making Ransom so unmistakably good and his captors so evil Lewis has eliminated moral complexity from his story" (*C. S. Lewis in Context* 43). Jerry Root, on the contrary, has suggested that the contrast of good and bad characters is Lewis's method of highlighting the rhetoric of objectivism and subjectivism (215). In terms of their evilness, Sanford Schwartz particularly focuses on their imperialist motivation, European supremacy, and legitimation of domination, which reflect historical and political context (22). Although the researchers are divided in their opinions, they seem to agree that Lewis's science fictions are built on a dualistic framework owing to Weston and Devine's pure evilness.

It is possible to claim that Weston is indeed described as a simplified antagonist because his characterization emphasizes the dualistic universe of Good and Evil. Weston's intention to conquer the planet and eventually the universe shows that he is one of Lewis's typical antagonists, who turn their back on everything related to Goodness, fight against God, and are fundamentally debunked, neutralized, and nullified in the end. In terms of Weston's worship for science, Lewis was concerned about scientific progress possibly going against Christian faith. In a letter addressed to Sister Penelope on August 9, 1939, Lewis clearly states that scientific discovery and progress could be a dangerous enemy to Christianity as follows:

What set me about writing the book [*Out of the Silent Planet*] was the discovery that a pupil of mine took all that dream of interplanetary colonization quite seriously, and the realization that thousands of people in one form or another depend on some hope of perpetuating and improving the human race for the whole

meaning of the universe – that a “scientific” hope of defeating death is a real rival to Christianity. (qtd. in Green and Hooper 188)

Lewis considered scientific progress with the intent of defeating death against the Christian doctrines. Assuming that the conflict between Christianity and science is built on the foundation of the Dualism of Good and Evil, Weston’s scientific idealism is portrayed as Evil, which is to be collapsed in the end. Indeed, in *Out of the Silent Planet*, Weston’s “scientism” makes him violate God’s forbidden domain, without him realizing that it is an act of confrontation against God; however, the conflict between God and Weston is easily collapsed in *Perelandra* because of Weston’s worship of the Life-Force, which eventually deprives him of his humanity and turns him into the “Un-man.” This chapter, therefore, mainly discusses Weston as one of the Lewisian antagonists by focusing on his three passions: scientism, planetary colonization, and the Life-Force (Emergent Evolution).

This chapter comprises four sections. Examining the historical background of the genre of science fiction, the first section focuses on the development of Lewis’s science fiction trilogy, especially his position as a Christian science fiction writer. The second section discusses the characterization of Weston, particularly his science-centered ideology called scientism. The third section elucidates how Weston’s planetary colonization makes him challenge God. The final section investigates the nullification of Evil from the representation of Weston’s worship of the Life-Force and Emergent Evolution, which turns him into the “Un-man.”

1. The Origin of Weston:

Lewis as an Anti-Scientific Science Fiction Writer

Lewis's combination of Christian doctrine and science makes him a unique science fiction writer. While many science fiction writers praise progress, technology, and civilization, Lewis dares to portray humankind's worship of progress as wrong and misguided. Before analyzing the characterization of Weston in particular, this section mainly studies Lewis's position as a Christian science fiction writer. To begin with, this section studies the background of science fiction as a genre from the end of the eighteenth century to the early twentieth century. After exploring the background of the trilogy, Lewis's admiration of science fiction as a promising genre is examined, with particular focus on his praise for David Lindsay's *A Voyage to Arcturus*. Finally, this section analyzes the feature of Lewis's science fiction: his negative view of the modern concept of "progress" from his Christian perspective.

Science fiction has been developing since the end of the eighteenth century. Before the emergence of science, ancient people used to regard the future as the continuation of the present. After the rise of Darwinism, which claims that human beings develop from the lower to the higher, the idea of the future became completely isolated from the past and present. The blueprint of the new concept of the future consolidated the foundation of science fiction (Scholes and Rabkin 6-7). The origin of science fiction is considered to be Mary Shelley's 1818 work, *Frankenstein* (Scholes and Rabkin 6). The era of scientific discovery and technical innovation gradually followed the publication of this novel. H. G. Wells inherited Shelley's legacy and became one of the most influential science fiction writers in history (Scholes and Rabkin 15). Inspired by Wells, a considerable number of writers both in Europe and the U. S. embarked on this genre from around the 1920s to the 1930s. In Europe, the rise of fascism in Germany and Italy caused the intellectuals to write a new type of science fiction, anti-utopian or dystopian novels such as Karel Čapek's *War with the Newts* (1936) and Yevgeny

Zamyatin's *We* (1924) (Scholes and Rabkin 26-31). Furthermore, in the United States, certain magazines for the masses developed to meet the demands of the young (Scholes and Rabkin 75). In 1923, Hugo Gernsback coined the term "scientifiction," the predecessor of science fiction (Scholes and Rabkin 36-37).

Although Lewis considered what Gernsback called "scientifiction" detestable in the earlier days, he later admitted science fiction as a prominent new genre. After this genre improved greatly, Lewis started to defend science fiction saying, "[...] some science fiction really does deal with issues far more serious than those realistic fiction deals with; real problems about human destiny and so on" ("Unreal Estates" *OOW* 139). As a defender of science fiction, he claimed that a certain kind of science fiction "represents simply an imaginative impulse as old as the human race working under the special conditions of our own time" ("On Science Fiction" *OOW* 107). These quotations indicate that Lewis regarded science fiction as a genre revealing the truth ingrained in the human mind. Pseudo-scientific or even supernatural apparatus can be employed to reveal truth in science fiction because it merely serves as a machine ("On Science Fiction" *OOW* 108). This is the reason Lewis did not highlight the articulacy of scientific knowledge but its "flavours" provided by the story; for example, Lewis puts the Martian canal in *Malacandra* because the "flavours" given by the novel were more important than scientific articulacy: "When I myself put canals on Mars I believe I already knew that better telescopes had dissipated that old optical delusion. The point was that they were part of the Martian myth as it already existed in the common mind" ("On Science Fiction" *OOW* 109). Lewis also explains that an unrealistic canal in the novel complies with the conventional recognition of Mars: "The canals in Mars are there not because I believe in them but because they are part of the popular tradition" ("A Reply to Professor Haldane" *OOW* 120). Such emphasis on the unrealistic Martian canal shows that Lewis's science fiction trilogy is closer to fantasy. As a science fiction writer, Lewis demonstrates scientific authenticity as less important than what mind can conceive as awe, wonder, and beauty.

Lewis's science fiction trilogy, characterized by the protagonist's adventures to strange planets with fantastic visions, is clearly influenced by David Lindsay's *A Voyage to Arcturus* (1920), a combination of science fiction and mythopoetic literature. The story of *A Voyage to Arcturus* begins with Maskull and Nightspore attending a séance. As an apparition appears, a man named Krag arrives to strangle it. Krag invites Maskull and Nightspore to visit Tormance, a planet orbiting Arcturus. After setting off from an observatory, Maskull finds himself in Tormance alone. He sees various people who end up dying after meetings. Maskull himself dies at the end of the novel as he realizes that he himself is Nightspore. This strange novel is considered to broaden the range of science fiction into myth by exploiting fantasy (Scholes and Rabkin 212). Lewis seemingly read *A Voyage to Arcturus* in 1935 (Hooper 205). Being an avid reader of Lindsay's novel, he called it "shattering, intolerable, and irresistible work" ("On Science Fiction" *OOW* 112). He also says that Lindsay properly describes the first journey to a completely new planet: "It's a remarkable thing, because scientifically it's nonsense, the style is appalling, and yet this ghastly vision comes through" ("Unreal Estates" *OOW* 139). Considering his statements, *A Voyage to Arcturus* is possibly the embodiment of Lewis's ideal science fiction novel. As Lewis declares, science fiction that offers us the "flavours" of a story is closer to fantastic or mythopoetic literature ("On Science Fiction" *OOW* 109). Lewis believed that these fictions not only provide ever-lasting pleasures but also widen our life experiences:

If good novels are comments on life, good stories of this sort (which are very much rarer) are actual additions to life; they give, like certain rare dreams, sensations we never had before, and enlarge our conception of the range of possible experience. ("On Science Fiction" *OOW* 111)

Lewis's purpose of writing science fiction is revealed by these statements: science fiction does not serve to encourage or admire the scientific progress of the human race but to awaken imaginative experiences in the readers' mind.

Lewis's negative perspective of humankind's progress is one of his distinctive

features as a science fiction writer. On December 4, 1962, Lewis had an informal conversation about science fiction with Kingsley Amis and Brian Aldiss in his room at Magdalene College, Cambridge.²¹ During the conversation, Lewis implied that his achievement as a science fiction writer is to indicate the presumptuousness of the human race: “[...] most of the earlier stories start from the opposite assumption that we, the human race, are in the right, and everything else is ogres. I may have done a little towards altering that” (“Unreal Estates” *OOW* 142). In response to Amis’s comment that recent science fiction novels were becoming “terribly self-critical and self-contemplatory,” Lewis said, “This is surely an enormous gain – a human gain, that people should be thinking that way” (“Unreal Estates” *OOW* 142). As Lewis stresses in this conversation, it used to be common amongst many science fiction writers to represent aliens as monstrous to justify the human invasion and colonization of their realm. Lewis’s trilogy, which depicts humanity as unworthy of their mastership, is different in this aspect. Lewis regarded this subversion as his small contribution to this genre:

It was in part these reflections that first moved me to make my own small contributions to science fiction. In those days writers in that genre almost automatically represented the inhabitants of other worlds as monsters and the terrestrial invaders as good. Since then the opposite set-up has become fairly common. If I could believe that I had in any degree contributed to this change, I should be a proud man. (“The Seeing Eye” *CR* 214)

As Lewis is regarded as a champion of the anti-science-fiction movement by some researchers (Scholes and Rabkin 43), it is no exaggeration to say that his trilogy had a great impact on the history of science fiction. By writing a science fiction trilogy without admiring science, Lewis relegated humankind’s status to remind the readers of the fact that we are all fallen creatures.

Lewis disagrees with progress of humankind’s because Lewis’s idea of “progress” and its modern conception differs in terms of definition. According to Lewis, “progress” is regarded in modern society as “a simple, unilinear movement from worse to better –

what is called a belief in Progress – so that any given generation is always in all respects wiser than all previous generations” (“Why I Am Not a Pacifist” *WG* 81-82). The idea of progress in this sentence implies the inferiority of past generations and superiority of contemporary and future generations. Lewis states that progress should be defined as movements toward “increasing goodness and happiness of individual lives” (“Is Progress Possible?” *GID* 347). The following extract plainly demonstrates Lewis’s conception of “progress”:

We all want progress. But progress means getting nearer to the place where you want to be. And if you have taken a wrong turning, then to go forward does not get you any nearer. If you are on the wrong road, progress means doing an about-turn and walking back to the right road; and in that case, the man who turns back soonest is the most progressive man. We have all seen this when doing arithmetic. When I have started a sum the wrong way, the sooner I admit this and go back and start again, the faster I shall get on. There is nothing progressive about being pig headed and refusing to admit a mistake. And I think if you look at the present state of the world, it is pretty plain that humanity has been making some big mistake. We are on the wrong road. And if that is so, we must go back. Going back is the quickest way on. (*MC* 28-29)

Lewis points out that to continue progressing on the wrong road does not lead humankind to goodness. To undo progress is sometimes the fastest way to reach their goal. This idea is also highlighted in the preface of *The Great Divorce*:

I do not think that all who choose wrong roads perish; but their rescue consists in being put back on the right road. A sum can be put right: but only by going back till you find the error and working it afresh from that point, never by simply *going on*. Evil can be undone, but it cannot ‘develop’ into good. Time does not heal it. (viii)

Lewis’s concern that the Darwinian conception of progress might not lead humans to goodness is evident in these quotations. In a sense, the modern idea of “progress” is

rejected in his science fiction trilogy as it makes humanity turn from Good.

In short, Lewis is a science fiction writer who awakens one's mind as a fallen creature, unworthy of domination, colonization, and rulership. In contrast to the optimistic descriptions of humanity in the science fictions of the time, Lewis portrays the human race as barbaric, uncivilized, and ignorant, while aliens are depicted as cultured, civilized, and innocent. Lewis's challenging representations of humans and other creatures, which imply the Christian doctrine of depravity, distinguish his science fiction trilogy from any other science fiction novel. As Lewis himself admitted, his rejection of scientific progress is embodied by the character Weston, the main antagonist of *Out of the Silent Planet* and *Perelandra*.

2. Weston and "Scientism"

As mentioned in the first section, Lewis admitted that his contribution as a science fiction writer is to debunk human superiority in science fiction in the age of scientific progress. One enemy that reveals his concept is a scientist named Weston. Strictly speaking, Lewis's intention is not to attack scientists but to show the hollowness of Weston's "scientism": "It was against this outlook [of 'scientism'] on life, this ethic, if you will, that I wrote my satiric fantasy, projecting in my Weston a buffoon-villain image of the 'metabiological' heresy" ("A Reply to Professor Haldane" *OOW* 122). This extract clearly shows that Lewis attempted to offer a new perspective to this genre through Weston's lack of ethics and morality. In order to describe the characterization of Evil in the two works, this section mostly discusses the representation of Weston and his "scientism." This section first pursues Lewis's conception of the conflict of science and Christianity through his various Christian writings. Following this, the definition of "scientism" in *Out of the Silent Planet* is investigated, largely focusing on its justification of violence. Finally, this section indicates Lewis's intention to highlight the danger of progress and civilization without Goodness.

In analyzing Weston's "scientism," it is important to note that Lewis does not claim that science and Christianity conflict with each other. In *The Screwtape Letters*, the senior devil Screwtape indicates that science can sometimes verify reality: "Above all, do not attempt to use science (I mean, real sciences) as a defence against Christianity. They will positively encourage him to think about realities he can't touch and see. There have been sad cases among the modern physicist" (*SL* 4). Screwtape's advice suggests that science could be a portal to recognize the divine truth. Science, according to Lewis, studies Nature, and it cannot study "outside" Nature ("Religion and Science" *GID* 67). Since Nature and humankind are both products of God, it is impossible to search for God in Nature since God is the inventor of Nature: "To look for Him as one item within the framework which He Himself invented is nonsensical" ("The Seeing Eye" *CR* 208). This is the reason Lewis strongly opposed J. B. S. Haldane, a famous biochemist and biologist who severely criticized Lewis's trilogy. Haldane published a review of Lewis's trilogy entitled "Auld Hornie F. R. S." in the *Modern Quarterly* in 1946, in which he regarded Lewis's trilogy as an attack against science and scientists. Lewis, on the other hand, states in an unpublished essay "A Reply to Professor Haldane" that what he censures is not scientists but "scientism":

It certainly is an attack, if not on scientists, yet on something which might be called 'scientism' – a certain outlook on the world which is casually connected with the popularisation of the sciences, though it is much less common among real scientists than among their readers. (*OOW* 121)

As Lewis describes, by prioritizing the pursuit of the biological development of the human race, humans disregard faith, humility, and obedience toward God; in other words, "scientism" is indeed against Christianity because it prioritizes humans over God.

Weston is a scientist who advocates "scientism" in *Out of the Silent Planet*. In "A Reply to Professor Haldane," Lewis defines "scientism" as follows:

It is, in a word, the belief that the supreme moral end is the perpetuation of our own species, and that this is to be pursued even if, in the process of being fitted

for survival, our species has to be stripped of all those things for which we value it – of pity, of happiness, and of freedom. (*OOW* 121)

“Scientism,” according to Lewis, is a belief that the protection and preservation of scientific progress have priority over everything. In *Out of the Silent Planet*, Weston brings Ransom, a fellow Englishman, to Malacandra as a sacrifice based on this science-centered ideology transcending ethics and morality. The following statement made by Weston when he kidnaps Ransom encapsulates Lewis’s concept of “scientism”:

‘[...] My own defence is that small claims must give way to great. As far as we know, we are doing what has never been done in the history of man, perhaps never in the history of the universe. We have learned how to jump off the speck of matter on which our species began; infinity, and therefore perhaps eternity, is being put into the hands of the human race. You [Ransom] cannot be so small-minded as to think that the rights or the life of an individual or of a million individuals are of the slightest importance in comparison with this.’ (*OSP* 27-28)

Weston believes that human ethics, happiness, and freedom can be neglected for the advancement of science. Weston believes that scientific progress should be protected by all means, even if it requires Ransom’s life. It is obvious that Weston, especially considering his statements and acts, embodies Lewis’s definition of “scientism.”

Moreover, Weston’s “scientism” justifies violence and cruelty toward others. Weston and Devine, believing all the inhabitants in Malacandra to be inferior and uncivilized, kill Hyoui with a rifle, a “civilised” weapon: “At that moment Ransom was deafened by a loud sound – a perfectly familiar sound which was the last thing he expected to hear. It was a terrestrial, human and civilised sound; it was even European. It was the crack of an English rifle [...]” (*OSP* 101). This scene depicts the process of Ransom’s perception following the sound of the rifle, as he gradually acknowledges the identity of the owner of the rifle in the order of terrestrial being, human, European, and English. Similar to how the Europeans owned, enslaved, and killed natives in the age of European Imperialism, Weston and Devine murder one of the inhabitants in another

planet without hesitation. This scene not only reveals Weston and Devine making the same mistakes as the Europeans of the past but also nullifies science and civilization. By making a “civilised” weapon barbaric and lethal, Lewis deprives those supposedly “civilised” people, Weston and Devine, of the façade of being civilized. In effect, their violence, cruelty, and murder suggested in this scene fundamentally dismantle and neutralize civilization, science, and progress.

Considering his conception of “scientism” presented above, Lewis seems to condemn science, civilization, and progress as lacking roots of Goodness. As a Christian, Lewis thinks that if we make civilization our supreme aim, we will lose not only what is outside of civilization, but also civilization itself:

Peace, a high standard of life, hygiene, transport, science and amusement – all these, which are what we usually mean by civilization, have been our ends. It will be replied that our concern for civilization is very natural and very necessary at a time when civilization is so imperilled. But how if the shoe is on the other foot? – how if civilization has been imperilled precisely by the fact that we have all made civilization our *summum bonum*? Perhaps it can’t be preserved in that way. Perhaps civilization will never be safe until we care for something else more than we care for it. (“First and Second Things” *GID* 310-11)

While he is not at all disdainful of civilization, Lewis is concerned that civilization itself is in danger because of the priority granted to it. It is necessary to search for something more important than civilization: “[...] we shall never save civilisation as long as civilisation is our main object. We must learn to want something else even more” (*MC* 134-35). Lewis also clarifies that something other than civilization refers to God, glory, personal honor, doctrinal purity, and justice (“First and Second Things” *GID* 311). Civilization, according to Lewis, should be preserved by people who care about those factors:

Those who care for something else more than civilisation are the only people by whom civilisation is at all likely to be preserved. Those who want Heaven most

have served Earth best. Those who love Man less than God do most for Man.
 (“On Living in an Atomic Age” *PRCON* 101)

As can be seen, since civilization can only develop based on morality, faith, justice, and whatever else is connected to Goodness, civilization without these aspects could easily destroy civilization itself. Considering these factors, *Out of the Silent Planet* demonstrates the process of Weston’s “scientism” being demolished by his own obsession with the sciences.

3. God vs. Weston: Weston’s Planetary Colonization

Weston’s “scientism” justifies one of his ambitious projects: planetary colonization. Weston clearly acknowledges the superiority of Earth over the other planets because of which he thinks it his right to colonize, dominate, and exploit other planets. Although some science fiction writers, such as Arthur C. Clarke, were unhappy about this view, Weston’s domination of other planets is demonstrated as a violation of “God’s quarantine regulations.”²² It can be said that Weston unknowingly becomes an opponent of God by his imperialist ambition. In examining the dualistic framework in the trilogy, this section clarifies how Weston’s imperialistic plan for planetary colonization makes him an enemy of God. First, this section reveals Lewis’s attitude toward imperialism in general. Second, Weston’s attitude of superiority toward the inhabitants in Malacandra is explored. Third, this section argues that Weston’s ambition of planetary colonization challenging “God’s quarantine regulations” exposes a dualistic conflict between God and Weston.

As a Christian, Lewis feared that planetary colonization, or any act of scientific invasion of another planet, would repeat the European colonialism of the past. Lewis’s attitude towards British Imperialism, for example, can be seen in his Christian apologetic work, *The Four Loves*:

If our nation is really so much better than others it may be held to have either the duties or the rights of a superior being towards them. In the nineteenth century

the English became very conscious of such duties: the “white man’s burden.” What we called *natives* were our wards and we their self-appointed guardians. This was not all hypocrisy. We did do them some good. But our habit of talking as if England’s motive for acquiring an empire (or any youngster’s motives for seeking a job in the Indian Civil Service) had been mainly altruistic nauseated the world. And yet this showed the sense of superiority working at its best. Some nations who have also felt it have stressed the rights not the duties. To them, some foreigners were so bad that one had the right to exterminate them. Others, fitted only to be hewers of wood and drawers of water to the chosen people, had better be made to get on with their hewing and drawing. “Dogs, know your betters.” (33)

Although Lewis discusses patriotism in this chapter, what can be discerned in this extract is Lewis’s accusation against British superiority over the natives in the past. As the British people used to exercise their right as if it were naturally given, Weston similarly claims his right over the inhabitants of Malacandra; in a sense, Lewis presents in his science fiction that the sins of the past would be repeated in the guise of progress, science, and technology. In addition to the quotation above, the relation between planetary colonization and European imperialism is suggested as follows:

We know what our race does to strangers. Man destroys or enslaves every species he can. Civilised man murders, enslaves, cheats, and corrupts savage man. Even inanimate nature he turns into dust bowls and slag-heaps. There are individuals who don’t. But they are not the sort who are likely to be our pioneers in space. Our ambassador to new worlds will be the needy and greedy adventurer or the ruthless technical expert. They will do as their kind has always done. What that will be if they meet things weaker than themselves, the black man and the red man can tell. If they meet things stronger, they will be, very properly, destroyed. [...] I therefore fear the practical, not theoretical, problems which will arise if ever we meet rational creatures which are not human. Against

them we shall, if we can, commit all the crimes we have already committed against creatures certainly human but differing from us in features and pigmentation. (“Religion and Rocketry” *WLN* 94-95)

Lewis’s conviction that the sins of the “civilized” people of the past will lead them to the sins of the future is displayed in this paragraph. In light of Lewis’s writings presented above, the scene of Weston killing Hyoui not only reminds the readers of the Western colonialism of the past but also implies a warning for future generations. Grounded in Christian belief, Lewis evinces that the sins that could possibly be committed in the future are implied by the sins committed in the past.

Weston’s ambition of planetary colonization is indeed driven by what Lewis is concerned about, as shown above: superiority over the natives in other planets. Believing that human civilization is proof of humankind’s superiority over all the other species in the universe, Weston thinks that humans are given the right to rule the universe. Weston’s imperialist statement is succinctly described in the following sentences:

‘Your tribal life with its stone-age weapons and beehive huts, its primitive coracles and elementary social structure, has nothing to compare with our civilization – with our science, medicine and law, our armies, our architecture, our commerce, and our transport system which is rapidly annihilating space and time.

Our right to supersede you is the right of the higher over the lower.’ (*OSP* 173)

Weston considers the inhabitants of Malacandra inferior, stupid, and superstitious, and claims that humans on Earth have better qualities. In fact, Weston thinks that he is even more cultured, well-educated, and civilized than Oyarsa, the greatest of the Eldil. When Weston hears Oyarsa’s voice, which seems to echo strangely, he thinks it is merely “ventriloquism,” which is “[q]uite common among savages” (*OSP* 161). Owing to his shallow mind, Weston fails to conceive the divine power, which is misunderstood merely as a savage method. Instead, they show off their cheap necklaces to claim that they are better than the uncivilized inhabitants in Malacandra (*OSP* 163). In the end, Weston and Devine give up because they think those creatures are too simple to understand any of

this: “‘It *doesn't* seem to be working,’ admitted Weston, ‘and I’m inclined to think they have even less intelligence than we supposed’” (*OSP* 164). As far as Weston can see, civilization grants humankind the privilege to rule all the unintelligent and uncultured creatures of the other planets. Weston’s ambition of planetary colonization, therefore, shows humanity’s pride to go beyond its own position as a mere creature.

Weston’s ambition of planetary colonization portrays him as one of the Lewisian antagonists. In the sequel, *Perelandra*, Ransom retrospectively describes Weston as an ambitious scientist as follows:

But his chief captor, Professor Weston, had meant plenty of harm. He was a man obsessed with the idea which is at this moment circulating all over our planet in obscure works of “scientification,” in little Interplanetary Societies and Rocketry Clubs, and between the covers of monstrous magazines, ignored or mocked by the intellectuals, but ready, if ever the power is put into its hands, to open a new chapter of misery for the universe. It is the idea that humanity, having now sufficiently corrupted the planet where it arose, must at all costs contrive to seed itself over a larger area: that the vast astronomical distances which are God’s quarantine regulations, must somehow be overcome. This is for a start. But beyond this lies the sweet poison of the false infinite – the wild dream that planet after planet, system after system, in the end galaxy after galaxy, can be forced to sustain, everywhere and for ever, the sort of life which is contained in the loins of our own species – a dream begotten by the hatred of death upon the fear of true immortality, fondled in secret by thousands of ignorant men and hundreds who are not ignorant. The destruction or enslavement of other species in the universe, if such there are, is to these minds a welcome corollary. (97)

Ransom, criticizing real organizations, explains that Weston’s goal is planetary colonization, and ultimately, the perpetuation of humanity. The obstacle of distance between Earth and the other planets is referred to as “God’s quarantine regulation,” and it is also mentioned in Lewis’s other essay, in which he states, “I have wondered before

now whether the vast astronomical distances may not be God's quarantine precautions. They prevent the spiritual infection of a fallen species from spreading" ("Religion and Rocketry" *WLN* 96). God imposed a regulation in order to protect other species from the Fall. Hence, Weston's planetary colonization is an act of challenging God's quarantine regulations, and Weston can be described as a scientist who boldly challenges God. Therefore, Weston, who plans to colonize for the sake of humanity's perpetuation, is in conflict with God, as are the other Lewisian antagonists.

4. The "Un-Man": Weston's Belief in Emergent Evolution and the Life-Force

In *Perelandra*, Weston eventually becomes the "Un-man," the man who loses his humanity, owing to his worship of Emergent Evolution. When Weston is reunited with Ransom in *Perelandra*, he clarifies his position to Ransom stating, "I became a convinced believer in emergent evolution" (*PER* 108). Claiming that the Life-Force neutralizes the Dualism of God and the Devil, Weston is taken further down the path of Evil. Focusing on Weston's belief in the Life-Force and Emergent Evolution, the final section of this chapter clarifies that Weston is actually discredited in the framework of Dualism. To start, this section reveals an indication of Weston's worship of a Darwinian principle in *Out of the Silent Planet*. After the definition of Emergent Evolution is examined, this section turns to *Perelandra* to investigate Weston's belief in Emergent Evolution, which makes him reject the Dualism of Good and Evil. Finally, this section concludes with Weston's assimilation of God, the Devil, and Weston himself, which leads him to become the "Un-man," the nullification of man.

As is implied in *Out of the Silent Planet*, Weston is a Darwinian evolutionist who strongly believes in linear progress. He thinks that civilization is proof of humankind's superiority because it is the product of Life, which is "[...] greater than any system of morality; her claims are absolute. It is not by tribal taboos and copy-book maxims that she has pursued her relentless march from the amoeba to man and from man to civilisation"

(*OSP* 174). In Malacandra, Weston claims that Life is a biological engine that leads humankind to a civilized society. In fact, Weston's planetary colonialism, which is discussed in the previous section, is justified by the Darwinian principle, as the following excerpt reveals:

“It is in her right,” said Weston, “the right, or, if you will, the might of Life herself, that I am prepared without flinching to plant the flag of man on the soil of Malacandra: to march on, step by step, superseding, where necessary, the lower forms of life that we find, claiming planet after planet, system after system, till our posterity – whatever strange form and yet unguessed mentality they have assumed – dwell in the universe wherever the universe is habitable.” (*OSP* 175)

Life, according to Weston, is the driving force behind linear progress, which vindicates Weston's Imperialist ambition. Clearly, Weston's worship of Life, which legitimates his right to conquer the planet, can be seen even before Weston declares himself “a convinced believer of emergent evolution” in *Perelandra*.

Emergent evolution is a philosophical hypothesis that centers on the concept of the Life-Force. The term Emergent Evolution, or Creative Evolution, was espoused by French philosopher Henri Bergson (1859-1941). Bergson regarded the universe as a place where continuous creation is constantly being produced, and rejected the idea that God created the world all at once (Shinohara 22). In this evolutionary theory, he shows that the structural similarity of complex organs in diverse organisms is due to an evolutionary driving force called *Élan Vital* (Shinohara 76-77). The definition was understood by Lewis as follows: “People who hold this view [Emergent Evolution] say that the small variations by which life on this planet ‘evolved’ from the lowest forms to Man were not due to chance but to the ‘striving’ or ‘purposiveness’ of a Life-Force” (*MC* 26). Lewis regarded Bergson's idea of *Élan Vital* (which is rephrased as Life-Force) in Creative Evolution as a dangerous deification of Spirit (Downing *The Most Reluctant Convert* 126). According to his view, it is dangerous because the belief in Life-Force philosophy is a kind of “tame God,” a philosophy of wishful thinking that allows us to

enjoy the excitement that religion provides without paying the price for it (*MC* 26). Lewis occasionally mentions his view on Life-Force philosophy and Emergent Evolution theory. In *Miracles*, for example, Life-Force philosophy is represented as a form of Pantheism (133). The fundamental concept of Pantheism is expressed as “[God] animates the universe as you animate your body: that the universe almost *is* God, so that if it did not exist, He would not exist either, and anything you find in the universe is a part of God” (*MC* 37). As Lewis objects to the Pantheist’s assertion that everything, including evil, is providential, he affirms that the universe is merely God’s creation, which cannot be identified as God Himself.²³ Additionally, in *The Screwtape Letters*, there are some passages in which Screwtape says to his nephew Wormwood that Screwtape once tempted his Patient by employing Emergent Evolution: “Hence the encouragement we have given to all those schemes of thought such as Creative Evolution, Scientific Humanism, or Communism, which fix men’s affections on the Future, on the very core of temporality” (76). From Lewis’s point of view, Life-Force and Emergent Evolution are, in fact, a doctrine strongly connected to Evil.

As a scientist espousing Emergent Evolution and the Life-Force, Weston has a particular understanding of Dualism. Since he believes that the Life-Force is most important and essential for humankind’s progress, Weston claims that the Dualism of God and the Devil is actually meaningless in the universe (*PER* 112), and that these are merely two aspects of the Life-Force:

“*Your* Devil and *your* God,” said Weston, “are both pictures of the same Force. Your heaven is a picture of the perfect spirituality ahead; your hell a picture of the urge or *nisus* which is driving us on to it from behind. Hence the static peace of the one and the fire and darkness of the other. The next stage of emergent evolution, beckoning us forward, is God; the transcended stage behind, ejecting us, is the Devil. Your own religion, after all, says that the devils are fallen angels.” (*PER* 112-13)

In this paragraph, another type of collapsed Dualism is shown. As has been clarified in

the Introduction and Chapter I of this dissertation, Lewis claims that God is not the opponent of the Devil as He is the source of his existence, and the opposition between Good and Evil, namely, between God and the Devil, cannot exist to begin with. On the other hand, in *Perelandra*, Weston denies the distinction between God and the Devil, relegating them to the background of humankind's progress. In fact, by saying that there is no difference between the two, Weston denies God as the Creator and solidifies the independence of the Devil. Hence, Weston's worship of Life-Force actually causes him to assimilate God and the Devil, Good and Evil.

Eventually, Weston, who attempts to deify the Life-Force and completely neutralizes God and the Devil, is ironically incorporated into the framework of Dualism. Having regarded God and the Devil as mere aspects of the Life-Force, Weston goes on to develop his theory that humans, the agent of progress, are both God and the Devil, as follows:

‘There is no possible distinction in concrete thought between me and the universe. In so far as I am the conductor of the central forward pressure of the universe, I am it. Do you see, you timid, scruple-mongering fool? I *am* the Universe. I, Weston, am your God and your Devil. I call that Force into me completely...’
(*PER* 115-16)

The boundary between God, the Devil, and Humankind (Weston) is blurred in the name of progress in this paragraph. Although those three are assimilated according to Weston, the only possible assimilation is the one of the Devil and Weston, which is brought by Weston's demoniac pride in assimilating himself with God. Thus, Weston's belief in Emergent Evolution and the Life-Force turns him into the “Un-man,” the pure evil, created by surrendering his body and soul to the Devil (*PER* 116). Weston, who becomes the “Un-man,” is now the embodiment of Evil:

It [Weston] did not defy goodness, it ignored it to the point of annihilation. Ransom perceived that he had never before seen anything but half-hearted and uneasy attempts at evil. This creature was whole-hearted. The extremity of its evil had passed beyond all struggle into some state which bore a horrible

similarity to innocence. (*PER* 135)

Weston's denial of Dualism, which is actually the assimilation of God, the Devil, and Humankind, leads him to abandon himself, to be incorporated into Evil in Dualism, and to be extinguished. By deifying human progress, Weston's dedication easily turns into demoniac self-worship, without goodness, honor, kindness, ethics, and morality; in short, he completely loses his own humanity. Thus, Weston's loss of humanity suggests that he, who is identified as a proud adversary of God, is literally disproved in the face of God.

Conclusion

To conclude, Weston is one of the Lewisian antagonists in terms of his "scientism," planetary colonization, and Life-Force (Emergent Evolution) in *Out of the Silent Planet* and *Perelandra*. Lewis's unique position as a science fiction writer allows him to characterize a scientist who pursues "scientism," namely, science lacking morality, ethics, and goodness. Even though Weston's "scientism" is debunked through the revelation of the contradiction of uncivilized civilization, which is embodied by a rifle killing an inhabitant in Malacandra, Weston claims his right to dominate planets, violating God's quarantine regulations. Weston, who challenges God, is considered an evil antagonist, as are Lewis's other adversaries of God. His worship of the Life-Force and Emergent Evolution eventually causes him to regard God and the Devil as merely some parts of humankind's progress from lower to higher. This makes him consider God, the Devil, and himself as equals, so he turns into the "Un-man," losing his final shred of humanity. In actuality, Weston is taking the same path as the Devil in his own way, regarding himself as independent from Goodness ("scientism"), challenging God (planetary colonization), and eventually worshipping his own self (Life-Force) to fall into nothingness. As a Christian science fiction writer, Lewis exposes the danger of belief in science, civilization, and progress without Divine Goodness.

**Chapter IV. The Homosexuals without “Chests”:
The Representation of N.I.C.E. in *That Hideous Strength***

This chapter examines a male-dominated exclusive society called N.I.C.E. (the National Institute for Co-ordinated Experiments) in Lewis’s *That Hideous Strength* (1945), the final novel of the science fiction trilogy.²⁴ This novel retells the biblical episode of the Tower of Babel in the modern era, combined with Arthurian legends and supernatural elements. Since it is heavily influenced by Charles Williams, this book is often described as “a Charles Williams novel by C. S. Lewis” (Hooper 231).²⁵ Following the previous chapters, which focus on political and scientific ideologies that challenge God’s omnipotence, this chapter mainly highlights the male-centeredness of the N.I.C.E. group.

It is important to understand the plot of *That Hideous Strength* as it is distinct from the other two volumes. Although it is certainly a sequel to *Out of the Silent Planet* and *Perelandra*, *That Hideous Strength* is not an interplanetary adventure to other planets. *That Hideous Strength* is set in Thulcandra, Earth. The protagonist is changed from Ransom to a young couple named Mark and Jane. Jane is a Ph.D. candidate who intends to pursue her career as a scholar of English Literature even after she is married to Mark. One day, she sees a vision of a man named Alcasan, whose head is twisted off his body. Realizing that the vision is real, Jane asks for help from Mrs. Dimble, who encourages her to visit Miss Ironwood at St. Anne’s. Mark, on the other hand, is a Fellow of Sociology at Bracton College. Obsessed with the idea of being in the “progressive element” in college, he happily accepts a job at N.I.C.E. offered by Lord Feverstone, who appeared as Dick Devine in *Out of the Silent Planet*. Mark sees John Wither, “Fairy” Hardcastle, Professor Filostrato, Mr. Straik, and the Head of N.I.C.E., the actual head of Alcasan. Assisted by “macrobes,” dark eldila that are actually devils, N.I.C.E. attempts to control humankind through scientific and biological methods. The aim of N.I.C.E. is to exhume the body of Merlin buried in Bragdon Wood, which is owned by Bracton

College, to gain his magic power. With the help of Ransom, who became the New Pendragon of Logres, Merlin wakes up to go to Belbury as an interpreter for the fake Merlin who attends the banquet. At the banquet, the curse of the Tower of Babel is loosened upon the members of N.I.C.E., and eventually all these members are murdered in a horrible manner.²⁶

Some critics discussed the problematic representation of the opposition between St. Annes and N.I.C.E. Kath Filmer has pointed out that Lewis's female characters are always stereotypically depicted: "As with many of his [Lewis's] arguments, he adopts a kind of 'either/or' position; they are either saints or sluts. There is no attempt to show women who are, perhaps, neither" (*The Fiction of C. S. Lewis* 88). Gretchen Bartels also regards the protagonist Jane's transformation from an independent woman to a domestic wife as problematic (332). While these feminist scholars' discussions often tend to fit the conflict of men and women into the framework of Good and Evil, Steven Elmore considers the contrast between N.I.C.E. and St. Anne's in terms of sexuality from a different perspective:

You see this most directly in the contrast between the positive sexuality at the end of the novel among the Fellowship of St. Anne's and the negatively portrayed sexual views of Filostrato, Hardastle, and Jules of the N.I.C.E., who respectively advocate a transcending of sex and the body completely, torture/extreme S&M, and a complete cultural openness regarding sex, which leads to both women and men becoming degraded and less than human. (118)

Based on the abovementioned excerpt, it seems more important to focus on sexuality, especially the positive and negative sexuality represented in the novel. Viewed in light of Elmore's argument, it is noteworthy that people in St. Anne's are heterosexual, while members of N.I.C.E. emphasize close and intimate relationships between the same sex. From Lewis's philosophical standpoint, homosexuality is considered to be employed as a symbol of the extreme state of "The Inner Ring," which demotes men to lose their "Chests." This chapter, therefore, aims to deepen the comparison of Good and Evil,

which is shown as that of heterosexuality and homosexuality.

This chapter comprises four sections. The first section explains the origin of N.I.C.E. by referring to *The Abolition of Man*, a series of Lewis's lectures on *Tao*. The second section investigates the nature of N.I.C.E. as an exclusive and homosexual community of "The Inner Ring." The third section examines the distinguished conflict between St. Anne's and N.I.C.E. in terms of the "Head." The final section reveals the fall of N.I.C.E., which completely nullifies their authority as "the Conditioner."

1. The Origin of N.I.C.E.:

Lewis's Three Lectures on Philosophy Compiled in *The Abolition of Man*

Before analyzing the representation of N.I.C.E., it is essential to delve into Lewis's *The Abolition of Man*, which is considered a philosophical commentary on *That Hideous Strength*. In the preface of *That Hideous Strength*, Lewis writes "[t]his is a 'tall story' about devilry, though it has behind it a serious 'point' which I have tried to make in my *Abolition of Man*" (THS ix). *The Abolition of Man*, subtitled as *Reflections on Education with Special Reference to the Teaching of English in the Upper Forms of Schools*, was published in 1943, two years before the publication of *That Hideous Strength*. It consists of Lewis's Riddell Memorial Lectures delivered at the University of Durham during the evenings of February 24, 25, and 26, 1943 (Hooper 329-30). *The Abolition of Man* consists of three lectures, entitled "Men without Chests," "The Way," and "The Abolition of Man." An examination of *The Abolition of Man* is essential because it mainly discusses the problem of Good and Evil as the backdrop of *That Hideous Strength*. This section, therefore, pursues the philosophical origin of N.I.C.E. by comparing these two works. The first three paragraphs summarize each chapter of *The Abolition of Man*. Subsequently, this section examines some scenes of *That Hideous Strength* to compare them with Lewis's statements in *The Abolitions of Man*.

The first lecture, named "Men without Chests," reveals that "Chests," which were

ignored by some educators, are in fact most important to men. In “Men without Chests,” Lewis begins his observation of an English textbook for “boys and girls in the upper forms of schools” (AOM 1). The actual title of this textbook is *The Control of Language*, and it is written by Alec King and Martin Ketley (Ward *After Humanity* 12). In order to conceal the writers’ names, Lewis refers to them as Gaius and Titius and to the book as *The Green Book*. The writers of *The Green Book*, who are also educators, claim that people admiring a waterfall by describing it as “sublime” rather than “pretty” do not actually describe the state of the waterfall but their own feelings. Regarding their opinions, Lewis argues that children who read these statements in *The Green Book* will be led to two conclusions: (1) any statements containing predicate of value are only about the speaker’s own emotions; (2) any type of this statement is meaningless and unimportant. According to Lewis, these educators are removing the possibility of certain experiences before children are old enough. The ultimate result of *The Green Book* is to make children think that human feelings, when encountering something like the waterfall, should be eradicated because they are contrary to Reason. Following the theories of Aristotle and Plato, Lewis avers that human feelings need to be trained in order to distinguish what gives true pleasure. What is important to distinguish them is *Tao*, which is “the doctrine of objective value, the belief that certain attitudes are really true, and others really false” (AOM 18). Although not all emotions and feelings are logical, it is possible for them to be in conformity with Reason. *The Green Book*, therefore, deprives children of what Plato calls “Chest,” namely, magnanimity and sentiment; in other words, it creates “Men without Chests.” To conclude this lecture, Lewis said that “Chest,” which is demoted in *The Green Book*, makes humans truly human:

The Chest-Magnanimity-Sentiment – these are the indispensable liaison officers between cerebral man and visceral man. It may even be said that it is by this middle element that man is man: for by his intellect he is mere spirit and by his appetite mere animal. (AOM 25)

As can be seen, this lecture sounds an alarm bell about “Chests” being disregarded as

unnecessary sentiments.

The second lecture, entitled “The Way,” describes the invalidity of ideologies espoused by humankind. In “The Way,” although Lewis continues to denounce *The Green Book* by declaring that this book would lead a society to destruction, he also says that the act of writing *The Green Book* itself implies that these educators were motivated not merely by their subjective values, but by objective values. They had a purpose to make our society better, and the book was unquestionable proof that they were driven by something outside themselves. Behind the practical principles of the innovators’ care about posterity, society, and species, there is *Tao*. Their care for humanity originates *Tao*, or traditional morality. Since *Tao* is the origin of all value judgments, it is impossible to create a new system of values from scratch:

The effort to refute it [*Tao*] and raise a new system of value in its place is self-contradictory. There has never been, and never will be, a radically new judgement of value in the history of the world. What purport to be new systems or (as they now call them) “ideologies,” all consist of fragments from the *Tao* itself, arbitrarily wrenched from their context in the whole and then swollen to madness in their isolation, yet still owing to the *Tao* and to it alone such validity as they possess. (*AOM* 43-44)

Ideologies, whatever they are, can exist as long as they depend on *Tao*. As Lewis explains, a new ideology against *Tao* is “a rebellion of the branches against the tree: if the rebels could succeed they would find that they had destroyed themselves” (*AOM* 44). As mentioned in Chapter I, the metaphor of tree and branch, which expresses the relationship of God and the Devil, Good and Evil, also explains the relationship of ideologies and *Tao*. Although *Tao* is a fixed standard, it does not mean that our objective value judgment based on *Tao* has never developed since the beginning of time. It has developed from Confucius to Jesus Christ within *Tao*; in a sense, only those who are inside *Tao* can modify the direction of humankind. People outside *Tao*, on the other hand, have no right to modify it. Simply put, Lewis’s lecture of “The Way” develops

the idea of philosophical absolutism, which regards *Tao* as the sovereign of the universe taking charge of the human mind. The ideologies espoused by humankind cannot be truly original, and they merely deny the origin of themselves by establishing a new one, as do devils who try to rebel against God within a dualistic conflict. Lewis's writings confirm that the basis of the relationship between *Tao* and ideologies is actually the one between Good and Evil.

"The Abolition of Man," Lewis's third lecture, cautions young people in the twentieth century against the modern idea of conquering Nature. To start the discussion, Lewis considers the problem of "Man's Conquest of Nature" (*AOM* 53). Lewis takes three examples of the conquest: the airplane, wireless, and contraceptive. Amongst these three examples, Lewis considers the contraceptive the most problematic because it rejects the existence of the future generation; in other words, humankind's power over Nature is essentially the power over other human beings, as he states "From this point of view, what we call Man's power over Nature turns out to be a power exercised by some men over other men with Nature as its instrument" (*AOM* 55). As he reveals that "Man's Conquest of Nature" is no less than some human's domination over others, Lewis predicts that the final stage of "Man's Conquest of Nature" is as follows:

The final stage is come when Man by eugenics, by pre-natal conditioning, and by an education and propaganda based on a perfect applied psychology, has obtained full control over himself. *Human* nature will be the last part of Nature to surrender to Man. (*AOM* 59)

The people who obtain full control of humans are called "the Conditioners" in Lewis's writings. They are disconnected from *Tao*, so Good and Bad hold no meaning for them as long as they believe these concepts are derived from themselves (*AOM* 63). In a way, by stepping outside *Tao*, they turn out to be artifacts rather than humans; in fact, the final stage of the Conquest of Nature turns out to be "the Abolition of Man" (*AOM* 64). By regarding *Tao* as a mere subjective product, humans lose the possibility of becoming true human beings (*AOM* 75). Hence, "The Abolition of Man" discusses that the domination

of Nature, Humans, and even God is justified by the sin of Pride, which makes humans forget their own status as God's creatures.

In view of Lewis's statements, the members of N.I.C.E. in *That Hideous Strength* are indeed described as "Men without Chests," stepping outside *Tao* to establish a new standard of value judgment. The following excerpt is taken from the scene in which Lord Feverstone, Dick Devine, belittles an elderly man called Canon Jewel at the college meeting:

At this moment Lord Feverstone sprang to his feet, folded his arms, and looking straight at the old man said in a very loud, clear voice:

"If Canon Jewel wishes us *not* to hear his views, I suggest that his end could be better attained by silence."

Jewel had been already an old man in the days before the first war when old men were treated with kindness, and he had never succeeded in getting used to the modern world. For a moment as he stood with his head thrust forward, people thought he was going to reply. Then quite suddenly he spread out his hands with a gesture of helplessness, shrunk back, and began laboriously to resume his chair.

(*THS* 23)

This scene emphasizes the contrast between the young, modern, and progressive Lord Feverstone and elderly, old-fashioned, and conservative Canon Jewel. Ambushed by Feverstone's sudden attack, Canon can do nothing but sit back in this scene. Lord Feverstone, who once helped Weston only for the sake of profit in *Out of the Silent Planet*, embodies a shallow-minded and superficial person without respect for others. The idea of treating an old person unkindly is considered an act out of *Tao*:

Those who know the *Tao* can hold that to call children delightful or old men venerable is not simply to record a psychological fact about our own parental or filial emotions at the moment, but to recognize a quality which *demand*s a certain response from us whether we make it or not. (*AOM* 18-19)

Lord Feverstone, as well as the other members of N.I.C.E., fails to recognize a certain

demand from something greater, dares to ignore objective values, and eventually puts himself outside *Tao*. Even though Feverstone lacks the right to do it, he claims that it is important for some men to take charge of other people: “Man has got to take charge of Man. That means, remember, that some men have got to take charge of the rest” (*THS* 44). This statement clearly reveals that Feverstone believes some men have the right to modify the direction of humankind. The method of leading humanity to prosperity and happiness is grounded in the conquest of Nature, such as “sterilisation of the unfit, liquidation of backward races [...], selective breeding,” and “real education, including pre-natal education” (*THS* 44). In reality, what N.I.C.E. does is control the human race for the sake of Good as per their own understanding. N.I.C.E. considers the concept of Good and Evil an arbitrary idea, grounded in philosophical relativism, and this prevents them from understanding the difference between Good and Evil. Their aim of the conquest of nature and humankind gradually makes them believe that it is possible to create God, so Straik insists, “Don’t you see [...] that we are offering you the unspeakable glory of being present at the creation of God Almighty?” (*THS* 241). In light of Lewis’s claim in *The Abolition of Man*, it becomes palpable that the members of N.I.C.E. are all “Men without Chests” who have abandoned *Tao* to control Nature, Humanity, and even God.²⁷

2. N.I.C.E., “The Inner Ring” of the Homosexuals

As the previous section explains, the purpose of N.I.C.E. is to control, select, and eventually murder other human beings. These Conditioners form a group in N.I.C.E. as they should be exclusive and separated from others. The exclusivism of N.I.C.E. implies its male-centeredness, particularly homosexual undertones, as Mark’s commitment to N.I.C.E. is strengthened both by his ambition to be a man in the know and his yearning for masculine allure. Since the intimate relationships between the members of N.I.C.E. seem to imply homosexuality rather than homosocial connections, this section explores the implicit meaning of the homosexuality of N.I.C.E. by focusing on its male characters and one female character, Fairy Hardcastle. First, in discussing the representation of N.I.C.E., this section shows that N.I.C.E. has some characteristics of “The Inner Ring.” Following this, Lewis’s explanation of homosexuality, a symbolical implication of “The Inner Ring,” is pursued. Lastly, this section analyzes the representation of the homosexual orientation of Fairy Hardcastle, the only woman in N.I.C.E.

It is important to note that N.I.C.E. is frequently depicted as “The Inner Ring” because of its exclusivism. Mark, who is certainly described as a vulgar and ostentatious person, is easily drawn into N.I.C.E. because he is a snob with a strong desire to join an exclusive group and be privy to its inner workings. Mark’s ambition is evident from his feelings when he joins Curry’s group before joining N.I.C.E.:

You would never have guessed from the tone of Studdock’s reply what intense pleasure he derived from Curry’s use of the pronoun “we.” So very recently he had been an outsider, watching the proceedings of what he then called “Curry and his gang” with awe and with little understanding, and making at College meetings short, nervous speeches which never influenced the course of events. Now he was inside and “Curry and his gang” had become “we” or “the Progressive Element in College.” It had all happened quite suddenly and was still sweet in

the mouth. (*THS* 7)

Mark is delighted that Curry uses the pronoun “we,” which undoubtedly includes Mark. He cannot help feeling superiority and pride when he becomes a member of “the Progressive Element in College,” a major group of the college. Mark’s spiritual defect implied in this paragraph is his wish to be a part of “The Inner Ring.”

As Lewis explains in an essay entitled “The Inner Ring,” “The Inner Ring” can be rephrased as “that gang,” “they,” “so-and-so and his set,” or “the Caucus” (*WG* 145). In his unfinished reply to J. B. S. Haldane, who once criticized Lewis’s science fiction trilogy, Lewis explicitly states that one’s desire to be a person in the know is criticized in *That Hideous Strength* as follows:

All men, of course, desire pleasure and safety. But all men also desire power and all men desire the mere sense of being “in the know” or the “inner ring,” of not being “outsiders”: a passion insufficiently studied and the chief theme of my story [*That Hideous Strength*]. (“A Reply to Professor Haldane” *OOW* 125)²⁸

Humankind’s passion for “The Inner Ring” is also shown in *The Screwtape Letters* as Screwtape writes “[t]he new circle in which he [the Patient] finds himself is one of which he is tempted to be proud for many reasons other than its Christianity” (*SL* 130). It can be noted that even a Christian community is considered a method of temptation for the Devil as long as it is regarded as “The Inner Ring.” Screwtape continues as follows: “The idea of belonging to an inner ring, of being in a secret, is very sweet to him” (*SL* 132). This sweetness of being part of a group in *The Screwtape Letters* reflects the sweetness Mark feels when Curry accepts him as one of his members. Owing to his attraction to “The Inner Ring,” Mark is easily drawn into one of the exclusive groups of N.I.C.E.

In relation with its exclusivism, the members of N.I.C.E. are described not merely as homosocial, but possibly homosexual. The symbol of N.I.C.E. is “a muscular male nude grasping a thunderbolt” (*THS* 293); this mythological symbol suggests that N.I.C.E. glorifies the power of the male body. The homosocial group’s praise for a beautiful and

strong man insinuates their desire for a close connection with the same sex. The scene in which Mark first rides in Feverstone's car implies that he even feels an aversion to women because of Feverstone's irresistible male attraction: "And what fine, male energy (Mark felt sick of women at the moment) revealed itself in the very gestures with which Feverstone settled himself at the wheel and put his elbow on the horn, and clasped his pipe firmly between his teeth!" (*THS* 54). Mark is already caught up in Feverstone's masculine charm in this scene. It is obvious that Mark is not fascinated by Feverstone's words, intelligence, or personality, but only his external elements of gesture and attitude. This indicates that members of N.I.C.E., who are supposedly gathered for the same purpose, are inclined to have a physical connection rather than a spiritual one. A similar depiction which evokes homosexuality is illustrated in the following quotation: "They [Frost and Wither] were now sitting so close together that their faces almost touched, as if they had been lovers about to kiss" (*THS* 332). The intimacy that characterizes "The Inner Ring" is transformed into a desire for same-sex bodies. Although Lewis indicates in his Christian apologetic work that homosexual desire is perversion (*MC* 89), the implication of homosexuality in *That Hideous Strength* must be regarded as a metaphor of the most negative aspect of "The Inner Ring": the further in you go, the further the truth goes away. Although the members of N.I.C.E. feel a sense of belonging that strengthens their relationships, their desire to enter the inner part of the group does not bring about the truth they are seeking. Their inward desire is eventually replaced by a physical, rather than spiritual, desire. Hence, the homosexual portrayal of N.I.C.E. is not merely an expression of Lewis's criticism of homosexuality but is a satire of "The Inner Ring" which preserves pride, narcissism, and self-love.

In addition to the homosexual allusions between men, there is a particular female member of N.I.C.E., Fairy Hardcastle, whose homosexual orientation has a different implication of cruelty and violence. As she is often described as "Miss Hardcastle," she is portrayed as a lesbian, unmarried, and masculine woman. Mark's impression of Miss Hardcastle vividly illustrates her unique appearances:

Mark found himself writhing from the stoker's or carter's hand-grip of a big woman in a black, short-skirted uniform. Despite a bust that would have done credit to a Victorian barmaid, she was rather thickly built than fat and her iron-grey hair was cropped short. Her face was square, stern and pale, and her voice deep. A smudge of lipstick laid on with violent inattention to the real shape of her mouth was her only concession to fashion and she rolled or chewed a long black cheroot, unlit, between her teeth. As she talked she had a habit of removing this, staring intently at the mixture of lipstick and saliva on its mangled end, and then replacing it more firmly than before. (*THS* 70-71)

As the description of her lipstick ignoring the shape of her lip symbolizes, Miss Hardcastle is deviant from the traditional concept of femininity. She prefers interaction with women as a man as "Miss Hardcastle behaved to them [girls] as if she were a man, and addressed them in tones of half-breezy, half ferocious, gallantry" (*THS* 122). By attaining masculinity, she achieves to become the only woman in the know; nevertheless, her masculine attitude, which allows her to transcend gender differences, leads her to violence, self-satisfaction, and cruelty. In the scene in which Jane meets Miss Hardcastle face to face, Miss Hardcastle is described as follows: "The face of the other woman [Hardcastle] affected her [Jane] as the face of some men – fat men with small greedy eyes and strange disquieting smiles – had affected her when she was in her teens" (*THS* 204). In her interrogation of Jane, Miss Hardcastle clearly employs masculinity as a tool to assault Jane; in a sense, her attained masculinity produces nothing but self-centered pleasure, lifelessness, and sterility. Therefore, Miss Hardcastle's sexual orientation metaphorically manifests the hollowness of "The Inner Ring."

To sum up, the homosexual references of N.I.C.E. in *That Hideous Strength* symbolize the ultimate state of "The Inner Ring." Homosexuality between men and women is depicted as a form of the desire to be part of the group. The desire to have a close relationship becomes a physical connection because the inward desire based on pride and narcissism can never attain truth. Moreover, Fairy Hardcastle's masculinity

and homosexual orientation indicate the barrenness of N.I.C.E. Although she becomes an essential member of N.I.C.E. by attaining masculinity, it is used as a tool to enslave and violate women. The homosexuality of N.I.C.E., therefore, demonstrates the result of humankind's sins, such as pride, self-love, and superiority, fostered in the exclusive community.

3. St. Anne's vs. N.I.C.E.: The Meaning of the "Head"

Considering the conflict between St. Anne's and N.I.C.E. presents the dualistic framework of Good and Evil, the opposite representations of the two forms of sexuality, heterosexuality and homosexuality, should be addressed. While the homosexual preference of N.I.C.E. results in barrenness, the married couples and male-female pairs of St. Anne's result in prosperity. The third section of this chapter mainly focuses on the heterosexual elements of St. Anne's to compare to homosexual elements of N.I.C.E. through the representation of the "Head." The first point this section highlights is the heterosexual preferences of St. Anne's, especially the depiction of Mr. Bultitude, the bear. The second point is the comparison of heterosexual couples in St. Anne's and homosexual preferences in N.I.C.E. in terms of the "Head." The third point is the problematic characterization of Jane, who is considered to be against God because she abandons her duty as a wife and mother.

Certain motifs of marriage and breeding are repeatedly alluded to in St. Anne's. For example, the scene in which the bear named Bultitude notices the presence of a female bear as well as food is deliberately inserted:

And the smells here were, on the whole, promising. He [Mr. Bultitude] perceived that food was in the neighbourhood and – more exciting still – a female of his own species. There were a great many other animals about too, apparently, but that was rather irrelevant than alarming. He decided to go and find both the female bear and the food; [...]" (*THS* 486)

Although the story of Mr. Bultitude is only a subplot in the novel, it is suggestive that Lewis dares to include Mrs. Bultitude in the story. In fact, Lewis even asked E. R. Eddison, the author of *The Worm Ouroboros* (1922), for advice on December 29, 1942, in order to introduce Mrs. Bultitude: “Sir, yf you knowe aught of the nuptiall practises and amorous carriages of beares, fayle not to let me knowe, for I haue brought in a beare in the book I now write and it shal to bedde at the end with the other” (*CL* vol. 2 543-44). Although the letter is written in a unique and old-fashioned style of mock Tudor English, Lewis seems to place great importance on the scene in which the male and female bears meet, as the phrase “nuptiall practises [nuptial practices]” indicates. Not only these bears, but also humans, such as Mr. and Mrs. Dimble, Mr. and Mrs. Maggs, and Mr. and Mrs. Denniston, appear as married couples, and Mr. MacPhee and Miss Ironwood, the only two unmarried people, are recommended to get married by Ransom: “If you two quarrel much more, [...] I think I’ll make you marry one another” (*THS* 272). Thus, the difference between men and women, or masculinity and femininity, is distinctively emphasized in the description of St. Anne’s.

The difference between the homosexuality of N.I.C.E. and heterosexuality of St. Anne’s becomes clear with their treatment of the “Head.” N.I.C.E., as mentioned earlier, is a group comprised exclusively of some men and a masculine woman. Since mothers and wives are absent, the intimacy between men develops into homosexual relationships. Their self-love, pride, and self-admiration lead them to praise the head of Alcasan, which is barely surviving through scientific and artificial methods. The community without women is incomplete, as is the “Head” without muscles, limbs, and other organs. In St. Anne’s, on the other hand, different roles are assigned to men and women; for example, Mrs. Dimble, known as “Mother Dimble” to the people in St. Anne’s, is a mother figure despite being “childless” (*THS* 24). She is portrayed as a mild-mannered, gentle, and motherly person: “And then, for a moment, Mrs. Dimble became simply a grown-up as grown-ups had been when one was a very small child: large, warm, soft objects to whom one ran with bruised knees or broken toys” (*THS* 26). As she is repeatedly referred to

as “Mrs. Dimble,” she serves her husband, as all the people in St. Anne’s regard Ransom as the leader. As Lewis states, male superiority, the idea of men being the “Head” in a community including the conjugal unit, is suggested by Christianity: “Christian wives promise to obey their husbands. In Christian marriage the man is said to be the ‘head’” (*MC* 112). By knowing one’s place, people in St. Anne’s make an organically united, single body.

These characterizations of N.I.C.E. and St. Anne’s imply that Jane, one of the protagonists, is portrayed as a woman who neglects her duty as wife and mother. Although Jane is married to Mark, she does not intend to have a child or become a mother because she is studying for her Ph.D. in English Literature: “She [Jane] had always intended to continue her own career as a scholar after she was married: that was one of the reasons why they were to have no children, at any rate for a long time yet” (*THS* 2). Jane refuses to be a devoted wife who supports her husband or a caring mother who gives birth to a child to prioritize her career. Merlin indirectly admonishes her for this decision: “[...] be assured that the child will never be born, for the hour of its begetting is passed. Of their own will they are barren” (*THS* 384). From Merlin’s point of view, Jane is a self-centered woman who wants to pursue her own career by not having children. The following quotation in Ransom’s words is often taken as a stark illustration of Lewis’s misogyny: “Go in obedience and you will find love. You will have no more dreams. Have children instead” (*THS* 530). Although Jane’s final resolution to live as a wife and mother is often denounced by scholars as incompatible with modern feminism, it is crucial to recognize that this view of womanhood reflects Lewis’s Christian ideal of marriage:

The Christian idea of marriage is based on Christ’s words that a man and wife are to be regarded as a single organism – for that is what the words “one flesh” would be in modern English. And the Christians believe that when He said this He was not expressing a sentiment but stating a fact – just as one is stating a fact when one says that a lock and its key are one mechanism, or that a violin and a bow are

one musical instrument. The inventor of the human machine was telling us that its two halves, the male and the female, were made to be combined together in pairs, not simply on the sexual level, but totally combined. (*MC* 104)

In light of the Christian conception of marriage as “one flesh,” Jane’s behavior in neglecting her family in pursuit of her career is an obstacle to the creation of “a single organism.” This is the reason Jane and Mark’s relationship is close to what Lewis calls a “business partnership” (*MC* 105), which could easily be dissolved. In a way, Jane’s conversion is achieved when she accepts her role as a woman within “one flesh.”

To summarize what is discussed above, St. Anne’s and N.I.C.E. contrast each other because heterosexuality in St. Anne’s creates a single community of “one flesh” and homosexuality in N.I.C.E. creates merely a “Head” without the body. In St. Anne’s, men and women fulfill different roles and form a Christian community. Jane, who never commits herself to her role as wife and mother, is criticized because she abandons her role as a woman to prioritize her own career. On the other hand, as symbolized by the unbalanced Head figure of Alcasan, N.I.C.E. is a male-centered community espousing Reason. As the N. I. C. E. members are men without Chests, the community sustained only by Reason is eventually demolished by its inner bestial Appetite.

4. The Abolition of N.I.C.E.

As explained in the previous sections, the members of N.I.C.E. abandon *Tao*, form an exclusive and masculine community cultivating self-love, and prove themselves an inorganic and un-Christian group admiring Reason, which is symbolized by a hideous head of Alcasan. Their destiny is foreshadowed by the epigraph of *That Hideous Strength*, taken from Sir David Lindsay’s *Ane Dialog*, which describes the Tower of Babel as “The Shadow of that hydeous strength / Sax mile and more it is of length” (*THS* v). As this biblical reference suggests, the confused and excited members of N.I.C.E. fall into chaos and kill each other by their own hands because their ideologies and plans challenge

God as does the Tower of Babel. In order to discuss the nullification of Evil, the final section of this chapter investigates the self-destruction of N.I.C.E. from the scenes of the banquet. The first part of this section examines the ultimate result of their stepping outside *Tao*: confusion of tongues. The second and third parts study the nullification of N.I.C.E., the members' loss of humanity, from the scenes of the murders.

The havoc of Belbury, which begins with confusion of tongues, is the catastrophic result of their will to go outside *Tao*. As the following example shows, a speech at the banquet at Belbury becomes words that make no sense: "For Jules seemed to be saying that the future of density of mankind depended on the implosion of the horses of Nature" (*THS* 477). In this sentence, "density" should be "destiny" and "horses" should be "forces." The meaningless combination of words nullifies their ideal of the conquest of humankind. Wither's speech, which follows this, also confuses the audience:

The Deputy Director [Wither] could not understand this, for to him his own voice seemed to be uttering the speech he had resolved to make. But the audience heard him saying, "Tidies and fogleman – I sheel foor that we all – er – most steeply rebut the defensible, though, I trust, lavatory, Aspasia which gleams to have selected our redeemed inspector this deceiving. It would – ah – be shark, very shark, from anyone's debenture..." (*THS* 480)

Obviously, these scenes reflect the Old Testament episode of the Tower of Babel. In the novel, however, the Tower is replaced by the selection and control of humans and the conquest of death (*THS* 237-38). As with the episode of the Tower of Babel, in which the construction of a tower reaching heaven causes confusion of language, their ambition to create a new order outside *Tao* hinders the communication that strengthens the bond of "The Inner Ring." As they forget they are creatures of God, scheme to become more powerful than any other person, and abandon the concept of Good and Evil, they lose their own humanity by overcoming their own human nature. In the end, they lose their own ideology and reduce themselves to nothing but animals.

The N.I.C.E. members' loss of humanity is reinforced by the murder of their fellow

human beings. The first murder committed at this banquet is Miss Hardcastle's murder of Jules: "There came an ear-splitting noise and after that, at last, a few seconds of dead silence. Mark noticed first that Jules had been killed: only secondly, that Miss Hardcastle had shot him" (*THS* 482). For the exclusive community, which once showed a tendency toward homosexuality, the loss of language raises suspicions and fears amongst them. Their exclusivism leads to the exclusion of the members, which eventually encourages them to murderous acts. Following the death of Jules, Filostrato, Wither, and Straik, unable to understand each other's language, go to meet the Head to avoid confusion. The Head, which has been animated by the dark Eldil, demands a head from the three so Wither and Straik murder Filostrato, who finally realizes that he underestimated the terror of being killed (*THS* 493-94). Wither and Straik notice that the Head is demanding another head so Wither captures Straik, who is fleeing from the scene, and kills him with a knife (*THS* 494). Having lost "Chests," they fail to feel remorse for killing their friends. As the killing of the N.I.C.E. members has an element of self-demolition, this scene can be said to depict demolition of Evil, whose very existence is a self-contradiction. Therefore, this scene depicts the dismantling of Evil, which proves by itself that its very existence is self-contradictory.

Their loss of humanity is also emphasized by the reversed hierarchy of humans and animals. Amidst the loss of tongues and the chaos of the banquet, the animals used for scientific experiments are unleashed. Elephants, tigers, snakes, and other animals overrun the humans. Steele's death is described as follows:

[...] monstrous, improbable, the huge shape of the elephant thrust its way into the room: its eyes enigmatic, its ears standing stiffly out like the devil's wings on each side of its head. It stood for a second with Steele writhing in the curl of its trunk and then dashed him to the floor. It trampled him. After it raised head and trunk again and brayed horribly; then plunged straight forward into the room, trumpeting and trampling – continuously trampling like a girl treading grapes, heavily and soon wetly tramping in a pash of blood and bones, of flesh, wine, fruit,

and sodden tablecloth. (*THS* 485-86)

In this scene, Steele is trampled to death by an elephant, which leaves his body in a state that is no longer in its original form. The remains of Steele's body as inorganic materials are highlighted; his body, blood, bones, and flesh are compared to a "grape" and juxtaposed with "wine," "fruit," and "tablecloth." The hierarchy of human and animal is completely overthrown, and these humans are nothing more than flesh, bone, and blood. The members of N.I.C.E., who once aimed to be more than human, become less than human by losing their "Chests" and eventually demote themselves to the status of inorganic objects.

In summary, some aspects of the Lewisian antagonists are displayed in the representation of the abolition of N.I.C.E. By losing the "Chests" that make them human, the members of N.I.C.E. are driven by instinctive fear and are eventually destroyed. While the aim of N.I.C.E. to overcome Nature, Humanity, and God can be described as a modern-day Tower of Babel, confusion of language loosens their strong bond of "The Inner Ring" and ultimately leads them to slaughter each other for Hobbesian self-preservation. As the corpse of one of the N.I.C.E. members is depicted not as human but a thing, their attempt to stand above humankind ends with their becoming beings lower than humans and animals. The members of N.I.C.E., who cannot organically unite with each other as "one flesh," as people in St. Anne's can, have no choice but to die as worthless individuals.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the framework of sexuality was investigated in order to demonstrate that N.I.C.E. in *That Hideous Strength* is a male group of Lewisian antagonists who aim to emulate God. In *The Abolition of Man*, a philosophical commentary on *That Hideous Strength*, it is implied that the members of N.I.C.E. are “the Conditioners” who try to conquer Nature, Humanity, and even God from outside *Tao*. In terms of sexuality, N.I.C.E. is a group mainly composed of men, while people in St. Anne’s are mostly couples; thus, the contrast of heterosexuality and homosexuality certainly fits in the framework of Good and Evil. The intimate connection between members of the same sex, especially the allure of the male body, symbolizes the hollowness of self-love within “The Inner Ring.” As they exclude femininity and women to preserve their homosexual preference, N.I.C.E. is not considered a Christian community like St. Anne’s, which is grounded in a firm hierarchy of men and women. Their self-love and self-deification lead them to confusion of tongues, murderous acts, and loss of humanity. Thus, the depiction of chaos and tragedy within N.I.C.E. at the end of the novel reveals the self-contradiction and self-demolition of Evil in the face of Good. In fact, since they are disconnected from God, they aim to control everything, worship themselves, and thus prove themselves to be Lewis’s examples of Evil overpowered by Good.

**Chapter V. Gender Interchangeability:
The Representation of the White Witch, Jadis,
in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* and *The Magician's Nephew***

This chapter focuses on the White Witch, Jadis, in *The Chronicles of Narnia*, a series of fantasy novels for children published in the 1950s.²⁹ The series consists of seven volumes: *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* (1950), *Prince Caspian* (1951), *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader* (1952), *The Silver Chair* (1953), *The Horse and His Boy* (1954), *The Magician's Nephew* (1955), and *The Last Battle* (1956). The White Witch, one of the most well-known antagonists in the series, appears as an antagonist in two works: *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* and *The Magician's Nephew*.³⁰ This section aims to prove that the White Witch is a symbol of gender interchangeability, which makes the difference between the two genders meaningless.³¹

In order to examine the representation of the White Witch in the two books, it is essential to summarize *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* and *The Magician's Nephew*. *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* is a story about four children, Peter, Susan, Edmund, and Lucy Pevensie. During the Nazi bombing attack, the Blitz, they are evacuated from London to the English countryside. There they find a magical wardrobe, which is a gateway to the kingdom called Narnia, a beautiful land populated by talking beasts and mythological creatures. This country is, however, under the control of the White Witch, who has cast a spell of perpetual winter over the nation. Many Narnian inhabitants who oppose her are transformed into stone statues. The Narnians welcome the Pevensie children because the prophecy says that the evil time will end when four humans sit on the thrones with the help of Aslan, the divine lion. Although Edmund, one of the Pevensie children, betrays his brother and sisters, Aslan sacrifices himself on the Stone Table to save Edmund. After Aslan's resurrection and the White Witch's defeat in the battlefield, peace and order are finally restored to Narnia.

The Magician's Nephew, set at the beginning of the 1900s, features young Professor

Kirk (Digory) from *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* and his friend Polly. They are sent to “The Wood between the Worlds” by Digory’s uncle, Andrew, a self-centered scientist. From this place, they enter the world of Charn, where they awaken the sleeping Queen Jadis, later known as the White Witch. She goes to the world from which Digory and Polly come in order to ruin it. Jadis arrives in London and causes a great commotion. Digory and Polly take her back to the Wood between the Worlds. From there, they witness the great Lion bring the world to life. As soon as Jadis sees it, she runs away. The Lion, Aslan, tells the animal inhabitants that Evil was brought to this young world, Narnia. To fulfill his responsibility for bringing Jadis into Narnia, Digory is ordered by Aslan to bring an apple from the garden. In the garden, he finds Jadis devouring the forbidden apples. Although she tempts Digory to take an apple for his sick mother, he adamantly refuses her and takes it back to Aslan. When he plants the apple in the ground, it quickly grows and becomes a tree. As Aslan allows him to take an apple from the tree, Digory brings it to his mother, and he plants its core in the garden. The tree in the garden is later cut down and turned into a wardrobe, which plays an important role in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*.

Unlike most of the antagonists who appear in only one book of the series, the White Witch is a rare antagonist who appears in two volumes. In an essay explaining his method of writing fiction, Lewis states that the characterization of the White Witch started developing when he conceived the idea of *The Chronicles of Narnia*:

Some people seem to think that I began by asking myself how I could say something about Christianity to children; then fixed on the fairy tale as an instrument; then collected information about child-psychology and decided what age-group I’d write for; then drew up a list of basic Christian truths and hammered out “allegories” to embody them. This is all pure moonshine. I couldn’t write in that way. Everything began with images; a faun carrying an umbrella, a queen on a sledge, a magnificent lion. At first there wasn’t even anything Christian about them; that element pushed itself in of its own accord. (“Sometimes Fairy

Stories May Say Best What's to Be Said" *OOW* 57)

As Lewis's explanations indicates, the story of Narnia begins with a vivid image of a faun, a lion, and a witch queen.³² The White Witch, therefore, is an essential antagonist to examine not only because she appears in more than one work but also because she can be defined as the cornerstone of Evil in the Dualism of Good and Evil in *The Chronicles of Narnia*.

As *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* clearly suggests the White Witch to be a descendant of Lilith, the first wife of Adam, studies on the relationship between the White Witch and Lilith have been conducted. Heather L. Blasdell, Glen Goodknight, and Meredith Price primarily discussed the symbolical meaning of Lilith in *The Chronicles of Narnia*. In the 2000s, especially around 2005, the year the film entitled *The Chronicles of Narnia: The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe* was released, the representation of the White Witch seemingly gained the attentions of researchers. Karin Fry, Jean E. Graham, and Cathy McSparran discussed the features of Lilith in the White Witch from a feminist perspective. It can be said that Lilith is treated as a symbol of Lewis's misogyny rather than a cultural representation. These arguments from the 2000s are often accepted as the basis for the claim that Lewis was a misogynist. Grasham, in particular, following the work of Kath Filmer, who points out that Lewis's misogyny is revealed throughout his novels, adopts a dualistic framework for his view of gender, saying that men are portrayed as good and women as evil in Lewis's literary works (32).

However, the White Witch, Jadis, has another literary ancestor with the same name, and that ancestor is rarely discussed in conjunction with the issue of the gender of the White Witch. "The Quest of Bleheris," an unfinished prose poem Lewis wrote as a teenager, features a man named Wan Jadis. Since it is incomplete and unpublished, research on "The Quest of Bleheris" is scarce. Although David C. Downing's "The Dungeon of his Soul: Lewis's Unfinished 'Quest of Bleheris'" and Don W. King's "C. S. Lewis's 'The Quest of Bleheris' as Prose Poetry" thoroughly investigate the poem, the relationship between Wan Jadis and Jadis could have been highlighted more. Although

the similarities between these two characters are seemingly few, they are considered symmetrical from the perspective of gender since Wan Jadis is feminine, while the White Witch is masculine. In other words, the act of trying to acquire the opposite gender by ignoring one's own sex may be portrayed as Evil in *The Chronicles of Narnia*. The name Jadis, therefore, functions not as a symbol of the fruition of Lewis's discrimination against the female gender, but as a symbol of the interchangeability of two different genders. This chapter discusses gender interchangeability, embodied by the White Witch, Jadis, as Evil, which is eventually neutralized and defeated by Aslan, a truly masculine figure.

This chapter consists of four sections. The first section discusses the representation of Wan Jadis in "The Quest of Bleheris" as the possible origin of the White Witch. The second section clarifies the impact of Lilith as the ancestor of the White Witch. Focusing on the White Witch's gender interchangeability, the third section contrasts the White Witch's totalitarian society and Aslan's ideal Christian community. The final section examines the White Witch's defeat, which suggests the resurrection of gender hierarchy.

1. The Origin of the White Witch, Jadis: Wan Jadis in "The Quest of Bleheris"

The White Witch in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* is identified as Jadis in *The Magician's Nephew*. As some critics have pointed out, the name Jadis is possibly taken from a character named Wan Jadis in Lewis's prose poem "The Quest of Bleheris," written when he was seventeen years old.³³ The name Wan Jadis consists of "pale" (Wan) with the French adjective "times of yore" (Jadis) (Downing "The Dungeon of His Soul" 50). Although Wan Jadis in the poem and Jadis in *The Chronicles of Narnia* seem to have nothing in common in terms of their appearance and personality, it should be noted that Jadis was originally a man's name, later appropriated for an evil woman in *The Chronicles of Narnia*. Focusing on one of the characters in Lewis's earliest prose poems as the basis of the White Witch, this section investigates the name Jadis as Lewis's symbol

of gender interchangeability. To start, the first part of this section examines the writing background of Lewis's "The Quest of Bleheris." Following the characterization of Wan Jadis, the subsequent parts of this section analyze the similarities between Wan Jadis and the White Witch, Jadis, from the perspective of gender. The final part focuses on Lewis's gender essentialism embedded in the two characters.

Amalgamating chivalric romance with Norse mythology, Lewis wrote "The Quest of Bleheris" in 1916 while studying at William T. Kirkpatrick's house. Lewis wrote it for his best friend, Arthur Greeves, who was his only reader at the time. The hero named Bleheris is a 23-year-old man who has lived his entire life in the City of Nesses. Before his marriage to "Alice the Saint," he feels that he has not yet seen the world and decides to go on a journey. Although there is an obvious root of *The Chronicles of Narnia* in this manuscript, Downing sees that it has a strong element of a spiritual journey, which Lewis did not complete because he had not yet returned to Christianity. Downing implies that Lewis could not complete it because his own spiritual journey to Christianity was incomplete at the time ("C. S. Lewis's 'The Quest of Bleheris' as Prose Poetry" 37).

The name Jadis first appears as "Wan Jadis," the name of a young man in "The Quest of Bleheris." Even though Bleheris is warned that evil and hardship await in the north, he decides to travel there to look for STRIVER. At the Hostel of the Crossways, Bleheris meets three unique men. One of these men is called Gerce the Desirous, a tall man with feverish eyes searching for tomorrow. Although the characterization was never completed as the poem is unfinished, Gerce the Desirous is considered to represent a fanciful utopian believer (Downing 47). There is another man called Hyperites among them, a middle-aged man with a golden beard. Hyperites is identified with Christ (Downing 46). The last man is Wan Jadis, a young, gorgeously dressed man searching for yesterday. Wan Jadis is so beautiful that Bleheris mistakes him for a woman at first. He is slender like a girl, his skin is smooth, and his voice is low, sweet, and melancholic. Wan Jadis invites Bleheris to join him on a journey in search of yesterday with mesmerizing words:

It lies in the West, in the traces of the setting sun: and, as men say, it is not a great journey from these mountains. It is the home of things passed, and of all old, forgotten, unhappy memories: a vallied land, full of soft mists and trees that ever shed their leaves in the drowsy winds: there the queens of olden story abide, Helen and Agamemnon's child, Isolde and Guenevere, deathless forever in their sorrows and loveliness as the ancient singers made them. In that country, a man can hide away from the care and moil of the world: nor is there anything, so much worth as the quiet peace we shall find yonder, the quiet peace of noble sorrow softened by many years. (qtd. in King 8)

Considering that Wan Jadis's admiration for the goddesses of mythology resembles that of the Romantic poets, Wan Jadis symbolizes romanticism, sentimentalism, and imagination. Hearing these words, Bleheris decides to abandon his quest for STRIVER to follow Wan Jadis, just as John in *The Pilgrim's Regress* abandons the Landlord for his quest for the Island. However, as Wan Jadis attempts to cross a swamp in a small boat, he is swallowed by it and dies. Apparently, Wan Jadis sanctifies his longing for the past so much that it eventually kills him at a young age.

From a gender perspective, Wan Jadis and Jadis are both physically and mentally symmetrical. Wan Jadis in "The Quest of Bleheris" is a delicate, thin, and beautiful man who exudes femininity more than masculinity. Dangerously devoted to ideal women in the past, Wan Jadis seems to internalize femininity. In this case, Wan Jadis's biological male sex is betrayed by the feminine gender arbitrarily chosen by him. Jadis in *The Chronicles of Narnia*, on the other hand, is a tall, powerful, ambitious, and proud woman. In the scene of Edmund's first encounter with the White Witch, she is described as "a great lady, taller than any woman that Edmund had ever seen" (*LWW* 33), and it implies that she is deviant from common standards of femininity, similar to Miss Hardcastle in *That Hideous Strength*. Both Wan Jadis and Jadis, a feminine man and a masculine woman, respectively, deviate from the norms of their given genders.

Considering Lewis's description of Wan Jadis and Jadis, these characterizations

seem to imply the influence of gender essentialism, the theory of gender preceding biological sex. The following excerpt is taken from *Perelandra* in *The Space Trilogy*, which is often regarded by critics as an illustration of Lewis's gender essentialism and gender hierarchy:

Our ancestors did not make mountains masculine because they projected male characteristics into them. The real process is the reverse. Gender is a reality, and a more fundamental reality than sex. Sex is, in fact, merely the adaptation to organic life of a fundamental polarity which divides all created beings. Female sex is simply one of the things that have feminine gender; there are many others, and Masculine and Feminine meet us on planes of reality where male and female would be simply meaningless. Masculine is not attenuated male, nor feminine attenuated female. On the contrary the male and female of organic creatures are rather faint and blurred reflections of masculine and feminine. (253)

According to this excerpt, Lewis's understanding of gender essentialism is that gender is not ascribed to sex, but rather sex is ascribed to gender. Lewis believes that gender is the God-given essence, which contradicts Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* (1949), published around the same time. Lewis's view of gender essentialism suggests that the name Jadis remained in Lewis for thirty-four years as the name of a person who deliberately twists one's own gender. For Lewis, Jadis is the name that threatens the value of divine gender, which is supposed to be more essential than sex. In other words, Wan Jadis and Jadis contradict God's will because they do not conform to their given gender; their attempt to arbitrarily switch genders is an evil act of defiance of God.

2. The White Witch, Jadis: The Descendent of Lilith

After establishing that the masculine woman, the White Witch, originates from the feminine man named Wan Jadis in Lewis's earlier poem, it is now necessary to examine the White Witch through the Lilith archetype. Lilith is often used as a symbol of feminism because she is considered the very first woman who opposes male authority; in other words, the fact that Lilith attempts to achieve masculine authority consolidates the foundation of the White Witch's gender interchangeability.³⁴ In a way, the White Witch obtains her status as a villain in *The Chronicles of Narnia* by attaining Lilith's will for power. This section, therefore, discusses the influence of the Lilith archetype on the characterization of the White Witch. First, it is important to focus on the similarity between Jadis and Lilith, namely, their inhuman beauty. Then, this section examines the legend of Lilith, whose claim is considered to be the pursuit for gender equality. Following this, gender equality is analyzed from Lewis's Christian perspective. After discussing that gender equality nullifies the difference between men and women, this section studies the White Witch's act of nullifying Aslan's given masculinity.

It is important to note that the beauty of the White Witch symbolizes her evilness as a descendant of Lilith. When Edmund first encounters the White Witch in *The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe*, she is described as follows: "Her face was white – not merely pale, but white like snow or paper or icing-sugar, except for her very red mouth. It was a beautiful face in other respects, but proud and cold and stern" (*LWW* 33). These sentences reveal that the White Witch is beautiful but cruel. Interestingly, the White Witch's beautiful face is compared to inorganic objects, such as snow, paper, and icing-sugar. As the following chapters show, there is not a drop of human blood flowing through her. That means she is essentially a being who is not qualified for the position of queen, and the possibility of her conversion or redemption is denied. Her beauty is also referred to in *The Magician's Nephew* in the following paragraph:

The last figure of all was the most interesting – a woman even more richly dressed

than the others, very tall (but every figure in that room was than the people of our world), with a look of such fierceness and pride that it took your breath away. Yet she was beautiful too. Years afterwards when he was an old man, Digory said he had never in all his life known a woman so beautiful. (*MN* 48)

It can be said that the White Witch, Jadis, is a threat because her inhuman beauty overwhelms the human boys.

The White Witch's beauty is extraordinary because she is a descendant of Lilith, Adam's first wife. After entering Narnia, Peter, Edmund, Susan, and Lucy are respectfully referred to as "Sons of Adam" and "Daughters of Eve" respectively. Mr. Beaver emphasizes that the White Witch is not one of the "Daughters of Eve":

"She'd like us to believe it [that she is human]," said Mr. Beaver, "and it's on that that she bases her claim to be Queen. But she's no Daughter of Eve. She comes of your father Adam's" – (here Mr. Beaver bowed) "your father Adam's first wife, her they called Lilith. And she was one of the Jinn. That's what she comes from on one side. And on the other she comes of the giants. No, no, there isn't a drop of real human blood in the Witch." (*LWW* 76)

Lilith is Adam's first wife, who refuses to lie under Adam during sexual intercourse because she insists that she should not be treated as inferior. As both of them do not concede to each other, Lilith shouts the ineffable name of God and flies away into the sky (McSporran 192). Consequently, God makes Lilith barren (Grasham 34). Hence, Lilith is regarded as the enemy of life and motherhood, and the suffering of childbirth and sterility are blamed on her (Blasdel 4). This aspect of Lilith is clearly suggested in the scene in which the White Witch mentions, "I have no children of my own" (*LWW* 39), revealing herself to be barren. In other words, Lilith, the White Witch's ancestor, is a demon who lost the ability to conceive children because of her insistence on gender equality.

Lilith's insistence on equality resembles a feminist discourse, which Lewis used to regard as belittlement of the difference between the two genders. Pointing out that

gender equality is nothing but the interchangeability of genders, Lewis disagreed with the idea of disregard for gender hierarchy. For example, in “Priestesses in the Church?” in which he discusses the ordination of women, Lewis argues that the fact that men and women have the same jobs means that men and women are conceived as “neuters” (*GID* 259). He continues that the Church does not regard men and women as “neuters,” or equal, or interchangeable:

And the kind of equality which implies that the equals are interchangeable (like counters or identical machines) is, among humans, a legal fiction. It may be a useful legal fiction. But in church we turn our back on fictions. One of the ends for which sex was created was to symbolize to us the hidden things of God. One of the functions of human marriage is to express the nature of the union between Christ and the Church. We have no authority to take the living and sensitive [sic.] figures which God has painted on the canvas of our nature and shift them about as if they were mere geometrical figures. (*GID* 260)

Lewis takes gender equality seriously as a matter of Christianity. He believes that men must be the masters of the Church and regards the intervention of women in the Church as disrespect for the difference between men and women: “Only one wearing the masculine uniform can [...] represent the Lord to the Church: for we are all, corporately and individually, feminine to Him” (*GID* 261). According to him, the differences between men and women are not merely superficial because of “the live and awful shadows of realities utterly beyond our control and largely beyond our direct knowledge” (*GID* 262). A similar argument is made in another essay, entitled “Equality,” in which Lewis explains that equality is neither good nor ideal state to be pursued because the authorities of kings, husbands, and fathers, and the obedience of subjects, wives, and sons, are naturally good and beautiful (*PRCON* 8). If equality is treated as an ideal, people would develop jealousy of those who are superior to them, and eventually end up as beings who cannot feel joy in obedience (*PRCON* 9). Then, Lewis argues that it is dangerous for a wife to have the idea of equality (*PRCON* 10). Although Lewis’s

argument that modesty is especially necessary for women may be difficult to accept today, the consistency of Lewis's suggestion is noteworthy. Men and women are assigned different roles, and each should exercise his or her assigned powers in the ideal Christian community, such as that of St. Anne's in *That Hideous Strength*. Lewis's argument suggests that both Lilith and the White Witch are threats to the Christian community because they are women trying to gain equal status with men (whether Adam or Aslan), ignoring their own assigned jobs, and subverting gender hierarchy.

As Lilith disobeys Adam and claims equality, the White Witch asserts her rights over Aslan by symbolically taking away Aslan's dominant masculinity. In *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, as the White Witch kills Aslan on the Stone Table, she first orders Aslan's mane to be shaved: "Let him first be shaved" (139). Apart from Christian symbolism referring to the lion as Jesus Christ, the lion is an animal whose sex is evident by the presence or absence of its mane (McSporran 193). The act of shaving Aslan's mane not only humiliates Aslan, but also signifies that the White Witch nullifies his authority by taking away the symbol of her antagonist's masculinity. In a manner of speaking, like Lilith, who insists on equality by refusing to sleep under Adam, the White Witch is dismantling Aslan's authority, making them equal by violating his masculinity. Thus, the act of nullifying the value of the assigned gender indicates Lilith and the White Witch's nature as adversaries of God.³⁵

3. Aslan vs. the White Witch: Diversity and Monotony

According to C. N. Manlove, Narnia under the control of the White Witch is “monotony,” since the White Witch “simply spreads herself over all Narnia in the form of a dead white frost, allowing nothing else independent life: the unchanging monotony of winter is her symbol” (93). It is possible to notice the political background, such as the rise of Nazism, in the White Witch’s reign over Narnia. Conversely, the two different types of reigns of the White Witch and Aslan, respectively, reveal the contrast of an equal, inorganic, and totalitarian regime and a hierarchical, organic, and diverse community of Christians. This section, therefore, elucidates that the White Witch’s reign of eternal winter is a symbol of interchangeability, which is portrayed in contrast to Aslan’s reign. First, it is important to show that the White Witch’s reign, which certainly reflects Nazi Germany, produces a world full of things without diversity. Then, this section turns to the arrival of Aslan awakening the personalities of everything. Subsequently, the interchangeability of personality, which makes these two reigns different, is investigated. Finally, this section shows that lack of personality and gender issues are deeply related.

The White Witch’s dictatorship undeniably mirrors totalitarianism because she imposes unity upon the inhabitants by depriving them of freedom. The notion that Narnia under the White Witch’s reign reflects the totalitarian system is supported by three features: single dictator, secret police, and informants. First, a single dictator, the White Witch, reigns over the country through fear. Mr. Tumnus, a faun whom Lucy first meets, tells her that Narnia with its four seasons has been turned into “Always winter and never Christmas” (*LWW* 23). He then confesses that he invited Lucy for tea not because he wanted to be her friend but because he had been ordered to turn her over to the White Witch. He continues that if he were to disobey the order, he would be violated and then turned into a stone statue:

‘And if I don’t, [...] she’s sure to find out. And she’ll have my tail cut off, and my horns sawn off, and my beard plucked out, and she’ll wave her wand over my

beautiful cloven hoofs and turn them into horrid solid hoofs like a wretched horse's. And if she is extra and specially angry she'll turn me into stone and I shall be only a statue of a Faun in her horrible house until the four thrones at Cair Paravel are filled – and goodness knows when that will happen, or whether it will ever happen at all.' (*LWW* 24)

Mr. Tumnus's words indicate that the White Witch's dictatorship is strengthened by violence and death. In fact, when Edmund goes to the White Witch's house, he sees some stone statues that had once been living creatures (*LWW* 88-89). Later, Edmund sees the White Witch turning the animals into stone (*LWW* 106-07). Her rulership and abuse of power transforms Narnia into a devastated world with death, desolation, and fear. Second, the Secret Police, the professional enforcement that has the right to arrest citizens, covers the White Witch's sovereignty. Maugrim, the Captain of the Secret Police, arrests Mr. Tumnus for entertaining Lucy without handing her over to the White Witch (*LWW* 57). In Narnia under the rule of the White Witch, the Secret Police is the cornerstone of the order of the country. Third, the White Witch employs spies and informants to legitimate her power. Mr. Tumnus says, "The whole wood is full of *her* spies. Even some of the trees are on her side" (*LWW* 25). He seems to suggest that the Narnians are surrounded by spies who eradicate treachery. Mr. Beaver also states "There are the trees, [...] They're always listening. Most of them are on our side, but there *are* trees that would betray us to *her*; you know what I mean" (*LWW* 64). Betrayal is the most important motif in the story because one of the siblings, Edmund, becomes the White Witch's informant by betraying his family. All these motifs of totalitarianism, a single tyrant, the secret police, and informants, lend a dystopian atmosphere to Narnia. Although its atmosphere possibly reflects the political structure of Germany during wartime from Britain's perspective, it is more important to note that the Narnians are deprived of their freedom, joy, and personality by a single ruler and those who serve her. The snowy world obscures all that is beautiful, reducing it to an identical, colorless, and interchangeable entity.

However, with the arrival of Aslan, the world regains its personality. Lewis vividly depicts the arrival of spring with its sounds, colors, and scents. In the beginning, Edmund hears a sound, which he later remembers as the sound of a flowing river:

And in that silence Edmund could at last listen to the other noise properly. A strange, sweet, rustling, chattering noise – and yet not so strange, for he'd heard it before – if only he could remember where! Then all at once he did remember. It was the noise of running water. All round them though out of sight, there were streams, chattering, murmuring, bubbling, splashing and even (in the distance) roaring. And his heart gave a great leap (though he hardly knew why) when he realized that the frost was over. (*LWW* 108)

In this paragraph, the words describing the sound of the river are highlighted. The frozen river, which did not make any sound, begins to produce distinctive sounds with the thawing of snow. Edmund also sees “the dark green of a fir tree” for the first time since he entered Narnia (*LWW* 108). The various colors continue to be seen as described: “Then the mist turned from white to gold and presently cleared away altogether. Shafts of delicious sunlight struck down on to the forest floor and overhead you could see a blue sky between the tree tops” (*LWW*110). The weather clears up and even the warmth of the light becomes palpable. Flowers, including celandine and snowdrops, bloom happily as birds begin to sing (*LWW* 110-11). Eventually, Edmund encounters a sweet fragrance: “A light breeze sprang up which scattered drops of moisture from the swaying branches and carried cool, delicious scents against the faces of the travellers” (*LWW* 122). The other Pevensie children, Peter, Susan, and Lucy, also rejoice the arrival of spring: “Look! there’s a kingfisher,” or “I say, bluebells!” or “What was that lovely smell?” or “Just listen to the thrush!” (*LWW* 113). Rivers that make different sounds, trees and flowers of all colors and smells, birds singing happily, and the ever-changing warmth of the sun through the trees, are all different, various, and unique. Under the White Witch’s reign, the frozen river could substitute for the land, and the trees and flowers had no color or smell. As Aslan’s spring arrives, they can fully rejoice that they

are irreplaceable, precious, and unsubstitutable.

Narnia under the reign of the White Witch and Narnia after the arrival of Aslan differ in terms of interchangeability. In the Narnia reigned over by the White Witch, the personality of all is hidden by snow. After the arrival of Aslan's spring, they regain their personality; in other words, Narnia after the arrival of Aslan is an ideal Christian community. In Christianity, all human beings are considered to gather to form a single organism. Christianity, therefore, rejects individualism and emphasizes connections with others because it sees people as separate parts endowed with different roles in one flesh (Mühling 25). In his essay "Membership," Lewis explains the ideal Christian community as one single organism as follows:

The Christian is called not to individualism but to membership in the mystical body. A consideration of the differences between the secular collective and the mystical body is therefore the first step to understanding how Christianity without being individualistic can yet counteract collectivism. (*WG* 163)

As indicated above, Christianity falls neither into individualism nor collectivism.³⁶ Collectivism is, as Lewis puts it, "pebbles laid in a row" ("Equality," *PRCON* 11-12), and is nothing more than a group formed by people without personality. This is Narnia under the reign of the White Witch because as she dyes everything the same color as herself, it becomes a collective, dead, and inorganic community. The reason the descriptions of Aslan's arrival and the celebration of life are so carefully depicted is that they suggest the beginning of a Christian community, living fully as one flesh. Lewis states that in the ideal Christian community, the individuals function as organs by clarifying the Christian use of the word, "members":

The very word *membership* is of Christian origin, but it has been taken over by the world and emptied of all meaning. In any book on logic you may see the expression "members of a class." It must be most emphatically stated that the items or particulars included in a homogeneous class are almost the reverse of what St. Paul meant by *members*. By *members* ([Greek]) he meant what we

should call *organs*, things essentially different from, and complementary to, one another, things differing not only in structure and function but also in dignity. (*WG* 163-64)

As human organs are not interchangeable because each has a different function, none of us is also interchangeable. By fulfilling assigned tasks, Christians can be ideal Christians forming an ideal Christian community.

The idea that the ideal Christian community should be a single organism is deeply related to the gender issue. Wan Jadis in “The Quest of Bleheris,” who is a feminine man, Lilith who rebels against her husband Adam, and the White Witch, who tries to undermine gender by shaving Aslan’s mane, all ignore their given gender. They are a threat to the Christian community because they assume their gender is interchangeable. In the end, they cannot survive in a Christian community as one single organism and are eventually doomed to death or exile. Therefore, Narnia under the reign of the White Witch lacks life, not merely because it is Lewis’s political criticism of totalitarianism, but because it fails to become a Christian community, as each was reduced to an interchangeable entity. Thus, the thaw caused by Aslan is a symbol of Narnia as a Christian organism: the resurrection of personality.

4. The Defeat of the White Witch: The Resurrection of Divine Masculinity

As discussed above, the White Witch, as a descendant of Lilith, seeks to nullify the authority of masculinity by the act of depriving Aslan of his masculinity. The gender interchangeability she embodies is depicted by the snowy world that deprives the inhabitants of individuality. The White Witch’s defeat, therefore, is the nullification of gender interchangeability: the restoration of gender hierarchy. Hence, the final section of this chapter discusses the subversion of gender interchangeability, which leads to the hierarchical Christian society. Before analyzing the nullification of gender interchangeability, this section first discusses the White Witch’s imperfectness in light of

the Dualism of Good and Evil. Then, this section argues that the White Witch's gender interchangeability is completely nullified from two aspects: the resurrection of Aslan's masculinity and the emphasis of personalities of humans. Finally, the conflict between the White Witch and Aslan in terms of gender is discussed from the perspective of the Dualism of Good and Evil.

The fact that the White Witch is as imperfect as the other antagonists is often traced to her comical words and acts. For example, in *The Magician's Nephew*, a funny conversation occurs between Aunt Letty and Jadis, who arrives in twentieth-century England. Aunt Letty regards Jadis, who uses strange language, as a "Drunk" (MN 76). The dialogue between the English onlookers and Jadis, who causes a commotion in London, is comedic despite the seriousness of the situation. Moreover, Jadis runs away like a coward when she sees that Aslan is unmoved by the iron rod she throws at him (MN 99). In *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, the White Witch is frightened when she hears Aslan's roar: "[...] and the Witch, after staring for a moment with her lips wide apart, picked up her skirts and fairly ran for her life" (131). Since her masculine authority is arbitrarily obtained, her status as the head of the country is unstable and fluctuates according to circumstances. By mocking her actions, it is possible for people to neutralize the authority she believes she possesses.

The authority of the White Witch, Jadis, is nullified in these scenes described above, and her gender interchangeability is completely subverted in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* in two respects. First, Aslan's triumph, which reflects the legend of Lilith's banishment, indicates the triumph of true masculinity. As already noted, Lilith refuses to lie under Adam during sexual intercourse with him in order to be equal to men. The White Witch also tries to seize power equal to Aslan's by attempting to nullify Aslan's masculinity, symbolized by his mane. However, after the Stone Table breaks, Aslan is resurrected: "There, shining in the sunrise, larger than they had seen him before, shaking his mane (for it had apparently grown again) stood Aslan himself" (LWW 147). Clearly, his restored mane symbolizes his restored masculinity. In the final battle scene, the

White Witch is pinned to the ground under Aslan: “Then Lion and Witch had rolled over together but with the Witch underneath” (*LWW* 161). This scene is considered to highlight the return of a male-dominated hierarchy (McSporran 196, Grasham 39). In a sense, the defeat of the White Witch restores male superiority to its rightful place. Thus, the White Witch’s defeat is indicated not only by the death of the single dictator, but also by the restoration of the unjustly usurped masculinity.

Second, the individuality of the four Pevensie siblings presents a Christian community that contrasts with Narnia under the White Witch’s dictatorship. In the two novels that the White Witch appears in as the main antagonist, men and women share the roles assigned to them, yet display their own individuality at the end of the story. In *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, the joint control of two men and two women begins after the defeat of the White Witch. As the following excerpt indicates, Peter, Susan, Edmund, and Lucy wisely reign over Narnia as kings and queens:

And they themselves grew and changed as the years passed over them. And Peter became a tall and deep-chested man and a great warrior, and he was called King Peter the Magnificent. And Susan grew into a tall and gracious woman with black hair that fell almost to her feet and the kings of the countries beyond the sea began to send ambassadors asking for her hand in marriage. And she was called Queen Susan the Gentle. Edmund was a graver and quieter man than Peter, and great in council and judgement. He was called King Edmund the Just. But as for Lucy, she was always gay and golden-haired, and all the princes in those parts desired her to be their Queen, and her own people called her Queen Lucy the Valiant. (*LWW* 166-67)

As indicated earlier, the White Witch reigned over the country where all the living things suffer equally by depriving the inhabitants of Narnia of their individuality. With the arrival of Aslan, however, the individuality of Narnian inhabitants, including the trees and flowers, is restored. The emphasis on the characters of each of the four Pevensie brothers and sisters, Peter’s bravery, Edmund’s wisdom, Susan’s gentleness, and Lucy’s

cheerfulness, signifies that the ideal Christian community has been achieved. The scene of the coronation shows that the death of the White Witch brings about a sharp distinction between masculinity and femininity, which is restored in the form of each one's individuality. Similarly, in *The Magician's Nephew*, Frank and Helen, a married couple, are appointed as king and queen by Aslan: "Rise up King and Queen of Narnia, father and mother of many kings that shall be in Narnia and the Isles and Archenland. Be just and merciful and brave. The blessing is upon you" (159). The progenitor of the Narnian royals is neither one king nor one queen, but a husband and wife. The masculine man and feminine woman at the end of these works suggest the invalidity of the White Witch, who gains unjustified power by nullifying her originally assigned gender.

Considering Lewis's rejection of Dualism, the White Witch's gender interchangeability is as incomplete as Evil in the conflict of Good and Evil. The White Witch's reign is completely nullified by the restoration of Aslan's masculinity and its replacement with a gender-balanced reign. It is not femininity but gender interchangeability that is described as Evil, as Lewis's letter to Arthur Greeves suggests that Lilith has a will to power that violates her own femininity:

Lilith is still quite beyond me. One can trace in her specially the Will to Power, which here fits in quite well – but there is a great deal more than that. She is also the real ideal somehow spoiled: she is not primarily a sex symbol, but includes the characteristic female abuse of sex, which is love of Power. (qtd. in Blasdel 4)

The word "spoiled," as used in this paragraph, implies some correspondence with Lewis's definition of Evil, which is described as "spoiled" Good. Lilith, as well as Satan, who once was an angel, is the ideal of a being "spoiled" by lust for power. Evil, therefore, is not described as femininity or the female gender, but gender reduced to something meaningless.

Conclusion

To conclude, Evil is represented in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* and *The Magician's Nephew* as gender interchangeability, which is fundamentally nullified through the defeat of the White Witch, Jadis. Jadis in *The Chronicles of Narnia* and Wan Jadis in "The Quest of Bleheris" both violate their God-given genders. The symmetrical representations of Wan Jadis's femininity and the White Witch's masculinity imply Lewis's stance as a gender essentialist. As a gender essentialist, Lewis regards gender equality as gender interchangeability that nullifies the difference between men and women. The White Witch's characterization as a descendant of Lilith, who insisted on equality with men, implies her violation of gender. The contrast of the White Witch's winter and Aslan's spring indicates that of equality and hierarchy. When Narnia is reigned over by the White Witch, everything is equal and interchangeable; on the other hand, with the arrival of Aslan, everything becomes varied, hierarchical, and uninterchangeable individuals. The gender issue can be employed in this vivid contrast as Wan Jadis, Lilith, and Jadis all ignore their own gender and are eventually banished or doomed. The White Witch's defeat leads to the restoration of gender hierarchy and individuality as can be seen from the resurrection of Aslan's masculinity and the distinguished individuality of the royals. The White Witch, therefore, is one of the Lewisian antagonists who confronts God in terms of her acquired gender of masculinity, and is eventually defeated by a truly masculine figure.

Chapter VI. The Ungodly Love:
The Representation of Orual in *Till We Have Faces*

The final chapter of this dissertation examines the representation of Orual as a Lewisian antagonist in *Till We Have Faces* (1956).³⁷ In contrast to the previous works, there are no obvious enemies in this novel; however, the narrator Orual is considered not only the protagonist but also a Lewisian antagonist as she declares herself an opponent of God at the beginning of the novel as follows: "I will accuse the gods, especially the god who lives on the Grey Mountain" (*TWHF* 3). *Till We Have Faces* is Lewis's first attempt to describe the whole story from the antagonist's perspective. Being the antagonist of God, Orual continues to confess her love for others, although her love merely consists of her own self-centeredness. The dualistic framework of Orual and God collapses in the end in terms of love. This chapter, therefore, explores Lewis's concept of love which demonstrates the nullification of the dualistic framework of Good and Evil.

In order to analyze Lewis's concept of love and Evil, it is necessary to understand the contents of *Till We Have Faces*. *Till We Have Faces* is based on the story of Cupid and Psyche, a well-known episode of Apuleius's *The Golden Ass*. The novel comprises two parts: the narrator's accusation against the gods and the confession of her conversion. The story is set in a fictional pagan kingdom called Glome. In the first part, the narrator Orual tells us how she is ill-treated by the gods. Orual, a daughter of the king of Glome, loves her beautiful half-sister, Psyche. The citizens in Glome begin to adore Psyche as a goddess, and it arouses the goddess Ungit's jealousy. To appease Ungit, Psyche is sent to the Mountain as a human sacrifice. When Orual comes to the Mountain to bury Psyche's corpse, Orual finds her without a scratch. Psyche says that she has become god's wife and lives in a beautiful palace, which Orual cannot see at all. Psyche is not allowed to see her husband's face, and Orual demands that Psyche see it to prove her love for Orual. After Psyche reluctantly obeys her order, she is immediately banished from the palace and she begins to wander as an exile. Orual, on the other hand, becomes the

queen of Glome after her father dies, and rules the country for a long time with the support of her friends, Bardia and the Fox; Bardia is an honorable soldier, and the Fox is a wise mentor. One day, she enters a temple in Essur and hears a story of the goddess Istra from a priest. It is obvious that the Istra in his story is Orual's sister, Psyche. He tells her that Istra's elder sister, obviously Orual, deceived Istra to make her a wanderer because of her jealousy. This legend angers Orual, and she decides to accuse the gods. The second part is written after her conversion. Orual gradually realizes that she made many mistakes throughout her life. She admits that her love for Psyche, Bardia, and the Fox was self-centered, and she finally gains a "face" to see God.

Over the past few decades, *Till We Have Faces* has been heavily studied, mostly in the context of its role in the development of Lewis's Christian apologetic work, *The Four Loves* (1960). Peter J. Schakel analyzes *Till We Have Faces* from various perspectives, including the theme of love, sacrifice, pagan religion, mythology, and the influence of Lewis's personal background. Schakel states that "[i]t would not be unfair or misleading to call *Till We Have Faces* a development in fiction of the central themes Lewis would spell out a few years later in *The Four Loves*" (*Reason and Imagination in C. S. Lewis* 27). Karen Rowe goes further than Schakel in her essay, "*Till We Have Faces*: A Study of the Soul and Self," claiming that "[i]n essence, *The Four Loves* can be read as a commentary on the novel, as it is a study of the nature of Love in its four manifestations" (136-37). Caroline J. Simon studies the love depicted in Lewis's various novels and examines Schakel and Rowe's opinions on the theme of love in *Till We Have Faces*. Doris T. Myers also follows Schakel's study, and she analyzes *Till We Have Faces* and the theme of love chapter by chapter in *Bareface*.³⁸

Although the theme of love is important in the composition of *Till We Have Faces*, these studies focusing on the relationship between *The Four Loves* and *Till We Have Faces* have not revealed that the protagonist and narrator Orual has the same characteristics as Lewis's typical antagonists. Lewis's letter addressed to Father Peter Milward on September 24, 1959, simply summarizes his idea of love as follows: "The

main themes [of *The Four Loves*] are (1) Natural affection, if left to mere nature, easily becomes a special kind of hatred, (2) God is, to our natural affections, the ultimate object of jealousy” (qtd. in Hooper 250). This letter suggests that love can easily be distorted if it is rejected and it turns God into one’s supreme enemy. In light of Lewis’s letter, Orual’s love for Psyche and jealousy toward God seem to create a foundation for the battlefield between a creature and God. Declaring a war against the gods because of her love for Psyche, Orual does not realize that the conflict itself dismantles her love and her own self, as with the other opponents of God discussed in the previous chapters. In the end, she realizes her foolishness and converts to face God. Since the theme of love is at the center of *Till We Have Faces*, it can be proposed that love leads to the framework of a dualistic opposition and its collapse. Therefore, the final chapter discusses the dualistic opposition between God and Orual and its collapse in *Till We Have Faces* through the theme of love.

In analyzing Orual’s love and evilness, this chapter is divided into four sections. The first section examines the background of *Till We Have Faces* by focusing on Lewis’s pagan and Christian concepts of loves. Following the discussion of the origin of the characterization of Orual, the second section analyzes Orual’s loves for others by highlighting her relationship with Psyche, the Fox, and Bardia. Then, the third section turns to Orual’s *Storge* for Psyche in order to reveal the conflict between Orual and God. To conclude this chapter, the final section clarifies that Orual’s conversion nullifies the dualistic framework of God and Orual.

1. The Origin of Orual: Love in Paganism and Christianity

Till We Have Faces is Lewis's retelling of the mythological story of Psyche and Cupid combined with some Christian elements. Although it was initially difficult for him to retell the story from the perspective of Psyche's sister, Lewis finally completed it by highlighting the theme of love in the story. In order to examine the origin of Orual's characterization, this section discusses the background of the writing of *Till We Have Faces*, particularly its connection with Lewis's idea of four types of loves: *Storge*, *Philia*, *Eros*, and *Agape*. First, the foundation of *Till We Have Faces* is investigated from his diary and some fragments of a poem. Then, this section highlights a letter he wrote to Warren in 1940, which is the basis of Lewis's classification of the types of love. The final part of this section examines Lewis's conceptual framework of pagan religion and Christianity, following the analysis of Greek *Storge* elevated by Christian *Agape* in *Till We Have Faces*.

Of all of Lewis's works, *Till We Have Faces* took the longest time to conceive. In his twenties, Lewis decided to write an original story based on Apuleius's "Metamorphosis." Lewis's interest in the story of Psyche is seen in his diary entry of November 23, 1922: "After lunch I went out for a walk up Shotover, thinking how to make a masque or play of Psyche and Caspian" (*AMRBM* 142). Moreover, the following quotation from the diary, dated September 9, 1923, shows that Lewis already had a concrete idea of his own version of the story:

My head was very full of my old idea of a poem on my own version of the Cupid and Psyche story in which Psyche's sister would not be jealous, but unable to see anything but moors when Psyche showed her the Palace. I have tried it twice before, once in couplet and once in ballad form. (*AMRBM* 266)

Lewis was keen to narrate the story of Psyche and her sister in verse, and a fragment of his first attempt was copied by his brother, Warren Lewis, in the *Lewis Papers*: "The tale of Psyche is unjustly told / And half of the truth concealed by all who hold / With Apuleius"

(qtd. in Hooper 246). Despite several attempts to write it in verse, he could not work out how to complete it until the spring of 1955 (Hooper 247). In the end, Lewis seems to have found his own way to retell the story of Psyche and Cupid by combining it with the idea of various types of love.

The origin of Lewis's idea of love can be traced back to a letter addressed to Warren in the 1940s. After the Second World War broke out in 1939, Warren was called into active duty and stationed at Le Havre in Northern France as a soldier. Their letters were exchanged between the battlefield and homeland amidst the confusion and conflict of the war. Lewis's idea of love is particularly clarified in the letter written on May 4, 1940 (Schakel "Till We Have Faces" 285). As Hooper suggests, this letter "anticipates much of what became the subject of Lewis's *The Four Loves* (1960)" (*CL* vol. 2 408). Considering the contents of the letter from Lewis to Warren, Warren asked a question regarding Christian love: "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you" (Matt. 5:44). Warren seems to have had difficulty understanding the meaning of this biblical phrase, when confronted with massacre, destruction, and confusion during the war. In reply to Warren's letter, Lewis explained that this well-known biblical doctrine is almost impossible to accept in facing totalitarianism. He admitted that he is sometimes tempted to hate and despise people such as Stalin, Hitler, and Mussolini: "I pray every night for the people I am most tempted to hate or despise (the present list is Stalin, Hitler, Mussolini, Mackenzie, Austen and Opie) and in the effort to make this real I have had to do a good deal of thinking" (*CL* vol. 2 408). Following his statement on the difficulty of loving one's enemy, he offers Warren a plausible answer by redefining the meaning of love in this biblical phrase.

In the same letter addressed to Warren, Lewis states that there are four different types of love: *Storge*, *Philia*, *Eros*, and *Agape*. In *The Oxford English Dictionary*, *Storge* is defined as "Natural affection; usually, that of parents for their offspring" ("storge"). *Philia* is "amity, friendship, liking" ("philia"). *Eros* is, "in recent Christian writings,

earthly or sexual love, contrasted with Agape” (“eros” def.1b). And *Agape* is used as “N. T. [New Testament] sense of Christian love (of God or Christ or fellow Christians)” (“agape”def.2). *Agape* is identified with the word “charity,” meaning “God’s love to men” (“charity” def.1a), “Man’s love to God and his neighbor” (def.1b), and “Christian benignity of disposition expressing itself in Christ-like conduct” (def.1c). Therefore, *Storge* exists in parent-child relationship, *Philia* in friendship, *Eros* in romantic relationship, and *Agape* in between Christians and God.

It is important to note that *Storge*, a pagan concept of love devalued in Christianity, is regarded as one of the most important types of love by Lewis. In Christianity, love is mostly classified into three categories: *Philia*, *Eros*, and *Agape*. Lewis adopted another type of Greek love, *Storge*, into the classification of love (Simon 146). In the letter, Lewis states, “[t]here were three words in Gk. [Greek] wh. [which] covered most kinds of love (Eros = sexual love, Storge = family affection, Philia = friendship) but the N. T. [New Testament] word for ‘love’ or ‘charity’ is Agapē, wh. has hardly any use in classical Gk – i.e. it is a new word for a new thing” (*CL* vol. 2 408). As suggested, the Greek language classifies love into four different terms: *Eros* (sexual love), *Storge* (family affection), *Philia* (friendship), and *Agape* (charity). According to Lewis, the love referred to in the New Testament is *Agape*, which was not commonly used in classical Greek. After this classification of loves, Lewis discusses the meaning of *Agape* and putting the Christian idea of love into practice in the letter. It is certain that this classification of four different types of love in the letter consolidates the foundation of Lewis’s retelling of a mythological story.

In light of his classification of different types of love, *Till We Have Faces* depicts the process of some pagans elevated by Christianity as Greek *Storge* elevated by Christian *Agape*. The time and place of the novel is before the birth of Christ, as Chad Walsh locates the time of the story between the death of Socrates and the birth of Christ (162). Following Walsh’s study, Myers concludes that the time of the story should be after 310. B. C. E. from the Fox’s characterization (*C. S. Lewis in Context* 193).³⁹ In terms of the

setting, Walsh states that Glome is located “on the fringes of Asia Minor, far away from the great civilizations of classical antiquity; possibly in what is now Turkey, or near the Black Sea” (161). Myers also claims that the location for the country is likely to be in the Caucasus Mountains, looking east to the Caspian Sea (*C. S. Lewis in Context* 195). As the story is set in a pagan kingdom before the birth of Jesus Christ, the characters in the novel know neither the life and death of Christ nor the Christian concepts of Incarnation, Passion, and Salvation. However, as Lewis constantly describes in his novels and essays, the road to salvation is open even to some pagans before Christ. In his essay “Myth Became Fact” (1944), Lewis states that old myths tell the truth, even though they were eventually transcended by the historical event of Incarnation:

Now as myth transcends thought, Incarnation transcends myth. The heart of Christianity is a myth which is also a fact. The old myth of the Dying God, *without ceasing to be myth*, comes down from the heaven of legend and imagination to the earth of history. It *happens* – at a particular date, in a particular place, followed by definable historical consequences. (*GID* 58-59)

As suggested in this extract, the old myth of the Dying God foretold the historical truth of Christ’s Crucifixion and Resurrection; in other words, the old myths unknowingly told of later events that came true.

Lewis insists that some people before the birth of Christ could achieve salvation as long as they were wise enough to pursue the truth. In *Reflections on the Psalms* (1958), Lewis indicates that the fact that some phrases in Plato’s *Republic* seemingly represents Crucifixion in Christianity means that some pagan philosophers could sense truth before it became historical facts:

If Plato, starting from one example and from his insight into the nature of goodness and the nature of the world, was led on to see the possibility of a perfect example, and thus to depict something extremely like the Passion of Christ, this happened not because he was lucky but because he was wise. If a man who knew only England and had observed that, the higher a mountain was, the longer

it retained the snow in early spring, were led on to suppose a mountain so high that it retained the snow all the year round, the similarity between his imagined mountain and the real Alps would not be merely a lucky accident. He might not know that there were any such mountains in reality; just as Plato probably did not know that the ideally perfect instance of crucified goodness which he had depicted would ever become actual and historical. (122)

According to Lewis, wise philosophers like Plato could see glimpses of truth even if they did not completely reach it. The concept of truth gained by some pagans is demonstrated in some of Lewis's novels, including Emeth in *The Last Battle* (1956), the only Calormene character who gains salvation in the end.⁴⁰ Lewis's inclusivist ideas on the relationship between Christianity and pagan religion certainly affects the theme of love in *Till We Have Faces*. The dualistic conflict between God and Orual is the one between Christianity and paganism. This conflict is eventually nullified in terms of love since Orual's distorted *Storge*, the pagan love, succumbs before Love in the Christian sense, the source of everything.

2. *Storge, Philia, and Eros:*

Orual's Loves for Psyche, the Fox, and Bardia

As critics have pointed out, the combination of Christian loves and a Greek love, *Philia, Eros, Agape*, and *Storge*, respectively, is considered to be indicated in *Till We Have Faces* before the publication of *The Four Loves*.⁴¹ The central theme of *Till We Have Face* is certainly love, as seen in the relationships between Orual, Psyche, Bardia, and the Fox. Orual loves Psyche like a daughter, the Fox like a father, and Bardia like a lover. Orual also considers the Fox and Bardia her best friends. It is possible to assume that Orual has *Storge, Philia, and Eros* for each of them. This section examines the relationship between Orual and the three characters around her in order to pursue Lewis's idea of the types of love in *Till We Have Faces*. First, *Storge* in the mother-daughter relationship

between Orual and Psyche is examined. Second, *Storge* and *Philia* in the father-daughter relationship and friendship between Orual and the Fox are studied. Third, *Philia* and *Eros*, especially *Eros* in Orual's pursuit for a romantic relationship with Bardia are investigated.

Orual's love for Psyche is categorized as *Storge*. As Psyche often calls Orual "Maia," which indicates the name of the eldest daughter of Atlas and mother of Hermes, Orual is given the role of Psyche's mother. Since Orual is the eldest daughter of King Trom and Psyche is the daughter of his new bride, Orual is actually Psyche's half-sister. Orual, however, often addresses Psyche as "daughter" and "child" to demonstrate her motherly love, *Storge*, for Psyche. Orual's *Storge* for the newborn Psyche is so deep that she does not hesitate to devote herself to nursing. Despite the Fox's worry, Orual enthusiastically engages herself in looking after Psyche because she does not regard the time she spends for Psyche as toil: "I lost more sleep looking on Psyche for the joy of it than in any other way" (*TWHF* 21). As her affectionate care for Psyche clearly leads her to her sense of joy, the mother-daughter relationship between Orual and Psyche suggests Orual's *Storge* for Psyche, which makes her a devoted mother.

Orual's love for the Fox is categorized as both *Storge* and *Philia*, although mostly *Storge*.⁴³ The Fox is a slave taken from his own country, Greece, and he becomes the mentor of Orual and her sisters. Although the Fox is not related to Orual by blood, he frequently calls Orual "daughter," and Orual calls him "grandfather." While Orual's father, King Trom, is so menacing and domineering that his unfatherly attitude fails to build a proper relationship with his daughter, the intimacy of the Fox and Orual develops as *Storge*. Orual says to the Fox "You [the Fox] are ten times my father" (*TWHF* 149). The Fox also fulfills his role not only as her father in place of King Trom, but also as her close friend, sharing an interest in academic knowledge. For Orual, the Fox is both her friend and father, from whom she expects devotion and caring in return.

Orual's love for Bardia can be categorized as *Philia* and *Eros*, but especially *Eros*. Bardia, the captain of the royal guard and Orual's tutor of swordplay, develops a

friendship with her through their shared interest in sword fighting and politics. Orual develops *Eros*, as indicated in the representations of her sexual desire and delusional thinking. Orual's *Eros* is subtly implied through her reaction to physical contact with Bardia when he kisses her hand. As she describes the moment as "the touch of lightning" (*TWHF* 224), her reaction to this physical contact certainly implies her sexual interest in him. Orual's fancy of having Bardia as her husband and Psyche as her daughter also demonstrates the features of *Eros*: "The picture, the impossible fool's dream, was that all should have been different from the very beginning and he would have been my husband and Psyche our daughter" (*TWHF* 224). In this way, knowing that Bardia will never be her husband, Orual dreams herself to be at his side.

Thus, the categorization of different types of love, which is later presented in *The Four Loves*, is indeed revealed in *Till We Have Faces*. As already noted, Lewis added the Greek *Storge* to the three Christian loves of *Philia*, *Eros*, and *Agape*. In particular, Orual's *Storge* for Psyche, which is easily sanctified and eventually demonized, is central to the story. According to Lewis, *Storge* could possibly be Evil under certain circumstances, as the following sentence suggests: "If Affection [*Storge*] is made the absolute sovereign of a human life the seeds will germinate. Love, having become a god, becomes a demon" (*FL* 68). With reference to this statement, Orual's love for Psyche is distorted mainly because of her love becoming a god, which makes her antagonize God.

3. God vs. Orual: *Agape* and *Storge*

As mentioned earlier, love creates a dualistic conflict between God and His creature. In *The Four Loves*, it is stated as follows:

The rivalry between all natural loves and the love of God is something a Christian dare not forget. God is the great Rival, the ultimate object of human jealousy; that beauty, terrible as the Gorgon's, which may at any moment steal from me – or it seems like stealing to me – my wife's or husband's or daughter's heart. (47)

As long as a human loves someone, God could easily become his or her ultimate adversary. In *Till We Have Faces*, Orual's love for Psyche is indeed transformed into jealousy and anger, and it eventually makes her oppose God. Following the previous section discussing the categorization of the types of love in *Till We Have Faces*, this section mainly analyzes how Orual becomes a Lewisian antagonist by examining her *Storge* for Psyche. First, it is important to examine how Orual's loves for others, especially *Storge* for Psyche, changes into a demoniac state. After the analysis of Orual's *Storge* becoming a god, this section studies the conflict of Orual and God in the scene of Orual's accusation by focusing on the word "Mine."

Orual's *Storge* for Psyche turns into hatred and anger as Psyche's husband on the Grey Mountain, namely a pagan god, becomes Orual's competitor. Before being sacrificed, Psyche says that she is encouraged by something unfamiliar to Orual, namely, the Grey Mountain where she is to be sacrificed the next day. Psyche expresses her sense of longing to Orual as "Do you remember? The colour and the smell, and looking across at the Grey Mountain in the distance? And because it was so beautiful, it set me longing, always longing" (*TWHF* 74). At this moment, Orual realizes that Psyche no longer needs her guidance: "She was (how long had she been, and I not to know?) out of my reach, in some place of her own" (*TWHF* 74). As Psyche's life is filled with a new interest, Orual is left behind as Psyche leaves her. Realizing that she is unable to fulfill her role as a mother, Orual's *Storge* for Psyche turns into a negative feeling of bitterness:

“I felt, amid all my love, a bitterness. Though the things she was saying gave her (that was plain enough) courage and comfort, I grudged her that courage and comfort. It was as if someone or something else had come in between us” (*TWHF* 75). In this scene, Orual is disturbed by something that comes between them. After the sacrifice, Orual goes to the Mountain to bury Psyche’s body properly, but finds that Psyche lives in the palace with her husband as she enters the world of divinity. When Orual attempts to force Psyche to return to Glome together, Psyche disobeys her, saying “Dear Maia, I am a wife now. It’s no longer you that I must obey” (*TWHF* 127). Since Psyche’s statement indicates that her husband is more essential to her than Orual, Orual describes her feelings as follows: “I learned then how one can hate those one loves” (*TWHF* 127). Because of this incident, Orual employs her love for Psyche as a tool, demanding that Psyche break the promise never to see her husband’s face in order to test Psyche’s love for her. Since Orual’s desire to satisfy herself is more important than Psyche’s suffering and torment, Psyche describes her feeling as follows:

‘Oh Orual – to take my love for you, because you know it goes down to my very roots and cannot be diminished by any other newer love, and then to make of it a tool, a weapon, a thing of policy and mastery, an instrument of torture – I begin to think I never knew you. Whatever comes after, something that was between us dies here.’ (*TWHF* 165)

The process of Orual’s love for Psyche turning into hatred can be attributed to Orual’s deification of her own love for Psyche. Orual cannot forgive Psyche for assuming that something more than the mother-daughter relationship between them exists. These scenes clearly imply Orual’s love turning into a demon in opposition to God.

Although Orual’s *Storge* for the Fox and *Eros* for Bardia similarly transform into jealousy, hatred, and bitterness, it is noteworthy that God does not stand between Orual and them. For example, *Storge* for the Fox changes into hatred and envy when he tries to return to his family in Greece. After the death of King Trom, Orual frees the Fox as the Queen of Glome in front of the others, not knowing the meaning of this act. As

Orual declares him free, she realizes that she leaves the Fox two choices: to stay in Glome or to return to Greece. Since Orual takes it for granted that the Fox stays in Glome, the fact that the Fox even has a wish to return to Greece is an unexpected betrayal for Orual. After noticing that the Fox is still attracted to his family in Greece, Orual shows her feeling as follows: “It embittered me that the Fox should even desire to leave me. He had been the central pillar of my whole life, something (I thought) as sure and established [...]” (*TWHF* 209). In the end, the Fox decides to stay in Glome and Orual wins the battle against his family, who might endanger her identity as the Fox’s daughter.

Furthermore, Orual’s *Eros* for Bardia also changes into jealousy every time he shows love for his wife, Ansit. Bardia is a married man who cares about his family, so he calls his time with Orual merely as “the day’s work.” (*TWHF* 222). It is a cruel notion to Orual that Bardia regards her not as a beloved woman but merely as a queen to serve. Knowing that she cannot be his wife, Orual attempts to consider that she is more important than Ansit as his friend. Orual’s feeling of triumph over Ansit is illustrated as follows: “I have known, I have had, so much of him that she [Ansit] could never dream of. She’s his toy, his recreation, his leisure, his solace. I’m in his man’s life” (*TWHF* 233). The fact that there is something Ansit cannot share with Bardia rejoices Orual, and she highlights their friendship in order to fulfill her satisfaction by keeping him in the palace. Orual’s *Eros* causes Bardia’s painful and exhausted life in the end. Although it is clear that Orual’s two types of love for the Fox and Bardia transform, Orual’s enemy is not God but the Fox’s family and Bardia’s wife. Thus, Orual’s *Storge* for the Fox and her *Eros* for Bardia simply emphasize her dictatorial nature, which is culminated in the confrontation with God.

Lewis’s typical representation of a conflict between God and an antagonist is shown in the scenes of Orual’s accusation at the divine court, particularly in her use of the word “Mine.” Orual demands her right to possess Psyche:

“We want to be our own. I was my own and Psyche was mine and no one else had any right to her. Oh, you’ll say you took her away into bliss and joy such as

I could never have given her, and I ought to have been glad of it for her sake. Why? What should I care for some horrible, new happiness which I hadn't given her and which separated her from me? Do you think I wanted her to be happy, that way? It would have been better if I'd seen the Brute tear her in pieces before my eyes. [...] Did you ever remember whose the girl was? She was mine. *Mine*. Do you not know what the word means? Mine! You're thieves, seducers. That's my wrong. I'll not complain (not now) that you're blood-drinkers and men-eaters. I'm past that ...” (*TWHF* 291-92)

Orual's use of the word “Mine” suggests her sense of ownership. The same usage of “Mine” can also be seen in *The Great Divorce*, an allegorical tale about a bus ride from Hell to Heaven (Schakel *Reason and Imagination* 28). In this book, the similar situation is demonstrated in Pam's statement. Pam is a Ghost who wants to meet her lost son, Michael. Taking a bus tour to see her son again, Pam is disappointed because she sees not Michael but her brother, Reginald. Pam insists on meeting Michael, but Reginald says that she is required to admit that her love for her son was too possessive and egoistic. Reginald explains that she needs total surrender to God to see Michael again. Pam cannot accept his advice, insisting, “No one had a right to come between me and my son. Not even God. Tell Him that to His face. I want my boy, and I mean to have him. He is mine, do you understand? Mine, mine, mine, for ever and ever” (*GD* 103). Pam decides to stay in Hell, regardless of how Reginald encourages her to convert to God. After witnessing this situation, George MacDonald, the narrator's guide, explains the scene as follows: “What she calls her love for her son has turned into a poor, prickly, astringent sort of thing” (*GD* 104). Although Pam insists that she loves her son deeply, MacDonald reveals that Pam's love is fake. In *The Screwtape Letters*, the senior demon Screwtape suggests “the sense of ownership in general is always to be encouraged” (*SL* 113) because the word “Mine” actually belongs to either God or Satan:

And all the time the joke is that the word “Mine” in its fully possessive sense cannot be uttered by a human being about anything. In the long run either Our

Father [Satan] or the Enemy [God] will say “Mine” of each thing that exists, and specially of each man. They will find out in the end, never fear, to whom their time, their souls, and their bodies really belong – certainly not to *them* – whatever happens. At present the Enemy says “Mine” of everything on the pedantic, legalistic ground that He made it: Our Father hopes in the end to say “Mine” of all things on the more realistic and dynamic ground of conquest, [...] (SL 114-15)

In this extract, the collapsed dualistic conflict between God and the Devil is suggested as Screwtape admits that only God can call everything “Mine.” Even though they hope to be able to call humans “Mine” someday, only God, the maker of all things, can legally and legitimately use the word for now. In *Till We Have Faces*, Orual’s use of the word “Mine” shows that she, like Pam and the Devil, is in opposition to God by playing god herself and separating her own self from her creator. Considering the fact that Orual employs this word as if she possesses Psyche, it is possible to assume that this scene shows Orual’s closest approach to Evil.

4. Orual’s Conversion

The significant difference between Orual in *Till We Have Faces* and Lewis’s other antagonists in his previous books is that the antagonist of God in this novel is converted in the end. In *The Four Loves*, Lewis states, “[t]he natural loves are summoned to become modes of Charity [*Agape*] while also remaining the natural loves they were” (161-2).⁴³ The natural loves do not completely change because the traits of each love remain; for example, the mother’s love for the daughter remains as it is, although its basis changes into the mode of *Agape*. Orual’s recognition of *Agape* changes her distorted loves into how they are supposed to be. The final section of this chapter explores Orual’s spiritual journey from a selfish queen to a selfless convert. Focusing on the scenes of Psyche’s tasks, the first part of this section examines the difference between Lewis’s *Till We Have Faces* and Apuleius’s original version. The second part studies Charles

Williams's doctrine of Exchange, which has an influence on the scene of Orual helping Psyche. The final part of this section examines Orual's conversion, which leads her to recognize her incompetence and imperfection as an antagonist of God.

Owing to his intention to incorporate the Christian concept of *Agape* into a pagan world, Lewis alters the descriptions of Psyche's tasks in *Till We Have Faces* from Apuleius's original version. In Apuleius's *The Golden Ass*, Psyche is required to complete four tasks after her banishment: to sort out mixed seeds, to fetch wool from the golden sheep, to collect the black water from the source of the rivers Styx and Cocytus, and to go to the underworld to take Queen Proserpina's box filled with beauty. On the verge of accomplishing the fourth task, Psyche is impelled by curiosity and opens Proserpina's box. In the end, Psyche is saved by her husband, Cupid. In Apuleius's story, Psyche does not complete her task by herself, as she always has supporters: ants sorting out the seed, Pan advising her on collecting the wool, Jupiter's eagle fetching the bucket of black water instead of her, and Cupid saving her from eternal sleep. Recognizing this fact, Lewis describes the scenes of Psyche's tasks from the perspective of Psyche's supporter, Orual. In Lewis's version, Orual helps Psyche complete the tasks of sorting out the mixed seeds by transforming into the ant, fetching the golden wool by sacrificing herself to a violent sheep, and collecting the black water by walking over the painfully hot sands to carry an empty bowl for Psyche. In a vivid vision, Orual is led by the Fox to see the pictures depicting Psyche's difficult tasks. Seeing Psyche accomplishing them without any effort, Orual asks the Fox, "But how could she – did she really – do such things and go to such places – and not...? Grandfather, she was all but unscratched. She was almost happy" (*TWHF* 300). The Fox then replies, "Another bore nearly all the anguish" (*TWHF* 300). Orual realizes that she bears Psyche's anguish. Through the selfless act of taking another person's burdens, Orual finally conquers her selfish nature.

The scenes of Orual bearing Psyche's three burdens are considered to be influenced by Charles Williams's doctrine of Exchange or Substitution. Williams's central idea of

the doctrine of Exchange is the selfless act of bearing another person's burdens. His concrete idea of the doctrine of Exchange is introduced by Lewis in *Arthurian Torso* published in 1948. This book contains a fragment of Williams's *The Figure of Arthur* and Lewis's commentary on Williams's poems. The following statement is Lewis's comment on Williams's doctrine of Exchange:

We can and should "bear one another's burdens" in a sense much more nearly literal than usually dreamed of. Any two souls can ("under the Omnipotence") make an agreement to do so: the one offer to take another's shame or anxiety or grief and the burden will actually be transferred. [sic.] (*AT* 123)

This comment shows that the doctrine of Exchange is possibly practiced through the taking of another person's burdens of shame, anxiety, or grief. The connection of Orual's selfless act and Williams's doctrine of Exchange is also recognized by some critics as follows: "It calls attention also to the doctrine of substitution in *Till We Have Faces*, something perhaps learned from Charles Williams, by which one person suffers the pain of another, such as Orual's having Psyche's pain in her side" (Kilby 64). Clearly, Lewis's attempt to demonstrate Williams's doctrine of Exchange is seen in Orual's self-sacrifice.

The dualistic conflict between Orual and God is easily collapsed as she comes to regard herself as one of God's creatures in the end. After realizing her deadly pride and self-centered claim, she kneels in front of Psyche to surrender herself: "'Oh Psyche, oh goddess,' I said. 'Never again will I call you mine; but all there is of me shall be yours. Alas, you know now what it's worth. I never wished you well, never had one selfless thought of you. I was a craver'" (*TWHF* 305). The comparison of her accusation in which she calls Psyche "Mine" with her statement of "all there is of me shall be yours" implies Orual's dramatic redirection as she finally learns how to be an obedient and humble servant. Orual then notices that the origin of everything, including herself, is God Himself:

I was being unmade. I was no one. But that's little to say; rather, Psyche

herself was, in a manner, no one. I loved her as I would once have thought it impossible to love, would have died any death for her. And yet, it was not, not now, she that really counted. Or if she counted (and oh, gloriously she did) it was for another's sake. The earth and stars and sun, all that was or will be, existed for his sake. And he was coming. The most dreadful, the most beautiful, the only dread and beauty there is, was coming. (*TWHF* 307)

Orual finally understands that her love and she originate from the one she once accused. Her love, which was separated from God and became a demon, changes into a genuine one and comes home at last. In *The Four Loves*, Lewis states as follows:

It is not that we shall be asked to turn from them, so dearly familiar, to a Stranger. When we see the face of God we shall know that we have always known it. He has been a party to, has made, sustained and moved moment within, all our earthly experiences of innocent love. All that was true love in them was, even on earth, far more His than ours, and ours only because His. In Heaven there will be no anguish and no duty of turning away from our earthly Beloved. First, because we shall have turned already; from the portraits to the Original, from the rivulets to the Fountain, from the creatures He made lovable to Love Himself. But secondly, because we shall find them all in Him. By loving Him more than them we shall love them more than we now do. (168-69)

To love God does not mean to cease loving others, because to love God means to know Love. At the end of the novel, Psyche gives the casket filled with beauty to Orual and makes Orual as beautiful as Psyche. Orual sees the reflection of Psyche and herself in the water and realizes that there are two Psyches: "Two Psyches, the one clothed, the other naked? Yes, both Psyches, both beautiful (if that mattered now) beyond all imagining, yet not exactly the same" (*TWHF* 307-08). Orual sees herself gaining Psyche's divine beauty in the reflection of the water. This physical transformation indicates her spiritual transformation from ugliness to beauty within. As can be seen, Orual, realizing that she was fighting against the origin of her loves and herself, surrenders herself to be taken into

the Divine Goodness. Orual, who was once incorporated into a dualistic opposition of Good and Evil, conquers her ugly nature and proves that the conflict of God and her is fundamentally meaningless.

Conclusion

To conclude this chapter, by analyzing the representation of Orual, the Lewisian antagonist of *Till We Have Faces*, it is clarified that a pagan love elevated by the Christian love functions to collapse the Dualism of Good and Evil. Lewis added the Greek love *Storge* to three Christian loves, *Philia*, *Eros*, and *Agape*, and published *Till We Have Faces* as a step in the development of his theological work entitled *The Four Loves*. In terms of Lewis's categorization of the types of love in his 1940 letter, Orual has *Storge* for Psyche, *Storge* and *Philia* for the Fox, and *Philia* and *Eros* for Bardia. These natural loves, especially *Storge*, are gradually separated from God, deified, and eventually demonized. Hence, Orual, who accuses God for taking Psyche away from her, can be regarded as one of the Lewisian antagonists deifying themselves. However, Orual takes on Psyche's tasks and ultimately realizes that her love for others and even her own existence cannot be separated from her origin. Human love, as well as our lives, cannot be separated from the divine and selfless love because God is Love, as Lewis partly quotes from the New Testament at the beginning of *The Four Loves*: "God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him" (1 John 4:16). Since love, the center of the Christian faith, triggers Orual's accusation and conversion, Orual is considered both further from and closer to God than any other Lewisian antagonists.

Conclusion

It can be concluded that Lewis's representations of antagonists are based on the Christian concept of Evil within the collapsed Dualism of Good and Evil. Being against God, the Lewisian antagonists are positioned as Evil within Dualism; however, as Christian catechism rejects the notion of equal powers of Good and Evil, these antagonists are demoted, dismantled, and eventually defeated in the face of Good. By analyzing their characterizations from various perspectives, it is proved that Lewis aims to clarify and nullify Evil in the age of uncertainty.

Lewis's concepts regarding God and the Devil indicate definitions of Good and Evil. In ancient times, God was regarded as an absolute Goodness that transcends human understanding. However, after the Age of Enlightenment, people began to claim that the Goodness of God was required to be understood through reason. In the twentieth century, the two world wars exposed human cruelty and evoked skepticism. Lewis, who fought in the First World War, fulfilled his obligation as a citizen, and eventually became a Christian apologist, considered it his duty to restore people's belief in the absoluteness of God. The concept of the Law of Nature, a guide that shows what is Good or Evil, proves that God, connected to us all, reigns as the absolute Goodness. Since humans are so immature that we cannot always be good, God guides and sometimes transforms us as a "Physician." However, by regarding oneself as a god, one breaks one's connection with God and turns oneself Evil. The Evil ones, such as devils, always regard themselves as equal to God; nevertheless, an opposition between Good and Evil collapses because Evil, by separating itself from God, denies the source of its own existence and falls into self-contradiction. Thus, the absoluteness of Good and vulnerability of Evil consolidate the foundation for Lewis's characterizations of antagonists.

In light of the historical context of the rise of Nazism, the characterizations of Savage and his Dwarfs in *The Pilgrim's Regress* are important. In *The Pilgrim's Regress*,

an allegorical novel written and published when Nazi Germany began to seize power, philosophical and political thought in the twentieth century is portrayed through the characters. The Dwarfs, for example, allegorically represent the political movements of Nazism and Communism. Their master, Savage, is an allegory of Heroic Nihilism, which the Nazi philosophers once glorified. Savage expresses his disappointment with the world in which he lives and his urge for destruction. Even though his inclination toward violence and cruelty are palpable, Vertue, John's conscience, is drawn to Savage for his charismatic appeal, similar to how German people used to be drawn to Adolf Hitler. Savage's will to substitute God with himself indicates the oppositional structure of God (the Landlord) versus Savage. However, the depiction of the Dwarfs reveals that no one can ever be a perfect substitute for God. Since Savage is merely a tenant of the Landlord like the other ideologies and ideas allegorized in the book, the Dwarfs who adore him are "less than men" who cannot see what is most important to them, similar to the Germans who adored Hagen instead of Siegfried. By describing the Dwarfs as the reversion of Humankind, *The Pilgrim's Regress* radically subverts Savage as the ultimate opposition of Good. Therefore, Lewis's political criticism of Nazi Germany in *The Pilgrim's Regress* is grounded in the Christian rejection of the Dualism of Good and Evil.

It is also essential to recognize a scientist's antagonism toward God in *Out of the Silent Planet* and *Perelandra*. Weston's scientism, interplanetary colonization, and Life-Force imply that the relationship between God and Weston certainly fits in the framework of Good and Evil. Although Lewis appreciated science fiction as akin to mythopoetic literature, he was skeptical about the human progress advocated by some science fiction writers. Lewis believed that, as the word "progress" should mean a path to Good, mere upward mobility in the name of "progress" would make us prouder. Embodying these ideas, Weston is depicted as a scientist willing to make sacrifices, Ransom's life in particular, for the advance of science. As highlighted in the scene of the murder of Hyoi in *Out of the Silent Planet*, Weston's scientism becomes merely a means of justifying violence against natives. Science, civilization and progress that are

not grounded in Good ultimately destroy themselves. The conflict between God and Weston lies in Weston's plan for planetary colonization, which is an act that challenges God's quarantine regulations placed to prevent depravity from spreading to the outer planets. Hence, Weston can be regarded to be in opposition to God like the other Lewisian antagonists. In *Perelandra*, Weston becomes a believer of Emergent Evolution and the Life-Force, arguing that progress itself nullifies the dualistic opposition between God and the Devil. By denying both God and the Devil, Weston falls into satanic self-worship and ultimately becomes the "Un-Man." Thus, it is revealed that Weston's scientism leads him to interplanetary colonization, which places him against God in *Out of the Silent Planet*, and his faith in the Life-Force makes himself sub-human and ultimately invalidates Evil within Lewis's Christian concept of Dualism.

Moreover, the conflict between N.I.C.E. and St. Anne's within the framework of the conflict between homosexuality and heterosexuality in *That Hideous Strength* also suggests the battlefield of Good and Evil. In light of Lewis's arguments in *The Abolition of Man*, which is considered the root of its characterization, N.I.C.E. is portrayed as a group of scientists without "Chests" who aim for the realization of Technocracy, a society dominated by scientists. N.I.C.E. struggles to build a new order outside traditional morality called *Tao*, but their attempt is equivalent to the acts of the devils who deny their own roots in an attempt to oppose God. The members of N.I.C.E. do not realize that the denial of *Tao* means the denial of their own humanity. They seek to dominate nature, humankind, and ultimately God from outside *Tao*. The exclusive bonds of the Conditioners, which are strengthened by the nature of "The Inner ring," are also tightened by their admiration and longing for a masculine body. However, the desire to go inward is eventually replaced by a physical, rather than spiritual connection, and truth they should seek is lost. Homosexuality, therefore, metaphorically symbolizes the ultimate form of "The Inner Ring," which allows its members to retain their self-worship. Unlike St. Anne's, which functions as a community with male and female couples, N.I.C.E., with its lack of women and femininity, does not function as a Christian community. Although

they have a “Head” like the people in St. Anne’s do, their “Head” is literally the head of Alcasan being kept alive artificially. Ultimately, N.I.C.E., whose bond is strengthened by homosexual preferences, is led to self-demolition as the members lose faith in each other amidst the confusion of language, murder each other, and lose their own humanity. The members of N.I.C.E., who once tried to dominate Nature, Humankind, and God, cease to be human beings. Thus, the self-admiration and self-worship of the homosexuals without “Chests” indeed make them turn against God.

Furthermore, the representation of the White Witch (Jadis) in *The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe* and *The Magician’s Nephew* in the series of *The Chronicles of Narnia* is vital as she is against God because of her gender interchangeability. The name “Jadis” leads to Wan Jadis, a character from Lewis’s unpublished heroic poem “The Quest of Bleheris.” Jadis in *The Chronicles of Narnia* and Wan Jadis in “The Quest of Bleheris” both betray their gender as Jadis behaves like a man, and Wan Jadis, like a woman. From Lewis’s gender essentialist perspective, gender precedes sex. As gender is given by God, the act of betraying it is equivalent to the betrayal of God. From this point of view, the name “Jadis” symbolizes opposition to God in terms of gender. This gender interchangeability is complemented by Lilith, the ancestor of Jadis. Lilith, Adam’s first wife, once refused to lie under him during sexual intercourse and advocated gender equality. According to Lewis, since gender equality is an act that nullifies the differences between men and women, it makes two genders interchangeable and delegitimizes the holiness of gender. Hence, women who seek to gain equality, such as Lilith and Jadis, are threats to Christianity. While the nullification of gender differences brings about a totalitarian, singular, and uniform world, as symbolized by the eternal winter in Narnia, Aslan’s arrival restores color and individuality. In the end, the restoration of Aslan’s mane and the four children’s individual differences defeat the White Witch. Aslan’s revival of masculinity and humans’ fulfillment of their given roles turn Narnia into a new state as an ideal Christian community. Embodied by the White Witch, the concept opposed to God in these two works is gender interchangeability, which is

defeated in the end by the revival of gender hierarchy.

Finally, the representation of Orual, both narrator and antagonist of *Till We Have Faces*, demonstrates that love functions as the root of the antagonist's conflict with God. Set in a pre-Christian world, *Till We Have Faces* is a retelling of the story of Psyche and Cupid. In *Till We Have Faces*, a concept of four types of love that would later be expatiated in *The Four Loves* is expressed: Christian love of *Philia*, *Eros* and *Agape*, and Greek love of *Storge*. Orual's *Storge* for Psyche, *Storge* and *Philia* for the Fox, and *Eros* for Bardia, show that the classification of love is already referred to. The core of the story is a conflict between *Storge* and *Agape*. Although Orual loves Psyche like her own daughter, her love transforms when she sees that Psyche has a longing for the Gray Mountain and is determined to live as Cupid's wife. Her *Storge* is separated from God, and deified, which eventually turns her into a demon. Her use of the word "Mine," emphasizing her sense of ownership, suggests that Orual is completely separated from God. The ultimate representation of a dualistic conflict can be seen in Orual's accusation of God. However, Orual sacrifices herself for Psyche and realizes that her love and even she are rooted in the divine love, *Agape*. In other words, the dualistic conflict of paganism and Christianity, represented by *Storge* and *Agape*, collapses through a process in which a Greek love is saved by Christian love. Hence, it can be said that a pagan love creates a dualistic conflict between God and His creature, but it collapses in the end as it is saved by Christian love.

The imperfection of Evil, which Lewis depicts through various genres including allegory, science fiction, fantasy, and mythology, suggests his faith in the absoluteness of Good in the post-Christian society. After becoming a Christian apologist, Lewis preached on the greater one guiding human beings in a time of uncertainty. As a Christian writer, he criticized some ideologies and gender views such as Heroic Nihilism, scientism, homosexuality, gender equality, and pagan love to show that these things could be a path to Evil into which one unexpectedly falls. Despite this, Lewis powerfully conveys that such Evil is meaningless in the face of absolute Good. This unshakable

faith in Good shown in Lewis's works reflects the following statement in the New Testament: "And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not" (John 1:5). The conflict between Good and Evil is also the conflict between light and darkness; while light knows darkness, darkness cannot comprehend it. As the dynamics of the opposition collapses, the readers realize how to follow the path to Good full of light. Even though the Good and Evil Lewis presents in his works may be criticized and censured by some readers, his works will continue to be read and will become a light in the time of darkness.

(45000)

Notes

1. Coincidentally, the day Lewis died was the same day that John. F. Kennedy (1917-1963), the 35th President of the United States, was assassinated. The assassination of the U.S. President almost overshadowed Lewis's obituary on the newspapers at that time. Aldous Huxley (1894-1963), the author of *Brave New World* (1932), also died on the very same day, and this brought Peter Kreeft to write a book entitled *Between Heaven and Hell: A Dialog Somewhere Beyond Death with John F. Kennedy, C. S. Lewis, & Aldous Huxley*, which is an imaginary discussion of Christian faith between Lewis, Huxley, and Kennedy in Purgatory.
2. The fact that Lewis regards Pride not only as the most abominable sin but also his personal obstacle is discussed in Chapter I of this dissertation.
3. "God in the Dock" is Walter Hooper's title for "Difficulties in Presenting the Christian Faith to Modern Unbelievers" compiled in *Lumen Vitae* vol. III in September 1948.
4. The Law of Nature is slightly different from conscience in his writings since Lewis defines conscience as the following two meanings: "the pressure a man feels upon his will to do what he thinks is right" and "his judgement as to what the content of right and wrong are" ("Why I Am Not a Pacifist" *WG* 65). Lewis states that conscience in the first sense is "the sovereign of the universe, which 'if it had power as it has right, would absolutely rule the world'" ("Why I Am Not a Pacifist" *WG* 65).
5. "Religion and Rocketry" was originally published as "Will We Lose God in Outer Space?" in *Christian Herald*, April 1958.
6. "The Seeing Eye" was first published under the title "Onward, Christian Spacemen" in the American periodical, *Show* vol. III in February 1963. Walter Hooper renamed the title and compiled it in *Christian Reflections*.
7. Screwtape's eloquence is based on Adolf Hitler's speech in 1940. On July 20, 1940, Lewis wrote a letter to Warren, who had been evacuated from Dunkirk, and explained about the night he was almost tempted by Hitler's speech:

Humphrey came up to see me last night (not in his medical capacity) and we listened to Hitler's speech together. I don't know if I'm weaker than other people: but it is a positive revelation to me how *while the speech lasts* it is impossible not to waver just a little. I should be useless as a schoolmaster or a policeman. Statements which I *know* to be untrue all but convince me, at any rate for the moment, if only the man says them unflinchingly. (CL vol. 2 425)

In this letter, Lewis openly reveals that he was almost convinced by Hitler's speech for a moment. This incident is considered the origin of *The Screwtape Letters*. Screwtape's first letter appeared on May 2, 1941, on the page of *The Guardian*, a weekly Anglican religious newspaper, and it continued until November 28, 1941. In the following year, the collection of Screwtape's letters were published as an epistolary novel entitled *The Screwtape Letters*.

8. The definition of *Tao* is fully explained in Chapter IV.
9. A shortened version of this essay appeared as "Notes on the Way" in *Time and Tide*, vol. XXII on March 29, 1941. The longer version compiled in *God in the Dock* appeared in *The Socratic Digest*, No. 2 in June 1944.
10. Although *The Pilgrim's Regress* was not a commercial success, critics praised its high degree of perfection. In *The Times Literary Supplement* on July 6, 1933, *The Pilgrim's Regress* received an excellent review: "It is impossible to traverse more than a few pages of the allegory without recognizing a style that is out of the ordinary" (qtd. in Green and Hooper 131). In *Blackfriars* on February 4, 1936, George Sayer said that "Thanks to a mind of quite remarkable acuity, he [Lewis] is able to expose, in only a few lines, the most essential weakness of almost every contemporary doctrine" (qtd. in Green and Hooper 131-32). On the other hand, some critics wrongly assumed Lewis was a Roman Catholic, not an Anglican, and they congratulated him for making a contribution to Catholic Literature (Hooper 185).
11. When Lewis asked Greeves for his criticisms on *The Pilgrim's Regress*, he suggested that all the Latin and Greek quotations should be translated or omitted (Green and

- Hooper 130-31).
12. Two years after the original 1933 publication of *The Pilgrim's Regress* by J. M. Dent and Sons in Britain, the second edition was published by Sheed and Ward in 1935. In the same year, *The Pilgrim's Regress* was first published by the same publishing company in America. The third edition, with Lewis's afterword and headlines, was published in 1943 by Geoffrey Bles (Hooper 801).
 13. David Jasper points out that *The Allegory of Love* published in 1936 provides the rhetorical backdrop to *The Pilgrim's Regress* (225).
 14. "Swastici" is derived from swastika. A swastika is "[the] symbol (with clockwise projecting limbs) used as the emblem of the German (and other) Nazi parties" and it is also referred to as a Hakenkreuz ("swastika" def.2).
 15. Lewis occasionally employs the metaphor of the Landlord and tenants as follows: "Does it not make a great difference whether I am, so to speak, the landlord of my own mind and body, or only a tenant, responsible to the real landlord?" (MC 74).
 16. "First and Second Things" was first published under the title "Notes on the Way" in *Time and Tide* vol. XXII on June 27, 1942.
 17. As a child, Lewis enjoyed Norse mythology, especially Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's *The Saga of King Olaf*, a translated poem on Balder entitled "Tegner's Drapa," and *Siegfried and the Twilight of the Gods*. He learned about *The Ring of the Nibelung* from a magazine *The Soundbox*, wrote his own heroic poem of Wagnerian Nibelung story, and purchased *Siegfried and the Twilight of the Gods* illustrated by Arthur Rackham (SBJ 72-75).
 18. The theme of putting first thing first is described in his letter to Dom Bede Griffith as "[p]ut first things first and we get second things thrown in: put second things first and we lost *both* first and second things" (qtd. in Brown "The Screwtape Letters: Telling the Truth Upside Down" 187). Also, Lewis refers to it in a different manner as follows: "A man who makes his golf or his motor-bicycle the centre of his life, or a woman who devotes all her thoughts to clothes or bridge or her dog, is being just as

- ‘intemperate’ as someone who gets drunk every evening” (*MC* 79).
19. Although Lewis’s intention was to instruct Christian doctrine in a form of science fiction, many reviewers did not understand what he meant by *Out of the Silent Planet*. Hooper regards E. L. Mascall as one of the few reviewers who understood the author’s intention. In *Theology* published in April 1939, Mascall states as follows: “This is an altogether satisfactory story, in which fiction and theology are so skillfully blended that non-Christian will not realize that he is being instructed until it is too late. It is excellent propaganda and first-rate entertainment” (qtd. in Hooper 214).
 20. The meaning of the word *Maleldil* is clarified by Lewis in a reply on August 11, 1945, addressed to Victor Hamm’s article, “Mr. Lewis in Perelandra” as follows: “MAL- is really equivalent to the definite article in some of the definite article’s use. ELDIL means a lord or ruler, Maleldil ‘The Lord’: i.e. it is, strictly speaking, the Old Solar not for DEUS but for DOMINUS” (qtd. in Hooper 213). Hooper clarifies the other words including the “Old One” (God the Father), the “Bent” Oyarsa of *Thulcandra* (Satan), and *Eldila* (Angels) (213).
 21. The conversation is compiled as “Unreal Estates” in *Of Other Worlds*.
 22. Arthur C. Clarke, a science fiction writer who became a chairman of the British Interplanetary Society in 1946, was offended by Lewis’s paragraph concerning Weston in *Perelandra*. Clarke mentions Lewis’s view on Interplanetary Project in his fiction, *Preface to Space* in 1951. Clarke and Lewis’s creative techniques were incompatible because Clarke’s articulate descriptions of science did not interest Lewis. Lewis and Clarke met in a pub in Oxford to have a discussion in 1947 (Nakamura 290-91).
 23. In defense of his claim, Lewis employs a metaphor of painter and picture to expose a contradiction in Pantheism. According to Lewis, pantheists persist that painter *is* his picture, so the painter should die if the picture is destroyed. It is absurd to equate painter and picture from Lewis’s perspective. His Christian theory explains that the universe (the picture) should be separated from the Creator (the artist) (*MC* 37).
 24. According to David Lake’s “The Variant Texts of *That Hideous Strength*” (1989),

there are numerous differences in three editions of the novel: The Bodley Head version in 1945, The Macmillan version in 1946, and The Avon Books version in 1946, whose title is changed to *The Tortured Planet*. The Macmillan version is seemingly printed from Lewis's original manuscript, whereas the Bodley Head version is revised by Lewis or one of his editors before the publication. In terms of the Avon Books version, the Avon Publishing asked Lewis to abridge the novel, so it is third time shorter than the other two (Hooper 241). This dissertation refers to *That Hideous Strength* published by Harper Collins Publishers, which is based on the Bodley Head version.

25. Lewis was a great admirer of Charles Williams. Williams had been working at Oxford University Press when the Second World War broke out in 1939. The company moved its offices from London to Oxford, and this circumstance allowed Williams to participate the meetings of the Inklings for a while.
26. In a letter addressed to Dorothy L. Sayers on December 6, 1945, Lewis admits that the novel received bad reviews because “[a]pparently reviews will not tolerate a mixture of the realistic and the supernatural” (Hooper 231). Lewis says it is pity because he likes this kind of mixture, and everyone has to put up with it in reality (Hooper 231). In the *Evening Standard* published on August 24, 1945, Graham Greene says that the good characters are unconvincing while the description of the Institute is promising: “[...] but I found Professor Ransom and the ‘good’ characters peculiarly unconvincing. The allegory becomes a little too friendly, like a sermon at a children’s service, or perhaps like a whimsical charade organized by a middle-aged bachelor uncle” (Hooper 239).
27. The aim of N.I.C.E. can be succinctly described as “technocracy,” a domination of scientists. As Lewis explains, technocracy is “the form to which a planned society must tend” (“Is Progress Possible?” *GID* 350); in other words, technocracy is a society in which politicians continue to seek the advice of scientists until they become their puppets. Lewis explains it is extremely dangerous for scientists to discuss politics,

which is outside their expertise: “But government involves questions about the good for man, and justice, and what things are worth having at what price; and on these a scientific training gives a man’s opinion no added value” (“Is Progress Possible?” *GID* 351).

28. In Lewis’s “A Reply to Professor Haldane,” Lewis pointed out that Professor Haldane misunderstood his books, especially *That Hideous Strength*:

That Hideous Strength he [Professor Haldane] has almost completely misunderstood. The “good” scientist is put in precisely to show that “scientists” as such are not the target. To make the point clearer, he leaves my N.I.C.E. because he finds he was wrong in his original belief that “it had something to do with science” [...]. To make it clearer yet, my principal character, the man almost irresistibly attracted by the N.I.C.E. is described [...] as one whose “education” had been neither scientific nor classical – merely “Modern.” (*OOW* 123-24)

29. All the seven books were originally published in hardback by Geoffrey Bles and the Bodley Head. The series was published by several publishing companies, such as Penguin Books Ltd. and William Collins & Sons. William Collins & Sons bought Geoffrey Bles, and it was later called Harper Collins after William Collins & Sons and Harper & Row are combined.
30. *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, published on October 16, 1950, by Geoffrey Bles, received fairly good reviews (Hooper 452). In *The Guardian* on February 23, 1951, it is reviewed as “[t]he whole air of the story is rich and strange and coherent; there is something of Hans Andersen’s power to move and George MacDonald’s power to create strange worlds, and it is, naturally, beautifully written” (Hooper 449). *The Magician’s Nephew*, published on May 2, 1955, by the Bodley Head, was admired by E. S. Launterbach in *The New York Herald Tribune Book Review* as follows: “There are magic happenings on every page of this book which will delight old and young lovers of fairy tales. Mr. Lewis’s prose is clear and simple, yet at times extremely

- subtle” (Hooper 451).
31. This chapter mainly employs the name Jadis in the argument of *The Magician’s Nephew* and the White Witch in that of *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*.
 32. As suggested in the paragraph, Lewis argues that there used to be no Christian elements in the series in the composition of *The Chronicles of Narnia*. In a letter addressed to Mrs. Hooke on December 29, 1958, he indicates that Aslan is not an allegory of God, but the answer to the following question: “[W]hat might Christ like if there really were a world like Narnia and He chose to be incarnate and die and rise again in *that* world as He actually has done in ours?” (qtd. in Hooper 424). Despite this, many critics and readers have regarded *The Chronicles of Narnia* as Christian allegory, or even Christian propaganda.
 33. David C. Downing and Paul F. Ford assume that the name Jadis is originally taken from Wan Jadis in Lewis’s prose poem. Downing states that “[t]he powerful witch Jadis we meet in *The Magician’s Nephew* is nothing like this pallid aesthete; yet she too comes from a world where death prevails” (“The Dungeon of His Soul” 50). Ford presents that Lewis’s first published usage of the name Jadis is in his letter to Arthur Greeves on October 4, 1916, referring to Wan Jadis in “The Quest of Bleheris.” Ford continues that the name, which is applied to woman, comes from Lewis’s reading of Francois Villon’s “Ballade des Dames du Temps Jadis” in *Le Grand Testament*, which Lewis read in 1917 according to his letters (Ford 456). During the World War I, Lewis read and particularly loved its well-known refrain “Mais où sont les neiges d’antan?” (“But where are the snows of yesteryear?”) (Ford 456).
 34. Some Jewish women studied the Talmud, interpreted the Bible, and participated in the women’s equality movement that took place within the American Jewish community. They espoused Lilith as their group name (Ueyama 339).
 35. In the movie *The Chronicles of Narnia: The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, the White Witch, played by Tilda Swinton, wears the mane of Aslan after she killed him on the Stone Table. By wearing the symbol of Aslan’s masculinity, she shows off

her power as a ruler. Isis Mussenden, the costume designer for the film, explains, “It’s as if she’s telling these people, I’m your Queen and you’ve lost your king, and how irreverent I am to wear his fur” (qtd. in Moore 207).

36. Lewis’s concept of an ideal Christian community is also suggested in the relationship between Eustace and his parents in *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader*. One of Eustace’s characteristics is that he calls his parents by their names, “Harold” and “Alberta,” instead of “Father” and “Mother” (7). Lewis believed that the modern notion that children should call their parents by their Christian names is false as follows:

For this is an effort to ignore the difference in kind which makes for real organic unity. They are trying to inoculate the child with the preposterous view that one’s mother is simply a fellow citizen like anyone else, to make it ignorant of what all men know and insensible to what all men feel. They are trying to drag the featureless repetitions of the collective into the fuller and more concrete world of the family. (“Membership” *WG* 165)

As suggested, a community of the family is undermined when children see their parents not as fathers and mothers, but mere members of a Christian community. This paragraph illustrates the idea that the order of family is maintained by patriarchy; children respect their parents, wives respect their husbands, and men, as fathers and husbands, must fulfill their responsibilities to form a small Christian community.

37. Though Lewis personally loved *Till We Have Faces* as his best fiction, critics and readers did not wholly comprehend it. In his review of *Till We Have Faces* in *Time and Tide*, T. H. White states that Lewis should have used plain terms instead of metaphysical explanation in the final section (qtd. in Hooper 262). Hooper explains in defense of *Till We Have Faces* that the book is too complicated for most of the reviewers (262). The book was reassessed in recent years, and it is now regarded not only as Lewis’s best book but as a great English literary work (Hooper 243).
38. Lewis originally intended to title it *Bareface*, but he was asked to change it into *Till*

- We Have Faces*. This title is taken from the narrator's phrase, "How can they meet us face to face till we have faces?" (*TWHF* 294).
39. The Fox is a Stoic, and the founder of Stoic philosophy, Zeno, started teaching in Athens in about 310. B. C. E. (Myers *C. S. Lewis in Context* 193).
40. The name Emeth means "truth" in Hebrew as it is indicated in Lewis's writings as follows: "He [God] enjoins what is good because it is good, because He is good. Hence His laws have *emeth* 'truth,' intrinsic validity, rock-bottom reality, being rooted in His own nature, and are therefore as solid as that Nature which He has created" (*RP* 71).
41. In January 1958, two years after the publication of *Till We Have Faces*, the Episcopal Radio-TV Foundation of Atlanta asked Lewis to make some tape-recordings. Lewis could choose any subject, so he chose to talk about Love. On January 5, 1958, Lewis said as follows: "The subject I want to say something about in the near future in some form or other is the four loves – Storge, Philia, Eros and Agape. This seems to bring in nearly the whole of Christian ethics" (qtd. in Hooper 367). Finishing his script in the summer of 1958, Lewis used it as the basis of his book, *The Four Loves* (Hooper 367).
42. According to Schakel, two of those natural loves coexist within Orual; for example, Orual's love for the Fox has strong elements of *Storge* and *Philia*, and her love for Bardia has those of both *Philia* and *Eros* (*Reason and Imagination in C. S. Lewis* 54).
43. The term *Agape* shares the same meaning with the word "charity." According to *the Oxford English Dictionary*, the Greek word for "love" in the New Testament is ἀγάπη (*Agape*). ἀγάπη is rooted in the verb ἀγαπάω, which means "to treat with affectionate regard" or "to love." In the Latin Vulgate in the fourth century, ἀγάπη was translated into two words: *dilectio* and *caritas*. *Dilectio* is a noun based on the verb *diligere*, which means "to esteem highly" or "to love." *Caritas*, on the other hand, means "dearness, love founded on esteem." Following this classification, *dilectio* was translated into "love" and *caritas* into "charity" in Wycliff's English bible

in the fourteenth century. However, Tyndale and King James Version did not follow the *dilectio* and *caritas* of the Latin Vulgate, and used “love” more often than “charity.” In the Revised Version in 1881, the difference between “love” and “charity” was completely eliminated, and all of the instances were replaced by the word “love” (“charity”). Thus, the biblical words of “agape,” “love,” and “charity” share the same meaning.

Bibliography

1. Primary Sources

- Lewis, C. S. *The Abolition of Man*. 1944. Harper One, 2001.
- . *The Allegory of Love*. 1936. Cambridge UP, 2013.
- . *All My Road before Me: The Diary of C. S. Lewis 1922-1927*. Edited by Walter Hooper, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1991.
- . *Arthurian Torso: Containing the Posthumous Fragment of "the Figure of Arthur" by Charles Williams and a Commentary on the Arthurian Poems of Charles Williams by C. S. Lewis*. Oxford UP, 1948.
- . *Christian Reflections*. 1967. Edited by Walter Hooper, William B. Eerdmans, 2014.
- . *The Collected Letters of C. S. Lewis*. Edited by Walter Hooper, 3 vols, Harper Collins, 2004-2007.
- . *C. S. Lewis: Letters to Children*. Edited by Lyle W. Dorsett and Marjorie Lamp Mead, Collier, 1985.
- . *The Four Loves*. 1960. William Collins, 2016.
- . *God in the Dock: Essays on Theology and Ethics*. Edited by Walter Hooper, William B. Eerdmans, 1970.
- . *The Great Divorce*. 1946. William Collins, 2015.
- . *A Grief Observed*. 1961. Harper One, 1994.
- . *The Horse and His Boy*. 1954. Harper Collins, 2000.
- . *The Last Battle*. 1956. Harper Collins, 2000.
- . *Letters of C. S. Lewis*. Edited by W. H. Lewis, Harcourt, 1966.
- . *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*. 1950. Harper Collins, 2000.
- . *The Magician's Nephew*. 1955. Harper Collins, 2000.
- . *Mere Christianity*. 1952. Collins, 2012.

- . *Miracles*. 1947. William Collins, 2016.
- . *Of Other Worlds: Essays and Stories*. 1966. Harper One, 2017.
- . *Out of the Silent Planet*. 1938. Harper Collins, 2005.
- . *Perelandra*. 1943. Harper Collins, 2005.
- . *The Pilgrim's Regress*. 1933. William B. Eerdmans, 2014.
- . *Poems*. 1964. Harper One, 2017.
- . *A Preface to Paradise Lost*. 1942. Oxford UP, 2016.
- . *Present Concerns: Journalistic Essays*. 1986. Harper One, 2017.
- . *Prince Caspian*. 1951. Harper Collins, 2000.
- . *The Problem of Pain*. 1940. William Collins, 2015.
- . *The Reflections on the Psalms*. Harper One, 1958.
- . *The Screwtape Letters*. 1942. Harper One, 2001.
- . *The Silver Chair*. 1952. Harper Collins, 2000.
- . *Studies in Words*. 1960. Cambridge UP, 2013.
- . *Surprised by Joy*. 1955. Mariner, 2012.
- . *That Hideous Strength*. 1945. Harper Collins, 2003.
- . *Till We Have Faces*. 1956. Mariner, 2012.
- . *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader*. 1952. Harper Collins, 2000.
- . *The Weight of Glory*. 1949. William Collins, 2013.
- . *The World's Last Night and Other Essays*. 1952. Harper Collins, 2017.

2. Secondary Sources

- “Agape.” *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989.
- Ando, Satoshi. *Fantazi to Rekishiteki Kiki* [*Fantasy and Historical Crises: The Golden Age of English Children’s Literature*.] Sairyusha, 2003.
- Aoki, Takeshi. *Zoroasta-kyo Shi (The History of Zoroastrianism)*. Tosui Shobo, 2008.
- Apuleius. *The Golden Ass*. Translated by Robert Graves, Penguin, 1950.
- Augusteijn, Joost, Patrick Dassen, and Maartje Janse, editors. *Political Religion beyond Totalitarianism: The Sacralization of Politics in the Age of Democracy*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Bambach, Charles. *Heidegger’s Roots: Nietzsche, National Socialism and the Greeks*. Cornell UP, 2003.
- Barkman, Adam. “All Is Righteous and There Is No Equality: C. S. Lewis on Gender and Justice.” *Christian Scholar’s Review*, vol. 36, no. 4, 2007, pp. 415-36.
- Barnes, Kenneth C. *Nazism, Liberalism and Christianity: Protestant Social Thought in Germany and Great Britain 1925-1937*. UP of Kentucky, 1991.
- Bartels, Gretchen. “Of Men and Mice: C. S. Lewis on Male-Female Interactions.” *Literature and Theology*, vol. 22, no. 3, 2008, pp. 324-38.
- Benewick, Robert. *The Fascist Movement in Britain*. Penguin P, 1969.
- Bergson, Henri. *L’évolution Créatrice*. 1907. Translated by Masato Goda et al., Chikuma Shobo, 2010.
- Bloom, Harold, editor. *C. S. Lewis*. Chelsea House, 2006.
- Brown, Devin. “Are the Chronicles of Narnia Sexist?” Curtis and Key, pp. 91-108.
- . “The Ongoing Appeal of the Chronicles of Narnia: A Partial Explanation.” *New Review of Children’s Literature and Librarianship*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2003, pp. 99-112.
- . “*The Screwtape Letters: Telling the Truth Upside Down*.” Edwards, pp. 175-208.
- Bunyan, John. *The Pilgrim’s Progress*. Edited by Roger Pooley, Penguin, 2008.

- Carpenter, Humphrey. *The Inklings: C. S. Lewis, J.R.R. Tolkien, Charles Williams and Their Friends*. Allen and Unwin, 1978.
- Chapman, Roger. "The Lion, the Witch and the Cold War: Political Meanings in the Religious Writings of C. S. Lewis." *Journal of Religion and Popular Culture*, vol. 24, no. 1, 2012, pp. 1-14.
- "Charity." *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989.
- The Chronicles of Narnia: The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*. Directed by Andrew Adamson, Walt Disney Pictures, 2005.
- Clarke, Arthur C. *Prelude to Space*. 1951. Translated by Toru Nakamura, Hayakawa Shobo, 2015.
- Curtis, Carolyn, and Mary Pomroy Key, editors. *Women and C. S. Lewis*. Lion Hudson, 2015.
- Daiches, David. *The Present Age*. Shenvall P, 1958.
- Downing, David. C. *C. S. Lewis and the Narnia Chronicles*. Jossey-Bass, 2005.
- . "The Dungeon of his Soul: Lewis's Unfinished 'Quest of Bleheris.'" *Journal of the Marion E. Wade Center*, vol. 15, 1998, pp. 37-54.
- . *The Most Reluctant Convert*. Inter Varsity, 2002.
- . *Planets in Peril*. U of Massachusetts P, 1992.
- . "The Pilgrim's Paradox: Female Characters in *The Pilgrim's Regress*." Curtis and Key, pp. 127-33.
- Dunckel, Mona. "C. S. Lewis as Allegorist: *The Pilgrim's Regress*." Edwards, pp. 29-49.
- , and Karen Rowe. "Understanding C. S. Lewis's *Surprised by Joy*: 'A Most Reluctant' Autobiography." Edwards, pp. 257-78.
- Duriez, Colin. *The Oxford Inklings*. Lion, 2015.
- Dyer, Justin Buckley, and Micah. J. Watson. *C. S. Lewis on Politics and the Natural Law*. Cambridge UP, 2016.
- Edwards, Bruce L, editor. *C. S. Lewis: Life, Works, and Legacy*, 4 vols. Praeger

- Perspectives, 2007.
- Elmore, Steven. “‘The Abolition of Woman’: Gender and Hierarchy in Lewis’ Space Trilogy.” Curtis and Key, pp. 109-19.
- “Eros.” *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989.
- Ezard, John. “Narnia Books Attacked as Racist and Sexist: Phillip Pullman Dismisses Work of C. S. Lewis as Blatant Religious Propaganda.” *The Guardian*, 3 June 2002, p. 8.
- Filmer, Kath. *The Fiction of C. S. Lewis*. Macmillan, 1993.
- . “Masking the Misogynist in Narnia and Glome.” Bloom, pp. 149-64.
- Ford, Paul F. *Companion to Narnia*. 1980. Harper One, 2005.
- Fry, Karin. “No Longer a Friend of Narnia: Gender in Narnia.” *The Chronicles of Narnia and Philosophy: The Lion, the Witch and the Worldview*, edited by Gregory Bassham and Jerry L. Walls, Open Court, 2005, pp. 155-66.
- Gillespie, Michael A. “Nihilism After Nietzsche.” *Bollettino Filosofico*, vol.30, 2015, pp. 80-100.
- Graham, Jean. E. “Women, Sex, and Power: Circe and Lilith in Narnia.” *Children’s Literature Association Quarterly*, vol. 29, 2004, pp. 32-44.
- Green, Roger Lancelyn, and Walter Hooper. *C. S. Lewis: A Biography*. 1974. Harper Collins, 2002.
- Hannay, Margaret. “Surprised by Joy: C. S. Lewis’s Changing Attitudes Toward Women.” *Mythlore*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1976, pp. 15-20.
- Harvey, A. E. *Companion to the New Testament*. Oxford UP, 1979.
- Hilder, Monika. B. *The Feminine Ethos in C. S. Lewis’s The Chronicles of Narnia*. Peter Lang, 2012.
- . “Jack, the ‘Old Woman’ of Oxford: Sexist or Seer?” Curtis and Key, pp. 173-85.
- Hitler, Adolf. *Mein Kampf*. 1925. Translated by Ichiro Hirano et al., Reimei Shobo, 1971.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. 1651. Translated by Yasumasa Tsunoda, Kobunsha

Classics, 2014.

The Holy Bible: King James Version. American Bible Society, 1980.

Hooper, Walter. *C. S. Lewis: A Companion and Guide.* 1996. Harper Collins, 2005.

Hopkins, Lisa. "Female Authority Figures in the Works of Tolkien, C. S. Lewis and Charles Williams." *Mallorn: The Journal of the Tolkien Society*, vol. 33, 1992, pp. 364-66.

Hunt, Peter. *Children's Literature.* Blackwell, 2001.

---. *An Introduction to Children's Literature.* Oxford UP, 1994.

---., editor. *Children's Literature: An Illustrated History.* Oxford UP, 1995.

Iwanami, Tetsuo. *Nihilizumu [Nihilism.]* Risosha, 2006.

Jacobs, Alan. "The Chronicles of Narnia." MacSwain and Ward, pp. 265-80.

---. *The Narnian: The Life and Imagination of C. S. Lewis.* Harper One, 2005.

Jasper, David. "The Pilgrim's Regress and Surprised by Joy." MacSwain and Ward, pp. 223-36.

Kaufmann, U. Milo. "The Pilgrim's Progress and The Pilgrim's Regress: John Bunyan and C. S. Lewis on the Shape of the Christian Quest." *Bunyan in Our Time*, edited by Robert G. Collmer, Kent State UP, 1989, pp. 186-99.

Kilby, Clyde S. *The Christian World of C. S. Lewis.* William B. Eerdmans, 1964.

Kimura, Toshio. *Pushuke, aruiwa Narunia no Kanata e [Psyche, or Beyond Narnia].* Shichigatsudo, 2021.

King, Don W. "C. S. Lewis's 'The Quest of Bleheris' as Prose Poetry." *The Lamp-Post of the Southern California C. S. Lewis Society*, vol. 23, no. 1, 1999, pp. 3-15.

---. "Introduction to the Colloquium Issue: C. S. Lewis and Gender: 'Positively Medieval?'" *Christian Scholar's Review*, vol. 36, no. 4, 2007, pp. 387-90.

Kirk, E. J. *The Chronicles of Narnia: Beyond the Wardrobe.* Harper Collins, 2005.

Kitchen, Martin. *The Third Reich: Charisma and Community.* 2008. Routledge, 2013.

- Koemon, Katsuhiko. "Jan Naberu ni okeru 'Seitoka Dekinai Mono' toshiteno Aku: Sogosyukansei wo Jiku toshita Tetsugakuteki Kosatsu" ("The Unjustifiable in the Philosophy of Jean Nabert: A Case of Philosophical Study of Evil in Terms of Intersubjectivity.") *Jinbun Shakaikagaku Ronso (Studies in Humanities and Social Sciences)*, vol.26, 2017, pp.19-30.
- Kreeft, Peter. *Between Heaven and Hell: A Dialog Somewhere Beyond Death with John F. Kennedy, C. S. Lewis, & Aldous Huxley*. 1982. IVP, 2008.
- Levi-Strauss, Claud. *La Pensée Sauvage*. 1962. Translated by Ōhashi Yasuo, Misuzu Shobo, 1976.
- Lindskoog, Kathryn. "C. S. Lewis: Reactions from Women." *Mythlore*, vol. 3, no. 4, 1976, pp. 18-20.
- . *Finding the Landlord*. Cornerstone P Chicago, 1995.
- Lobdell, Jared. *The Scientifiction Novels of C. S. Lewis: Space and Time in the Ransom Stories*. McFarland and Company, 2004.
- Loconte, Joseph. *A Hobbit, a Wardrobe, and a Great War*. Nelson Books, 2015.
- MacSwain, Robert, and Michael Ward, editors. *The Cambridge Companion to C. S. Lewis*. Cambridge UP, 2010.
- "Maia." *The Encyclopedia Britannica*. 1st ed. 1964.
- Manlove, C. N. "The 'Narnia' Books." Bloom, pp. 83-114.
- McGrath, Alister E. *C. S. Lewis: A Life*. Hodder, 2013.
- McSporran, Cathy. "Daughters of Lilith: Witches and Wicked Women in The Chronicles of Narnia." *Revisiting Narnia: Fantasy, Myth and Religion in C. S. Lewis's Chronicles*, edited by Shanna Caughey, Benbella Books, 2005, pp. 191-204.
- Miyatani, Nobufumi. "Joron (Introduction)." *Aku no Imi: Kirisutokyo no Shiten kara [The Meaning of Evil: From Christian Perspective]*. Edited by Nobufumi Miyatani, Shinkyō, 2004.
- Moore, Perry. *The Chronicles of Narnia: The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe: The*

- Official Illustrated Movie Companion.* Harper San Francisco, 2005.
- Mühling, Markus. *Gott Und Die Welt in Narnia: Eine Theologische Orientierung Zu C. S. Lewis' Der König von Narnia.* Translated by Ueda Akira et al. Ichibaku Shuppansha, 2006.
- Myers, Doris T. *Bareface: A Guide to C. S. Lewis's Last Novel.* U of Missouri P, 2004.
- . *C. S. Lewis in Context.* The Kent State UP, 1994.
- “Myth.” *The Oxford English Dictionary.* 2nd ed. 1989.
- Nagatsuna, Keisuke. *Raipunitsu ni okeru Benshinrontekishii no Konpontekidouki [The Fundamental Motivation of Leibniz's Theodicy].* Koyo Shobo, 2011.
- Nakamura, Toru. Afterword. *Prelude to Space*, by Arthur C. Clarke, translated by Nakamura, Hayakawa Shobo, 2015, pp. 287-96.
- Passmore, Kevin. *Fascism: A Very Short Introduction.* Translated by Norihiko Fukui, Iwanami Shoten, 2016.
- Paxton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Fascism.* Translated by Hiroshi Setooka, Sakurai Shoten, 2009.
- Payne, Leanne. *Real Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Works of C. S. Lewis.* Barker Books, 1995.
- “Philia.” *The Oxford English Dictionary.* 2nd ed. 1989.
- Rackham, Arthur. *Rackham's Color Illustrations for Wagner's "Ring."* Dover, 1979.
- Rauschnig, Hermann. *The Revolution of Nihilism: Warning to the West.* Ams P, 1939.
- Reed, Gerard. *C. S. Lewis Explores Vice and Virtue.* Beacon Hill, 2001.
- Reynolds, Kimberley. *Children's Literature: A Very Short Introduction.* Oxford UP, 2011.
- Root, Jerry. *C. S. Lewis and a Problem of Evil: An Investigation of a Pervasive Theme.* James Clarke, 2009.
- Rowe, Karen. “*Till We Have Faces: A Study of the Soul and the Self.*” Edwards, pp.135-156.
- Sammons, Martha C. *A Guide Through Narnia.* Regent College P, 2004.

- . *War of the Fantasy Worlds: C. S. Lewis and J. R. R. Tolkien on Art and Imagination*. Praeger, 2010.
- Sayer, George. *Jack: C. S. Lewis and His Times*. Harper and Row, 1988.
- Schakel, Peter J. *Reason and Imagination in C. S. Lewis*. William B. Eerdmans, 1984.
- . "Till We Have Faces." MacSwain and Ward, pp. 281-293.
- Scholes, Robert and Eric C. Rabkin. *Science Fiction: History, Science, Vision*. Oxford UP, 1977.
- Schwartz, Sanford. *C. S. Lewis on the Final Frontier: Science and the Supernatural in the Space Trilogy*. Oxford UP, 2009.
- Sena, Hideaki. *Arthur C. Clarke*. NHK, 2020.
- Sherratt Yvonne. *Hitler's Philosophers*. Translated by Michio Mikage et al., Hakusuisha, 2015.
- Shinohara, Motoaki. *Beruguson [Bergson]*. Iwanami, 2006.
- Simon, Caroline J. "On Love." MacSwain and Ward, pp. 146-159.
- Steigmann-Gall, Richard. *The Holy Reich: Nazi Conceptions of Christianity, 1919-1945*. Cambridge UP, 2003.
- . "Nazism and the Revival of Political Religion Theory." *Fascism, Totalitarianism and Political Religion*, edited by Roger Griffin, Routledge, 2005, pp. 82-102.
- "Storge." *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989.
- Suzuki, Fumiharu. "Kirisutokyo Shingiron no Ichikosatsu: Enu Beruja-efu no 'Ungrund' to Kei Baruto no 'Das Nichtige' wo Megutte" ("A Study on Christian Theodicy: An Examination Regarding N. Berdyaev 'Ungrund' and K. Barth 'Das Nichtige.'") *Den-en Chofu Gakuendaigaku Kiyō (Bulletin of Den-en Chofu University)*, vol. 9, 2014, pp. 37-88.
- "Swastika." *The Oxford English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. 1989.
- Tarrants, Thomas. A. "Pride and Humility." *Knowing and Doing: C. S. Lewis Institute*, vol. 44, Winter 2011, pp.3, 14-19.
- Thurlow, Richard. *Fascism in Britain*. Basil Blackwell, 1987.

- Uemura Takeo. "Shingiron (Benshinron)" ("Theodicy.") *Tokyo Daigaku Shukyogaku Nenpo (The University of Tokyo Annual Report of Religious Studies)*, vol.32, 2014, pp.197-99.
- Ueyama, Yasutoshi. *Majo to Kirisuto-kyo [Witches and Christianity]*. Jinbunshoin, 1993.
- Walsh, Chad. *The Literary Legacy of C. S. Lewis*. Harcourt Brace, 1979.
- Ward, Michael. *After Humanity*. Word on Fire Academic, 2021.
- . *Planet Narnia*. Oxford UP, 2008.
- West, John G. editor. *The Magician's Twin: C. S. Lewis on Science, Scientism, and Society*. Discovery Institute, 2012.
- White, Michael. *C. S. Lewis: Creator of Narnia*. Carroll and Graf, 2004.
- Williams, Donald. T. *Deeper Magic: The Theology Behind the Writings of C. S. Lewis*. Square Halo Books, 2016.
- Wilson, A. N. *C. S. Lewis: A Biography*. 1990. Harper Perennial, 2005.
- Wolfe, Judith. "On Power." MacSwain and Ward, pp. 174-88.
- Worley, Matthew. "Communism and Fascism in 1920s and 1930s Britain." *W. H. Auden in Context*. Edited by Tony Sharpe, Cambridge UP, 2013, pp. 141-49
- Zaleski, Philip and Carol Zaleski. *The Fellowship: The Literary Lives of the Inklings*. Farrar Straus and Giroux, 2016.