

# C.S. Lewis, Church Unity, and the Dynamics of the Hallway

Ray Schneider

Assistant Professor of Mathematics and Computer Science  
Bridgewater College, Bridgewater, Virginia

## Abstract

One of the great contributions of C.S. Lewis was and continues to be his desire to promote unity in the body of Christ. From the dark days of World War II in England until his death in 1963, C.S. Lewis drew many disenchanted moderns to a journey with Christ. This paper explores the theme of church unity as found in Lewis's writings, his fiction, his non-fiction, and his vast correspondence. Themes that will be explored are Lewis's vision of unity and his particular doctrinal originality of interpretation which often provided clarity and particular insights. Lewis's own spiritual growth from his conversion, first to theism and then to Christianity will be used as the backbone of the paper. His advice to correspondents and his personal exploration of doctrine as evidenced in his writing will be the resources that tie the narrative together. We seek to provide insight into Lewis's remarkable popularity across denominational lines that so often seem to raise insurmountable obstacles to church unity in our troubled times.

## INTRODUCTION

J. R. R. Tolkien wrote of his friend C. S. Lewis in 1964, less than a year after Lewis died: "... I wish it could be forbidden that after a great man is dead, little men should scribble over him, who have not and must know they have not sufficient knowledge of his life and character to give them any key to the truth. ..." <sup>1</sup> Since I am exactly endeavoring to investigate Christian unity from the viewpoint of C.S. Lewis, Tolkien is speaking directly of me in this matter. I hope that he would not be too cross with me.

I seek to explore Christian unity using the writings of Lewis and those closest to him, his immediate circle of friends. The feasibility of such an effort is promoted by the clarity of C.S. Lewis's mind. Owen Barfield, Lewis's friend of the second kind, found in Lewis an impressive unity characterized by consistency and unswerving sincerity. He summarized it as "presence of mind" and added: "If I were asked to expand on that, I could say only that somehow what he thought about everything was secretly present in what he said about anything." <sup>2</sup> In presenting C.S. Lewis to you, I am striving to make him present to you as a friend and not a distant academic. For that reason I refer to him throughout, almost uniformly as "Jack."

## THE JOURNEY

Clive Staples Lewis was born into a Christian family, but he lost his faith at a young age. Lewis was born in the winter of 1898 in Belfast, Ireland. His father Albert was a lawyer, the first of his family to achieve professional rank, and his mother Flora was the daughter of an Anglican clergyman. Before the age of four, Clive had announced that he would be known as Jacksie, which was later shortened to Jack.

Flora died of cancer on August 23, 1908, when Jack was only nine. While she was sick he prayed for her recovery, and when she died, for a miracle. It was, he wrote, his “first religious experience” but when she was not restored to him his disappointment produced only the sense that “the thing hadn’t worked.”<sup>3</sup> He described his religious sensibilities as pre-Christian. He viewed God as something like a magician.<sup>4</sup>

The death of his mother had a devastating effect on the whole family. Less than a month later (Sep 18, 1908), Albert, himself crippled emotionally by the deaths of his father, his wife and his brother all within a few months, sent Warren, Jack’s older brother, and Jack, to Wynyard in Watford, a school Jack would characterize many years later as ‘Belson.’ The school was run by Rev. Robert Capron whose sanity was doubtful. Ironically it was here that Jack first gained a real faith.

He wrote to his father on October 3, 1908 — “I do not like church here at all because it is so frightfully high church that it might as well be Roman Catholic.” A year later, in a little diary he kept dated November 1909 he wrote: “We were obliged to go to St. John’s, a church which wanted to be Roman Catholic, but was afraid to say so. ... In this abominable place of Romish hypocrites and English liars, the people cross themselves, bow to the Lord’s Table (which they have the vanity to call an altar), and pray to the Virgin.” Oddly, Jack was to write years later: “There first I became an effective believer.” Despite his surface rejection, on a deeper level he was moved.

“Unconsciously, I suspect, the candles and incense, the vestments and the hymns sung on our knees, may have had a considerable, and opposite, effect on me. But I do not think they were the important thing. What really mattered was that I here heard the doctrines of Christianity (as distinct from general “uplift”) taught by men who obviously believed them.”<sup>5</sup>

But Wynyard was a desolate and punishing environment. Warnie, as Warren was called, fell afoul of Rev. Capron (Oldie) soon after returning to the school in September 1908. After some delay he was removed from the school in April 1909 and sent to Malvern College. Jack, however, remained at Wynyard until 1910 when the school collapsed after a legal action brought against Capron. Jack spent a term at Campbell College in Belfast, and then was sent in January 1911 to a small preparatory school named Cherbourg House overlooking Malvern where his serious education began.

It was at Cherbourg House that Jack lost his faith. The school matron, Miss G. E. Cowie, whom Jack loved, was herself spiritually immature. Her confusion was transmitted to the impressionable Lewis. “We all loved her; I the orphan, especially. ... She was (as I should now put it) floundering in the mazes of Theosophy, Rosicrucianism, Spiritualism; the whole Anglo-American Occultist tradition. ... Little by little, unconsciously, unintentionally, she loosened the whole framework, blunted all the sharp edges, of my belief.”<sup>6</sup>

Jack won a scholarship to Malvern College in 1913 but was unhappy there. The emphasis on athletics and games at the school left no room for a reclusive, introspective boy like Jack. He was miserable. He had become an atheist of a sort. “I was at this time

living, like so many Atheists or Antitheists, in a whirl of contradictions. I maintained that God did not exist. I was also very angry with God for not existing. I was equally angry with Him for creating a world.”<sup>7</sup> His father sent him to his old tutor, William T. Kirkpatrick who lived at Great Bookham. “Kirk” or “The Great Knock”, as Albert, Warnie and Jack all called him, was a legend in the Lewis house. He had tutored Albert and in 1913 had also tutored Warnie in preparation for his Army entrance examinations. Warnie won a place at the Royal Military Academy at Sandhurst as a prize cadet entering in February 1914. Jack, in his turn, arrived at Great Bookham in September of 1914, a month after the beginning of World War I.

His first experience of the Knock was a shattering few minutes in which his casual attempts at conversation were demolished as the Kirk revealed to him how utterly shallow and unprepared he was for dealing with serious subjects. “If ever a man came near to being a purely logical entity, that man was Kirk. Born a little later, he would have been a Logical Positivist. The idea that human beings should exercise their vocal organs for any purpose except that of communicating or discovering truth was to him preposterous. ... Some boys would not have liked it; to me it was red beef and strong beer.”<sup>8</sup>

Kirk was himself an atheist. Under his influence, Lewis slipped more deeply into atheism gaining an intellectual framework for it. He abandoned all religion as merely of human invention and embraced something like the myth embodied in H.G. Wells’s *Outline of History*. In October of 1916 Jack wrote to Arthur Greeves, “...I think I believe in no religion. There is absolutely no proof for any of them, and from a philosophical standpoint Christianity is not even the best. All religions, that is, all mythologies to give them their proper name are merely man’s own invention — Christ as much as Loki.”<sup>9</sup>

Jack went to Oxford in December of 1916 and won a scholarship to University College. By August 1917 when Jack arrived at Oxford to read Classics most of the college was in use as an army hospital. Lewis joined the Officer Training Corps when he arrived and entered the Army in June. After a few months of training he was sent to the front in November 1917, a Second Lieutenant in the Somerset Light Infantry. He was wounded in April of 1918. After an extended convalescence he returned to Oxford in January of 1919.

His father’s financial generosity sustained him at Oxford where he performed brilliantly. During the years from 1922 until 1927 he kept a long diary which was published in 1991 as *All My Road Before Me*.<sup>10</sup> Experiences of death, insanity, and the occult would recur in Lewis’s life over his years at Oxford. He twice visited the poet William Butler Yeats. On the first visit the talk “was all of magic and cabbalism” and Jack apologized in his letter to his brother that he could give only “the insanity of the man without his eloquence and presence, which are very great.”<sup>11</sup> A second visit was described as more literary talk.

Almost two years later, in late February and early March of 1923 Jack was to experience the insanity of Mrs. Moore’s brother, Dr. John Askins. During almost three weeks Jack tried to help him. He described “frightful fits” and the doctor “rolling on the floor and

shrieking that he was damned for ever and ever. Screams and grimaces unforgettable.”<sup>12</sup> Jack described the experience to Arthur Greeves in a letter of April 22nd 1923. “He was here nearly three weeks and endured awful mental tortures. ... He had the delusion that he was going to Hell. ... After three weeks of Hell the Doc. was admitted to a pensions hospital at Richmond: and at first we had hopeful accounts of him. But the poor man had worn his body out with these horrors. Quite suddenly heart failure set in and he died — unconscious at the end, thank God.”<sup>13</sup> These experiences served to frighten him showing him the dangers of the occult. In the same letter he counseled Arthur, “Keep clear of introspection, of brooding, of spiritualism, of everything eccentric. ... We hold our mental health by a thread: & nothing is worth risking it for.”

Lewis scored a triple First at Oxford. “He took a First Class degree in Classical Honour Moderations in April 1920, a First in *Literae Humaniores* or ‘Greats’ in August 1922, and a First in English in July 1923.”<sup>14</sup> During those years he practiced a good deal of deception, concealing from his father the nature of his relationship with Mrs. Janie Moore and her daughter Maureen whose household he had joined. After being passed over for many fellowships, in May 1925 Lewis was finally elected to a fellowship in English at Magdalen College where he was to stay until 1954.

## CONVERSION

His conversion was a slow and intellectual affair. He progressed from atheism to a kind of Berkeleyian idealism. He described the process in a letter to N. Fridama on Feb 15th 1946. “I was brought back (a.) By Philosophy. I still think Berkeley is unanswerable. (b.) By increasing knowledge of medieval literature. It became harder & harder to think that all those great poets & philosophers were wrong. (c.) By the strong influence of 2 writers, the Presbyterian George Macdonald & the R.C., G.K. Chesterton. (d.) By argument with an Anthroposophist. [Barfield and The Great War] He failed to convert me to his own views (a kind of Gnosticism) but his attack on my own presuppositions smashed the ordinary pseudo-‘scientific’ world-picture forever.”<sup>15</sup>

In 1927 Jack’s father “began to suffer cruelly from rheumatism.”<sup>16</sup> Jack’s spiritual struggles all came to a climax in 1929 when as he describes it “In the Trinity Term [Spring] of 1929 I gave in, and admitted that God was God, and knelt and prayed: perhaps, that night, the most dejected and reluctant convert in all England.”<sup>17</sup> In the Summer Albert was diagnosed with cancer. In the Fall on 25 September 1929, Albert died. The father whom he had ridiculed and thought poorly of but who has loyally sustained him through his career at Oxford until he acquired a position was now dead. The loss of a father is a kind of rite of passage, a passing of the baton from one generation to the next with the finality that death entails.

Jack was not yet a Christian. In January of 1930 in letters exchanged with his friend Arthur Greeves, Jack shares his progress. He describes himself as “...coming, I won’t say, to religion but to an attempt at religion ...” and goes on to say: “It is emphatically coming home: as Chaucer says ‘Returneth *home* from worldly vanitee.’” In a letter a few days later he says: ‘Things are going very, very well with me (spiritually).’ He goes on

to describe moments of extraordinary delight in nature not unlike the experiences he would later call *Joy*.<sup>18</sup>

In a letter to Arthur in June, Jack describes what might be called a providential moment. He allowed himself to be driven by Frederick Lawson, a Junior Research Fellow of Merton College, to a tea on Boar's Hill. He described Lawson as "a terrible boor" who "talks, talks, talks, all about himself." Since they had time Lawson decided to drive first to visit his old father. Jack's experience of the father and Lawson's evident care of him caused Jack to remember "how abominably I had treated *my* father — and worst of all how I had dared to despise Lawson, I was, as I said, humiliated."<sup>19</sup>

In the Summer of 1930 Jack was reading Thomas Traherne's *Centuries of Meditations*, "a little every evening." He had also just finished reading Dante's *Paradiso* with Barfield.<sup>20</sup> In September he relates a dream about his dead father to Arthur in a letter and on Christmas Eve he shares that, "I think the trouble with me is *lack of faith*." Despite his experiences of *Joy* he is plagued by his own inactivity: "How well I *talk* about it: how little else I do. I wonder would it be better not to speak to one another of these things at all? Is the talking a substitute for the doing?"<sup>21</sup>

Jack's journey back to Christianity was coming to a climax. On September 19th Hugo Dyson and John Tolkien joined him in College and stayed up deep into the night speaking of myth, metaphor and Christianity. He shared a little of the experience with Arthur three days later in a letter: "We began (in Addison's walk just after dinner) on metaphor and myth — interrupted by a rush of wind which came so suddenly on the still, warm evening and sent so many leaves pattering down that we thought it was raining. We all held our breath, the other two appreciating the ecstasy of such a thing almost as you would. We continued (in my room) on Christianity: a good long satisfying talk in which I learned a lot: then discussed the difference between love and friendship — then finally drifted back to poetry and books."<sup>22</sup>

Of Jack's conversion Warnie remembers: "I well remember that day in 1931 when we made a visit to Whipsnade Zoo, Jack riding in my sidecar: as recorded in *Surprised by Joy*, it was during that outing that he made his decision to rejoin the Church. This seemed to me no sudden plunge into a new life, but rather a slow steady convalescence from a deep-seated spiritual illness of long standing — an illness that had its origins in our childhood, in the dry husks of religion offered by the semi-political church-going of Ulster, in the similar dull emptiness of compulsory church during our schooldays. With this background, we both found the difficulty of the Christian life to lie in public worship, rather than in one's private devotions."<sup>23</sup> It was September 28, 1931 and Jack said of it, "I was driven to Whipsnade one sunny morning. When we set out I did not believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and when we reached the zoo I did."<sup>24</sup>

Three days later he shared his experience with Arthur, "I have just passed on from believing in God to definitely believing in Christ — in Christianity. I will try to explain this another time. My long night talk with Dyson and Tolkien had a good deal to do with

it.”<sup>25</sup> Jack had come full circle almost exactly fifteen years after telling Arthur that he believed in no religion.

On the 18th of October Jack wrote again to Arthur explaining. He had been held back by a failure to understand the doctrine of Redemption. “What I couldn’t see was how the life and death of Someone Else (whoever he was) 2000 years ago could help us here and now — except in so far as his *example* helped us. And the example business, tho’ true and important, is not Christianity: right in the centre of Christianity, in the Gospels and St. Paul, you keep on getting something quite different and very mysterious expressed in those phrases I have so often ridiculed (‘propitiation’ — ‘sacrifice’ — ‘the blood of the Lamb’) — expressions wh. I cd. only interpret in senses that seemed to me either silly or shocking.

Now what Dyson and Tolkien showed me was this: that if I met the idea of sacrifice in a Pagan story I didn’t mind it at all: again, that if I met the idea of a god sacrificing himself to himself I liked it very much ... in Pagan stories I was prepared to feel the myth as profound and suggestive of meanings beyond my grasp even tho’ I could not say in cold prose ‘what it meant.’

Now the story of Christ is simply a true myth: a myth working on us in the same way as the others, but with this tremendous difference that *it really happened*: and one must be content to accept it in the same way, remembering that it is God’s myth where the others are men’s myths: i.e. the Pagan stories are God expressing Himself through the minds of poets, using such images as He found there, while Christianity is God expressing Himself through what we call ‘real things’. Therefore it is *true*, not in the sense of being a ‘description’ of God (that no finite mind could take in) but in the sense of being the way in which God chooses to (or can) appear to our faculties. The ‘doctrines’ we get *out* of the true myth are of course *less* true: they are translations into our *concepts* and *ideas* of that wh. God has already expressed in a language more adequate, namely the actual incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection.”<sup>26</sup>

A year later — “During a two-week holiday in Ireland with Arthur Greeves in September 1932 he wrote the whole of *The Pilgrim’s Regress*.”<sup>27</sup> — published in May of 1933. It is an allegorical account of Jack’s journey to faith. The pilgrim, John, strays about the main road going first into the North and then to the South of Puritania. In an Afterword written for the third edition of 1943 Lewis explains the symbolism of North and South. The austere North is where one finds “men of rigid systems whether skeptical or dogmatic, Aristocrats, Stoics, Pharisees, Rigorists, signed and sealed members of highly organized ‘Parties’. The Southerners are by their very nature less definable; boneless souls whose doors stand open day and night to almost every visitant, but always with readiest welcome for those, whether Maenad or Mystagogue, who offer some sort of intoxication.”<sup>28</sup>

The pilgrim is finally saved by *Mother Kirk*. This figure caused some early reviewers of the book to think Jack was a Catholic. He corrected this in the same Afterword: “The name *Mother Kirk* was chosen because ‘Christianity’ is not a very convincing name. Its

defect was that it not unnaturally led the reader to attribute to me a much more definite *Ecclesiastical* position than I could really boast of. The book is concerned solely with Christianity as against unbelief. ‘Denominational’ questions do not come in.”<sup>29</sup>

## CHURCH

We have come at long last to the topic of ‘Church’. C.S. Lewis had become a Christian, but a Christian with a highly unusual history. His conversion had not involved Churchmen. No priests or ministers had played a role in his conversion unless you count those who had written books and in most cases were long dead. He was a man wholly converted by intellectual means. His reading had ranged widely. He had read Pagans, Catholics, the key reformers of the Reformation period as well as all the opposition. Indeed he had been thoroughly converted to a kind of secular atheism by his reading and from this had now returned. But he was a man wholly unecclesiastical. “...I thought that I could do it on my own, by retiring to my rooms and reading theology, ...”<sup>30</sup> “To me, religion ought to have been a matter of good men praying alone and meeting by twos and threes to talk of spiritual matters.”<sup>31</sup>

When Jack first returned to Theism he began attending church services: “... I started attending my parish church on Sundays and my college chapel on weekdays, not because I believed in Christianity, nor because I thought the difference between it and simple Theism a small one, but because I thought one ought to “fly one’s flag” by some unmistakable overt sign.”<sup>32</sup> His church attendance was at least initially done out of a sense of honor. “The idea of churchmanship was to me wholly unattractive. I was not in the least anticlerical, but I was deeply antiecclesiastical.”<sup>33</sup> Perhaps it went back to the memories of his youth, perhaps only that he disliked large groups of people. He thought “... daily prayers and religious reading and churchgoing are necessary parts of the Christian life. We have to be continually reminded of what we believe.”<sup>34</sup>

“If there is anything in the teaching of the New Testament which is in the nature of a command, it is that you are obliged to take the Sacrament, and you can’t do it without going to Church.”<sup>35</sup> “This is an order and must be obeyed. The other services are, I take it, traditional and might lawfully be altered. But the New Testament does not envision solitary religion; some kind of regular assembly for worship and instruction is everywhere taken for granted in the Epistles. So we must be regular practicing members of the Church.”<sup>36</sup> “We are forbidden to neglect the assembling of ourselves together. Christianity is already institutional in the earliest of its documents. The Church is the Bride of Christ. We are members of one another.”<sup>37</sup> In addition to being a regular communicant, Jack began going to confession in the Fall of 1940.

C.S. Lewis was anything but a household word in 1933 when *The Pilgrim’s Regress* was published. In 1938 the first volume of what was to become his space trilogy, *Out of the Silent Planet* was published. Ashley Sampson, a publisher impressed by *The Pilgrim’s Regress* and by *Out of the Silent Planet* approached Jack and asked him to write a book on pain for his *Christian Challenge* series. Jack was reluctant at first as he was not a clergyman or a physician and wanted any such book published pseudonymously. This

solution was rejected as inconsistent with the series, but Jack was encouraged to write a *Preface* expressing his concerns.<sup>38</sup> *The Problem of Pain* was published in 1940 and in the preface Jack wrote: “If any real theologian reads these pages he will very easily see that they are the work of a layman and an amateur. . . . I write, of course, as a layman of the Church of England: but I have tried to assume nothing that is not professed by all baptized and communicating Christians.”<sup>39</sup> The dedication was to “The Inklings.” and we already see a desire to write so as to avoid division.

*The Problem of Pain* made a great impression on James Welch, the Director of Religious Programming at the BBC. Welch wrote to C.S. Lewis on 7 February 1941 and suggested two ideas for a series of talks, either “. . . about the Christian, or lack of Christian assumptions underlying modern literature, . . .” or “A series of talks on something like ‘The Christian Faith As I see It — by a Layman’ . . .”<sup>40</sup> On 10 February Jack replied: “I think what I mainly want to talk about is the Law of Nature, . . . The first step is to create, or recover, the sense of guilt. Hence if I give a series of talks I should mention Christianity only at the end, and would prefer not to unmask my battery till then.”<sup>41</sup>

Thus began a process which was to make C.S. Lewis a household word in England. “During World War II, Lewis' broadcast talks made his voice second only to Churchill as the most recognized on the BBC. In the years following, Lewis' photo appeared on the cover of *Time* and other leading magazines.”<sup>42</sup> In all he gave four series of radio broadcasts. These were published as three small books which were later gathered together, revised and published as *Mere Christianity* in 1952.

Even before the broadcast talks, Jack had thought of the idea for *The Screwtape Letters*. It is a little book consisting of thirty-one letters from Screwtape, a seasoned member of hell's foreign service to his nephew Wormwood who is undertaking his first assignment tempting humans to *Our Father Below*, as Jack styles Satan. The letters first appeared in *The Guardian*, a weekly Anglican religious newspaper, from May 2 to November 28, 1941. It was *The Screwtape Letters* that secured Jack a reputation in the United States. It was favorably reviewed in *The Times Literary Supplement* of February 28, 1942 and later, September 8, 1947, Jack made the cover of *Time Magazine* with an accompanying article: “Oxford's C.S. Lewis, His Heresy: Christianity.”<sup>43</sup> On the cover, along with an artist's portrait of Jack, was a drawing of Screwtape looking belligerently towards God or *the Enemy* as Screwtape characterizes Him, represented by the Holy Spirit, whose wing is above Jack's head.

These beginnings conferred a worldwide reputation on Lewis, and from the beginning he was always concerned with Christian unity. On November 14, 1941 he wrote to Eric Fenn who had asked how the scripts for ‘What Christians Believe’ — the second series of talks for the BBC, were coming along. “I'm plugging away at the 5 talks,” replied Jack. “I'm thinking of sending copies to 3 theologians (C. of E., R.C., and Dissenting) to see if there's any disagreement. Let us at least be ecumenical.”<sup>44</sup> The scripts were reviewed by an Anglican, probably Austin Farrer, a Roman Catholic, Dom Bede Griffiths<sup>45</sup>, a Presbyterian, Eric Fenn<sup>46</sup>, and a Methodist, the Rev. Joseph Dowell<sup>47</sup>, an R.A.F. chaplain.<sup>48</sup>

## CHRISTIAN UNITY

It is time we turned to the topic of Jack's conception of Christian unity. It was profoundly non-ecclesiastical. According to Richard W. Ladborough, a colleague and friend of Jack's at Cambridge in the later years: "... I think it true to say, as others have also noticed, that neither in conversation nor in his works, did he show much interest in organized religion. He was orthodox in belief but seemed to have little sense of the Church. Some may see in this a weakness; others, in his lack of sectarianism, a sign of greatness. One thing is certain: he had little interest in ritual and, I think, did not pretend to understand it."<sup>49</sup> Jack in fact generally disliked church services.

For Jack the Church was the body of Christ. "The Christian is called, not to individualism but to membership in the mystical body."<sup>50</sup> "Why else were individuals created, but that God, loving all infinitely, should love each differently?"<sup>51</sup> "We were made not primarily that we may love God (though we were made for that too) but that God may love us, that we may become objects in which the Divine love may rest *well pleased*."<sup>52</sup> "We all once existed potentially in Him and in that sense were not other than He. And even now inorganic matter has a sort of unity with Him that we lack. To what end was creation except to separate us in order that we may be reunited to Him in that unity of love wh. is utterly different from mere numerical unity and indeed presupposes that lover & beloved be distinct."<sup>53</sup>

Jack describes the Church from Screwtape's point of view as "... spread out through all time and space and rooted in eternity, terrible as an army with banners."<sup>54</sup> But it is an army of individuals each providing something special in the Divine plan if he will only allow God to help. The role of the individual has been distorted. "Starting with the doctrine that every individuality is 'of infinite value', we then picture God as a kind of employment committee whose business it is to find suitable careers for souls, square holes for square pegs. In fact, however, the value of the individual does not lie in him. He is capable of receiving value. He receives it by union with Christ. There is no question of finding for him a place in the living temple which will do justice to his inherent value and give scope to his natural idiosyncrasy. The place was there first. The man was created for it. He will not be himself till he is there."<sup>55</sup>

He spoke to a gathering of Anglican priests and youth leaders during Easter 1945 and among other things spoke of how words used by the people differed in meaning from the meanings often attributed to them by the more educated. He made a list of words and gave the meanings as used by ordinary people. "CHURCH. Means (a) A sacred building, (b) The clergy. Does *not* suggest to them the 'company of all faithful people'. Generally used in a bad sense. Direct defence of the Church is part of our duty: but use of the word *Church* where there is no time to defend it alienates sympathy and should be avoided where possible."<sup>56</sup>

We have not addressed denominational questions nor will we in any particular depth. Nevertheless Jack was a member of the Anglican Church which is in some sense poised between the more radical elements of Protestantism and Catholicism. Jack had friends

who were from many denominations and in his journey to faith some accompanied him and went finally in different directions. Dom Bede Griffiths was one such who became a Catholic priest. He observed of Jack: “But apart from personal differences between us, I think that there was one thing that prevented Lewis from ever taking the question of Catholicism *versus* Protestantism very seriously. This was his almost total lack of concern about the Church as an institution.”<sup>57</sup>

## LITURGY

The experience of liturgy or ritual was not unimportant to Jack. But he saw it as dangerous, especially in the vernacular. Part of this conviction was that using the scripture in translation meant it was always getting out of date due to the changes in living languages. “The truth is that if we are to have translation at all we must have periodic re-translation. There is no such thing as translating a book into another language once and for all, for a language is a changing thing.”<sup>58</sup> “If you have a vernacular liturgy you must have a changing liturgy: otherwise it will finally be vernacular only in name. The ideal of “timeless English” is sheer nonsense. No living language can be timeless. You might as well ask for a motionless river.”<sup>59</sup> “Thus my whole liturgical position really boils down to an entreaty for permanence and uniformity. I can make do with almost any kind of service whatever, if only it will stay put.”<sup>60</sup>

One of the dangers Jack saw in liturgical change was the importation of hastily or ill-considered doctrine into the Church through the mechanism of liturgical change. “... I would ask the clergy to believe that we are more interested in orthodoxy and less interested in liturgiology as such than they can easily imagine.” “... What we laymen fear is that the deepest doctrinal issues should be tacitly and implicitly settled by what seem to be, or are avowed to be, merely changes in liturgy.”<sup>61</sup> Catholic Christians are particularly sensitive to these criticisms Lewis raises since they have endured many liturgical abuses since the Vatican II council and it has led to doctrinal abuses.

## BELIEF

If one of the dangers of liturgical change was the importation of doctrine or innovation into the Church, we must now turn to the topic of exactly what Jack meant by doctrine. To ask that question is to first ask on what basis doctrine rests. “All men alike, on questions which interest them, escape from the region of belief into that of knowledge when they can, and if they succeed in knowing, they no longer say they believe.”<sup>62</sup> Each group proceeds by applying their own techniques to the questions: “The mathematician’s proof ... is by reasoning, the scientist’s by experiment, the historian’s by documents, the judge’s by concurring sworn testimony. But all these men, as men, on questions outside their own disciplines, have numerous beliefs to which they do not normally apply the methods of their own disciplines.”<sup>63</sup> “Authority, reason, experience; on these three, mixed in varying proportions all our knowledge depends.”<sup>64</sup>

Knowledge is the goal, to move beyond mere belief. To achieve this we must apply the methods we have at hand and this was what Jack did. It was the story of his life. He, like

the mythic heroes Hercules, Odysseus, or Aeneas went down into the darkness of Hades, for Jack the darkness of atheism, visited the occult through Yeats, experienced madness in others and returned. Jack's journeys of imagination we have only partly visited. *The Pilgrim's Regress*, the space trilogy, *The Screwtape Letters*, *The Great Divorce*, *The Chronicles of Narnia*, and *'Til We Have Faces*, all aspects of his devotion to myth, played that role for him. He found himself at the end of his long journey a thoroughgoing supernaturalist.

### THE SUPERNATURALIST

The fact of awe pointed Jack to the supernatural. "There seem, in fact, to be only two views we can hold about awe. Either it is a mere twist in the human mind, corresponding to nothing objective and serving no biological function, yet showing no tendency to disappear from that mind at its fullest development in poet, philosopher, or saint: or else it is a direct experience of the really supernatural, to which the name Revelation might properly be given."<sup>65</sup> Reason and morals were also indicators of the supernatural. "The spearhead of the Supernatural which I call my reason links up with all my natural contents — my sensations, emotions, and the like — so completely that I call the mixture by the single word 'me'."<sup>66</sup> If reason were merely caused by the matter of which we are composed then we would have no reason to believe anything since the instrument of our beliefs would be merely the random firings of our neurons. Morals are even more difficult to explain on such a view. "If we are to continue to make moral judgments (and whatever we say we shall in fact continue) then we must believe that the conscience of man is not a product of Nature. It can be valid only if it is an offshoot of some absolute moral wisdom, a moral wisdom which exists absolutely 'on its own' and is not a product of non-moral, non-rational Nature."<sup>67</sup>

"To me the real distinction is not between high and low, but between religion with a real supernaturalism and salvationism on the one hand, and all watered-down and modernist versions on the other."<sup>68</sup> "Do not attempt to water Christianity down. There must be no pretence that you can have it with the Supernatural left out. So far as I can see Christianity is precisely the one religion from which the miraculous cannot be separated. You must frankly argue for supernaturalism from the outset."<sup>69</sup>

### DOCTRINE and TRUTH

It is all a matter of what is true. Jack saw Christianity as necessarily embracing the supernatural and summarized the essential doctrines. "To a layman, it seems obvious that what unites an Evangelical and the Anglo-Catholic against the 'Liberal' or 'Modernist' is something very clear and momentous, namely, the fact that both are thoroughgoing supernaturalists, who believe in the Creation, the Fall, the Incarnation, the Resurrection, the Second Coming, and the Four Last Things. This unites them not only with one another, but with the Christian religion as understood *ubique et ab omnibus*. [everywhere and by all — St. Vincent of Lérins] ... Perhaps the trouble is that as supernaturalists, whether 'Low' or 'High' Church, thus taken together, they lack a name. May I suggest 'Deep Church'; or, if that fails in humility, Baxter's 'mere Christians'?"<sup>70</sup> Jack had seen

the effectiveness of his practice of stressing those things on which all agreed. "... in all the things which I have written and thought I have always stuck to traditional dogmatic positions. The result is that letters of agreement reach me from what are ordinarily regarded as the most different kinds of Christians; for instance, I get letters from Jesuits, monks, nuns, and also from Quakers and Welsh Dissenters, and so on. So it seems to me that the 'extremist' elements in every Church are nearest one another and the liberal and 'broad-minded' people in each Body could never be united at all."<sup>71</sup>

When *Mere Christianity* was published in 1952 it contained a Preface which we will use as we continue our endeavor to explore Church Unity in the light of the writings of C.S. Lewis. If Jack is correct, Christian unity is to be sought in the 'Deep Church' — whether that or its more humble expression 'mere Christianity' is a coherent basis for such a task we will try to address.

### METAPHOR OF THE HALLWAY

He wishes to have no part in any issues of denomination. This is of course largely equivalent to saying that denomination is not of any real importance at least to Jack. We have seen in fact that that is true of him. He has adopted a self-imposed mission: "Ever since I became a Christian I have thought that the best, perhaps the only, service I could do for my unbelieving neighbours was to explain and defend the belief that has been common to nearly all Christians at all times."<sup>72</sup>

The importance of doctrinal disagreements is a contentious issue. Jack speaks of it in the Preface when he says, "One of the things Christians are disagreed about is the importance of their disagreements. When two Christians of different denominations start arguing, it is usually not long before one asks whether such-and-such a point 'really matters' and the other replies: 'Matter? Why, it's absolutely essential.'"<sup>73</sup> Avoiding contentious points was Jack's strategy and he acknowledged that the danger was that he would be left with "only a vague and bloodless H.C.F." [Highest Common Factor]. In fact the response to the book and the sustained response that we here can testify to shows that the H.C.F. may in fact be as Jack said "something not only powerful but pungent."<sup>74</sup>

There is a danger however, that this is illusory. Nowhere in *Mere Christianity* is the doctrinal core that makes it up clearly set forth. So in fact, it is a book which, while most Christians can agree with it, in fact most Christians can also read into it more than is there. The notion of 'Deep Church' is expressed when Jack says: "It is at her centre, where her truest children dwell, that each communion is really closest to every other in spirit, if not in doctrine. And this suggests that at the centre of each there is a something, or a Someone, who against all divergencies of belief, all differences of temperament, all memories of mutual persecution, speaks with the same voice."<sup>75</sup> Clearly the position is that Christ is the heart of the Church and those who most fully put on Christ are united despite the doctrinal differences.

The Preface goes on to warn of the dangers of destroying the word 'Christian' the way 'gentleman' has been destroyed, by emptying it of any meaning but a rather vague

approval. Instead “We must therefore stick to the original, obvious meaning. The name *Christians* was first given at Antioch (Acts 11:26) to ‘the disciples’, to those who accepted the teaching of the apostles. There is no question of its being restricted to those who profited by that teaching as much as they should have.”<sup>76</sup> The point is that the word is about what one is striving to do, not what is actually accomplished. Jack made this exact point when he said to A. C. Harwood: “I was not born to be free — I was born to adore and obey.”<sup>77</sup>

‘mere’ Christianity is not presented as the whole of Christianity. Jack is careful to point out that he is not suggesting an “alternative to the creeds of the existing communions.” In order to clarify, Jack introduces the metaphor of the hallway. The hallway is like ‘mere’ Christianity and the rooms then are where the differences exist. The hallway is not a place to live “... it is in the rooms, not in the hall, that there are fires and chairs and meals.” Why is one room selected over the others? While deciding “You must keep on praying for light ... And above all you must be asking which door is the true one; ...” Jack goes on to say: “In plain language, the question should never be: ‘Do I like that kind of service?’ but ‘Are these doctrines true: Is holiness here? Does my conscience move me towards this? Is my reluctance to knock at this door due to my pride, or my mere taste, or my personal dislike of this particular door-keeper?’”<sup>78</sup>

In plain language then what Jack is saying is that you are seeking “the true door” and that individual judgment, or conscience, dictates the room you enter planning to stay. The decision is not to be made on the basis of superficial aspects such as the kind of service, but on fundamentals. The fundamentals he advances are 1) truth, 2) holiness, and 3) conscience. Entering a room is making a judgment about truth.

He offers one final counsel. “... be kind to those who have chosen different doors and to those who are still in the hall. If they are wrong they need your prayers all the more; and if they are your enemies, then you are under orders to pray for them. That is one of the rules common to the whole house.”<sup>79</sup>

The fact that Jack proposes that there are “rules common to the whole house” is something that stretches the metaphor. The hall is not the whole house, but it is a source of some doctrine and certainly one might include the Dominical counsel of the two great commandments. These are sufficient to the whole house.

### SOME ILLUSTRATIONS

From the standpoint of supporting any restoration of unity among the several churches or denominations, this does not appear to offer us much. Nor has Jack ever suggested that it might. On any number of occasions he pointed out that he was simply a layman of the Church of England. Jack conducted a correspondence with Don Giovanni Calabria in Latin. Calabria died in 1954 and was beatified by Pope John Paul II on April 17, 1988. Fr. Calabria opened a correspondence with Jack in September of 1947. In his first letter (translated from the Latin by Martin Moynihan) to Fr. Calabria Jack wrote: “Be assured

that for me too schism in the Body of Christ is both a source of grief and a matter for prayers, being a most serious stumbling block to those coming in and one which makes even the faithful weaker in repelling the common foe. However, I am a layman, indeed the most lay of laymen, and least skilled in the deeper questions of sacred theology.”<sup>80</sup>

One might think that that was the end of it. The correspondence continued fruitfully until Fr. Calabria’s death. On 13 January 1948 Jack wrote: “By doing the truth which we already know, let us make progress towards the truth which as yet we are ignorant of. Then without doubt, we shall be one: for truth is one.”<sup>81</sup> This response points out that Jack believed in our ignorance on various matters and both the unity of truth, and the fact that Christian union would result from truth.

There are two ways that we can be ignorant of the truth. There are things we may hold to be true that are mistaken, and there may things of which we are ignorant that may need to be known to have the fullness of truth. It is arguable however, that because our minds are finite, that even in heaven we may be incapable of knowing the truth in all its fullness. Jack sees in this limitation of our minds, much of the reason for our divisions. We strive to overreach ourselves and in the act create enmity.

On April 14, 1952 Jack wrote to Fr. Calabria: ““That they all may be one” is a petition which in my prayers I never omit. While the wished-for unity of doctrine and order is missing, all the more eagerly let us try to keep the bond of charity: which alas, your people in Spain and ours in Northern Ireland do not.”<sup>82</sup>

On August 10, 1953 Jack wrote: “I think almost all the crimes which Christians have perpetrated against each other arise from this, that religion is confused with politics.”<sup>83</sup>

Fr. Calabria died on December 4, 1954 and Jack was informed by Don Luigi Pedrollo and continued to write to him from 1954 to 1961.

From this brief correspondence we see somewhat more clearly into Jack’s mind. We see human limitations of two kinds: ignorance often unavoidable, and politics masquerading as religion. Going forward we find this helpful in understanding some of Jack’s views on critical doctrine.

## FAITH/WORKS

Perhaps the most tragic of times was the Reformation which shattered Christendom and saw the rise of nationalism in Europe. Jack expressed his skepticism about the great claim of *sola fide* in his contribution to O.H.E.L. (Oxford History of English Literature).

“Each party increasingly misunderstood the other and triumphed in refuting positions which their opponents did not hold: Protestants misrepresenting Romans as Pelagians or Romans misrepresenting Protestants as Antinomians.”<sup>84</sup> “...on the purely theological level I think I may say that the barrier is no longer that between a doctrine of Faith and a doctrine of Works. I am not myself convinced that any good Roman ever did hold the

doctrine of Works in that form of which Protestants accused him, or that any good Protestant ever did hold the doctrine of Faith in that form of which Romans accused him."<sup>85</sup>

## ATONEMENT

If the controversy over faith versus works was a confusion fostered and encouraged by the political ambitions of princes, Jack pointed out that understanding of Christian doctrine in other areas was often an elusive thing. He addressed the doctrine of the Atonement in *Mere Christianity*: "The central Christian belief is that Christ's death has somehow put us right with God and given us a fresh start." This then is the bare fact: Christ's death atoned, somehow, for our sins. But what are we to make of it. Jack goes on to say: "Theories as to how it did this are another matter. A good many different theories have been held as to how it works; what all Christians are agreed on is that it does work. ... Theories about Christ's death are not Christianity: they are explanations about how it works. Christians would not all agree as to how important these theories are. ... On my view the theories are not themselves the thing you are asked to accept." <sup>86</sup>

If the theories are not what we are to accept then what exactly is? Jack explains that "We are told that Christ was killed for us, that His death has washed out our sins, and that by dying He disabled death itself. That is the formula. That is Christianity. That is what has to be believed. Any theories we build up ... are ... quite secondary: mere plans or diagrams to be left alone if they do not help us, and, even if they do help us, not to be confused with the thing itself." <sup>87</sup>

The distinction that Jack is making is between the reality and its explanation. He makes the analogy between the popular explanations, the pictures that scientists use when they are trying to explain their theories to ordinary people, and the real theory which is a mathematical formula. The explanations are not quite right because they are not the formula, but the formula is too complex for most people to understand. Jack's point here is that there are really two things here: the picture we are using to try to understand the thing (our understanding), and the reality, the real thing that is to be believed which may frankly be beyond understanding. After explaining his own picture he says: "Such is my own way of looking at what Christians call the Atonement. But remember this is only one more picture. Do not mistake it for the thing itself: and if it does not help you, drop it." <sup>88</sup>

We have not gotten the entire story here. Which exactly are the things that constitute the reality and which the explanations? What must we believe and what may we simply drop? It is exactly this point to which we must now turn. We have a useful distinction but we have not resolved the central issue of what must be believed.

## THE ONLYS

The battle cries of the Reformation turned on three great '*onlys*': 1) *sola scriptura* — scripture alone, 2) *sola fide* — Faith alone, and 3) *sola gratia* — Grace alone. Two other

'onlys' may be mentioned: 4) *solus Christus* — Christ alone, and 5) *solī deo Gloria* — the Glory of God alone. These last two I found on an Evangelical website.<sup>89</sup>

I do not bring these up to address them or offer my own interpretation. What I do want to ask however is whether or not they fall into the categories that Jack would have recognized as realities or whether they fall into the category of pictures? I am inclined to the latter view. There are several reasons for this. The first is that these are strong statements about difficult realities. Our human minds are not up to the full embrace of God's reality and we court great danger in condemning others on the basis of a pride filled view that we have the whole story. A second reason is that all of these ask us to judge others adversely and that is something that is against the rules of the whole house. Understanding of Divine things emerges from obedience and not from intellectual disputations: "Whenever you find any statement in Christian writings which you can make nothing of, do not worry. Leave it alone. There will come a day, perhaps years later, when you suddenly see what it meant."<sup>90</sup>

#### DIVISIONS and UNITY

For Jack, divisions in Christianity were deplorable, but were only surface manifestations: "We are all rightly distressed, and ashamed also, at the divisions of Christendom. But those who have always lived within the Christian fold may be too easily dispirited by them. They are bad, but such people do not know what it looks like from without. Seen from there, what is left intact, despite all the divisions, still appears (as it truly is) an immensely formidable unity. I know, for I saw it; and well our enemies know it. That unity any of us can find by going out of his own age. It is not enough, but it is more than you had thought till then."<sup>91</sup>

To an American Lady Jack wrote: "I believe we are very near to one another, but not because I am at all on the Rome-ward frontier of my own communion. I believe that in the present divided state of Christendom, those who are at the heart of each division are all closer to one another than those who are at the fringes. I would even carry this beyond the borders of Christianity: how much more one has in common with a real Jew or Muslim than with a wretched liberalizing, occidentalised specimen of the same categories. Let us by all means pray for one another: it is perhaps the only form of 'work for re-union' which never does anything but good."<sup>92</sup>

We can see this view echoed elsewhere. Charles Wrong, a student of Jack's in the 1930's in his contribution to *C.S. Lewis at the Breakfast Table* reported: "I observed that Charles Williams struck me as a man for whom the question of religious denomination appeared almost irrelevant. "Yes," he said, "but I think that's true of *all* good Christians."<sup>93</sup>

## THE RULES OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

In invoking the rules of the whole house, Jack explicitly cites a unity that he acknowledges does not exist. "The time is always ripe for re-union. Divisions between Christians are a sin and a scandal, and Christians ought at all times to be making contributions towards re-union, if it is only by their prayers."<sup>94</sup> Jack thought re-union a goal all Christians should adopt. "If I have not directly helped the cause of reunion, I have perhaps made it clear why we ought to be reunited. Certainly I have met with little of the fabled *odium theologicum* from convinced members of communions different from my own. Hostility has come more from borderline people whether within the Church of England or without it: men not exactly obedient to any communion."<sup>95</sup> In 1939 Jack wrote to Dom Bede Griffiths: "I think I said before that I have no contribution to make about re-union. It was never more needed. A united Christendom should be the answer to the new Paganism. But how reconciliation of the Churches as opposed to conversions of individuals from one church to another is to come about, I confess I cannot see. I am inclined to think that the immediate task is vigorous co-operation on the basis of what even now is common — combined of course with full admission of the differences."<sup>96</sup> He followed his own advice becoming the most ecumenical Christian apologist of the century. In one of his last books, *Letters to Malcolm Chiefly on Prayer*, he wrote: "I sometimes have a bright dream of re-union engulfing us unawares, like a great wave from behind our backs, perhaps at the very moment when our official representatives are still pronouncing it impossible."<sup>97</sup>

## TEARING DOWN WALLS

If reunion is to be achieved in this day or in any other we need to go rather further than we have. Doctrinal divisions and political power are two areas that have been identified as sources of our division. The first arises from ignorance and hubris. We imagine that we can know more than we actually can or sometimes we fill in perceived gaps with speculation or interpolation. Perhaps we would be better served by humility and admit that it is God who is the Lord of creation and we are simply ignorant bondsmen. The second problem is like the first but more deadly. It puts power in the service of ignorance.

Jack based the Faith primarily on authority which had 'grown up in the Church and won the assent of great doctors' — he saw his role as a translator: "When I began, Christianity came before the great mass of my unbelieving fellow-countrymen either in the highly emotional form offered by revivalists or in the unintelligible language of highly cultured clergymen. Most men were reached by neither. My task was therefore simply that of a *translator* — one turning Christian doctrine, or what he believed to be such, into the vernacular, into language that unscholarly people would attend to and could understand."<sup>98</sup> He achieved more than I think most people would have imagined possible.

Barriers to reunion remain. We can illustrate this perhaps most clearly from Jack's own response to Catholicism. He summarized his position as a "... disagreement about the seat and nature of doctrinal Authority. The real reason, I take it, why you cannot be in

communion with us is not your disagreement with this or that particular Protestant doctrine, so much as the absence of any real 'Doctrine', in your sense of the word, at all. It is, you feel, like asking a man to say he agrees not with a speaker but with a debating society. And the real reason why I cannot be in communion with you is not my disagreement with this or that Roman doctrine, but that to accept your Church means not to accept a given body of doctrine, but to accept in advance any doctrine your Church hereafter produces. It is like being asked to agree not only to what a man has said but to what he's going to say.

To you the real vice of Protestantism is the formless drift which seems unable to retain the Catholic truths, which loses them one by one and ends in a 'modernism' which cannot be classified as Christian by any tolerable stretch of the word. To us the terrible thing about Rome is the recklessness (as we hold) with which she has added to the *depositum fidei* — the tropical fertility, the proliferation of *credenda*. You see in Protestantism the Faith dying out in a desert: we see in Rome the faith smothered in a jungle."<sup>99</sup>

Authority is the question which is the crux of the issue of reunion. Jack pointed the question himself in his correspondence with Fr. Calabria: "Where you write that the Pope is 'the point of meeting' you almost commit ... what logicians call a *petitio principii* (begging the question). For we disagree about nothing more than the authority of the Pope: on which disagreement almost all the others depend.

Where you write that we should all as speedily as possible oppose the common foe (or foes, their name is Legion) with the unity of Charity and Christian living, I agree with my whole heart. Disputations do more to aggravate schism than to heal it: united action, prayer, fortitude and (should God so will) united deaths for Christ — *these* will make us one. The Lord has said 'If anyone will do the will of my Father, he shall know the doctrine' (I put the sense into my own words because today my Vulgate is not to hand). By doing the truth which we already know, let us make progress towards the truth which as yet we are ignorant of. Then without doubt, we shall be one: for truth is one."<sup>100</sup> He had written to Dom Bede Griffiths: "Nothing would give such strong support to the Papal claims as the spectacle of a Pope actually functioning as the head of Christendom."<sup>101</sup> Commenting on the times just a few months before his own death he said "God's purposes are terribly obscure. I am thinking both of your sufferings and of the removal of such a Pope [Pope John XXIII] at such a moment."<sup>102</sup>

Jack had come to the Christian faith through an arduous intellectual journey. His citation of John 7:17 "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." [King James Version] is a basis for his view of a 'Deep Church' of those who serve God through their obedience. " ... we find a certain heavenly unity existing between really devout persons of differing creeds — a mutual understanding and even a power of mutual edification which each may lack towards a luckwarm member of his own denomination — we must ascribe this to the work of Christ who, in the erroneous one, sterilizes his errors and inhibits the evil consequences they would naturally have ('If ye drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt you' [Mark 16:18])

and opens the eyes of the other party to all the truths mingled in his friend's errors, which are, of course, likely to be truths he particularly needs."<sup>103</sup>

### GOING HOME

Faith is both a personal matter and a public matter. If we are cells in the Body of Christ then we have a responsibility to be obedient cells so that we have the "... three things that spread the Christ life to us: baptism, belief, and that mysterious action which different Christians call by different names — Holy Communion, the Mass, the Lord's Supper. At least, these are the three ordinary methods. I am not saying there may not be special cases where it is spread without one or more of these."<sup>104</sup> We are all on a journey going home. It is not enough to be good cells, although that is certainly a good beginning. We are called to be more than that. We are called to that grand unity to which the image of the mystical Body of Christ testifies. We ought to resolve our differences for it was Christ's great prayer that we be one. [John 17: 20-22]

### CONCLUSIONS

I am not finished. My conclusions from this work are not complete. I am on the same journey that Jack Lewis was on and that all of you are on. It is a journey from which we cannot return to announce success, at least not yet. I believe that it is a journey best accomplished in a great company. But our banners are in disarray and many of our leaders have had falling outs, some over the maps, others over policy and strategy, and some over the question of who will lead. We have been in areas overrun by our enemies. But we should take heart. The full reality escapes us. If we could see as Screwtape does, the company "... spread out through all time and space and rooted in eternity, terrible as an army with banners." then perhaps we would take heart and assemble.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper is part of a work in progress and is itself by no means complete. I am indebted to the many good Lewisians on the C.S. Lewis listserv *SpareOom* which I moderate. The present paper owes more to *The C. S. Lewis INDEX* compiled by Janine Goffar than to any other single resource. Trying to draw upon all the writings of Lewis to draw out a thread on Christian re-union was immeasurably aided by her prior work. I also owe a personal debt to Doug Beyer whose unfailing friendship and personal knowledge of Lewis has often filled in gaps in my understanding that would have otherwise remained unfilled.

---

<sup>1</sup> from a letter to Anne Barrett, Houghton Mifflin Co., 30 August 1964, *The Letters of J.R.R. Tolkien* selected and edited by Humphrey Carpenter with the assistance of Christopher Tolkien, ISBN 0-395-31555-7, © 1981 by George Allen & Unwin (Publishers) Ltd.

<sup>2</sup> *Owen Barfield on C.S. Lewis* by Owen Barfield, ISBN 0-8195-5233-X © 1989, Wesleyan University Press, pg. 122.

<sup>3</sup> *Surprised by Joy* by C.S. Lewis, ISBN 0-15-687011-8©1955, pg. 20-21.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* pg. 21.

- 
- <sup>5</sup> Ibid. pg. 33. For the citations of letter and diary and the general discussion I am indebted to *C.S. Lewis Collected Letters Volume I—Family Letters 1905-1931* pages 7 and 8, and *C.S. Lewis Companion & Guide* pages 6 and 7 both edited by Walter Hooper.
- <sup>6</sup> Ibid. pgs. 59 and 60.
- <sup>7</sup> Ibid. pg. 115.
- <sup>8</sup> Ibid. pgs. 135 and 136.
- <sup>9</sup> *Collected Letters Volume I—Family Letters 1905-1931* pgs. 230 and 231.
- <sup>10</sup> *All My Road Before Me —The Diary of C.S. Lewis 1922-1927* edited by Walter Hooper, ISBN 0-15-104609-3 ©1991, published by the Collins Religious Division of the Harper Collins Publishing Group.
- <sup>11</sup> *C.S. Lewis Collected Letters Volume I* edited by Walter Hooper, ISBN 0 00 628145 1, © 2000 by C.S. Lewis Pte Ltd., Harper Collins Publishers, pgs. 531 and 532.
- <sup>12</sup> *All My Road Before Me —The Diary of C.S. Lewis 1922-1927* pg. 202.
- <sup>13</sup> *C.S. Lewis Collected Letters Volume I*, pg. 605.
- <sup>14</sup> *C.S. Lewis Companion & Guide* edited by Walter Hooper, ISBN 0-06-063879-6, ©1996 by C.S. Lewis Pte Ltd. and published by Harper Collins Publishers, Inc., pg. 12.
- <sup>15</sup> *C.S. Lewis Collected Letters Volume II*, edited by Walter Hooper, ISBN 0 00 628146 X, © 2004 C.S. Lewis Pte Ltd., pgs. 702 and 703.
- <sup>16</sup> *C.S. Lewis Companion & Guide*, pg. 13.
- <sup>17</sup> *Surprised by Joy*, pgs 228 and 229.
- <sup>18</sup> *C.S. Lewis Collected Letters Volume I*, pgs. 872 and 877.
- <sup>19</sup> Ibid. pgs. 902 and 903.
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid. pgs. 914 and 915.
- <sup>21</sup> Ibid. pgs. 937, 944 and 945
- <sup>22</sup> Ibid. pg. 970.
- <sup>23</sup> *Letters of C.S. Lewis* edited, with a Memoir, by W. H. Lewis, ISBN 0-15-650870-2, ©1966 by W.H. Lewis and Executors of C.S. Lewis, published by Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, pg. 19.
- <sup>24</sup> *Surprised by Joy*, pg. 237.
- <sup>25</sup> *C.S. Lewis Collected Letters Volume I*, pg. 974.
- <sup>26</sup> Ibid. pgs. 976 and 977.
- <sup>27</sup> *C.S. Lewis Companion & Guide*, pg. 182.
- <sup>28</sup> *The Collected Works of C.S. Lewis —The Pilgrim's Regress, Christian Reflections, God In The Dock*, ISBN: 0-88486-151-1, pg. 159.
- <sup>29</sup> Ibid. pg. 161.
- <sup>30</sup> *God In the Dock*, ISBN 0-8028-1456-5, pg. 61.
- <sup>31</sup> *Surprised by Joy*, pg. 234.
- <sup>32</sup> Ibid. pg. 233.
- <sup>33</sup> Ibid. pgs. 233 and 234.
- <sup>34</sup> *Mere Christianity* by C.S. Lewis © 1943, 1945, 1952 by Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc. pg. 124.
- <sup>35</sup> *God In the Dock*, pg. 61.
- <sup>36</sup> *Letters of C.S. Lewis*, pg. 224 letter of 7 December 1950.
- <sup>37</sup> *The Weight of Glory and Other Addresses Revised and Expanded Edition*, ISBN 0-02-095980-X(pbk.), pg. 106.
- <sup>38</sup> *C.S. Lewis Companion & Guide*, pg. 294.
- <sup>39</sup> *The Problem of Pain* by C.S. Lewis, published 1940, Macmillan Paperback edition, 1962, pg. 10.
- <sup>40</sup> *C.S. Lewis at the BBC—Messages of Hope in the Darkness of War* by Justin Phillips, ISBN 0 00 710437 5 © Justin Phillips 2002, published by Harper Collins, pg. 80.
- <sup>41</sup> *C.S. Lewis Collected Letters Volume II*, pg. 470.
- <sup>42</sup> *C.S. Lewis and Sigmund Freud: a comparison of their thoughts and viewpoints on life, pain and death* an article by Armand Nicholi, quoted from a copy published at <http://www.leaderu.com/real/ri9801/nicholi.html>
- <sup>43</sup> Text of the original article can be found at <http://www.apologetics.org/cslewis.html>
- <sup>44</sup> *C.S. Lewis Collected Letters Volume II*, letter to Eric Fenn pg. 496.
- <sup>45</sup> see *C.S. Lewis Collected Letters Volume II*, letter to Dom Bede Griffiths OSB, pg. 500-503.

- 
- <sup>46</sup> Ibid. citation of Eric Fenn's letter to Lewis of 5 December 1941, pg. 499.
- <sup>47</sup> Ibid. letter to Joseph Dowell, pg. 498.
- <sup>48</sup> *C.S. Lewis Companion & Guide*, pgs. 306 and 307.
- <sup>49</sup> *C.S. Lewis at the Breakfast Table and Other Reminiscences*, edited by James T. Como, ISBN 0-15-623207-3, © 1992, 1979 by James T. Como, published by Harcourt Brace, from an included essay *In Cambridge* by Richard W. Ladborough, pg. 103.
- <sup>50</sup> *The Weight of Glory and Other Addresses* by C.S. Lewis, edited by Walter Hooper, ISBN 0-02-095980-X (pbk.), from essay *Membership* read to the Society of St. Alban and St. Sergius, Oxford, on 10 February 1945, pg. 110.
- <sup>51</sup> *The Problem of Pain* by C.S. Lewis, pg. 150.
- <sup>52</sup> Ibid. pg. 48.
- <sup>53</sup> *C.S. Lewis Collected Letters Volume II*, letter to Dom Bede Griffiths OSB, pg. 880.
- <sup>54</sup> *The Screwtape Letters*, letter 2, paragraph 2.
- <sup>55</sup> *The Weight of Glory and Other Addresses* by C.S. Lewis, edited by Walter Hooper, pg. 118 and 119.
- <sup>56</sup> *God in the dock Essays on Theology and Ethics* by C.S. Lewis, edited by Walter Hooper, ISBN 0-8028-1456-5, © 1970 by The Trustees of the Estate of C.S. Lewis, pg. 97.
- <sup>57</sup> *C.S. Lewis at the Breakfast Table*, essay *The Adventure of Faith* by Alan Bede Griffiths, O.S.B., pg. 19.
- <sup>58</sup> *God in the dock*, pgs. 230 and 231.
- <sup>59</sup> *Letters to Malcolm Chiefly on Prayer* by C.S. Lewis, ISBN 0-15-650880-x, © 1963, 1964 by the Estate of C.S. Lewis and/or C.S. Lewis, pg. 6.
- <sup>60</sup> Ibid. pg. 5.
- <sup>61</sup> *God in the dock Essays on Theology and Ethics*, pg. 332.
- <sup>62</sup> *The World's Last Night and Other Essays* by C.S. Lewis, ISBN 0-15-698360-5 (pbk.) pg. 20.
- <sup>63</sup> Ibid. pg. 20.
- <sup>64</sup> *Christian Reflections* by C.S. Lewis, ISBN 0-802801430-1, © The Executors of the Estate of C.S. Lewis, 1967, an essay titled *Religion: Reality or Substitute?*, pg. 41.
- <sup>65</sup> *The Problem of Pain* by C.S. Lewis, pg. 20 and 21.
- <sup>66</sup> *Miracles* by C.S. Lewis, ISBN 0-684-82379-9, © 1947 by C.S. Lewis with later copyrights of revisions and by the estate, Touchstone edition 1996, pg. 44.
- <sup>67</sup> Ibid. pg. 53.
- <sup>68</sup> *Letters of C.S. Lewis*, pg. 170, letter to Sr. Penelope of 8 Nov 1939.
- <sup>69</sup> *God In the Dock*, pg. 99.
- <sup>70</sup> *God In the Dock*, pg. 336 from a letter dated 8 February 1952.
- <sup>71</sup> *God In the Dock*, pg. 60 part of the answer to Question 14 in *Answers to Questions on Christianity*.
- <sup>72</sup> *Mere Christianity*, Preface pg. viii.
- <sup>73</sup> Ibid. pg. x.
- <sup>74</sup> Ibid. pg. xi.
- <sup>75</sup> Ibid. pg. xii.
- <sup>76</sup> Ibid. pg. xv.
- <sup>77</sup> *C.S. Lewis at the Breakfast Table*, essay by A.C. Harwood, *About Anthroposophy* pg. 29.
- <sup>78</sup> *Mere Christianity*, Preface pg. xv and xvi.
- <sup>79</sup> Ibid. pg. xvi.
- <sup>80</sup> *The Latin Letters of C.S. Lewis* by C.S. Lewis & Don Giovanni Calabria, ISBN 1-890318-34-5, © 1998 by C.S. Lewis Pte Ltd, Translation and Introduction copyright © 1998 by Martin Moynihan, pg. 33.
- <sup>81</sup> Ibid. pg. 43.
- <sup>82</sup> Ibid. pgs 71 and 73.
- <sup>83</sup> Ibid. pg. 87.
- <sup>84</sup> *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century* by C.S. Lewis, Oxford University Press 1954, pg. 37.
- <sup>85</sup> *C.S. Lewis Essay Collection & Other Short Pieces* by C.S. Lewis, ISBN 0 00 628157 5, © 2000 C.S. Lewis Pte Ltd., essay *Christian Reunion*, pgs. 395 and 396.
- <sup>86</sup> *Mere Christianity*, pg. 58.
- <sup>87</sup> *Mere Christianity*, pg. 59.
- <sup>88</sup> *Mere Christianity*, pg. 61.
- <sup>89</sup> <http://www.monergism.com/thethreshold/articles/topic/fivesolas.html>

- 
- <sup>90</sup> *Mere Christianity*, pg. 128.
- <sup>91</sup> *God In the Dock*, pg. 204.
- <sup>92</sup> *Letters to an American Lady* by C.S. Lewis, Library of Congress Card Numbers 67-30853, © 1967 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1971 edition, pgs. 11 and 12, letter of November 10, 1952.
- <sup>93</sup> *C.S. Lewis at the Breakfast Table*, Charles Wrong's essay *A Chance Meeting* pg. 110.
- <sup>94</sup> *God in the Dock*, pg. 60. Question 14. *Answers to Questions on Christianity*.
- <sup>95</sup> *Mere Christianity*, pg. 8 Preface.
- <sup>96</sup> *Letters of C. S. Lewis*, pg. 165, letter to Dom Bede Griffiths, O.S.B., 8 May 1939.
- <sup>97</sup> *Letters to Malcolm Chiefly on Prayer*, pg. 16.
- <sup>98</sup> *God in the Dock*, pg. 181 and 183, from *Rejoinder to Dr. Pittenger*.
- <sup>99</sup> *C.S. Lewis Essay Collection & Other Short Pieces*, pg. 396.
- <sup>100</sup> *The Latin Letters of C. S. Lewis*, pg. 41 and 43 letter of 25 November 1947.
- <sup>101</sup> *Letters of C. S. Lewis*, pg. 165, letter to Dom Bede Griffiths, O.S.B., 8 May 1939.
- <sup>102</sup> *Letters to an American Lady*, pg. 116 and 117, letter of 10 June 1963.
- <sup>103</sup> *C.S. Lewis Essay Collection & Other Short Pieces*, pg. 397.
- <sup>104</sup> *Mere Christianity*, pg. 63.

