

The Great Divorce

Leanne Payne

If you do not take the distinction between good and bad very seriously, then it is easy to say that anything you find in this world is a part of God. But, of course, if you think some things really bad, and God really good, then you cannot talk like that. You must believe that God is separate from the world and that some of the things we see in it are contrary to His will. Confronted with a cancer or a slum the Pantheist can say, "If you could only see it from the divine point of view, you would realise that this also is God." The Christian replies, "Don't talk damned nonsense." For Christianity is a fighting religion. It thinks God made the world—that space and time, heat and cold, and all the colours and tastes, and all the animals and vegetables, are things that God "made up out of His head" as a man makes up a story. But it also thinks that a great many things have gone wrong with the world that God made and God insists, and insists very loudly, on putting them right again.

*Mere
Christianity*

To realize the Presence--and potential triumph--of God in all things, to experience the Incarnation working to redeem the whole of Creation, is to be sensitive to what St. Paul called "the mystery of iniquity," the problem of evil. It is to be particularly aware (though not dismayed by) the evilness of evil and its irreconcilable opposition to good. In response to those who would try in some way to reconcile good and evil, Lewis remarked,

Blake wrote the Marriage of Heaven and Hell. If I have written of their Divorce, this is not because I think myself a fit antagonist for so great a genius, nor even because I feel at all sure that I know what he meant. But in some sense or other the attempt to make that marriage is perennial. The attempt is based on the belief that reality never presents us with an absolutely unavoidable "either/or"; that, granted skill and patience and (above all) time enough, some way of embracing both alternatives can always be found; that mere development or adjustment or refinement will somehow turn evil into good without our being called on for a final and total rejection of anything we should like to retain. This belief I take to be a disastrous error.¹

To recognize that evil in this world is active, powerful, and intelligently malign is not necessarily to question God's final authority nor to deny the unity and ultimate goodness of what He has created. Rather it is to recognize that, as St. Paul put it, "Our fight is not against human foes, but against cosmic powers, against the authorities and potentates of this dark world, against the superhuman forces of evil in the heavens."² Believing in Satan or the Devil is not a requirement for entrance into heaven, but disbelieving in him will not only blind man to the ravaging Enemy totally committed to devouring—piecemeal if necessary—spirit, soul, and body, but can lead to an image of God that has evil in it. The figure of the Holy Spirit, in those who

reconcile good and evil, certainly has darkness in it. And this, as Christ solemnly declares³ is blasphemous. Such Lewis calls "damned nonsense"—the kind that "is under God's curse, and will (apart from God's grace) lead those who believe it to eternal death."⁴

And there is a very great deal of this nonsense abroad today, even among Christian scholars and theologians. A half century of naturalism's "demythologizing" of the Scriptures along with a concentration on scientific psychology has made it almost impossible for many Christian priests and ministers either to discern the need, or to perform the actions necessary, to release the soul in bondage to both the old fallen self and the Evil One. The individual suffering from depression or oppression, to mention nothing of the one suffering from actual possession, thus remains victimized as he is passed in wearying rounds from minister to medical doctor to psychiatrist to psychologist and back to minister. Also, on the corporate level, Christian fellowships are decimated by their inability to discern or to take authority over the unholy force committed to keeping them back from a shared life of love and power.

On the other hand, there is an equally dangerous error one must avoid:

There are two equal and opposite errors into which our race can fall about devils. One is to disbelieve in their existence. The other is to believe, and to feel an excessive and unhealthy interest in them. They themselves are equally pleased by both errors, and hail a materialist or a magician with the same delight.⁵

It has been my experience to see not a few souls, once they've repented their blindness concerning the devil's existence and wiles, begin to see him in just about everyone and everything; they begin, in effect, to "practice" his presence. They shortly begin their careers as "exorcists," and turn, in rapid succession, from "exorcist" into "magician." As Lewis points out, the devils who roam this fallen planet in search of souls to devour are delighted with this rapid transformation. Such are the hazards of removing, in this age of naturalism, the "Quality of Disbelief"⁶ which has, if not exorcised the devils, at least preserved us from the "superstitions" regarding their existence and from magicians both black and white. In the interest of truth, however, this risk must be taken, for evil can neither be denied nor can it be attributed to God. Possession of the truth about evil and its source is likewise necessary if the Church is to achieve a truly Christian psychology of man and once again assume responsibility for the healing of the oppressed and deluded minds of men.

No modern psychologist or philosopher has understood the unconscious mind and its ways of knowing better than Dr. C. G. Jung. He also knew that there are both diabolical and divine revelations—those that damn, leading to disintegration of the personality, as well as those that inform and lead to "individuation" or "integration" of the personality. Jung himself had from earliest childhood been open to diabolic revelation. It is our misfortune that despite his perception, this great mind reconciled good and evil, made "God, the dark author of all created things. . . alone responsible for the sufferings of the world."⁷ He, like the poet, Blake, married heaven and hell, in Jung's words, brought the Above and the Below together. Interestingly enough, also like Blake, he received this reconciliation of good and evil as *revelation*. It led him to say that the psychic life has two poles, good and evil, and that, in a similar fashion, Yahweh and Satan are polar ends of One Being—an argument identical to that Weston presents to Ransom.

When Jung was between the ages of three and four, he had a frightening dream in which he was taken underground and presented to the "Below" god, a horrible enthroned presence in the form of a ritual phallus.

The phallus of this dream seems to be a subterranean God "not to be named," and such it remained throughout my youth, reappearing whenever anyone spoke too

emphatically about Lord Jesus. Lord Jesus never became quite real for me, never quite acceptable, never quite lovable, for again and again I would think of his underground counterpart, a frightful revelation which had been accorded me without my seeking it.⁸

This dream phallus was introduced to him as the "man -eater," a horror that fed on human flesh. Haunted by this image for years, he later recognized it as a ritual phallus. This and several other such dark revelations shaped his life and his thought, and led him to believe and teach that "the dark Lord Jesus," or the dark side of God, and the phallus god are one and the same. Both are potentially destructive. It is interesting to note that the dark force which does in fact so quickly exploit and pervert man's procreative functions, also presents itself as a phallus to be worshiped. In primitive and pagan rites, no less than in present social fact, sexuality is "numinized," enthroned.⁹

From his study of ancient mythology and medieval alchemy, Jung calls this god the "chthonic" or "underground" spirit and sees it as a *numinosum* (a god) in the life and works of Freud. According to Jung, Freud was "emotionally involved in his sexual theory to an extraordinary degree. When he spoke of it, his tone became urgent, almost anxious, and all signs of his normally critical and skeptical manner vanished. A strange, deeply moved expression came over his face. . . ." ¹⁰ Later, Freud said to Jung, "Promise me never to abandon the sexual theory. That is the most essential thing of all. You see, we must make a dogma of it, an unshakable bulwark."¹¹ Freud, considering himself completely irreligious, had given up Yahweh, but in Jung's interpretation, he thereby only came into the grip of Yahweh's opposite, the Underground God or chthonic spirit: "Freud never asked himself why he was compelled to talk continually of sex why this idea had taken such possession of him I see him as a tragic figure; for he was a great man, and what is more, a man in the grip of his daimon."¹² About sexuality, Jung says that it "is of the greatest importance as the expression of the chthonic spirit. That spirit is the 'other face of God,' the dark side of the God-image."¹³

The dark force has other faces than the sexual one, but Jung notes how very often it wears the sexual mask. His observation explains why, when the intuitive faculty is developed apart from the work of the Holy Spirit, and/or apart from the good of reason, sexuality so often becomes in both art and religion, a *numinosum*. Sexual idolatry of one kind or another then ensues.¹⁴ Whether in art or in religion, the dark force often first fastens on man's procreative functions (whether by fantasy or act) and by this brings him into bondage. The force that can never create but can only destroy would start the process of death in a man at that very point where God intended man to give life.

Because of his theory of good and evil, Jung rejected the Christian revelation of a God Who is only good, and in Whom there is no darkness nor shadow of turning. Even though he never succumbed to materialism, Jung's view of reality ended in anthropocentricity. He came to have what Lewis calls the "inbetween view," that of God as an unconscious Force. While this force is an objective one outside man himself, it also becomes, in Jung's terminology, the unconscious mind. Jung's important concept of Individuation provides that "the unconscious is a process, and that the psyche is transformed or developed by the relationship of the ego to the contents of the unconscious."¹⁵

At one point, Jung had a momentous experience that made "the cosmic meaning of consciousness. . . overwhelmingly clear,"¹⁶ one that led him to believe his understanding of consciousness was the sole treasure he possessed. He concluded that man, by being conscious, gives to the world its objective existence, becomes "the second creator" of the world: "Human consciousness created objective existence and meaning, and man found his indispensable place in the great process of being."^{17,18} By identifying God as the unconscious

force which man's conscious mind must learn to relate to (and to control) Jung finally makes man out to be God.

As we have previously noted, Lewis does not make mind or consciousness an ultimate, but holds always to the Divine Spirit of God, both transcendent and immanent (without and within), as the Ultimate and as man's link with the Ultimate. Consciousness in Lewis's view is nearly a synonym for the rational soul—that which is an incarnation of reason and other spiritual elements in an animal body. But consciousness, however supernatural, is still a created thing—made in the image of God, but not God Himself. For Lewis, the Holy Spirit in man, not consciousness, is the prime treasure man can receive; and by it all his other gifts, including that of consciousness or rational soul, are illumined and sanctified.

Those who identify God with some unconscious force in His creation or with human consciousness itself are not the only ones to dangerously reconcile good and evil. Even among Christians there are attempts to explain what Paul was content to leave to God as "the *mystery* of iniquity." By ignoring this wisdom, they dangerously blur the distinction between good and evil and hurt our idea of God. To try to reconcile good and evil from our point of view only obscures what we already know about the difference between them and may damage the practice of our faith.

Charles Williams is an example of a committed Christian who attempts to reconcile good and evil, though his approach is quite different from Jung's. To Williams God is objectively Other, and not to be identified with man or the self; in fact, few have written better on the hell of self and the wonder of *losing* oneself in Love than has Charles Williams. Jung reconciled good and evil because he believed God was both good and evil. Insofar as Williams attempts the same, it is because he believes God to be wholly good and the *only* supernatural power. Therefore, Evil, though an active and powerful illusion, to him is finally only an illusion—only apparent—and a shadow of the good.

Christian theology has always tried to maintain a balance here between two equal and opposite errors. One is the view expressed in the ancient Zoroastrian faith of Persia, that Good and Evil are two real and equal powers, eternally warring, with neither finally dominant. The second is that since all that is real is good, only goodness really exists, and evil is just one of its masks. This view is common to pantheists, of one sort or another, including various eastern religions.

In between these views, the Christian faith has maintained a third view, known as the Augustinian since Augustine gave it its definitive formulation. Augustine says that God and all God created are totally good. Everything that is, insofar as it *is*, is holy. Even Satan was Lucifer, the Prince of Light, highest of the angels. When Satan turned to evil, he turned to "what was not," to non-being, to nothingness, to nonsense. His bent will could only oppose God by destroying, by striving after nothingness. Likewise, when man chooses evil, he is finally choosing nothingness—that which will only hurt himself and those around him. That is why all who follow the bent will of the Father of Lies will finally wind up the shadowy insubstantial creatures of the dark, as Lewis portrays them in *The Great Divorce*. All hell, the heavenly guide shows the narrator of that book, can finally be contained in a tiny crack between two blades of grass in the soil of heaven. From this classically Christian point of view, Dante and others speculate that a physical hell, insofar as it prevents the damned from disintegrating to complete nothingness, is a severe mercy.

Whatever one's speculations on the final fate of those who refuse to surrender their will to God the Father, it is true that evil bears to good the relationship of the parasite to its host. The very strength that evil has is stolen from things that are good in themselves. One need only

think of the metallurgy and logistics that go into a rifle, to see how the bad will of the murderer abuses things good in themselves. Satan as the initiator of evil, along with all evil wills after his, wittingly or unwittingly perverts the good. Most often, man does evil while striving for what Milton called "some fair appearing good"; that is, he does evil to achieve something (like power, or pleasure) in itself good. Nevertheless, his selfish motive and bent act are finally destructive of that good and of himself.

In one sense, evil is finally the highest unreality. But the orthodox view forbids us to see it as a masked form of good—or even willed by God. Evil is willed by the Evil One—by Satan—and by all who choose wrongly. True it is that God will finally thwart all evil purposes and bring good out of them—a good so great we can hardly imagine it. Similarly, the orthodox view sees good and evil (for now) in a real struggle, but evil (or its effects) will one day be entirely abolished. In fact, Christ's triumph on the Cross was the decisive battle in a war that evil is bound to lose.

All of this review of Christianity's historic teaching on evil is necessary to understanding why Charles Williams's view must be criticized. I would hasten to say at the outset that Williams as writer and Christian had a profound insight into faith and practice, and that his works and person have had a great influence for the good on figures as diverse and eminent as T. S. Eliot and C. S. Lewis. Lewis, recommending Williams to a friend, said of him: "His face [while lecturing] becomes almost angelic. Both in public and private he is of nearly all the men I have met the one whose address most overflows with *love*. It is simply irresistible."¹⁹ Williams understood incarnational reality (Love) and his response to it fired the hearts and imaginations of the great and the small.²⁰

Williams was a man who loved greatly and who yearned to see an exchange of love between men—the "old knowledge" of love working. Failing to find much of this, he embarked on a search for a solution that would help him see the apparent evil in the world in a new way. Though his motives were the best, the solution he came to gives rise to a figure of Love and of the Holy Spirit that contains darkness in it.

Because he treasured a vision of the unity of all things, he worked to reconcile not only good and evil, but all opposites. The story of his life, it seems to me, is the story of his untiring genius at work to cause "alien and opposite experiences to coinhere."²¹ There was, he believed, only Love to be known; therefore he synthesized opposites in order to find a "new knowledge" of love that would not only affirm all the universe as good, but also see evil as a mask of that Love.

This, he felt, was precisely the achievement of all the great poets. "In each of them discordant elements are united in one."²² This is, of course, a truism of literary criticism, but for Williams it means more than esthetic unity; it means a reconciliation of good and evil on a theological level. Evident in his critique of all poets and their poetry is the idea that what the poet needs is the courage to allow the Muse to lead him into the Unity. Those who affirm all images will be led into the knowledge of love. What seems to be missing from this view is the recognition that by itself the imagination can lead into the perverse and destructive as well as into the knowledge of love.

In Williams's mind, Dante was the poet *par excellence*, who had achieved this reconciliation in his *Divine Comedy*.²³ For most readers, Dante's three-part division of the next life reflects the traditional medieval notions of Hell, Purgatory, and Heaven, and the reconciliation would seem to be Williams's rather than Dante's. Yet to understand how Williams reconciles good and evil in Dante, we should examine briefly his view of evil. Like Jung, he thought the notion of the devil was coeval with Christianity. He believed that the Zoroastrian opposition of good to evil, the eternal dualism mentioned above, had tainted early Christian thought. Throughout his works, in order to preserve his vision of the Unity and to show all images as good, he does away with the idea of active powers or supernatural persons electing to do evil in opposition to God. Yet, he

retains the mythic and archetypal figures of the demonic. These figures of Satan and his fallen angels only symbolize men who elect "to know good as evil." They have occult powers and demonic gifts, not by an incarnation of an evil spirit or even by collaboration with one, but by a misuse of the one only supernatural power. Abiding in self, they are cut off from the co-inherence; they are therefore *in-coherent*. For Williams's purpose then, Dante's unified system was an ideal symbol. His Satan, forever frozen in the bottom circle of the Inferno, could well be interpreted as the last state of the in-coherent man, rather than as a distinct and operative power.

Hell, in Williams's terminology, is an image of an unchanging state which endures no more *becoming*, and to dwell in the alienated self is to dwell in hell. This insight is of course true, and any one who has read Williams will be aware of his genius in causing this terrible truth to leap alive.²⁴ Nevertheless, it is only part of the truth. Surely, for Dante, as for Lewis and the main teaching of the Scriptures and the Church, evil is more than the misuse of the one supernatural power by the individual human soul.

Williams's reconciliation of the good [God] and the evil [Satan] is more clearly seen in his dramas. One can almost say his poetry "led" him to the final figure of Necessity, who represents this reconciliation. Though Williams held the idea of Necessity previous to the dramas, the figure that results seems almost as much a product of his poetry as of his philosophy—almost, at times, a literary invention. The way of the affirmation of all images led him to it.

The figure of Satan first appears in *The Rite of the Passion*, a drama that attempts to show that in some mysterious way good and evil are in relationship to each other—not as opposites, but as substance and shadow. After all, Christ's enemies were the agents used to bring Christ to His fulfillment as Messiah and Redeemer; Gabriel and Satan are not really friend and foe of Christ respectively, but the right and left hand pillars of the way. Love is Christ, who reconciles these opposites. Love says, "Say, what art thou, my angel Satan?" And Satan replies, "Lord, I am thy shadow, only known as hell where any linger from thy sweet accord." Turning to Gabriel, Love says: "What art thou, my angel Gabriel?" And Gabriel answers: "Lord, I am nothing but thy annunciation; thy message and thy summons, and thy call, the Gospel to all men of thy great salvation." Then Love concludes: "And I alone am utterly all in all."²⁵

The figure of Satan is gradually transformed in the succeeding dramas until it becomes, finally, the Flame representing the Holy Spirit in *The House of the Octopus*. John Heath-Stubbs, writing the introduction to *Collected Plays*, a book containing nine of Williams's dramas, states:

Several interpreters of C. W. (including Mrs. Ridler, Mrs. Hadfield, and Brother George Every) have pointed out that the figure of Satan in this work anticipates a series of figures in the later plays the Skeleton in *Cranmer*, the Third King in *Seed of Adam*, the Accuser in *Judgement at Chelmsford*. In all these, a figure apparently representing Evil or Death ultimately appears, in the light of eternity, as the instrument of Good. This series really culminates in the Flame in *The House of the Octopus*; but the Flame is explicitly an image of the Holy Spirit guarding over and working in the Church.²⁶

This transformation is noted by the commentators. I have yet to see one take exception to it. Neither would I, if this final figure were merely a literary one, symbolizing the power of God to turn even the worst circumstances to the highest good by exorcising and defeating evil. As it is, however, the figure represents Williams's synthesis of good and evil in the unity of all things and purports to be a figure of God.

The Flame, representing the Holy Spirit, is a figure of God that is foreign to me. I can recognize Him even less in the figure that appears in *Terror of Light* explicitly named the Holy

Ghost. The Flame and other progressions of this figure, speaking from one mouth both Christ's and Satan's words, hold darkness. Elsewhere Williams takes exception to the figure of God that Milton portrays, because he would not go beyond "dualism"²⁷ into a synthesizing of the powers. But what about the figure that Charles Williams has come up with? The one that indeed makes this synthesis? As at once the *figura rerum* (the figure of truth) and the figure of Satan, it holds darkness; it is that adverse fate which is "Christ's back." It is the necessity one must choose, in love and with no reservations, as the Will of God. Satan is the other face of Christ.

Perhaps, because of the very image of Him he created, Williams was himself fearful of the Holy Spirit. In his struggle to find "a different kind of solution arising from a new knowledge of the activity of love,"²⁸ he came up with a Holy Spirit that is not truly the Comforter. Alice Mary Hadfield writes that Williams regarded the compulsion of the Holy Spirit as "horrifyingly disturbing"²⁹ and immortality as much a threat as a hope. Hints of this are reflected here and there in his writings:

There are those who find it easy to look forward to immortality and those who do not. I admit that, for myself, I do not. It is true that the gradual stupefaction of the faculties which normally overcomes a man as he grows older seems to make—if not the idea of immortality more attractive—at least the idea of annihilation less so. . . . Whatever else is true, the idea of annihilation is more repellent. But I cannot say I find the idea of immortality, even of a joyous immortality, much more attractive. I admit, of course, that this is a failure of intelligence; if joy is joy, an infinite joy cannot be undesirable. The mere fact that our experience on this earth makes it difficult for us to apprehend a good without a catch in it somewhere, is, by definition, irrelevant. It may, however, make the folly more excusable.³⁰

This is so unlike Lewis's "the best wave is yet to come!" Though none looks forward to the process of dying itself, it seems to me that Williams has so firmly convinced himself of the co-inherence of good and evil that he is robbed of joy and the hope of immortality that goes with it.

Charles Williams's affirmation of all images as good led him to an image of God the Holy Spirit which is a frightening one. Nor is this fear the proper awe implied in Lewis's assertion: "Aslan [Christ] is not a tame Lion." It would seem that Williams needed deliverance from his own image of God—one that is a mouthpiece for both Christ and Satan—in order to find that the Holy Spirit is in no way an Accuser, that He is a Comforter and not a terror. It has been said that Williams "has shown us how we may best love [in] a fallen world"³¹—by complete acceptance of the world and the affirmation of all images. But if we affirm *all* images, we will also affirm the dark ones, and our final image of God, like Williams's, will of necessity hold darkness.

Williams believed that there is finally no darkness in God, that God is Love, and that this life-giving Love, the primal energy, is only holy and pure. However, by constructing a philosophy that set out to prove evil as only apparent and thus finally identified with good, he ended without the joyous anticipation of immortality and heaven that weaves through all of Lewis's writing.

According to the Scriptures, Satan is the master counterfeiter, the "god" of this world, and the one through whom the diabolical revelations come that plague the mind of man and show up in his myths, his philosophies, his theologies, and his psychologies. Believing in the existence of Satan, writes Lewis, "seems to me to explain a good many facts. It agrees with the plain sense of Scripture, the tradition of Christendom, and the beliefs of most men at most times. And it conflicts with nothing that any of the sciences has shown to be true."³² He is the Unholy Dark

Spirit, the one that aims to bring all creation into bondage, to swallow it up into his darkness and nothingness. It was he who first tempted man to put self first and thereby to commit evil, to want to be God. It is he who demands the unending worship due only to God. By encouraging the reconciling of good and evil, he achieves subtly, and at least partially, this goal.

It is blasphemous to attribute the darkness in Satan, of that arising in any creature, to any Person of the Blessed Trinity. Christ solemnly declared "that any sin of man can be forgiven, even blasphemy against me, but the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit can never be forgiven. It is an eternal sin."³³ Where good and evil are reconciled, the character of the Holy Spirit is presented as at once divine and demonic, and He Who was sent as Comforter, as Stirrer of men's hearts toward God, becomes an ambiguous and fearful figure. This is, even as Jung himself acknowledges, blasphemy.

God's Love is eternal; this Love is, in a way past our understanding, Himself. He does not simply *will* our good, He gives Himself entirely *as* our good. "The world is a dance in which good, descending from God, is disturbed by evil arising from the creatures, and the resulting conflict is resolved by God's own assumption of the suffering nature which evil produces."³⁴ God's Love in us or, we might say, His Holy Spirit within us, is the divine energy that overcomes the evil or darkness in each individual life. Lewis has said, "The union between the Father and the Son is such a live concrete thing that this union itself is also a Person."³⁵ To blaspheme the Holy Spirit is to blaspheme Love, and God's way of saving man. God is Love, and this Love has been "from all eternity' a love going on between the Father and Son."³⁶ To fear the Holy Spirit (as many do) is to fear the Love which would re-create fallen creatures. "If you want joy, peace, eternal life, you must get close to, even into the thing that has them. They are not a sort of prize which God could, if He chose, just hand out to anyone. They are a great fountain of energy and beauty springing up at the very centre of reality."³⁷ To fear and thereby to shun the Holy Spirit is to fear Love and thereby step back into separateness.

The exquisite awe the creature feels in the Presence of the Uncreated is a *kind* of fear:

O how shall I, whose native sphere
Is dark, whose mind is dim,
Before the Ineffable appear,
And on my naked spirit bear, the uncreated beam?³⁸

But this fear is quite different from the horror of the Lord produced in the wicked. Darkness cannot abide absolute Goodness, the Light. This horror consists not in the figure of God, but in the fact that we, as sinners, must die to our old, false, usurping selves, submitting, like Eustace, to Aslan's claws. We are fearful because we know we must have our scaly dragon hides ripped off before we can be thrown into the healing waters and, cleansed, come up into the Presence. Only then are we prepared for that Presence to enter fully into so that we might cease to do our own works, that Another might take over and love through us.

The attempt to combine good and evil is, I believe, one of the greatest threats facing not only Christendom but all mankind today. The freedom and the welfare of all men is at stake in this issue. The Christian view of the Triune God as well as the Christian view of man are in various ways jeopardized by a powerful intellectual thrust toward this synthesis—one that is, especially as it affects the psychology of man, often subtle and undetected. One of the very few great

bulwarks against this ideological thrust that affects us at every level (spiritually, psychologically, intellectually, politically) is the intellect of C. S. Lewis.³⁹ His books are unique in this century.

God is good. But modern man often seems bent on believing otherwise. His motive for doing so may be reflected in the confession of Orual in *Till We Have Faces*: "Do you think the mortals will find you gods easier to bear if you're beautiful? . . . We want to be our own."⁴⁰ The darkness in the world did not overcome the Light Who came, incarnate, into the world. And it is this Light that enters into all who believe in Him. Of the utter purity of this Light none who know it will question. The whole burden of Lewis's writing, and of this book, is that we must become

. . . as glass

To let the white light without flame, the Father pass Unstained.⁴¹

And this is the terror, and this is the glory.

Notes:

1. Lewis, *Great Divorce*, p. 5.
2. Eph. 6:12, NEB.
3. Mark 3:28-9.
4. Lewis, *Mere Christianity*, p. 45, note.
5. Lewis, *Screwtape*, second Preface.
6. A phrase Charles Williams quotes and uses. See Williams's *Witchcraft: A History of Black Magic in Christian Times* (New York: World Publishing Co., 1971), pp. 70-5.
7. Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, p. 92.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
9. Phallicism or phallism: worship of the generative power in nature, symbolized by phallic art, as in the Dionysian festivals of ancient Greece.
10. Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, p. 150.
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Ibid.*, pp. 152-3.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 168.
14. The novels of D. H. Lawrence are an excellent case in point.
15. Jung, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, p. 209.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 255.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 256.
18. Lewis expresses his wonder at the gift of consciousness but interprets the gift differently. In the following lines he views this great gift from the perspective of nature and the body: "And but for our body one whole realm of God's glory—all that we receive through the senses—would go unpraised." *Letters to Malcolm*, p. 17.
19. Lewis, *Letters of Lewis*, p. 196.
20. I know that this book on Lewis would never have been written had I not first read Charles

Williams and been overwhelmed with what H. V. D. Dyson called "clotted glory from Charles," Lewis, *Letters of Lewis*, p. 197. Williams's imagery, his "clotted glory," produced such a riot of reactions and ideas in me that I could not but interact with both them and him. I think he had this same effect on Lewis and on Dorothy Sayers; and I have witnessed this same effect on scores of the keenest students. We all owe him a great deal.

21. Williams, *Descent of Dove*, p. 212.
22. Charles Williams, *The English Poetic Mind* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1963), p. 15.
23. Williams interpreted Dante's *Inferno* as differing states of man in himself and the *Purgatorio* as states of the purifying of the images of selfish man. See *Poetry at Present* and *The English Poetic Mind*, both by Charles Williams.
24. The character of Wentworth in Williams's *Descent Into Hell* is an incredible artistic revelation of an unchanging image that bears no more becoming and therefore descends into the hell of self. Many persons, students mostly, after reading *Descent Into Hell*, cry out that they are such a one. Their lives change after such a revelation.
25. Charles Williams, "The Right of the Passion," in *Three Plays* (London: Oxford University Press, 1931), p. 190.
26. Charles Williams, *Collected Plays* (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), p. vii.
27. Obviously Milton does not recognize an ultimate dualism. In his epic, Satan is the opposite not of God, but of the archangel Michael. Milton's view of evil is Augustinian.
28. Alice Mary Hadfield, *An Introduction to Charles Williams* (London: Robert Hale, 1959), p. 127.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 170.
30. Charles Williams, *Charles Williams Selected Writings*, selected by Anne Ridler (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), pp. 99-100.
31. Glen Cavaliero, "Diagram of Glory" (Ph.D. diss., St. Catherine's College, Cambridge University, n.d.), p. 141.
32. Lewis, *Screwtape*, p. vii.
33. Mark 3:28.
34. Lewis, *Problem of Pain*, p. 72.
35. Lewis, *Mere Christianity*, p. 152.
36. *Ibid.*
37. *Ibid.*, p. 153.
38. Thomas Binney, hymn, "Eternal light," ca. 1826, in *The Hymnal of the Protestant Episcopal Church in The United States of America* (New York: Church Pension Fund, 1940), no. 478.
39. Mr. Alexander Solzhenitsyn is the other great twentieth-century prophet crying out to an age that has reconciled good and evil and therefore cannot apply moral criteria to any situation, political or personal. The understanding that between good and evil there is an unbridgeable gap is key in his thought even as it is in Lewis's.
40. Lewis, *Till We Have Faces*, pp. 290-1. 41. Lewis, *Pilgrims Regress*, p. 177.