

UNIVERZITA PALACKÉHO V OLOMOUCI

PEDAGOGICKÁ FAKULTA

Ústav cizích jazyků

Diplomová práce

Bc. Eva Hřibová

Reason and Imagination of C. S. Lewis

Olomouc 2017

vedoucí práce: Mgr. Petr Anténe, Ph.D.

Čestné prohlášení

Prohlašuji, že jsem závěrečnou práci vypracovala samostatně pod vedením

Mgr. Petra Anténeho, Ph.D. s využitím pramenů, které jsou řádně uvedeny v bibliografii.

V Olomouci, 23. 6. 2017

.....

podpis

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Mgr. Petr Anténe, Ph.D. for his support and valuable comments on the content, style and form of my final project.

Obsah

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Abstract..... | 6 |
| Introduction..... | 7 |
| 1. THE LEXES | 9 |
| 1.1. Reason and Imagination..... | 9 |
| 2. C. S. LEWIS | 10 |
| 2.1. The Scholar | 10 |
| 2.2. Childhood..... | 11 |
| 2.3. The School Days..... | 12 |
| 2.4. A Private Tutor | 13 |
| 2.5. WWI..... | 14 |
| 2.6. Return to Oxford..... | 15 |
| 2.7. Surprised by Joy..... | 16 |
| 3. THE CHRONICLES OF NARNIA | 21 |
| 3.1. A New Story | 21 |
| 3.2. Reason behind imagination..... | 23 |
| 3.2.1. A Story | 23 |
| 3.2.2. The Threshold..... | 24 |
| 3.2.3. Escapism vs. Reality | 25 |
| 3.2.4. The Children | 25 |
| 3.2.5. Personified Animals..... | 27 |
| 3.2.6. The creatures..... | 28 |
| 3.2.7. Not an allegory..... | 28 |
| 3.2.8. The Lion..... | 29 |
| 3.3. Spirituality in Education | 32 |
| 4. TILL WE HAVE FACES | 38 |
| 4.1. A Myth Retold | 38 |
| 4.2. Reason behind imagination..... | 40 |
| 4.2.1. Face..... | 40 |

| | | |
|---------|---|----|
| 4.2.2. | The Grey Mountain..... | 41 |
| 4.2.3. | The Veil | 44 |
| 4.2.4. | Love | 45 |
| 4.2.5. | Fox | 48 |
| 4.2.6. | Bardia..... | 49 |
| 4.2.7. | Redival | 51 |
| 4.2.8. | Psyche | 51 |
| 4.2.9. | Orual | 53 |
| 4.2.10. | Bare love..... | 54 |
| 4.3. | Values in Education | 55 |
| | CONCLUSION..... | 62 |
| | Bibliografie | 64 |
| | Appendices..... | 68 |
| | Appendix 1: Lesson Plan 1 | 68 |
| | Appendix 2 – Lesson plan 1: The text | 70 |
| | Appendix 3 – Lesson Plan 1 – Worksheet..... | 72 |
| | Appendix 3 – Lesson Plan 2 | 73 |
| | Appendix 3 – Lesson Plan 2: The text..... | 74 |
| | Resumé..... | 76 |
| | Annotation..... | 77 |

Abstract

The aim of this thesis is to deal with the notions of reason and imagination in the work of a scholar, a teacher and a writer C. S. Lewis (1898 – 1963). His extensive non-fiction work together with far-reaching fiction reveals that he was not at all afraid to combine the two concepts and to approach his audience holistically – cognitively, emotionally and spiritually. The thesis studies mainly two of his books: *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* (1950), the first and best known of his seven-piece series called *The Chronicles of Narnia* (1950-56), and his last fiction called *Till We Have Faces* (1956) and examines Lewis' reason behind his imagination. Lewis' rational thought and meanings behind his stories is supported by concepts from his very rich collection of non-fiction, among which there is his autobiography *Surprised by Joy* (1955) and a radio broadcast collection *Mere Christianity* (1942), and a view of how he incorporates ideas by means of reason and imagination. Drawing on his message, the thesis elaborates on the concepts of spirituality in education and values in education. A lesson plan based on Lewis' text is enclosed.

Introduction

The terms *reason* and *imagination* tend to have a credible appearance of contradicting each other. One pointing to logic, rooted in proof, growing through verification, another sprouting from sensational assumption, detached from reality, maturing through fantasy and tied only to a single, subjective mind. The aim of this project is to show that C. S. Lewis' life and work, however, boldly reunite the two. In addition, I believe his work is remarkably significant and has a current momentous message for the twenty-first century.

Lewis himself explains that: "While reason is the natural organ of truth, imagination is the organ of meaning" (Lewis, 2013 str. 265), and within the interpretation itself he uses qualities of both: Reasoning via creating pictures of function and purpose. Among all his titles Lewis was above all a teacher. A teacher that used the means of reason and imagination to explain, teach, tutor, coach and help people across all ages to develop and mature. I am going to illustrate Lewis' approach.

Owen Barfield, Lewis' close friend, described him as having three identities – "imaginative Lewis", "logical Lewis" and "religious Lewis" (Barfield, 1977). The aim of this thesis is to explore the contradicting identities through the analysis of two of his works: the famous novel *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* (1950) from the series *The Chronicles of Narnia* (1950-1956) and a quite unfamiliar novel *Till We Have Faces* (1956), and finding where and how reason and imagination meet, if they are able to co-exist in harmony and how they are to be used in education.

The project will be divided into four main chapters.

Before the actual examination of the books I am going to look at the notions of *reason* and *imagination* themselves, their definitions and Lewis' viewpoint of them in chapter one.

In the second chapter, I am going to introduce the author C. S. Lewis and briefly recapitulate his life. I would like to show his own understanding of reason and imagination and how it developed throughout his life and what influence it had.

I am going to start chapter three with an introduction of Lewis' series *The Chronicles of Narnia* (1950-1956) and *The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe* (1950), then provide analysis of the work and explore the meanings behind the fantasy. I would like to examine how Lewis works with children – how he addresses their imagination and logic. I will also elaborate on how Lewis deals with spirituality in his work and if it has a place in education.

Chapter four will descend in the novel called *Till We Have Faces* (1956) which is not aimed at children, quite the contrary, it is one of his most complex and difficult works. I am going to provide an interpretation and analyse the characters and again examine Lewis' reason behind his imagination and their interaction. I am going to conclude with an enquiry into the place of values in our education today.

1. THE LEXES

1.1. Reason and Imagination

According to the Oxford Dictionary imagination is “the faculty or action of forming new ideas, or images or concepts of external objects not present to the senses” (English Oxford Living Dictionaries). It is important to note that Lewis drew clear distinction between the words *imaginative* and *imaginary*. *Imaginary* is something that is falsely imagined having no equivalent to reality, something even leading to delusion. On the other hand, the word *imaginative* means that something is produced by a human mind as a response to something greater than itself. From this point of view, it means that the more imaginative mythology, the better communication of reality. For Lewis, *imaginative* is to be seen as a valid and positive usage of human imagination, exposing and challenging the limits of reason and opening deeper understanding of reality (McGrath, 2013).

Reason is defined as “the power of the mind to think, understand, and form judgements logically” (English Oxford Living Dictionaries).

The idea of the dilemma between reason and imagination does not come from analysing Lewis’ fiction and non-fiction. It is Lewis who is not afraid to openly ask and struggle with the question. In his sixteen-line sonnet called *Reason*, where the maid symbolizes *imagination* and the mother embodies *reason*, he thinks aloud:

“Oh, who will reconcile in me both the maid and mother,
Who make in me a concord of the depth and height?
Who make imagination’s dim exploring touch
Ever report the same as intellectual sight?
Then could I truly say, and not deceive,
Then wholly say, that I BELIEVE” (Lewis, 1964 p. 81)

Reason and imagination appear throughout Lewis’ whole career in diverse relationships. In his thirties, Lewis put his fullest trust in reason and he excelled. His legendary talks on morality and other issues collected in *Mere Christianity* (1942) still sells in millions. In his fifties, he came to regard a myth as the best way to convey the Truth; *The Chronicles of Narnia* and *Till We Have Faces* are the perfect proofs (Schakel, 1984).

2. C. S. LEWIS

2.1. The Scholar

Clive Staples Lewis, a renowned Fellow and a Tutor in English Literature at Oxford University and a Chair of Medieval Renaissance Literature at Cambridge University, was born in Belfast, Ireland in 1898 (HarperCollins). A master of visual illustration yet skilled at constructing sound arguments (Gordon, 2014 p. 4), Lewis was also a poet, a novelist, an essayist, a literary critic, a Christian apologist, a lay theologian, a broadcaster, a teacher and an orator. Hooper¹ compiled a bibliography of Lewis' writings which contains over three hundred items including books, articles, reviews and letters (Gibson, 1980 p. 14).

Lewis' sharp and piercing intellect thriving with ideas and his imagination filled with pictures imply that he wrote easily and with enjoyment. As Lewis admitted to his brother and a long-life friend in one, he filled his life with what he wanted to do (Gibson, 1980 p. 14). Hooper recalls that Lewis was happiest with a pile of papers, ink and a large cup of tea (Hooper, 2014 p. 50).

Since his death in 1963 a bewildering cult has emerged. His books have been translated into all the world's main languages and even into some not so common ones. There seems to be a countless number and varieties of the reprints. There were many societies established across the world studying and promoting his work. Of course, plays, films and cartoons have been made and hundreds of theses written (Sayer, 1997 p. 21). It has been estimated that throughout the world fifty million copies of his works have been published (Gibson, 1980).

Lewis' profession, intelligence and success could have easily walled him away from ordinary people yet it proved the opposite. Lewis is known for his adherence to replying to each received letter, be it from a child, adult or group (Lewis, 1966). Clifford Morris, a taxi driver who frequently drove Lewis to Cambridge, said about Lewis: "he was never an intellectual snob and he was willing to talk to anyone on any subject." The driver admits that he overheard conversations with other professors that he was not able to understand but at the same time recalls a conversation with rough truck drivers at a stop café who were enthralled with Lewis' wit. In their words: "he's a toff, he is! A real nice bloke!" (Green and Hooper, 1974). Even his

¹ Walter Hooper (1931) was briefly Lewis' private secretary. After Lewis' death in 1963, Hooper devoted himself to Lewis memory collecting his work and writing extensive biographies.

appearance seemed to suggest a like-mindedness with the ordinary. His brother reported that he had a talent for making a new suit look shabby the second time he wore it. In one of Lewis' letters Lewis himself tells of leaving the house one day and discovering that he had on shoes that did not match. Moreover, one was clean and the other dirty. As he had no time to return Lewis tried to camouflage it but with no success humorously concluding: "you can get some mud on it – but it obviously remains a clean shoe that has had an accident" (Lewis, 1966).

No description of a man would be complete without mentioning his humour. Although humour does not appear much in his writing, Lewis' friends testify of his good-natured irony and the playfulness with words - examples of which are displayed in many pages of *The Screwtape Letters* and *The Chronicles of Narnia* (Gibson, 1980 p. 6).

2.2. Childhood

Clive Staples Lewis was born to a solicitor Albert Lewis and a clergymen's daughter Flora Hamilton as their second and last child. The Lewises were proper Welshmen – sentimental farmers, passionate and rhetorical self-made men whereas the Hamiltons were of cooler minds, clergymen and lawyers with analytical and ironic intellects and a talent for happiness. Clive was aware of the distinct contrast between his mother's calm warmth and his father's emotional ups and downs. Both his parents were clever people. Mother was a promising mathematician who started Clive on French and Latin and his father an orator speaking on political platforms in England, had he had the means he would have pursued a political career (Lewis, 2010).

In addition to the loving parents, enough food and a great garden, Clive acknowledges two other blessings in his childhood. His nurse Lizzie Endicott and his brother, three years his senior, Warren (Lewis, 2010). The Lewis' brothers became best friends and remained as such till parted by death (Sayer, 1997).

At the age of four, Clive Staples suddenly announced that he did not like his names and was to be called "Jacksie" (Lewis, 2010). From then on, he refused to respond to any other name. And so, Lewis became Jacksie, later shortened to Jacks and finally to Jack. What made him change his name at such an early age will never be known (Gibson, 1980).

In 1908, a tragedy struck on the family. Flora, Lewis' mother was diagnosed with cancer and died in August on the day of her husband's birthday. Lewis describes that the worst thing for his brother and himself was that their mother was taken from them gradually. Her whole

existence had been changing in front of their young eyes into something alien and frightening (Lewis, 2010). Lewis' father never quite recovered from the loss of his wife and felt that he would not be able to provide a home on his own and sent his sons to Wynyard School. Jack's life turned upside down – he was teared from his mother, from his home and taken under the wings of a brutal and maybe insane headmaster of a new boarding school and in effect lost his father too (Sayer, 1997). This brought the two brothers closer together, they learned to rely on each other (Lewis, 2010).

2.3. The School Days

The boys stayed at Wynyard only for two years not because their father realised that it was a bad school for them but because the school had to close-down for lack of students. For the rest of his life, Jack felt anger toward the tyrannical headmaster and succeeded to come to terms with it only a few months before his own death in 1963. Despite the damage caused by his teacher's cruelty, Jack claimed that the school had done him more good than harm. He started to read the Bible and pray seriously. Later Jack recalled that the cruelty “taught all the boys to stick together to support each other in resistance to tyranny” (Sayer, 1997).

In November 1910, Jack was sent to Cherbourg in Malvern. The town had a reputation of health resort and made a great first impression on Jack. He liked the school, made friends and seemed happy. His writing developed rapidly and in fact, prematurely. Jack wrote during the terms and during the holidays and he illustrated his stories with his own coloured pictures. The stories were full of desire to recover a lost paradise and to live in a simple world which suggested anxiety and need to escape (Sayer, 1997).

At Cherbourg, he lost his newly found faith but at the same time discovered Wagner and was overwhelmed by his work. He was stunned by last two operas *Siegfried* (1876) and the *Twilight of the Gods* (1876). These experiences inspired joy in him. Jack has deserted all belief in anything Christian but was enthralled by tales of heroic myths. The Christ story was to him as beautiful and heroic and false as the Norse myths (Gordon, 2014). He became utterly captivated in the imaginative world of a great writer, artist or musician (Sayer, 1997). Interestingly, he hid this imaginative life of his from others not by choice but simply because he had no friend he could share it with. He was afraid nobody would understand so the personality

that he showed to his peers was that of a witty, entertaining and sex obsessed schoolboy (Sayer, 1997).

From 1913 to 1914 Lewis studied at Malvern College. He was irritated by “absolute lack of appreciation of anything like music or books” among his peers. He hated being among boys who “never rise above the dull daily round of cricket and work and eating,” (Hooper, 1979).

2.4. A Private Tutor

On September 9, 1914 Lewis went to study under a private tutor Mr. Kirkpatrick in a pleasant village called Great Bookham in Surrey. The two and a half years that he spent with Kirkpatrick were the most peaceful years of his entire life. Freedom from emotional, academic, literary and other pressures enabled him to discover his own tastes. Great Bookham introduced a routine that he would follow for the rest of his life. He got up at half past seven every day and spent a few minutes walking in the garden before having breakfast. Work would begin at quarter past eight and would continue until lunch. Then he was free to read and write or walk around in the woods of the county (Sayer, 1997).

Lewis’ new teacher Mr. William T. Kirkpatrick dubbed “The Great Knock” or just “Kirk” was a rationalist and a logician who insisted that his students built their mental mansions with the same solid rocks (Gibson, 1980). He startled Jack and became a father figure of sorts to him (Gordon, 2014).

Jack made a rapid progress in his studies as Kirkpatrick’s method of teaching suited him just perfectly. Kirkpatrick would read approximately twenty lines of i.e. *Iliad* or another work they had been studying, translate it roughly and then tell his pupils to go through it in detail with a grammar book and dictionary while he went about his own business. Jack not only learned Greek but found that he could think in Greek. Moreover, then he learned French, Italian and some German (Sayer, 1997).

All Lewis’ pocket money went to ordering books by post. He found interest in other genres – poetry, romantic writings. Once Lewis received an assignment from Knock to read *Phantastes* (1858) by George MacDonald (Gordon, 2014). Lewis was mesmerised by its theme of reverence of something holy, something worth longing for. The book influenced him immensely, as Lewis revealed later, it “baptised his imagination” (Lewis, 2010).

Kirkpatrick's leadership excited and fulfilled Lewis' proof-loving and evidence demanding view of the universe and everything in it. Intellectual bar was set up high and Lewis held Kirk in highest esteem (Gordon, 2014).

2.5. WWI

In December 1916 Jack went to Oxford to take an entrance scholarship exam in classics. He wrote to his father that this place surpassed all his wildest dreams. Lewis was accepted but due to the First World War half the College had been transformed into hospital. Lewis had to enlist and was posted to France as a second lieutenant in the Somerset Light Infantry. On the day of his nineteenth birthday (1917) he found himself in the frontline trenches. What came to Lewis as a surprise was that he did not dislike the Army more. He recalls that the fact that no one was expected to like it nor had to pretend to like it, made the difference. In Lewis' words: "Straight tribulation is easier to bear than tribulation which advertises itself as pleasure" (Lewis, 2010).

Lewis made quite a few friends here. One of them called Owen Barfield said: "His prime quality, apart from his blazing intellect, was his humour - it was fun talking to him - and his genuine interest in what was going on around him, as long as it wasn't politics. I would say he was the best friend I had in my life" (Gordon, 2014).

When Lewis was asked had he been much frightened in France he replied: "All the time, but I never sank so low as to pray" (Gordon, 2014), separating himself from any form of faith or hope for God.

Barfield also mentions another friend called Paddy Moore. Lewis and Moore made a deal that should one of them die in the war the other would take care of the others' parent. Moore was killed and Lewis fulfilled his promise and took care of Mrs. Moore for the rest of her life to 1921 (Lambert, 1994). The nature of the relationship between Lewis and a twenty-six years older Mrs. Moore whom he called "Minto" or "mother" has always been a subject of much speculation. It is sometimes suggested to be romantic, another time a step parent/son relationship. Lewis resolutely refused to discuss the matter with anyone, not even his brother or father who were concerned about the way Lewis spent his allowances – supporting Mrs. Moore, her daughter and himself (Gordon, 2014).

2.6. Return to Oxford

In April 1918 Lewis was wounded and had to spend time in hospital. During his stay there, he worked on his lyric poems collectively published as *Spirits of Bondage* in 1919. After his recovery in January 1919 he returned to Oxford among his beloved libraries full of books and smoky cafés. He was well enough to resume his studies (Lewis, 2010). By this time, Oxford University was flooded with more than 1800 ex-soldiers that either started or continued their studies, for the University made considerable changes to their admission requirements in reaction to the post-war situation. Thanks to Lewis' service as a commissioned officer in the army he found himself exempt from the Responsions² and could immerse in his scholarship. He chose to study classical languages and literature. The course (also known as 'Literae Humaniores') is said to be like a diamond in Victorian Oxford's academic crown, a doorway to wisdom rather than accumulation of knowledge. The course took even a whole year longer than other ones at Oxford (McGrath, 2013 p. 82).

Lewis is said to have loved Oxford. He admired the architecture and the intellectual heritage, which he even expressed in a poem called "Oxford":

It is well that there are palaces of peace
And discipline and dreaming and desire. . .
A clean, sweet city lulled by ancient streams,
A place of visions and of loosening chains,
A refuge of the elect, a tower of dreams (Lewis, 1964).

From the beginning of his studies Lewis knew he wanted to pursue an academic career at university and had no plan B. After graduating from Greek and Latin Literature, Philosophy and Ancient history, Lewis put himself forward for the fellowship of classics offered by Magdalene College but to his disappointment was not elected. He went on to study English. Lewis managed to finish a three year course in nine months but found it extremely exhausting. In 1923 he finished with First Class Honours. McGrath points out that Lewis secured a 'Triple first'³ which was a rare distinction at Oxford. In 1925 Lewis was finally appointed English

² Responsions was the first of the three examinations required to get to University of Oxford. It consisted of questions from Latin, Ancient Greek, and mathematics. It was abolished in 1960.

³ First-Class Honours in three different major courses.

Fellow of Magdalene College, Oxford, where he tutored English and Literature (McGrath, 2013 pp. 104-110).

2.7. Surprised by Joy

C. S. Lewis is today mostly known as a Christian writer; however the nature of his earlier writings (around 1920) is atheistic, even critical of religion (especially Christianity). The process of his conversion was gradual and incredibly complex. Lewis labelled himself as “the most reluctant convert”. From atheism, he moved toward a form of theism but without believing in God in the first stage. Then he developed an intellectual belief in God at around 1930 which at around 1932 evolved into an informed commitment to Christianity (McGrath, 2013 p. 131). The process of finding back his faith became the main theme of Lewis’ autobiography, entitled *Surprised by Joy* (1955).

Lewis emphasizes that the word *joy* is like a technical term that must be distinguished from happiness or pleasure. He defines the term on three cherished events in his life, the first of which was the moment his brother brought him a toy garden when he was just a boy. The brothers called the handmade product an *Animal Land* and loved to play with it. Lewis describes the sensation that came over him as a strong feeling of desire. Desire not like wanting some sweets but yearning for something bigger. However, before he could grasp it, it was gone, leaving him stirred by longing. The second experience came through *Squirrel Nutkin*⁴. Lewis was fascinated by the idea of autumn and kept returning to the book not to satisfy the desire but to reawake it. The third glance came through poetry when he came across an unrhymed poem Tegner’s *Drapa*⁵. Lewis says in his own words: “. . . instantly I was uplifted . . . I desired with almost sickening intensity something never to be described . . . [and] found myself at the very same moment already falling out of that desire and wishing I were back in it” (Lewis, 2010).

Lewis also draws a distinction between *joy* and *aesthetic pleasure*. His *joy* is like a ‘stab of inconsolable longing’. Once experienced, one is left with a longing to re-live the sensation. Lewis felt the experiences of joy were they were deeply meaningful as if opening doors of

⁴ Beautifully illustrated children’s book by Beatrix Potter (1866-1943), first published in 1903.

⁵ Poem by H. W. Longfellow written in style of Esias Tegner (1782-1846) an influential Swedish poet. A drapa is an Old Norse poetic form used for hymns of praise (McGrath, 2013).

another world. Unlike pleasure which is often in one's power (one knows what makes him/her happy) Lewis stresses that *joy* comes unexpectedly from the outside (Lewis, 2010).

Nevertheless, as Lewis got older he soon condemned the joy experiences as illusory, simply a childhood dream: "The authentic 'joy' . . . had vanished from my life. . . so completely that not even the memory or the desire of it remained" (Lewis, 2010). He adhered to a rationalist way of thinking that suggested to leave all the wishes that his *joy* experiences were signs of deeper meaning (McGrath, 2013 p. 103).

Then came the *surprises*. When in a hospital bed during his time in the Army, he came across a volume of Chesterton's⁶ essays. Lewis had not known the author or his works but was astonished by how much he enjoyed it. Lewis loved Chesterton's humor and commented that "Liking an author may be as involuntary and improbable as falling in love. . . I did not need to accept what Chesterton said in order to enjoy it" (Lewis, 2010).

Lewis was overall surprised by the depth of literature that was grounded in and formed by Christian faith. He made a comment saying that modernists like G. B. Shaw (1856-1950) or H. G. Wells (1866-1946) "seemed a little thin" (Lewis, 2010), and without depth. On the other hand, a Christian poet George Herbert (1593-1633) was, according to Lewis: "a man who seemed to excel all the authors . . . conveying the very quality of life as we actually live . . . [but] in-stead of doing it all directly, insisted on meditating it through what I would still have called 'the Christian mythology'" (Lewis, 2010). That being said, these poets, novelists or essayists, however, did not write anything that would persuade Lewis to start to believe in God, they only offered a vision of human life leaving their readers to wonder and contemplate (McGrath, 2013).

In retrospect, Lewis wittingly observes that he "did not know what [he] was letting [him]self in for. A young man who wishes to remain a sound Atheist cannot be too careful of his reading. There are traps everywhere. . ." (Lewis, 2010).

Another element that belonged to Lewis' *life surprises* were his friends. Lewis had many influential friends among which were Arthur Greeves⁷, J. R. R. Tolkien⁸ (1892-1973). One of

⁶ G. K. Chesterton (1874-1936) was an English writer, poet, lay theologian and an orthodox Christian known for his reasoning apologetics. It is said that even when critics did not agree with him, they recognized the wide appeal of some of his work.

⁷ Lewis' childhood and life-long friend.

⁸ J. R. R. Tolkien (1892-1973) was English writer, poet, philologist, and university professor who is best known for the classic works *The Hobbit*, *The Lord of the Rings*, *The Silmarillion*. He is regarded a 'father' of modern fantasy literature. In 2009 Tolkien was ranked by the Forbes magazine as the 5th top-earning 'dead celebrity'.

the friends Lewis made in Oxford was A. K. Hamilton Jenkin⁹ (1900-1980) who taught Lewis to see, listen, smell and become a receptive creature that appreciates everything for what it was. Another significant friend of his was the already mentioned Owen Barfield whom Lewis admired yet at the same time disagreed with on almost everything. Lewis explains the types of these friendships through terms of ‘first’ and ‘second’ friend, the former being one’s soulmate the latter an anti-self. Both types of friends share one’s interests but the latter approaches them from a totally different angle. Lewis expressed his frustration with an analogy of a person speaking the same language but mispronouncing every word. Lewis concludes that thanks to all their debates and arguments they improved and formed each other’s reasoning and viewpoints. Barfield later converted to anthroposophy, causing what Lewis teasingly called, a ‘Great War’ between them. Nevertheless, it helped Lewis to modify his way of thinking in two aspects.

Firstly, Lewis got rid of his ‘chronological snobbery’ which is an “uncritical acceptance of the intellectual climate common to our own age and the assumption that whatever has gone out of date is on that account discredited” (Lewis, 2010). Every age has got its own illusions which no one dares to attack or doubt at the time, they are generally regarded as facts and considered superior to claims that preceded. Lewis learnt from Barfield that the newer idea was not necessarily a truer one.

Secondly, Lewis tended to assume that “the universe revealed by the senses” establishes “the rock bottom reality”. Barfield however pointed out that such thinking leads to accepting Behavioristic theory. But Lewis could not bring himself to do it; to accept such theory was for him “a physical impossibility”. He admits that he “was therefore compelled to give up realism” and accepted that “logic was participation in a cosmic Logos”. Lewis became a theist without believing in God and it made him feel safe: “There was nothing to fear, better still, nothing to obey” (Lewis, 2010).

In the chapter *Checkmate* of his autobiography, Lewis mentions another friend called Nevill Coghill (1899-1980). To Lewis’ surprise, except being “clearly the most intelligent” and “best informed in the class” Coghill was also a Christian (Lewis, 2010). Lewis says that if Barfield taught him to doubt, if not abandon, the so-called chronological snobbery, then Coghill made him wonder if there was something that humanity had lost entirely. Lewis was drawn to

⁹ A. K. Hamilton Jenkin (1900-1980) was a historian best known for his books on Cornwall.

literature, and at this point read S. Alexander's (1859-1938)¹⁰ *Space, Time and Deity* (1920) and came to "merely a logical result" which could also be proved in daily experience. He comments that it is "self-evident that one essential property of love, hate, fear, hope, or desire was attention to their object" and explains that "to cease thinking about or attending to the woman is, so far, to cease loving; to cease thinking about. . . dreaded thing is, so far, to cease being afraid." When such idea is turned around it means that "to attend to your own love or fear is to cease attending to the loved or dreaded object" thus coming to a conclusion that "the enjoyment and the contemplation of our inner activities are incompatible" (Lewis, 2010). This discovery made a huge impact on Lewis' life as he realized that the longing for joy was just a useless attempt to "contemplate the enjoyed". In his mind "there was no doubt that joy was a desire. . . But a desire is turned not to itself but to its object. . . [and] it owes all its character to its object". Lewis realized that he was wrong to desire joy itself. He then started to ask himself a question of 'what is to be desired'. Since he knew that a man is a relational human being (it is through relationships one finds the truest joy), Lewis soon altered the question to 'who is to be desired'. He referred to his god as the Absolute. Since this became too abstract he started to distinguish between his (true) 'God' and the (false) 'God of popular religion,' for there was no way he could be in personal relationship with 'him'. Lewis uses a perfect analogy when he makes a parallel of Hamlet also being unable to meet or be in personal relationship with his author, Shakespeare. Lewis started to call his god a 'Spirit' (Lewis, 2010).

Then Lewis recalls reading Chesterton's *Everlasting Man* and "for the first time saw the whole Christian out-line of history set out in a form that seemed to [him] to make sense". He opened the Gospels and remarked that he was "now too experienced in literary criticism to regard the Gospels as myths". One ordinary day on a bus he felt he was presented with a choice. Choice that was free of duty, free of a promise or any attachments. It was more as an open door. Lewis describes this experience as momentous yet "strangely unemotional". He concludes his *surprise by joy* with the above-mentioned analogy: "if Shakespeare and Hamlet could ever meet, it must be Shakespeare's doing". Lewis was overwhelmed, he accepted the Gospel story, admitted that God was God, he knelt and prayed. He later explained that he "believe[s] in

¹⁰ Samuel Alexander (1859-1938) was a British philosopher, first Jew Fellow of an Oxbridge College.

Christianity as [he] believe[s] that the sun has risen; not only because [he] see[s] it, but because by it [he] see[s] everything else” (Lewis, 2010).

None of Lewis’ *surprises* were logically or philosophically decisive. Individually they would be insufficient as a lonely piece of jigsaw. Their significance lies in their combination, consecutiveness and cumulative weight (McGrath, 2013 p. 135). It is interesting to notice that Lewis’ authentic autobiography has a tone of humility, as if proposing that it was not Lewis who discovered God but vice versa. Lewis felt he was found and it deprived him of any sort of pride. The notion of being found is portrayed in most of his work, for Lewis was truly surprised by joy.

Schakel additionally highlights Lewis’ change in the 1940s when it is evident that Lewis begins to rely less only on reason which enables him to write his fiction in a more effective way. Lewis comments: “I have found that nothing is more dangerous to one’s own faith than the works of an apologist” (Lewis, 2014). It was tempting for Lewis to overindulge in apologetics but he knew that a person who builds up an armory of defenses cannot at the same time be tasting the reality of God (Schakel, 1984 pp. 148-150).

3. THE CHRONICLES OF NARNIA

3.1. A New Story

There is a certain paradox in the fact that Lewis who never had children of his own nor was particularly fond of spending time around them is today most associated with the Narnia fantasy series for children (Gordon, 2014). The idea of writing a children's story arose in Lewis' mind in September 1939 but he did not complete it until many years later.

On the outbreak of the Second World War, children from the capital were sent to the country side to be protected from the danger of bombing. Lewis and Mrs. Moore took in several evacuees from London. Lewis, Mrs. Moore and her daughter lived in the Kilns – secluded bungalow just three miles from the centre of Oxford. The Kilns provided enough room for a number of children and offered beautiful gardens they could play in. Children in the first batch were only girls and brought almost nothing with them (Duriez, 2013). One of them was very curious about an old wardrobe, asking if she could go inside and if there was anything behind it (Sayer, 1997). The impact of the evacuees on Lewis penetrated his writing of *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* (1950). The book starts with four children from London who were evacuated from London to escape the bombing and sent to live in the countryside with a slightly strange professor. Later they enter through an old mysterious wardrobe to a magical world. The story connects the events of wartime with a battle against ancient evil in Narnia (Duriez, 2013).

Lewis' technique of writing made one wonder. He worked as if only compiling and connecting pictures that had appeared in his mind. He once said to the Library Association: "With me the process is much more like bird-watching than like either talking or building. I see pictures. . . Keep quiet and watch and they will begin joining themselves up. . ." (Sayer, 1997).

According to Gibson, Lewis was a skilled spinner of tales; he points to the fact that Lewis is not so much a narrator as a storyteller. The distinction being that he writes as if he were in the room with the reader, gesturing, smiling and making some humorous points. He repeatedly reminds a reader of his presence. For example, in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* he stresses: "As I have said," "I agree with them," or "I hope you know what I mean by a voice sounding pale," "ten to one you have never seen a giant. . ." These I's and you's inserted throughout the story establish a certain delicate one-to-one relationship (Gibson, 1980).

Although his well esteemed friend Tolkien thought that the story was not good - apparently flooded by too many unrelated mythological characters – the first Narnia story was published in the autumn of 1950 with great success. Then each year until 1956 there was another Narnia book published when the seventh book concluded the series (Sayer, 1997).

Some would see the speed with which he wrote the seven-piece series as genius. Others, like his dear friend J. R. R. Tolkien, viewed it as a signal of shallowness. But Lewis was an expert on literature. His scholarly work called *Poetry and Prose in the Sixteenth Century* had not been exceeded to this date and to write such analysis had meant reading literally everything there was of medieval fiction. With such vast exposure to poetry and prose, his lucid intellect and talent for imagination the pace is not a factor to indicate triviality (McGrath, 2013).

As to why Lewis invented imaginative world, there have been suggestions of him retreating to his childhood security, settling unresolved issues or his emotional immaturity which might bear vague hints of truth. Yet there is another notable factor. Lewis realised that children's stories were a remarkable means of exploring philosophical and theological questions – such as the nature of faith or human desire for God. He used a good story as an entrance to think on a much deeper level (McGrath, 2013).

The reviews of the Narnia books were cautious, a few of them even hostile. There were several reasons for such a cold acceptance. At the time the books were published, the real-life children's stories were in style. The reason behind this trend was an assumption that stories should help children to relate to real life, not to encourage them to pamper in fantasies. Other reviewers disapproved of the Narnia books for their Christian content, finding the parallels with the gospel story embarrassing and objected to indoctrination. There were a few people who thought there was too much moralizing. However, the children loved the Narnia stories and sales have never stopped (Sayer, 1997).

Lewis did not, as it is sometimes suggested, set out to write a religious story as a spoon for feeding Christianity to children in small doses. An image of a faun with an umbrella in a snowy wood carrying some parcels emerged in Lewis' mind long before the Narnian series without ethical or religious meaning. As a creature from Greek mythology, the faun would not at all be a promising character for a story concerning Christian doctrine (Gibson, 1980).

And that is the point. Lewis began a story, not a theme. He wrote stories because he firstly enjoyed reading them. He admitted that when he was ten he read fairy tales secretly as he

was worried of being discovered, exposed and laughed at but at the age of fifty he reads them openly (Gibson, 1980). The characters were of course heavily influenced by his conception of morality and beliefs because like many of his other books even Narnia stories were important for his own spiritual life (Sayer, 1997).

Narnian stories were completely different from stories at the time. Stories for children were limited to mirror the reality but since *The Chronicles* embarked on a totally different course they subsequently freed hitherto children's stories from their captivity of realism. Since their publication, magic, myth, fairy tale and fantasy stories have been written, but none with such inherent spiritual depth and mythic quality (Sayer, 1997).

3.2. Reason behind imagination

The concept of Narnia in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* begins with a question of who is to be trusted (McGrath, 2013). The young readers are not notified beforehand and are driven to follow the characters to be able to conclude their own opinion.

Similarly, the reader does not instantly know which character is good or bad. This is unusual because children's stories at that time clearly distinguished positive characters from the negative ones. However, Narnian characters do not display their moral tags on their foreheads. The readers of all ages are left to work these matters out on their own. Moreover, the characters are more complex, not black and white triggering a certain insecurity in the reader yet plenty of room to search and gradually make one's own opinion (McGrath, 2013).

That might be one explanation why *The Chronicles of Narnia* have appealed so strongly to audience from post war-age, through modernism, postmodernism and even (or especially) in the post-truth era. They speak of choices offered and decisions to be made, challenges to be encountered, and yet it is not handed in through a logical argument but offered by mere telling of a story (McGrath, 2013). Listening to or reading such a story then provides possibility to personally (pre-)experience it, in Narnia.

3.2.1. A Story

Lewis discovered the power of imagination and used it to arouse a desire in his readers. He allows them to long for goodness, to yearn for beauty, to want a paradise. Lewis said it was the influence of Charles Williams which made him realise that "when old poets made some

virtue their theme, they were not teaching but adoring and that what we take for the didactic is often the enchanted” (Lewis, 1969).

The key to moral (or any other) improvement is captivating one’s imagination. This is done through powerful stories because such stories do much more than only inspire. They have an unexpected ability to ennoble, making the reader want to do the same in his or her world (McGrath, 2013).

Stories, big or small have always appealed. Stories are like mosaic pieces which when put together are called reality. A news with no story to back it up, remains a hallow information destined to be forgotten. Stories have always been a medium through which abstract notions are explained. Lewis deals with it in one of his essays called *Myth Became Fact* when he points out that myths and stories outlast all the rational arguments that tried to confute them. Then he explains that human intellect is unbelievably abstract whereas reality one encounters is very concrete. Human beings are therefore faced with a dilemma of either experiencing without knowing or intellectually analysing without experiencing. Either we laugh or we analyse humour. One cannot do both at the same time. And that is where Lewis places a myth. It is only through a story tasting and knowing can be lived through together (Lewis, 1970).

It is not all a new idea. Ancient literature including the Bible are full of different stories and there are even stories within stories. Jesus, the Saviour character in the Bible, had also used the power of stories and used them as means of conveying important messages.

The Chronicles of Narnia take the reader on an exploration journey. Not for search of information, explanation and understanding but pursuit for meaning and virtue (McGrath, 2013).

3.2.2. The Threshold

One of the very significant concepts recurring in the Chronicles is that of a door – entrance – into another world. By this idea of a border that can be crossed, Lewis suggests that there is another world we are destined for but are, in that moment, at the wrong side of the door. Such idea is not unique especially in children stories. It can be compared to Platform 9^{3/4} at King’s Cross Station in J. K. Rowling’s *Harry Potter* (1997) or to earlier Edith Nesbit’s *The Story of the Amulet* (1906) that Lewis enjoyed in his childhood. Door, platform, amulet represent

a bridge or a link between the two worlds which some have been able to find and cross (McGrath, 2013).

Some is a crucial expression. Too often people rely (only) on actual seeing or touching for validation of a universal truth. A majority would enter the wardrobe *if...* This approach always results in no entrance. The Chronicles' protagonists enter Narnia through the wardrobe *because*. Because they believe, not in a sense that they expect the wardrobe to be magical nor do they know or hope for Narnia but because they have not set limits or barriers of what is possible and what is not. They entered for their minds and attitude remained open. The question to be asked is whether the threshold is an entrance point or an obstacle, even filter of some kind or what it becomes for whom.

3.2.3. Escapism vs. Reality

Following the above concept of crossing from reality to a realm, one might question the dangerous inclination to escapism, trivial hazardous attitude in life but Lewis defends that readers would not start to despise “real woods” because they have read about “enchanted woods”, instead, their experience of seeing would be enriched with other dimensions. In his essay *Is Theology Poetry?* he highlights that he believes “that the sun has risen not because I see it but because by *it* I see everything else” (Lewis, 2000). One has the option to look at the sun itself or at what it illuminates – and so enhancing, intensifying and deepening his/her intellectual, moral and aesthetic vision. Lewis calls it a ‘double vision’ – one can see something more clearly, more naturally once given a lens that helps one to focus. Virtues, assets, qualities are not invented in Narnia, they are ‘only’ lit up (McGrath, 2013).

3.2.4. The Children

Lewis' protagonists in *The Narnia Chronicles* are four children – siblings. Peter, the eldest, Susan, Edmund and Lucy, the youngest, who were displaced from their home and parents left them to cope on their own.

Peter is a natural leader with some royal potential. When he thinks about animals in the woods around the house the children were moved to, he mentions eagles, stags and hawks. He does not hesitate when Aslan (the creator of Narnia and its saviour) asks him to lead a battle.

He is always kind, can apologise when realising he was wrong. He grows up into a tall, manly ruler of Narnia, known as King Peter the Magnificent.

Susan is a caring, somewhat shy person who thinks twice before she acts. When she learns that Aslan is a lion she wants to know if he is safe. Nevertheless, her sense of duty is stronger than her fear as she votes to stay in Narnia to save Mr. Tumnus. Her loving nature reveals itself when she spends the night crying with Lucy after Aslan's death. She later becomes Queen Susan the Gentle.

Edmund, the traitor at first, is the most important character in the redemption story of *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*. He is not evil, he is just a naughty boy who has a tendency to selfishness, a bit of bullying. He is bad-tempered when he is tired or bored when it rains. Thanks to his selfishness and immaturity he becomes an easy prey for the Witch. On the other hand, Edmund is a character that undergoes the deepest transformation. Edmund is then knighted by Aslan and called King Edmund the Just.

Lucy is the most prominent character of all as she appears in five of the seven tales. Lewis uses her character as central intelligence. It is also Lucy to whom Aslan reveals the most about himself. She is true, courageous, loving, loyal and devoted. It is also Lucy who is given the task to lead the reader into the land of Narnia and thanks to her authenticity, the reader lets her. When she gets older she becomes Queen Lucy the Valiant.

Lewis tells a story with children as main characters not only because he was writing a fairy tale. Narnia is widely read by adults and it is the aspect of children characters that enable it. Adults in a way admire that the children are not tied by elements called experience and prejudice. Lewis realizes it and through children protagonists triggers the readers to loosen and live through their long-forgotten freedom of thought and imagination. It is through the four siblings that Lewis leads his readers to step over the threshold, enter Narnia land and meet Aslan. Lewis was a Christian, he read the New Testament in Greek - its original language, and was aware of Jesus' quote: "for the kingdom . . . belongs to such as these [the children] . . . anyone who will not receive the kingdom of God like a little child will never enter it" (Lewis, 2001 p. 36). A myth or a true report of an event, this attitude was the opposite of common in the first century and Lewis as a literary critic recognized its depth. It is worth noticing that it is only children who are able to approach Aslan.

Children are not primitive nor underdeveloped adults, they have a different but equally powerful and complex mind and form of consciousness. They have the ability of imagining and creating long before they can read and write and are able to distinguish between imagination and reality (Cole, 2011).

Lewis wrote to show readers that there is a bit of Edmund in everyone, as well as bits of Susan, Peter and sweet Lucy. There is some innocence, blame, awe, criticism, rejection, desire, honour, character flaws or strengths – all are part of that mix.

A very important thing is that all the children - whether it was because they lost their minds or that they were afraid, doubtful, cheerful, believers or agnostics – all were brought to the new world – Narnia. Lewis is not afraid of diversity nor does he suggest that Narnia can be entered under some conditions or achieved status (Gordon, 2014).

That makes Narnia extraordinary and very distinguishable. To enter a paradise or reach any other goal, myths, fairy-tales and most religious doctrines require their character to fulfil certain conditions and to prove worthiness. Thanks to the character of Edmund, the reader comes across rather an odd concept. The children do not have to qualify (pass certain criteria) to be able to enter Narnia. A mature reader gratifies such view as there is general inclination to the fact that a child should be eligible for ‘Narnia’ on merits of mere being.

It could be argued that Lewis shows a great pattern here. He recognized that there are things only a child is capable of and asks the reader to consider becoming like a child – not to lose his or her reason but to free oneself of the burden of needing or aspiring to be eligible. A child crosses the threshold, it is not a barrier for little ones. An adult, however, is likely to be worried at this point if he or she deserves to cross it. Adults have the tendency to think they must earn it to enter ‘Narnia’.

3.2.5. Personified Animals

The Chronicles have been criticised for their childish trick of talking animals (McGrath, 2013). It needs to be stressed that although the first of the Chronicles was published in 1950, Lewis started it on the brink of the WWII and was known to publicly criticise what was then called “progressive” movement advocating eugenics and vivisection. He considered it dehumanizing and immoral. He spoke openly about the dangers of assumptions that some human beings are inferior to others and protested at the torture on animals (Lewis, 2014). Thus,

Lewis's speaking animals with emotions are not an infantile attempt but a protest about shallow claim of humanity's right to do whatever they choose with the nature. Lewis carefully portrays animals as conscious moral representatives. Human dignity requires that humans show respect for animals (McGrath, 2013). "In justifying cruelty to animals we put ourselves also on the animal level. We chose the jungle and must abide by our choice" (Lewis, 2014 p. 244).

3.2.6. The creatures

Like a goat-footed Mr. Tumnus with his horns and tail, Lewis invites creatures from all the folklores and fables of many cultures – dryads, dragons, giants, Greek centaurs, German dwarfs, British witches (Gibson, 1980). Lewis made Narnia a place for anyone and everyone.

Throughout the whole story, the thoughts of the children are often revealed but there the omnipresence stops. The reader does not see into the minds of the other creatures. As readers we only know what they reveal through their words, actions or looks. Although there is no limit to creatures in Narnia, the Chronicles are primarily about human beings. Four children who experience all kinds of adventures in Narnia (Gibson, 1980).

Although readers view Narnia only through human eyes they do not discover strictly human characters. Fauns, unicorns, marsh-wiggles and all other species display habits and states of mind which declare the uniqueness of their own personhood (Gibson, 1980).

3.2.7. Not an allegory

Allegory is a style of writing where each concrete element represents abstract or spiritual meaning. It is not that Lewis did not write any allegories. He did, and one example is *The Pilgrim's Regress*. But he moved away from this style. Of course, it is possible to make attempts to allegorise Narnia but that on its own does not make it an allegory (McGrath, 2013). Lewis moves the idea further when he suggest that there is a difference between *allegory* and *supposition*. Supposition is an invitation to try to see things from different sides, an invitation to picture how it would appear should the "supposal" be true.

Lewis tempts the reader of Narnia to enter the world of possibilities when he replies to a letter from fifth-graders from Maryland: "Let us suppose there were a land like Narnia," (Lewis, 1996 p. 25) encouraging the children to imagine and find out for themselves.

The Chronicles of Narnia vibrate strongly with the basic human longing for one's own story to be a part of something bigger. Lewis was aware of the power of myths – stories that tried to answer the basic philosophical questions of Who we are?, Where we are going?, What has gone wrong? and What is done about it? so he offered stories from Narnia to give the reader an opportunity of finding a master story that gives sense to his or her own life story. Lewis goes even further and asks his reader which are the true stories and which mere fabrications. Gradually one narrative develops as extremely acceptable and desired – the story of Aslan. *Mere Christianity* gives its reader Christian ideas or arguments but the Narnia stories exceed it by far by letting the reader to step inside and allow him/herself to experience the Christian story in a nonthreatening way (McGrath, 2013).

3.2.8. The Lion

Once Lewis had written the majority of the first manuscript of what was later called *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, he got the idea of a lion Aslan, which, as he admitted, brought the whole story together (Sayer, 1997). It made a perfect literary and spiritual sense. In Christian tradition, it was more often a helpless sheep that was used as an image of Christ. But Lewis was astonished by his Savior and in lion he accentuated his magnificence. In the book of Revelation in the New Testament, there is a reference to Christ as “the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David.” In letters to children, Lewis explained that Aslan is not an allegory but an invention – an imaginary answer to the question what might Christ become like if there was a Narnia (Hooper, 2014 p. 698).

When asked about the name itself, Lewis explained that he had come across this name in the book *Arabian Nights* (1838) and that Aslan means lion in Turkish (Lewis, 1996).

It is important to point out that Lewis' first story of *The Chronicles* is somewhat special or different from the rest. In most stories, the children and their Narnian friends achieve things with Aslan's help or simply by following his instructions but in the first one – *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, it seems that Aslan does it all. The essential action of the plot begins with two disasters, the arrest of Mr. Tumnus, the faun, and the betrayal by Edmund. Then Mr. Beaver asserts that both problems must be turned over to Aslan as any other attempt would be hopeless. Although Aslan saves Edmund there is still a price to be paid, a debt that Aslan will

take over and pay. The book might as well have been called *The Acts of Aslan*. It focuses upon the unifying character of the entire series (Gibson, 1980).

The strongest characteristic of Aslan is that he evokes awe and wonder. Lewis develops the animal's character as a wild and magnificent creature. In the character of Aslan, Lewis unites two themes that had inspired him when reading Rudolf Otto's classic religious work *The Idea of Holy* (1923): *mysterium tremendum* – a sense of mystery that evokes fear and trembling and *mysterium fascinans* – a mystery that fascinates and attracts. Lewis chose a very attractive way of describing this numinous creature. Instead of detailed list of attributes, he introduces Aslan through individual experience of the children that met him (McGrath, 2013).

“While they were looking at this they heard a sound of music on their right; and turning in that direction they saw what they had come to see. . . For when they tried to look at Aslan's face they just caught a glimpse of the golden mane and the great, royal, solemn, overwhelming eyes; and then they found they couldn't look at him and went all trembly. . . His voice was deep and rich and somehow took the fidgets out of them. They now felt glad and quiet and it didn't seem awkward to them to stand and say nothing. . . Up to that moment Lucy had been thinking how royal and strong and peaceful his face looked; now it suddenly came into her head that he looked sad as well” (Lewis, 2009).

Edmund felt mysterious horror, Peter felt adventurous and brave, Susan sensed a beautiful smell and heard a melody, and Lucy experienced a pleasant surprise similar to a morning when one realises that it is the beginning of summer.

Susan's reaction is based on Lewis' classic analysis of longing – “the scent of a flower we have not found. . . the echo of a tune we have not heard. . .” found in the sermon *The Weight of Glory* (McGrath, 2013).

Through the character of Aslan, Lewis decodes one of his central themes from *Mere Christianity* that there is a deep emptiness within human nature that only God can satisfy into an imaginative mode. McGrath quotes a powerful passage from one of the most influential British atheists, Bertrand Russel (1872 – 1970):

“The centre of me is always and eternally a terrible pain. . . a searching for something beyond what the world contains, something transfigured and infinite.

The beatific vision – God. I do not find it, I do not think it is to be found – but the love of it is my life” (McGrath, 2013 p. 290)

When in *Voyage of the ‘Dawn Treader’* Lucy and Edmund fear that they will never see Aslan again, the Lion assures them that he exists in their country only has another name (Lewis, 2009), leaving hope and room for the reader to at least wonder if he or she can start searching for him.

One might be in Aslan’s country but is usually unaware of it. The most precious moments to Lewis in his ordinary life were those when he did know. When he was aware of the spiritual in a workday world and through Narnia series he “aimed at a sort of pre-baptism of child’s imagination” (Sayer, 1997).

Using Aslan as a Christ figure is nothing isolated in literature, not even contemporary literature. Similar characters are found across all genres, including children’s books (McGrath, 2013).

It is worth noticing that Lewis does not present a picture of God as a lenient nor benevolent old grandfather. One of the animals in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, Mr. Beaver, answers to girls’ trembling question if he (the Lion) is safe: “Course he isn’t safe. But he’s good.” Goodness, wisdom and majesty may not be predictable. The lion’s acts are sometimes breath taking. At the same time, although (or because) he is the son of the Emperor-Beyond-the-Sea he is also approachable. Aslan is majestic but not distant. Aslan is magnificent but not abstract. Aslan is great yet at the same time personal. The lowliest subject brought to Aslan is put at ease and given evidence of his love (Gibson, 1980).

The Lion’s love was of course best demonstrated by his death which raises questions of allegory to Christian salvation. But Lewis explains in a letter on *Till We Have Faces* (a work discussed later) that he speaks of parallels and instances, not symbols. This makes a great difference as what we see here is atonement in Narnia, not an allegory of atonement on Earth. Lewis is free to show how far Love can go (Gibson, 1980).

The character of Aslan is Lewis’s supreme achievement. Bede Griffiths says: “The figure of Aslan tells us more of how Lewis understood the nature of God than anything else he wrote. It has all the hidden power, majesty and awesomeness which Lewis associated with God. . . and the tenderness and even the humour which he believed belonged to him. . . There is nothing dark. . . in this. It is ‘mere Christianity’” (Sayer, 1997).

3.3. Spirituality in Education

It is not an exaggeration to claim that the spirituality in Education is in the Czech Republic in the twenty first century a taboo. The position of spirituality in education has not only been under researched, but its need extremely marginalised as if totally unrecognised. Although latest scientific broad view emphasises that a human being is a bio-psycho-social-spiritual-information system, clearly implying that a person is a very complex, holistic being, spirituality is something that the academia shies from. But when looked at spirituality for what it really is – “an appreciation of immaterial reality that influences social relations, mental dispositions as well as the universally more inclusive explanations we attach to the metaphysical world” – it cannot be ignored. It is undoubtedly a complex area which is hard even impossible to measure (therefore labelled unscientific), nevertheless, the complications and complexity of spirituality do not stop it from existing (Abdi, 2011).

Spirituality and education might seem like water and oil, yet, it is impossible to divide one’s intellect from one’s invisible being (Ritskes & Njoki, 2011)

Spirituality is also a child’s development of self – which includes a search for meaning, transcendence, wholeness and purpose. To give an easy example, a body is like a car, soul like its driver and spirituality a direction or course. The more the existing education system is proud of *outer* development, the more it neglects *inner* growth – the space of values, beliefs and transcendental reliance (Astin, 2004).

Spirituality is not a vigorous imposition of any form of religion, it is much broader than the general area of any doctrine. Spirituality is something that appeals to more inclusive aspects of people’s lives (Abdi, 2011). It is something that is tied to human consciousness - to the values one respects, to the search for answers to basic questions of who one is, where one comes from and what the purpose of life is. Consciousness is an extraordinary ability of a person to observe his/her own thoughts and feelings. This is called self-awareness and it is something that needs to be cultivated – in other words – educated.

Scientists claim that children with extraordinary IQ not adequately educated from a very early age not only lose their faculty but assimilate with the rest and are at high risk of developing malfunction (Hříbková, 2009). Hence, if consciousness is an exceptional competence, it logically also needs to be coached through, developed and systematically educated.

Czech National Education Framework for preschool, primary or secondary education

excludes outlines of spiritual education. Preschool education is divided into four areas: A man and his body, a man and another man, a man and society and a man and the world. Primary and secondary educational aims are divided into competencies in languages, mathematics, information technology, a man and society, culture, nature, health, work, ignoring the question of religions (at least information-wise) or spirituality.

There, of course, are reasons. Firstly, one might argue that since the concept of spirituality is so fractionalized – therefore subjective, it is near impossible to integrate it into something very objective as a national curriculum. Secondly, one might argue that the notion of spirituality is incorporated across the curriculum areas as if connecting them. That is true to an extent that since human beings are holistic one cannot leave one part of oneself behind whilst going to educate nor to be educated. The incorporation of spirituality depends solely on each teacher but it is important to note that most today's teachers were educated in communist or early post-communist era which succeeded in suppressing spirituality altogether. The consequences being that spirituality is not generally viewed as important part of peoples' lives although valuing the spirituality of students and teachers means valuing the uniqueness of everyone regardless of race, gender, sexuality or ability. Lewis comments that: "Almost our whole education has been directed to silencing this shy, persistent, inner voice; almost all our modern philosophies have been devised to convince us that the good of man is to be found on this earth" (Lewis, 2001 p. 32).

As to the first argument, in reality, there are not that many directions. To be precise, there is Hinduism, Islam, Buddhism, Christianity and in the postmodern era a New Age movement – a mixture of all the previous. Hinduism, Buddhism and the New Age movement recognise higher supernatural divinity but either it is unintelligent (energy) or turned toward inner self (me) – therefore secluding itself only for people from certain level of intelligence (the simpler mind the lesser interest in inner self and its development – therefore inaccessible by free will unless enforced via religion or else). *Energy* is too vague, impersonal and mindless. The *God in me* idea bears dangerous consequences – a disguised ego. Spiritual pursuits stripped of responsibility become narcissistic and destructive. It needs to be connected to something larger than the individuals' own egos. All also demand achieving higher levels of otherworldliness, becoming 'The Olympics' contest only for the best of best, detaching followers from reality.

Lewis himself is very clear on the subject, when he says that there are not that many varieties of religions to consider. For him there are two: “Christianity and Hinduism. (Islam is only the greatest of the Christian heresies, Buddhism only the greatest of the Hindu heresies. Real Paganism is dead. All that was best in Judaism and Platonism survives in Christianity)” (Lewis, 1970). Elsewhere he continues: “If you are a Christian you do not have to believe that all the other religions are simply wrong all through. If you are an atheist you do have to believe that the main point in all the religions of the whole world is simply one huge mistake” (Lewis, 2009) .

This leaves Christianity as the only direction that claims to offer an intelligent (rational) divinity, who is said to have loved the world so much to have even sacrificed himself for every man thus becoming very concrete and personal. This leaves Christianity as the only offer for all (broken/successful/intelligent and mentally retarded) as its only condition is acceptance. To put it in other words – one is born atoned with God unless he/she lucidly rejects it. Leaving each one a free will. The Gospel says in John 3: 17 that God sent his only Son not to condemn the world but to save it - meaning, that what needed to be done for man’s salvation had been done and each human being is left with the liberty to decide that it does not apply to him/her (New International Version (NIV) Bible).

Should an example be used, a dark light bulb does not prove electricity’s non-existence but rather a disconnection between the light bulb and the power. To stay plugged in or unplug is every person’s choice. This leaves Christianity as the only belief to offer a connection – relationship with the source.

That said, it does not mean that Lewis despised everything that was not clearly Christian. On the contrary. He was a scholar who adored literature from all over the world, respected cultural differences and found them fascinating. Kuteeva viewed Narnia as “Lewis’ unoriginality” where he was mixing many traditions, myths and pictures together - i.e.:

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| The account of Narnian creation | Genesis, Ovid, Lucretius and Milton |
| The scene of Aslan’s sacrifice | A setting of pagan mysteries: the stone knife and the Stone Table, similar to Celtic cromlechs |
| The Horse and his Boy | A peculiar admixture of characters and motifs deriving from Arabian, Babylonian, Greek, Roman, Celtic and Norse tales |
| The Voyage of the Dawn Treader | The tradition of the Irish immram |
| The Last Battle | The images of Revelation and Ragnarök |

(Duriez, 2013)

Lewis did not seem to consider all pagan religions completely empty of truth (Gibson, 1980 p. 232) He never regarded Christianity as a belief that is tied only to one nation nor secluded to a certain culture or traditions. Such attitude was at his time as still is today, the exact opposite of common as Christians in general have had the tendencies to isolate themselves either in monasteries and convents or other closed sets. At the same time, Lewis cannot be accused of trying to alleviate Christianity. Critics have a very hard time categorizing him, as he does not fit into either the conservative side or to the liberals. His ability to draw a very fine line between the gospel's core essentials and the rest is probably the reason he became one of the greatest Christian apologists of the 20th century.

It took Lewis many years and thorough research to accept the biblical story. The joy that overwhelmed him once he did, did not deprive him of reason but made him able to put forward logical justifications.

“Supposing there was no intelligence behind the universe, no creative mind. In that case, nobody designed my brain for the purpose of thinking. It is merely that when the atoms inside my skull happen, for physical or chemical reasons, to arrange themselves in a certain way, this gives me, as a by-product, the sensation I call thought. But, if so, how can I trust my own thinking to be true? It's like upsetting a milk jug and hoping that the way it splashes itself will give you a map of London. But if I can't trust my own thinking, of course I can't trust the arguments leading to Atheism, and therefore have no reason to be an Atheist, or anything else. Unless I believe in God, I cannot believe in thought: so I can never use thought to disbelieve in God” (Lewis, 2009).

Lewis also understood that spirituality was not something that evolved with time, but something that has always been there. Something given to each person in every time. As he got rid of doctrinal traits, took the absolute core of Christian belief he was able to share his experience not only through rational means but also through imagination.

Fernandes (2003) points out that although spirituality is often thought of as a personal, intimate experience, it should not be considered only as a private matter for its core lies in relational interactions. The theologian Martin Buber explains this understanding: “spirit is not in the ‘I’ but between the ‘I’ and ‘you’ . It is not like the blood that circulates in you but like the air in which you breathe.” This relational dynamic forms the basis of compassion and sense of

community (Cole, 2011). There lays a great value for education. Spirituality guides not to focus only on oneself but on how one relates to transcendence without losing one's self-confidence. Lewis does not advocate self-denial. He puts it clearly when he talks about humility:

“Do not imagine that if you meet a really humble man he will be what most people call ‘humble’ nowadays: he will not be a sort of . . . person, . . . telling you . . . he is nobody. Probably all you will think about him is that he seemed a cheerful, intelligent . . . who took a real interest in what you said to him. If you do dislike him it will be because you feel a little envious of anyone who seems to enjoy life so easily (Lewis, 2009)

True humility is not a low self-confidence. Children need to be led to find their self-confidence without becoming selfish or egoistic.

Imagination and reason do not have to be at odds if children could be coached early enough to keep the possibility of interaction of fact and fable alive. Lewis hated when university students arrived with their minds already closed. He often expressed concerns about imaginative deprivation. Through his work, he shows how to keep that frontier of mind – the place where reason and imagination meet – open (Gordon, 2014).

Lewis educates by telling a what-if story, leaving the conclusion out in the air, on each reader. He offers his readers a lens through which they can view their own reality. That is fascinating as it is stripped of any manipulation or control. There is nothing threatening about the idea of discovering a new dimension in one's life (*The Threshold*), there is nothing threatening about following four children on their adventure whilst knowing they are being looked after although they are not perfect, they need to make their own decisions and sometimes choose wrong (*The Children*) yet seeing someone who not only offers to take on the consequences but does it with the risk of not being accepted, demanding nothing in return out of unconditional love (*The Lion*). Placing it all into the surrounding of beautiful nature, full of animals and creatures, Lewis puts a very complex and complicated matter at ease. For him, if it (*Christianity*) is true, it is alive. If it is alive, then it can reach to each individual on its own merits.

It is not to be forgotten that Lewis was a teacher. He loved the idea that people learnt more by discovering things themselves, especially hidden things. A lot of the meaning of God

is hidden (Jamieson, 2008) and Lewis knew from experience that it is everyone's very own journey.

Lewis is a genius in introducing a new level of consciousness, a new way of seeing the world and a new way of rational thinking. Walking through Narnia is not just about seeing a strange yet wonderful land but about letting it shape the way we perceive our own land. The reader can study it as a spectacle (as Lewis would say) or use it - as a spectacle through which to perceive everything else in a new way (McGrath, 2013).

Today's education leads to study spectacles (carefully selected ones, usually from one point of view). Tied within the notion that teacher must know answers to all questions, teachers are not often leading children to use the spectacles as means through which to perceive other things, even areas there are not yes and no answers to.

Nonetheless, when the approaches to guide students' ethical and spiritual development are too categorical, they are likely to become contra-productive and push pupils away from them. It is quite a natural tendency of a human being facing anything that pushes one to act. To incorporate spirituality into education is about exposing pupils to some attractive stories of fantasy or myth which are rich in terms of true reality and aesthetic beauty, and listen to their responses, reactions, and ask questions that are not to be answered immediately.

Lewis shows his bold approach when he writes about the incident in which the siblings came to their temporary guardian desperate for help, as they were sure their sister had been lying. The old professor Kirke asks Edmund, Susan and Peter how they know that their sister is telling a lie. A logical debate follows which is then ended by the professor's comment: "unless any further evidence turns up, we must assume that she is telling the truth" (Gordon, 2014).

4. TILL WE HAVE FACES

4.1. A Myth Retold

A man's relationship to the transcendental is a persisting subject of literature in general. One of the central pieces tackling the question of existence of gods is Lewis' last fiction called *Till We Have Faces*, published in 1956. Despite its commercial failure at the time, it has been since regarded as his most profound and philosophical piece of fiction (McGrath, 2013). Lewis himself was very proud of his work and considered the novel as far and away the best he has ever written (Lewis, 2005). This was echoed by his long-life friend and literary critic J. R. R. Tolkien or *The New York Times* (Sayer, 1997).

The story is very unlike all other Lewis' work. Firstly, it seems to lack an easy plot typical for his previous work. As the full title reveals, it is *A Myth Retold* - Lewis takes a famous ancient legend of Cupid and Psyché by the Latin author called Apuleius from around the second century, which has been retold many times throughout the ages, and writes a novel (Schakel, 1984). Lewis' aim is not to create an epic sensational story (the length of descriptions of some scenes would be much longer and more detailed). In fact, Lewis does considerably more than retelling a myth - he revives it and gives it a mature depth (Gibson, 1980 str. 221).

This fiction excels due to its sophisticated technique and mature style. The density of themes, its symbolisms and dialogues in the novel might even have the tendency to cause some frustration among its readers. In this crucial piece of art, Lewis explores the tension between reason and imagination, tension between a man and gods. Reason and imagination appear across the whole of Lewis' work, of course, but it is not until *Till We Have Faces* that they are unified and reconciled (Schakel, 1984).

Lewis wrote *Till We Have Faces* after finishing *The Chronicles of Narnia* although the idea had been in his mind since his postgraduate years. At least three times, had he tried to put it into a poetic form (firstly in couplets, secondly in a ballad and then as a masque or play) but without success (Sayer, 1997). Three decades later he picked the theme up and found, as Lewis puts it, "what seemed to be the right form" (Gibson, 1980).

A myth for Lewis meant not "a fictitious story or unscientific account" but a use of "narrative structure and archetypal elements to convey through the imagination universal or divine truths not accessible through the intellect alone" (Schakel, 1984 str. 5). Lewis thought

that Apuleius failed to develop the story's mythical potential. It lacked what he called, using Otto's term, "numinousness," an aspect essential to myth (Schakel, 1984 str. 5).

This *Myth Retold* also seems to lack any embodiment of Christian themes that readers usually expect to find in Lewis' work. It also loses his typical direct and simple language. There are no easy or apparent morals. Moreover, there is not even a closure which leaves readers uncomfortable and unaided in the struggle of what conclusion to draw out.

The technical triumph of the novel derives from the introduction of a new character, Orual, the queen of Glome, who becomes the first-person narrator of the story (Sayer, 1997). In this superb move, Lewis accomplished the participant to relate to the story which gives a more intimate and subjective view of events. The book begins as Orual's public diary. Lewis gives his reader a sense of following a writing from ancient world on the peripheries of Greek world where people's religion is controlled by superstition and animal sacrifice. It is allegedly written in Greek, therefore for rationalists, for people who do not think much of the gods and are only open to scientific explanations. Greek is also an official language used for legal matters and as it is the protagonist's second language, Lewis makes the whole text more formal and less flowing (Schakel, 1984 p. 7).

Part one is written as a statement under oath – Orual's defence of her life escalating into the accusation of gods. The entire book is a most common human complaint against the divinity: If a divine power exists, why does it remain silent and hidden instead of guiding humans towards right and away from wrong? Orual is angry, and wants the world to know that there is no answer from gods and that they are unjust. Her narrative has the magnetic power of private confessions which no omniscient – third voice narrator – could have accomplished. Lewis allows Orual to test the human complaint against divinity as she records the critical episodes of her life as proof of the injustice of the gods. Orual does it honestly with utter truth-fullness. The tone of the book is not entirely bitter. There are hostile comments but there are touches of joy and pleasantness too (Gibson, 1980 p. 223). Although the reports of all her encounters are authentic, with strong capacity to induce the reader to identify with them, her subjective interpretations start to gradually raise questions about the validity of assumptions. All the mistakes and self-deceptions are revealed at the powerful ending in part two as the character gets to know her true-self and comes to some reconciliation (Schakel, 1984).

The book reveals a great change in Lewis' approach to the truth. In his earlier works, he conveys a message through reason but in *Till We Have Faces* he lets his readers taste reality through imagination. He uses a myth to embody and deliver a message (Schakel, 1984 str. 6), furthermore, he himself enters in through the characters - their beliefs, approaches and dialogues.

4.2. Reason behind imagination

4.2.1. Face

It was the ancient Greece which enriched the world by presenting philosophy, math, history, the concept of democracy, and origins of theatre, a culture which introduced the Olympic Games and a fascination by human beauty. The Greek idea of beauty was not only superficial, the external beauty was thought to match the internal. Beautiful body was a mirror of an equally beautiful soul. To be beautiful on the outside and ugly on the inside would be regarded as a repulsive deceit. That tradition carried over to our age as characters' outward appearance in movies or novels generally corresponds to his/her moral essences, heroes are attractive and villains deformed. It is tempting to claim that Psyche's moral perfection was mirrored in her stunningly beautiful face, consequently, Orual's ugliness portrayed her inner wickedness. However, as stated earlier, *Till We Have Faces* is not a novel with apparent symbolism. In Orual's defence, although she is hideous on the outside, it cannot be said that she is ugly on the inside. Quite the contrary. She is a remarkable woman despite her looks. Lewis eradicates such first-hand allegory by Orual's memory from her childhood. The young girl was aware of the fact, that she is ugly, in fact one of her earliest memories was being ordered to wear a veil not to frighten her father's bride. When she was only a child she acknowledged: "I clearly understood that I am ugly" (Lewis, 1980 p. 4), yet it never stopped her in her life to recognize or love beauty, be righteous or work hard. Lewis does not suggest that her face is her destiny to become immoral. Orual is wise, receives extraordinary education from her father's Greek slave, she later proves to be very brave and becomes an outstanding ruler of Glome. She also genuinely and wholeheartedly adores her gorgeous half-sister Psyche from the moment she was born. Orual shows respect and love to her tutor, even the captain guard called Bardia.

In *Till We Have Faces* Lewis puts forward a much crueller idea. Orual's ugliness is a symbol of her inner, spiritual condition, metaphor for (humanity's) disconnection with God. Orual did not do anything wrong, she was born ugly and Lewis wrestles with the question of utter unfairness. The gods were part of her life, education, even discussions. She talks *about* them, yet never *to* them. She never addresses them. When young she lingers on the idea of gods, maybe even their goodness, but once the gods take away the one thing she devoted herself to, her beloved half-sister, she puts on a veil – a sign of parting.

Note the paradox: in the loss of her face, Orual accuses the gods and is in effect 'drawing' their faces. She describes how vile the gods are for the Greeks (for the reason) to see and judge. As the story develops, the reader gradually sees Orual 'drawing' faces on other people. All her relationships become about what she sees, about her expectations and needs.

Through Orual Lewis is unreservedly sincere and makes a valid charge against his God. His protagonist is angry and wants everyone to know that gods are the vilest plague ever to come upon mankind (Gibson, 1980 p. 223). If some divine power exists, why there are people, who are able to perceive it whilst others cannot or why it remains silent instead of clearly guiding humans towards right and away from wrong.

4.2.2. The Grey Mountain

The Grey Mountain is the place where Psyche was to be sacrificed to the gods. It is also the place where Orual (in search for her remains) to her astonishment finds Psyche alive and well.

“I looked. A quivering shock of feeling that has no name. . . There, not six feet away, on the far side of the river, stood Psyche. . . The next was all a confusion — trying to talk, to cry, to kiss, to get my breath back, all together. But she led me a few paces beyond the river and made me sit in the warm heather, and sat beside me, our four hands joined in my lap. . . “ (Lewis, 1980 p. 48).

Chapters ten to twelve are one of the most moving parts of the book, full of real yet contradicting binaries. Joy mingles with perplexity, reason literally wrestles with imagination, beauty is jeopardised by danger. It is a place where belief meets unbelief. Since the events are imbedded in an atmosphere of real love, the portrayal is heart-breaking. Lewis does it justice

and shows the dilemma from both sides. He does a remarkable job in capturing authenticity, frustration and deep agony in a situation full of emotions, sound reasons and experience so each reader can easily identify with both sides yet at the same time find him/her-self lost in between.

Orual is acting under the urge of saving Psyche and bringing her home, whereas Psyche is the happiest she has ever been and overwhelmed by her experience of salvation.

“Oh, Psyche, you say all’s well now. Forget that terrible time. Go on quickly and tell me how you were saved. . . There’s no time —”

“Orual! There’s all the time there is. Don’t you want to hear my story?”

“Of course I do. I want to hear every bit. When we’re safe and —”.

“Where shall we ever be safe if we’re not safe here? This is my home, Maia. And you won’t understand the wonder and glory of my adventure unless you listen” (Lewis, 1980 p. 51).

Psyche had had an experience that Orual was not able to comprehend. As their conversation develops they start to begin to see they do not understand each other and that there is no way of bridging the gap.

“What change?” I didn’t know well what she was talking about . . .

“Psyche, are you sure this happened? You must have been dreaming!” (Lewis, 1980 pp. 51-52)

“Psyche,” said I, leaping up, “I can’t bear this any longer. You have told me so many wonders. If this is all true, I’ve been wrong all my life. . . Psyche, it is true? . . . Show me your palace.”

“Of course I will,” she said, rising. “Let us go in. . .”

“Is it far?” said I.

She gave me a quick, astonished look. . .

“Orual,” she said, beginning to tremble, “what do you mean?”

I too became frightened . . . She gave one loud cry. Then, with white face, staring hard into my eyes, she said, “But this is it, Orual! It is here! You are standing on the stairs of the great gate” (Lewis, 1980 p. 54).

The reunited sisters were physically a few feet apart, they had known each other and had always loved each other yet found themselves miles away from each other.

Here at the Grey Mountain, Lewis captures the deep pain between people divided by belief. “But in the reality (not in the dreams), with the horror came the inconsolable grief. For the world had broken in pieces and Psyche and I were not in the same piece” (Lewis, 1980 p. 56). Lewis embodied the desperation so reliably, one feels it was him speaking through Orual but at the same time him personally speaking through Psyche. The dignity with which Lewis portrayed the agony on both sides shows that he understands Orual’s arguments and inability to see the palace, same as Psyche’s shock that her beloved sister cannot recognize her new status and she cannot share her new experience. It is as if Lewis’ own experience is re-lived here, as if the reader listened to his mind having a dialogue with itself.

At the Grey Mountain, Lewis admits how faith is both imaginative and rational. One can come to his/her belief through reason by building logical arguments but those same rational claims might become a basis for not believing. It also shows a great respect Lewis holds for individual spiritual journeys.

At night, Orual cannot sleep and goes down to the river, she gets on her knees and drinks from the stream. At that moment, she has a temporary glimpse of Psyche’s palace:

“There stood the palace, grey - as all things were grey in that hour and place - but solid and motionless, wall within wall, pillar and arch and architrave, acres of it, a labyrinthine beauty. As she had said, it was like no house ever seen in our land or age . . . I never doubted that I must now cross the river. . . I must ask forgiveness of Psyche as well as of the god.” (Lewis, 1980 p. 63)

By being on her knees, she had a glimpse of Psyche’s palace as if the gods gave her what she needed – to see for herself. Lewis inserts a tiny detail that perhaps, one can see the un-seeable or think the unthinkable when kneeling. Orual was not praying, she acted on the impulse of thirst, and in that humble posture when she drank, she saw what could not be seen from a standing view point. When Orual stands up the palace vanishes and she asks bluntly: “And now, you who read, give judgement. That moment when I either saw or thought I saw the House — does it tell against the gods or against me?” (Lewis, 1980 p. 63)

Orual never shares her experience with anyone. She hides it as she hides her face behind a veil.

4.2.3. The Veil

Due to Psyche's obliviousness to the rain on the Grey Mountain during their reunion, Orual decided she should act on the basis of her own reason and should refuse anything that has to be accepted by faith (Alexander, 1997).

“Was it madness or not? Which was true? Which would be worse? I was at that very moment when, if they meant us well, the gods would speak. . . It began to rain. . . it changed everything for me.

“Here, child,” said I, “come under my cloak. Your poor rags! Quick. You’ll be wet through.”

She gazed at me wonderingly. “How should I get wet, Maia,” she said, “when we are sitting in-doors with a roof above us? (Lewis, 1980 str. 59)

When Orual returned from the mountain, a place where she was so close to meeting the gods, she bitterly refused to believe her sister and the divine. By putting on a veil, Orual said goodbye to the love of her life, she gave up on the purpose, joy and the gods. Such separation caused the Queen to become faceless, and when faceless one loses his/her true self, his/her identity and purpose in life.

Veil is not a mask. Orual does not pretend to be something or somebody else. She hides herself. She covers her lost identity. It is not until the end of her life, when she stops being afraid, she says what is truly on her mind, that she is able to take the veil off.

Lewis takes the biblical Adam and Eve story - their choice to deny God after which they realized they were naked. Lewis originally called this novel *A Bare Face*¹¹ by which he wanted to highlight the identity nakedness. By disconnecting with the Creator, Adam and Eve lost God's glory that had dwelled within them, which meant they turned their focus from God and from each other to their own ego – God and wife/husband became estranged. Orual recognized she was naked and hid behind a veil. It needs to be stressed that she has not done anything that would be, by worldly standards, called evil. She made a choice. Despite her sister's experience and invitation, Orual decided to deny the gods and turn to the god within herself (ego).

Lewis digs to the core and implies the idea that the mere disconnection with the divine is fatal. Orual came to reconciliation by realising and admitting she had a bare face. Once she

¹¹ The publisher refused Lewis' original title due to its connotations to western topics (Gibson, 1980, p. 225)

openly stated what was on her mind and addressed the gods her eyes were opened and she saw her life and everything she had written from another perspective. She once again thinks that justice is what she longs for and she asks: “Are the gods not just?” and receives the most soothing answer: “Oh no, child. What would become of us if they were?” (Lewis, 1980 p. 139) Orual, touched by the mercifulness, comes to a conclusion: “I ended my first book with the words no answer. I know now, Lord, why you utter no answer. You are yourself the answer” (Lewis, 1980 p. 144).

The meaning of Orual’s answer can be found in Lewis’ *Mere Christianity* where he explained that: “God cannot give us a happiness and peace apart from Himself, because it is not there. There is no such thing” (Lewis, 2009 p. 50). According to Lewis, there are no virtues apart from God himself. Everything of worth or any value comes only with God’s presence. One tends to require benefits from God without realising they are inseparable from him. This notion is Lewis’ explanation of a quote from the New Testament (John, 14:6) where Jesus says: “I am the truth, the way and the life” (New International Version (NIV) Bible). There are no doctrines, no happiness or piece, there is a Being.

Orual begins her book by accusing the gods and ends with getting to know them (Olson, 1997). She discovers that to be a human means learning who God is and learning what Love really is and what it is not. Before dies with a confession on her lips: “I ended my first book with the words no answer. I know now. . . You are yourself the answer. Before your face questions die away” (Lewis, 1980 p. 144).

Same as the veil, a symbol is also something that disguises in order to reveal. A symbol hides its meaning behind an image in order to be grasped by imagination which then gives a deeper value to the meaning. The *Faces* explores reason and imagination as a central theme and the veil suggests that the full value of the symbol may be hidden to an overly rational mind. The *book* reveals the full value of myth which allows one to think in dimension he or she otherwise would not (Schakel, 1984). Timothy Keller tweets that: “one cannot have an informed mind without an engaged heart” (Keller, 2017).

4.2.4. Love

What makes the *Faces* a masterpiece is the fact that all its topics of identity, faith, doubts and the divine are thoroughly interconnected by the theme of love. Lewis colourfully illustrates

all love's meanings, its types, possible reactions to it as well as its misapplications and abuses. *The New York Times Book Review* (13/1/1957) stated that "love is quite literally given wings again" (Sayer, 1997).

One of the protagonist's strongest character traits is love. Orual bears a very deep love for the few people around her - Psyche, Fox and Bardia. She wholeheartedly depends on them and would not hesitate to die for them. In fact, love is the greatest reason that she feels cheated by the gods (Olson, 1997).

According to Lewis there are four categories of love which he carefully explains in the book called *The Four Loves* (1958) published two years after *Till We Have Faces*. Except the four categories of love, Lewis also detects in each a need-love and a gift-love. The gift love is self-giving, like God's grace and is very rare among humans. One mostly experiences the need-loves which he compares to hunger (Lewis, 2017).

4.2.4.1. Storge

The first type of love is called Storge: *affection love*. It is a love of enjoying someone or something. The kind which usually occurs between relatives or even between a man and his pet. Its objects are familiar, it produces homely feelings and is often taken for granted. One of its assets is its ability to unite those who are otherwise incompatible, "if they had not found themselves put down by fate in the same household or community, would have had nothing to do with each other." Lewis defends that such process "broadens our minds" (Lewis, 2017 pp. 34-5). Storge teaches recognition of individuality and also responsibility people have among one another.

4.2.4.2. Philia

Lewis calls the second type of love Philia: *friendship love*. It unites individuals with common interest. Lewis notes that to "the Ancients, Friendship seemed the happiest and most fully human of all loves" (Lewis, 2017 p. 53) and warns that due to very few people experiencing it nowadays very few see its value. With the majority ignoring it, it becomes the least needed type of love. On the opposite note it is also most enjoyed and longest lasting. Lewis explains it best when he compares it with lovers' love: "Lovers are always talking to one another about their love; Friends hardly ever about their Friendship. Lovers are normally face to face, absorbed

in each other; Friends, side by side, absorbed in some common interest” (Lewis, 2017 p. 56). While Eros points people at each other, Philia points them toward a certain goal. He goes further when he clarifies, that “there is something in each friend that only some other friend can bring out”. Friendship is also one of the least biological and least jealous of all loves (Lewis, 2017 pp. 56-58).

4.2.4.3. Eros

Then Lewis sets apart another type of love called Eros: *romantic love*. Love that creates intense emotions. It means being in love. Pure romantic love where one gives oneself unselfishly to the loved one. Eros is a devotion. Lewis uses Charles Williams’ words to emphasize its preoccupation with a particular beloved person: “Love you? I *am* you” (Lewis, 2017 p. 87) The distinctive mark of Eros is the fact that a person will rather share unhappiness with the Beloved than be happy without him or her. “Eros never hesitates to say, ‘Better this than parting. Better to be miserable with her than happy without her. Let our hearts break provided they break together’” (Lewis, 2017 p. 98). He also sets apart what he calls Venus which is a deflection of Eros and means sex without love. On the whole Eros is the love that is least thought about but most felt (Sweis, 2014).

4.2.4.4. Agape

The last kind of love is called Agape: *charity love* and is the highest and most unselfish. Love that finds its meaning in giving. Giving oneself without a thought of getting anything in return. Lewis acknowledges it is not natural, on the contrary, it goes against human’s very nature and attributes this love to God: “God, who needs nothing, loves into existence wholly superfluous creatures in order that He may love and perfect them” (Lewis, 2017 p. 116). Agape love desires what is simply best for the beloved regardless of the cost. “This Divine Gift-love in the man enables him to love what is not naturally lovable; lepers, criminals, enemies, morons, the sulky, the superior and the sneering” (Lewis, 2017 p. 118). This love is hit with the most of loss (Sweis, 2014):

To love at all is to be vulnerable. Love anything, and your heart will certainly be wrung and possibly be broken. If you want to make sure of keeping it intact, you must give

your heart to no one, not even to an animal. Wrap it carefully round with hobbies and little luxuries; avoid all entanglements; lock it up safe in the casket or coffin of your selfishness. But in that casket safe, dark, motionless, airless - it will change. It will not be broken; it will become unbreakable, impenetrable, irredeemable (Lewis, 1980 pp. 111-112).

The novel *Till We Have Faces* personifies the various types of love, exemplifies their traits, shows their development, examples as well as their perversions.

4.2.5. Fox

Fox is a Greek scholar and a philosopher who had been enslaved by Glome. He is held by the King of Glome to educate the three princesses – Orual, Redival and Psyche. Orual describes him as short, thick-set, with very bright eyes and red hair and she remarks that unlike other slaves she never heard him to complain nor boast about who he used to be in his own country. Fox proves being open-minded when he explains to little Orual: “Everything is as good or bad as our opinion makes it” (Lewis, 1980 p. 3).

Fox is the voice of reason. There is much of Lewis himself in the character of Fox. Lewis bases Fox’s thoughts mostly on the philosophy of the Stoics characterized by rationalism and materialism. Old myths are only lies of the poets for Fox. Lewis was influenced by his tutor W. T. Kirkpatrick who rejected matters of belief or opinion. Lewis’ tutor left a lasting imprint on Lewis’ system of thought and building an argument.

Although Fox’s philosophy is an important theme in the book, the love of the old Greek slave for the ugly little princess is more significant (Gibson, 1980 p. 233). They spent a lot of time together and cared for each other. Through the character of Fox, Lewis explains the type of love called Affection. Fox and Orual became a family, she even called him “Grandfather”. Orual enjoyed his warmth, Fox and her baby sister turned out to be her home.

“This was the beginning of my best times. The Fox’s love for the child was wonderful.
. . . And it was now always we three — the Fox, and Psyche, and I — alone together”
(Lewis, 1980 p. 9).

When Orual gets older, they develop a candid openness and companionship between themselves. They enjoy sharing thoughts with each other, they share a hunger for knowledge and from the affectionate relationship they develop a perfect Friendship (Philia).

However, at one point Orual's possessiveness takes over. When she becomes the queen of Glome, the first thing she does is freeing Fox from slavery. What she does not expect is that he might wish to go home now, to return to Greece. Suddenly, she becomes very frightened and her love for him becomes only about her needs. She gets angry and upset: "It embittered me that the Fox should even desire to leave me. He had been the central pillar of my whole life. . ." and is very quick to doubt the entire relationship: as she said to herself: "What are you to the Fox? . . . His heart was always in the Greekland" (Lewis, 1980 p. 101). Here, Lewis exhibits a very typical instance of perverted love which manifests itself as a demand (Sauders, 2012 p. 7) even a right of some sort to be loved. Such approach then results in self-pity (Lewis, 2017 p. 39).

Fox's reaction was astonishing. He did not fire back with a valid argument, he did not defend himself nor did he try to make her understand. Fox came up to her and expressed, what Lewis calls, Agape: "'Peace, peace,' he said, embracing me. 'What would I have done in Greece?'" (Lewis, 1980 p. 101). Fox approaches Orual's corrupted love with a Gift-love – glimpse of a divine love which is doing what is best for the other one.

Ironically, having persuaded Fox to stay Orual starts to neglect him: "I was too busy to be with him much" (Lewis, 1980 p. 112). As usually Orual considers her loves according to what profit they bring to her (Schakel, 1984 p. 54).

Fox's uncorrupted love is extraordinary in its self but since Lewis made the Fox character a Greek Stoic, he is showing that not only is God's love dwelling in all nations and cultures but also that God is ever seeking in all nations and cultures (Gibson, 1980 p. 222). Lewis freely attributes divine traits to a pagan conveying that being an atheist, pagan, Greek or else, God's love resides everywhere and that God is not secluded only to designated societies or groups of people who would supposedly deserve him.

4.2.6. Bardia

Bardia was the captain of the guard who like Fox became the queen's counsellor. He was a god-fearing man, he accepted there are gods as a fact but never tried to explore the subject further. He liked action more than thought and he served the queen as a great soldier, a teacher,

a diplomat and a practical leader. His character in the book also relates to both issues: love and religion (Gibson, 1980).

Lewis sets the love between Orual and Bardia as a friendship. It is built on their common interest, in this instance, the natural talent with a sword. In *The Four Loves* (1958), Lewis points out that Philia between a man and a woman is very likely to grow into erotic love and Orual indeed becomes passionate about Bardia even though she never expresses it out loud. Bardia's love, however, never changes into Eros due to two reasons. Firstly, he is loyal to his wife and secondly, he is probably put off by Orual's ugliness. In a situation when they find themselves together at night in the cold forest Bardia suggests "shamefacedly, 'Lady, . . . you might be cruelly chilled before day. So. . . we'd best lie close, back to back, the way men do in the wars,'" and Orual follows up on as she acknowledges that "if you are ugly enough, all men (unless they hate you deeply) soon give up thinking of you as a woman at all" (Lewis, 1980 p. 62).

Lewis makes it clear that Bardia's vague appreciation of gods was not a result of his immoral actions. Bardia was a loyal, honest even tender man but he believed that gods are bad for people. When he and Orual have to stay the night on the mountain he worries: "I fear we must lie here. Not where a man'd choose; too near the gods" (Lewis, 1980 p. 62).

It is not until Bardia dies that Orual learns the true nature of her feelings for him. Bardia's wife Ansit shocks Orual when she states: "that [her] queen-ship drank up his blood year by year and ate out his life". By keeping him by her side all the time, Orual worked him to death. She quickly tries to defend herself: "Then why did you not tell me? A word from you would have sufficed." In her deep sorrow, Orual cannot help herself not to include her rage against the gods: "Or are you like the gods who will speak only when it is too late?" (Lewis, 1980 p. 125) but Ansit explains that taking from him his work, which was his life, would be the same as working him to death. Ansit also adds her view of gods when she continues: "Yours is Queen's love, not commoners'. Perhaps you who spring from the gods love like the gods. . . They say the loving and the devouring are all one, don't they?" (Lewis, 1980 p. 125). Ansit and Bardia both personify the Gift-love, "love that does not cling to its object, but rejoices in the joys of the other, even though it means separation" (Gibson, 1980 p. 247).

In contrast, Orual reveals a very painful truth about her kind of love: "a love like that can grow to be nine-tenths hatred and still call itself love" (Lewis, 1980 p. 126). When love

becomes selfish, even possessing it changes one into a monster, calling itself love but becoming fatal.

4.2.7. Redival

Redival, the second oldest daughter of the king of Glome, is attractive, sensuous and feather-headed. Throughout the story, she seems to show instances of deformed Eros – called Venus or sex without love. She appears full of lust, selfishness and desire for pleasure that there is no room for affection for her sisters or anybody close to her. There is not even room for gods, she does not rebel against them, she pays no attention to them whatsoever. Redival is also an example of distortion of Eros, but unlike Orual's Eros for Bardia, Redival's romantic love turns into a kind of religion. She worships being in love and it becomes her all-consuming passion (Sauders, 2012).

Orual despises her sister but later in the story she has the chance to get an insight of her behaviour. Orual calls it the first snowflake of her own winter. When Orual meets Redival's lover, now a chief eunuch in another kingdom, he remembers: "Oh yes, yes, [she was] very lonely. . . She used to say, "First of all, Orual loved me much; then the Fox came and she loved me little; then the baby came and she loved me not at all. (Lewis, 1980 p. 121)" which puts a whole new light on Redival's motives. Lewis explains that: "As soon as we are fully conscious, we discover loneliness. We need others physically, emotionally and intellectually" (Lewis, 2017 str. 3). Yes, humans mostly engage in a need-love but for every seeker there should be a giver. In that sense, Orual learns that Redival's actions were only an expression of lack of love, however, Orual was too oblivious to her sister's deep emptiness, to at least try to satisfy it. In her self-centeredness, she did not see her own responsibility for Redival and neglected her.

4.2.8. Psyche

In a letter to C. Kilby¹², Lewis describes Psyche as having a naturally Christian soul. She is Orual's youngest half-sister and she is not only beautiful but has all the inner and outer qualities of perfection (Gibson, 1980). Fox describes her: "Virtue herself had put on a human

¹² Clyde Samuel Kilby (1902-1986) was an American author and English professor at Wheaton College, best known for his scholarship on the Inklings, especially J. R. R. Tolkien and C. S. Lewis. After reading *The Case for Christianity* in 1943 he began a long-term correspondence with Lewis that lasted until the author's death in 1963.

form” (Lewis, 1980 p. 11). Psyche’s life is illustrated by love and a series of sacrifices. This caused some to call her a symbol of Christ and although there are hints like “ransom for all Glome” (Lewis, 1980 p. 34), that she dies at “a single leafless tree” (p. 45) “for many” (p.27), Lewis wrote to Kilby: “She is in some ways like Christ because every good man or woman is like Christ,” (Lewis, 1966 p. 274).

Gibson points out that had she been the main character, it would probably be very difficult for readers to accept such inhumane faultlessness. At first readers get to know her only through the praise of Orual and Fox, however, after it becomes known that she is to be the great offering for the people of Glome, most of her character traits are presented directly (Gibson, 1980 p. 242).

Lewis was inspired by people who were able to approach others and gods in the non-rationalistic way. Psyche is a symbol for natural, almost intuitive response to God. Her inner beauty – the connection to the gods – is reflected in her physical beauty (Schakel, 1984 p. 14).

Psyche represents Agape love – the perfect gift-love, as she is always concerned about the other one. She is not naive nor careless. She is self-confident and always ready to be there for anyone who needs her. She is not afraid to go to a crowd of sick people had there been only a slightest chance it could help them: “‘Let me go out,’ said Psyche. ‘They are our people’” (Lewis, 1980 p. 14). When on a death row, Psyche is genuinely concerned with Orual’s small injuries. She was not oblivious to what was to happen to her nor did she foresee some bright future yet willingly took on her vocation:

“You think it devours the offering. I mostly think so myself. Anyway, it means death. Orual, you didn’t think I was such a child as not to know that? How can I be the ransom for all Glome unless I die? . . . Today I shall meet cruel men, cowards and liars, the envious and the drunken. They will be like that because they do not know what is good from what is bad. This is an evil which has fallen upon them not upon me. They are to be pitied, not —” (Lewis, 1980 p. 33)

Orual was angry at Psyche for she “spoke so steadily and thoughtfully”. Psyche was lucid, but for Orual there was nothing rational about her willingness. Orual was furious for Psyche was prepared to sacrifice something for the people of Glome, only to see later in part two, Psyche bearing horrendous consequences of her own doing. Only then, Orual fathomed Gift-love.

4.2.9. Orual

Orual loved Fox, Bardia and Psyche, they were all she had yet had always felt that such love did not return in kind. Fox longed for his love and family in Greece, Bardia cared deeply for his wife and Psyche left her for the gods. Orual yearned for the same love in return, nothing more. She pitied herself without realizing her love was conditional. Love as a weapon or means to be loved – self-seeking love. (Olson, 1997).

Psyche sees through it when she replies: “I begin to think I never knew you” (Lewis, 1980). Even Fox, a Greek slave that became a tutor of the princesses, addresses Orual: “There’s one part love in your heart, and five parts anger, and seven parts pride” (Lewis, 1980).

It is to be remarked that although it was not Orual who had been sacrificed to the gods, she pitied herself due to her loss. Although it was not Orual who was a whole life slave, she again felt sorry for herself. Through the relationships, no matter what the circumstances, it was Orual who felt being the victim. There is a very significant concern raised here by Lewis. The category of “victim” is regarded as a moral absolute: no one dares to undermine it. Its danger lies in the reconciliation: to position self into the victim category, in an instance of a conflict, means shutting the door for possible compromise – i.e.: resolving the problem. It is not to say there are no true victims but in *Till We Have Faces* we see an abuse of the meaning of ‘victim’ and ill-treatment of love.

Orual blames Psyche: “Oh cruel, cruel! It is nothing to you that you leave me here alone?” (Lewis, 1980 str. 33). Orual accuses Psyche of her courage, Orual sees it as a proof of lack of love for her and again when Orual wants to bury her sister, and finds her alive and very happy, she yet again shows disbelief and groans: “the gods. . . they had stolen her,” then turns on Psyche and blames her: “it is nothing to you at all that you are leaving me. . . turning your back on all our love?” (Lewis, 1980 p. 59). From this moment on, Orual exhibits selfish possessive and victimized love that had developed in her although she herself portrays it as true – gift love (Sauders, 2012). Orual goes as far as to say: “We’d rather you drank their blood that stole their hearts. We’d rather they were ours and dead than yours and made immortal. . . She was mine. Mine!” (Lewis, 1980). Lewis reveals what can happen to love over time, how it can gradually twist from a genuine love to a self-centred, destructive love which by definition, ceases to be love, consequently resulting in anger. Orual’s anger than turns against everything

including the gods: “Do you and I need to flatter gods anymore? They’re tearing us apart. . . oh how shall I bear it? . . . and what worse can they do?” (Lewis, 1980 p. 33).

Orual was torn apart by the loves she held for others and also between two beliefs: “I could not find out whether the doctrines of Glome or the wisdom of Greece were right. I was the child of Glome and the pupil of the Fox I saw that for years my life had been lived in two halves, never fitted together.” It is only in the second part of the book when she sees Psyche’s sacrifice for her that Orual is able to move beyond the limitations of Glome and Greece. Only when she becomes the pupil of Psyche, pupil of the Gift-love, she finds answers (Schakel, 1984).

4.2.10. Bare love

In the *Faces* Lewis scrutinizes the most noble virtue in life. Lewis takes love and lays it bare. He reveals the unavoidable fate of all natural loves if left only to themselves: “They all go bad when they set up on their own and make themselves into false gods” (Lewis, 1946). Natural loves need to be converted - fuelled with divine love for them to live and grow (Schakel, 1984). Lewis is adamant that: “You cannot love a fellow creature fully till you love God.” Once objects of love are mistaken for first things in life love loses its power to full-fill. Reader sees the frustration in Orual when she cries: “I wanted to be a wife so that I could have been her real mother. I wanted to be a boy so that she could be in love with me. I wanted her to be my full sister instead of my half-sister. I wanted her to be a slave so that I could set her free and make her rich” (Lewis, 1980 p. 10). The quote twists the focus from the loved one to Orual’s self. Orual later admits that she “learned how one can hate those one loves” (Lewis, 1980 p. 59).

In a letter to C. Kilby, C. S. Lewis wrote that: “Orual is (not a symbol but) an instance, a ‘case’ of human affection in its natural condition, true, tender, suffering, but in the long run tyrannically possessive and ready to turn to hatred when the beloved ceases to be its possession” (Sauders, 2012).

Fox claimed that the divine nature has no jealousy, but whether it has or not, Lewis shows that human nature certainly has. Lewis invites his reader to examine if Orual’s fears are in part a projection of her own feelings. Lewis once expressed his surprise that readers fail to see that *Till We Have Faces* is about jealousy and possessive love but Schakel reasons that it might be a failure to understand the way possessive love and love-longing oppose each other in the character of Orual (Schakel, 1984 p. 22; 27).

Lewis then dedicates the book *The Four Loves (1958)* to the topic and says that: “Every human love, at its height, has the tendency to claim for itself a divine authority. . . It tells us not to count the cost, it demands of us a total commitment . . . it insinuates that any action which is sincerely done ‘for love’s sake’ is thereby lawful and even meritorious” (Lewis, 2017)

Lewis explains in *The Four Loves (1958)* that: “Every human love, at its height, has the tendency to claim for itself a divine authority. . . It tells us not to count the cost, it demands of us a total commitment . . . it insinuates that any action which is sincerely done ‘for love’s sake’ is thereby lawful and even meritorious” (Lewis, 2017).

Orual starts her story by accusing the gods and ends with knowing them. Meanwhile she learns what it means to be a human: it means learning who God is and trusting Him, learning what love really is – and what it is not, learning what it means to finally have a face and to let the old self die.

“Do you and I need to flatter gods anymore? They’re tearing us apart. . . oh how shall I bear it? . . . and what worse can they do?” (Lewis, 1980). Orual sways between superstition and agnosticism. The reader can understand Orual for the ways of the gods were not always easy to grasp. She refused to believe because she did not want to or because she did not want to change because of it.

4.3. Values in Education

According to Oxford Dictionary, values are “principles or standards of behaviour; one’s judgement of what is important in life” (English Oxford Living Dictionaries). The definition does not explain what principles or whose standards but the term “one’s judgement” suggests that values are subjective and depend on one’s view of the world. It is commonly thought that moral and ethical standards derive from a religion, therefore are closely tied together. Knoblock says that any attempt to teach values bears a risk of misinterpretation of implying a religious undertone in the curriculum (Knoblock, 2013).

Lewis was, in the first half of the last century, very alarmed by loudening voices at the Oxford Socratic Club which seemed to question the existence of an objective moral law (Michelson, 2008 p. 2). Despite the huge technological, medical or social progress the society has since undergone, such attitude of relativity of moral law has stayed more or less the same. Lewis’ reaction to at the time was an essay on values in education, called *The Abolition of Man*

(1944) which bears an important message for education today. This lecture argues that to teach there is no spirituality (or not an objective spirituality) is to deprive a whole generation of people of direction. To teach there are no objective values is turning students into mechanisms, successful androids¹³ even, left to go through life without a moral compass. It could be argued that no teacher says such thing literally but there lies the problem, by not saying anything loud, thus tabooing the issues is in effect abandoning them¹⁴. Such attitude has resulted in what is called white collar crime and similar misconducts.¹⁵

According to Michelson, Lewis accuses modern teachers of producing two kinds of graduates: urban blockheads¹⁶ and trousered apes¹⁷. Nearly a century ago, Lewis warned that once the specific distinctions of humanity (rationality, purpose, volition, freedom, imagination, commitment, the image of God) are stripped away people become either emotionally retarded or instinct-driven apes (Michelson, 2008).

The question of right and wrong, their objective existence and distinction between them is a difficult problem. However, as with each problem, the solution starts with the identification of the problem, identification *with* the problem (it must be owned that it is *our* problem) and then looking into it and searching for possible steps for solution.

However, the setbacks that follow the way to the solution derive from a specific nature of the problem. Firstly, it is personal. It is personal to an extent that its solution cannot be transmitted by information, values must develop from within. One cannot but grow through them. Lewis was not different. His life work is like an open diary of that process.¹⁸ And so as Lewis, our society does not need to be ashamed that it struggles with the issue but allow room, the time and individual leadership in such personal growth.

¹³ Lewis uses a term “men without chests”.

¹⁴ Lewis called the objective values *Tao* and warned about catastrophic consequences not only on ethics and morality but also knowledge (Lewis, 2009).

¹⁵ The character of Lucy in *Prince Caspian* says: “Wouldn’t it be dreadful if someday in our own world, at home, men started going wild inside like animals here, and still looked like men, so that you’d never know which were which?” (Lewis, 2009)

¹⁶ Eustace Clarence Scrubb, a character from *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader*, is Lewis’ example of an informed ignorant. A person who has training but no education, has information but not knowledge (Lewis, 2009).

¹⁷ The blockhead counterpart is The Ape from *The Last Battle*, an absurd character without senses and logically challenged: “The Ape. . . looked ten times uglier. . . for he was now dressed up. . . Than the Ape spoke, “I hear some of you saying I’m an ape. Well, I’m not. I’m a man. . . old man. . . and very wise man. . .” (Lewis, 2009)

¹⁸ Question of an objective moral law became a critical turning point for Lewis. He developed this topic into numerous works, one of which is his apologetic work *Mere Christianity* (1952) (Lewis, 2009 p. 4).

That is where education comes in; it should even be its core aim. But despite every generation's struggle for values, education system is more than ever very reluctant to incorporate the theme concretely into its program. It is easier to teach about values than values themselves. It is easier to teach factual information instead of immersing in moral and cultural preparation for life, it is easier to fill than to shape. Belief in the significance of values is important yet useless without its implementation.¹⁹

That is an unfortunate misjudgement of our age. Education is set up to train intellect and independence whereas in real life each person is actually dependent (man is a relational human being unable to live outside community or not be influenced by relationships) and powerless against own emotions and impulses.²⁰ Children are taught equations, dates, grammar rules and other nowadays easily found information, only to realise as adults they are unable to communicate, differentiate between right and wrong, find compromises or make decisions. Such skills depend on matured value structure.²¹

Second hindrance regarding the nature of the problem of what is right or wrong, is that although it is personal it is not private even though it is widely considered to be. It is popular to say everyone must decide what is right or wrong for him/her. Value system is considered person-specific, subjective suspending any moral absolutes.

But following Lewis' study, irrespective of one's beliefs everyone accepts that a man is subjected to physical and biological laws and that they exist regardless of one's awareness. However, a question arises how the third set of laws can be objective (true for everyone) if its observance depends on individual's will.²² Such lack of restriction makes the third set of laws vulnerable in two senses. Firstly, it undermines its importance if not its actual existence. Secondly, it releases a need for vindication not only of its existence but also its worth.²³ The

¹⁹ Lewis remarks that: "It still remains true that no justification of virtue will enable a man to be virtuous.

Without the aid of trained emotions, the intellect is powerless against the animal organism" (Lewis, 2009 p. 24).

²⁰ Lewis warns that "Education without values, as useful as it is, seems rather to make man a more clever devil. . . We make men without chests and expect from them virtue and enterprise. We laugh at honour and are shocked to find traitors in our midst" (Lewis, 2009).

²¹ In Lewis' words, in a battle it is not logical arguments that keep one's nerves and muscles in place (Lewis, 2009 p. 24).

²² Lewis refers to the term the Law of Nature (natural to the majority) and reasons that people are subjected to three sets of laws of which there is one set a man is at liberty not to follow (Lewis, 2009 p. 4).

²³ In *Mere Christianity* Lewis explains: „As a body, he is subjected to gravitation and cannot disobey it; if you leave him unsupported in mid-air, he has no more choice about falling than a stone has. As an organism, he is subjected to various bio-logical laws which he cannot disobey any more than an animal can. That is, he cannot disobey those laws which he shares with other things; but the law which is peculiar to his human nature, the law

twenty-first century prides itself in its, so called, moral pluralism proclaiming there is no objective truth and no moral absolutes; all being subject to a culture, time and needs. It sounds very enlightened, even progressive – as all people are equal, their religions and values should also be equal. It is thought that to secure that no idea is superior would ensure the world peace. However, underneath such noble voice lies an ugly deceit.

To say there is no objective truth is making the same type of claim. There is nothing open-minded about a statement contradicting another only to sound liberal and tolerant when it is, in fact relativizing the discussed matter.

To assert there is no objective moral law is to dispose of a chance ever to denounce any injustice or call anything evil.²⁴ If one came across a culturally closed community that ill-treated its children, one would not be able to condemn it nor do anything about it. In this line of thinking any genocide or even WWII atrocities could not only be relativized but even excused.²⁵ There are tendencies to say that there is no evil and that everything has its place in our lives. But since evil lives off good it cannot exist on its own thus it is not an equal. Without the good, there cannot be evil as without light, there cannot be darkness. Without a picture, there cannot be a hole. Evil is only like a parasite. The withdrawal from the moral or spiritual absolutes does not help the pluralistic society to live in peace, quite the contrary, it is sentenced to produce chaos. Using Lewis' compass analogy, it is to say that north is where one wants it to be. Arrows pointing in all directions are doomed to raise confusion.

Each age defies itself according to its attitude to facts - modernism adores facts, postmodernism relativizes them and post-truth²⁶ era despises them - meanwhile inadvertently each age is missing the point – it is neglecting values.

It is interesting to note that the biblical definition of sin is 'to miss the point'. Although it is common in our age to think that sin is breaking a kind of rule from the Ten commandments,

he does not share with animals or vegetables or inorganic things, is the one he can disobey if he chooses (Lewis, 2009 pp. 4-5).

²⁴ Lewis notices that when people argue they do not hesitate to refer to some kinds of standards as if there was something that ought to be, that is fair/unfair (Lewis, 2009).

²⁵ One European nation genuinely believed they were superior and entitled to rule the world. That 'honest' mistake cost over sixty million people their lives.

²⁶ The term 'post-truth' was named the 2016 word of the year. According to *Oxford Dictionary*, it is an adjective meaning: "relating to or denoting circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief." Post-truth era is an age in which truth is becoming irrelevant; age typical for 'evidence-rejecting' society. BBC's correspondent explains that "the whole phenomenon could be summarized by the sentence: 'My opinion is worth more than the facts.'" (Coughlan, 2017).

The Bible explains that breaking such law is a mere consequence of sin, that it is only a result of missing the point – the point being love. To sin therefore means not to love and/or to love wrongly.

Post-truth society realizes that modernism (and previous movements) used moral absolutes to rule and oppress, so late modernism and post-modernism lost respect for things that were called values which left them to live only to work, make money and consume. Society needs to move forward but does not know in which direction, as there seem to be no objective values that do not change the believers into oppressors.

The Ten Commandments are sometimes being considered a summary of ethics but have also been misused to harass. It is significant to mention that the word *commandment* is not an adequate translation, for the original Hebrew language suggests that the Ten Commandments were more like a covenant, an offer.²⁷ It is an ethical codex based on protecting rights of a fellowman, as opposed to firstly of the addressee (Beneš, 2008). The New Testament summarizes the commandments in a sentence: Love your God and love your neighbor as yourself. That is in effect the Christian value system. Only an owned identity will provide one with self-confidence, only a self-confidence provides ability to love a fellowman as oneself. Not to love or love wrongly is ‘missing the point’ of life.

As with all principles, love and all other values remain abstract and philosophical – in other words useless, unless they are put into practise. The content of the word needs to obtain a specific form through which it is expressed. The advice from the so called Ten Commandments is a principle put in practice.²⁸ New Testament’s application of love in practice manifests itself in serving. The deepest love of all is (as Lewis explained) a Gift-love. Christianity has also ‘missed the point’ when it used values to oppress instead of applying them to serve.

Lewis was a literature scholar²⁹ not for the literature itself or its history but mainly for its messages. He was genuinely interested in what all the philosophies had to say. Although he

²⁷ The issue of the Ten Commandments is connected to the story of Jewish exodus from Egypt. Its addressees are those who had been freed from slavery, who were saved by the Lord and know the issuer. They were not to be commanded as if immature or in need of restrictions. The original Hebrew wording is not imperative but more like a promise ‘because you have experienced salvation and have been rescued, you do not have the urge to hurt, disrespect, steal, envy...’ (Beneš, 2008)

²⁸ Lewis is not afraid to recommend: “Do not waste time bothering whether you ‘love’ your neighbour; act as if you did. As soon as we do this we find one of the great secrets. When you are behaving as if you loved someone, you will presently come to love him” (Lewis, 2009).

²⁹ Lewis said: “I am a product [of] endless books. My father bought all the books he read and never got rid of any of them. There were books in the study, books in the drawing room, books in the cloakroom...” Lewis was

was a Christian he did not seclude to narrow line of thinking. He reasoned, compared and drew conclusions. When he studies the topic of values he quotes St Augustine's definition of virtue as *ordo amoris* (ordered love) – a condition in which every object is given a degree of love that is fitting to it. He also cites Aristotle who said that the aim of education is to make the pupil like and dislike what he ought (Lewis, 2009 p. 16). To gain such skill one needs to be nurtured, educated and led by a competent teacher. A teacher can inform but cannot pass on what he or she has not got.

Love is a word that has undergone a vast content inflation with very little credibility left, it is often regarded more as a sentiment as opposed to a value.³⁰ Yet it is only love which other values like compassion, gratitude, tolerance, effort, forgiveness, honesty, joy, belonging etc. derive from. Some people may reduce love to a feeling and warn against it but Lewis challenges especially the teachers with quite the opposite.³¹ He warns against love deficiency which may in a century called 'the century of a child' sound awkward, if not irrelevant. However, *Till We Have Faces* teaches that although one is surrounded by true gift love (as Orual was by Psyche, Fox and Bardia) he or she might not yet be fulfilled. The fact that love is given does not yet mean that it is received.

Lewis does not use reason nor imagination to manipulate but to show the significance of values and responsibility to a fellowman which for Lewis transforms into spirituality – relating to the transcendental – loving God.

Although it is not known how to apply such conclusion into education, it does by no means free the teachers from the responsibility to develop spiritual aspect of their students. Without it – without purpose and values, people (although materially/intellectually successful) lose interest in life which is gradually followed up by self-destruction of some form.

Lewis perceives knowledge as limited and constantly evolving and is not afraid to use imagination to leave some issues open. Imagination is humble in the sense that it leaves one the right, even a privilege, not to know. One does not need to be omniscient. There should always

adamant that: "Literature adds to reality, it does not simply describe it. It enriches the necessary competencies that daily life requires and provides; and in this respect, it irrigates the deserts that our lives have already become" (Lewis, 2010)

³⁰ Lewis warns that love as a virtue has been replaced by the term *unselfishness*. This negative term turns the focus from an object of love (a fellowman) to self, being in effect self-full. It suggests that abstinence of a relationship is more important than happiness in relationship. Love (a virtue) ensures good things for others whereas unselfishness (a pseudo-virtue) gives up on things in order not to share them (Lewis, 2001 p. 25).

³¹ "The task of modern educator is not to cut down jungles but to irrigate deserts" (Lewis, 2009 p. 13).

be room for everyone's search. Lewis does not even condemn failure. On the characters of Edmund, Orual etc. he leaves one the right of fallibility. Errors (when evaluated) are crucial part of a learning process. Lewis is an inspiration for teachers who should not have to pretend that knowledge is everything. In education, it is more important to ask the students the right questions as these do not limit, they open new areas for their own development of reason, imagination and experience. Reason is thus enriched by values like freewill, humility and authenticity. One without the other remains hollow.

Imagination without reason results in illusion and easily falls into the traps of conspiracy theories.³² On the other hand, worshipping only reason has resulted in loathing facts altogether.³³

Lewis places a tremendous emphasis on reason and the development of cognitive abilities. In his non-fiction books, he accomplishes it by a thorough explanation and gradual build-up of an argument accompanied by examples. He is at the same time aware that information is an abstract theory, that knowledge without a story is like an information without an application. In his fiction, he shows that an intangible philosophy is enlivened only by a story. Lewis acknowledges that not every person has the ability of learning through acquiring and processing information or through their own scientific research; therefore, he offers knowledge through experience – through letting his reader enter by imagining. As explained earlier, information on its own unless applied is hollow. Through imagination Lewis connects ideas with real life.

³² Lewis speaks against fortifying the minds against emotion when he says: “by starving the sensibility of pupils we only make them easier prey to the propagandist when he comes” (Lewis, 2009 p. 14).

³³ In post-truth age “borders blur between truth and lies, honesty and dishonesty. Deceiving others becomes a challenge, a game, and ultimately a habit” (Keyes).

CONCLUSION

The main aim of my diploma thesis was to tie the notions of reason and imagination of the well-known author C. S. Lewis and to see if his work has a message for the society and education in the twenty-first century.

The first part of the project starts with the definitions of reason and imagination and continues with what each meant for Lewis and how his early work showed that he himself wrestled with their compatibility.

To understand Lewis' fiction it is important to look at the author as a person so the second part of my thesis focuses on Lewis' life. I have found out that Lewis showed his love for literature very early in his life and this passion remained with him his whole life. Not only did he read extensive amount of literature, he read most of it in its original language. After a brief service in the First World War Lewis went to Oxford where he started studying. He excelled and pursued a career as an academic. In his late twenties, it was literature and countless intellectual discussions with his colleagues and friends that embarked him on a journey to faith. It was a very gradual process of reasoning and search for meanings. Lewis later described his experience as being surprised by joy.

The third part of the thesis introduces his fantasy book called *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* which reveals Lewis' skill to explore philosophical and theological questions by means of a fable. Lewis excelled in using a story as an entrance gate to think on a deeper level. Lewis did not set out to write a religious story, his aim was to captivate one's imagination and open one's mind to 'what if' possibilities. I was surprised by the ease with which he conveyed the basic Christian message in a way that was not only pleasantly playful but remarkably inspiring.

That led my project to elaborate on the subject of spirituality in education. I have approached the matter from current point of view, briefly exploring general approach to spirituality or the lack of it. The aim was to raise awareness of the importance of spirituality part of every person and evoke questions regarding its place in education. I have found out that Lewis' work can be of inspiration to this date due to his exceptional ability to set apart what is the core of Christianity, leaving the different doctrines behind as if they were various translations, and ability to share his experience not only through rational means but also through

imagination. Lewis offers a reader a lens through which one can view their own reality. I found it fascinating as such approach loses any traits of manipulation or control yet touches on spiritual level. I was inspired by the non-threatening way Lewis approaches spirituality in education as he leaves his reader to discover things for him/herself respecting one's individuality and leaving room for his/her own search.

The fourth part of the thesis introduces his last novel *Till We Have Faces* and again tries to analyze the retold myth by showing reasons behind Lewis' imagination. I was astonished by the complexity of the book and mesmerizing balance as there is nothing easy or black and white about it. The novel seems to lack any embodiment of Christian themes or apparent morals. In fact, this time Lewis makes a complaint against the divinity. Moreover, Lewis develops the topic of reason versus imagination and is not afraid to show the limits of both. It is only when they are combined that they provide one with the whole picture. The book is also an extraordinary insight of love and its variations. Lewis strips love bear and shows nuances that change it in a perverted love which is destructive. I have concluded the fourth part with the topic of values in education, as I feel there is a danger in moral pluralism. Although it is a difficult question, it does not mean that teachers are free from the responsibility to develop their pupil's values. I have concluded that Lewis perceives knowledge as limited as well as constantly evolving and is not afraid to use imagination to leave some issues open. Through imagination Lewis connects the reason with real life.

Bibliografie

- Chesterton, G. K. 1993.** *The Everlasting Man*. San Francisco : Ignatius Press, 1993.
- Cole, Susannah. 2011.** Situating Children in the Discourse of Spirituality. [editor] Wane & Manyimo & Ritskes. *Spirituality, Education & Society*. Rotterdam : Sense Publishers, 2011.
- Coughlan, Sean. 2017.** What does post-truth mean for a philosopher? *BBC News, Education & Family*. [Online] 1 2017. <http://www.bbc.com/news/education-38557838>.
- Abdi, Ali A. 2011.** Foreword. [editor] Energy L. Manyimo, Eric J. Ritskes Njoki N. Wane. *Spirituality, Education & Society*. Rotterdam : Sense Publishers, 2011.
- Alexander, Joan. 1997.** Till We Have Faces: A Restoration of Perspective. *Inklings Forever*. 1997, Sv. Volume I.
- Astin, Alexander W. 2004.** Why Spirituality Deserves a Central Place in Liberal Education. *Spirituality in Higher Education*. April 2004, Sv. 1, 1.
- Barfield, Owen. 1977.** *Lewis, Truth and Imagination*. 1977.
- Beneš, Jiří. 2008.** *Desítka aneb Deset slov o Bohu a člověku*. Praha : Návrat domů, 2008. 9788072551774.
- Duriez, Colin. 2013.** *C. S. Lewis: A Biography of Friendship*. Oxford : Lion Hudson Plc, 2013. 978-0745955872.
- . 2013. *Field Guide to Narnia*. Gloucestershire : The History Press, 2013. 9780752495545.
- Edwards, Bruce L., [editor]. 2007.** *C. S. Lewis: Life, Works, and Legacy*. místo neznámé : Praeger Publishers, 2007. Sv. Vol. 4 Scholar, Teacher and Public Intellectual.
- English Oxford Living Dictionaries.** English Oxford Living Dictionaries. [Online] Oxford University Press. [Citace: 12. 03 2017.] <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/imagination>.
- Friedersdorf, Conor. 2015.** The Rise of Victimhood Culture. *The Atlantic*. [Online] 11 2015. <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/09/the-rise-of-victimhood-culture/404794/>.
- Gibson, Evan K. 1980.** *C. S. Lewis Spinner of Tales*. Washington, D.C. : Christian University Press, WB Eerdmans Pub. Co, 1980.
- Gordon, Christopher. 2014.** *C. S. Lewis - A life inspired*. Kindle. místo neznámé : Wyatt North Publishing, LLC, 2014.
- Green and Hooper. 1974.** *C. S. Lewis, a Biography*. New York : Collins, 1974. p. 300. 978-0007157143.

- HarperCollins.** About C. S. Lewis. *The Official Website of C. S. Lewis*. [Online] Harper Collins Publishers. [Citace: 12. 3 2017.] <http://www.cslewis.com/us/>.
- Hooper, Walter. 2014.** *C. S. Lewis Apostle to the Sceptics*. Kindle. London : The Incorporated Catholic Truth Society, 2014.
- . **1996.** *C. S. Lewis, The Companion and Guide*. místo neznámé : Fount, 1996. 978-0006278009.
- . **1979.** *They Stand Together: The Letters of C. S. Lewis to Arthur Greeves*. London : Collins, 1979. p. 47.
- Hříbková, Lenka. 2009.** *Nadání a nadání*. Praha : Grada Publishing a.s., 2009. 978-80-247-1998-6.
- Jamieson, Alastair. 2008.** News/Religion. *Telegraph*. [Online] 2008. [Citace:] <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/religion/3536716/Secret-theme-behind-Narnia-Chronicles-is-based-upon-the-stars-says-new-research.html>.
- Keller, Timothy. 2017.** @DailyKeller. *Tim Keller Wisdom*. [Twitter]. 9. 6 2017.
- Keyes, Ralph.** The Post-Truth Era: Dishonesty and Deception in Contemporary Life. [Online] <http://www.ralphkeyes.com/the-post-truth-era/>.
- Kilby, Clyde S. 1977.** *The Longing for a Form: Essays on the Fiction of C. S. Lewis*. [editor] Peter J. Schakel. Kent, Ohio : The Kent State University Press, 1977.
- Knoblock, Joshua. 2013.** Why is it so difficult to teach 'Morality' and 'Values' in schools and other educational institutes? *Quora*. [Online] 11 2013. <https://www.quora.com/Why-is-it-so-difficult-to-teach-Morality-and-Values-in-schools-and-other-educational-institutes>.
- Lambert, Angela. 1994.** Independent, Lifestyle. *C. S. Lewis' other American*. [Online] 1994. [Citace: 13. 3 2017.] <http://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/c-s-lewiss-other-american-in-1954-walter-hooper-picked-something-up-he-hasnt-put-it-down-yet-angela-1427576.html>.
- Lewis, C. S. 1969.** *A Preface to Paradise Lost*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1969.
- . **2000.** *Essay Collection*. místo neznámé : Tausend edition, 2000. 978-0006281573.
- . **2014.** *God in the Dock*. Cambridge : Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2014. p. 244. 978-0802871831.
- . **1970.** *God in the Dock*. 1970.
- . **1966.** *Letters of C. S. Lewis (Edited with a Memoir)*. [editor] W. H. Lewis. New York : HARCOURT, BRACE & WORLD, 1966. 978-0156027977.

- , 1996. *Letters to Children*. [editor] Marjorie Lamp Mead Lyle W. Dorset. miesto neznámé : Pocket Books, 1996. 978-0684823720.
- , 2009. *Mere Christianity*. miesto neznámé : HarperCollins e-books, 2009. 978-0-06-194742-1.
- , 1964. *Poems*. [editor] Walter Hooper. London : Geoffrey Bless, 1964. B0014Z5NTI.
- , 2009. *Prince Caspian: The Return to Narnia*. Kindle. miesto neznámé : HarperCollins, 2009. B001I45UFW.
- , 2013. *Selected Literary Essays*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2013. 1107685389.
- , 2010. *Surprised by Joy*. miesto neznámé : William Collins, 2010. B004EEODII.
- , 2005. *The Collected Letters by C. S. Lewis*. San Francisco : Harper San Francisco, 2005. Letter to Anne Scott. 978-0060882280.
- , 2009. *The Abolition of Man*. miesto neznámé : HarperCollins e-books, 2009. ISBN 978-0-06-194912-8.
- , 2017. *The Four Loves*. San Francisco : HarperOne, 2017. 978-0062565396.
- , 1946. *The Great Divorce*. New York : Macmillan Publishing Co. Inc., 1946.
- , 2009. *The Last Battle*. Kindle. miesto neznámé : HarperCollins, 2009. 006447108X.
- , 2009. *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*. London : HarperCollins, 2009. Chapter 12, Peter's First Battle. 97800007325054.
- , 2009. *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader*. Kindle. miesto neznámé : HarperCollins, 2009. 0064471071.
- , 2001. *The Weight of Glory*. New York : HarperCollins, 2001. 978-0060653200.
- , 1980. *Till We Have Faces, A Myth Retold*. miesto neznámé : Harcourt Brace & Company, 1980. 978-0156904360.
- McGrath, Alister. 2013.** *C. S. Lewis: A Life: Eccentric Genius, Reluctant Prophet*. Kindle. miesto neznámé : Hodder & Stoughton, 2013. 978-1414339351.
- Mastin, Luke. 2008.** Philosophy basics. *Stoicism*. [Online] 2008. http://www.philosophybasics.com/branch_stoicism.html.
- Michelson, Paul E. 2008.** The Abolition of Man 1943 - 2008. *Inklings forever*. 2008, Sv. Volume VI.
- New International Version (NIV) Bible.** *John 14:6*. Sv. NIV.

- Olson, Lou. 1997.** Till Poems Have Faces. *Inklings Forever*. 1997, Sv. Volume I.
- Ritskes & Njoki. 2011.** Introduction. [autor knihy] Ali A. Abdi. *Spirituality, Education & Society*. Rotterdam : Sense Publishers, 2011.
- Root, Jerry. 2009.** *C. S. Lewis and a Problem of Evil: An Investigation of a Pervasive Theme*. Cambridge : James Clarke & Co., 2009. 9780227173381.
- Schakel, Petr J. 1984.** *Reason and Imagination in C. S. Lewis: A Study of Till We Have Faces*. místo neznámé : Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1984. 978-0802819987.
- Sauders, Paulette. 2012.** *Through the Lens of The Four Loves: The Idea of Love in Till We Have Faces*. Taylor University 2012. Upland : Frances White Ewbank Colloquim on C.S. Lewis&Friends, 2012.
- Sayer, George. 1997.** *Jack, A Life of C. S. Lewis*. London : Hodder and Stoughton Ltd, 1997. str. 441. ISBN: 0340690682.
- Sweis, Khaldoun A. 2014.** CS Lewis's The Four Loves—a humble summary. *Logically Faithful*. [Online] 5 2014. <http://www.logicallyfaithful.com/cs-lewiss-the-four-loves-a-humble-review/>.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Lesson Plan 1

Subject: ESL

Level: A2 – 8th - 9th Grade of Lower Secondary School

Time: 45 - 90 min

Aim: Reading: comprehension and pronunciation; Grammar: revising adjectives, learning about interjections, Speaking: describing a person; Crosscurriculum: raising curiosity/awareness about the author and/or a fantasy land called Narnia.

1. Warm up

- a. Look at the article – what is its title? (Introduction to the text)
- b. Who is it by? Who is the author? (Introduction to the text)
- c. Would you know what series this book belongs to? Have you read this or another series?
- d. What can you see in the picture? (Pupil uses: there is/are)
- e. Compare the picture to the title, elaborate on who might be the protagonist, antagonist and why.
- f. Describe one of the individuals according to the picture and try to guess their character, elaborate on the colours of the picture.

2. Read the text (teacher decides if text is read in pairs, groups or out loud for the whole class)

3. Vocabulary:

- a. Find 5 words you did not understand, compare with a partner and guess their meaning.

4. Comprehension check:

- a. How many characters do we come across in this part of the text?
- b. Where (what exact places) does the story start and end?
- c. Where did the characters meet? Did they know each other?

5. Grammar

- a. What do we use adjectives for? Where are they usually placed in a sentence?
Use green colour to highlight adjectives in the text – explain their meaning.
- b. What are interjections? Give examples in Czech. Do you use any English interjections in text messages/chats?
Use yellow colour to highlight interjections in the text – try to think of Czech equivalents.
- c. Look at your worksheet (Appendix 3), do you recognize any of the interjections?
Can you spell two of the interjections? Try to guess the pronunciation. Try to match the interjections with its meaning.

6. Skills / speaking

- a. Read the 4th paragraph again and try to draw the Faun according to the description.
- b. Swap drawings and try to describe your partner's Fauns.
Alternatively – teacher divides students into two teams, one team describes a drawing and the other listens and chooses the correct drawing (out of 5 – depending on the number of students in the team)

7. Conclusion

- a. What new word/grammar/idea/thing have you come across in today's lesson?
- b. Is it useful and how?

Appendix 2 – Lesson plan 1: The text

The Lion the Witch and the Wardrobe

by C.S. Lewis



“This must be a simply enormous wardrobe!” thought Lucy, going still further in and pushing the soft folds of the coats aside to make room for her. Then she noticed that there was something crunching under her feet. “I wonder is that more mothballs?” she thought, stooping down to feel it with her hand. But instead of feeling the hard, smooth wood of the floor of the wardrobe, she felt something soft and powdery and extremely cold. “This is very queer,” she said, and went on a step or two further.

Next moment she found that what was rubbing against her face and hands was no longer soft fur but something hard and rough and even prickly. “Why, it is just like branches of trees!” exclaimed Lucy. And then she saw that there was a light ahead of her; not a few inches away where the back of the wardrobe ought to have been, but a long way off. Something cold and soft was falling on her. A moment later she found that she was standing in the middle of a wood at night-time with snow under her feet and snowflakes falling through the air.

Lucy felt a little frightened, but she felt very inquisitive and excited as well. She looked back over her shoulder and there, between the dark tree trunks; she could still see the open doorway of the wardrobe and even catch a glimpse of the empty room from which she had set out. (She had, of course, left the door open, for she knew that it is a very silly thing to shut oneself into a wardrobe.) It seemed to be still daylight there. “I can always get back if anything goes wrong,” thought Lucy. She began to walk forward, crunchcrunch over the snow and through the wood towards the other light. In about ten minutes she reached it and found it was a lamp-post. As she stood looking at it, wondering why there was a lamp-post in the middle of a wood and wondering what to do next, she heard a pitter patter of feet coming towards her.

And soon after that a very strange person stepped out from among the trees into the light of the lamp-post.

He was only a little taller than Lucy herself and he carried over his head an umbrella, white with snow. From the waist upwards he was like a man, but his legs were shaped like a goat's (the hair on them was glossy black) and instead of feet he had goat's hoofs. He also had a tail, but Lucy did not notice this at first because it was neatly caught up over the arm that held the umbrella so as to keep it from trailing in the snow. He had a red woollen muffler round his neck and his skin was rather reddish too. He had a strange, but pleasant little face, with a short pointed beard and curly hair, and out of the hair there stuck two horns, one on each side of his forehead. One of his hands, as I have said, held the umbrella: in the other arm he carried several brown-paper parcels. What with the parcels and the snow it looked just as if he had been doing his Christmas shopping. He was a Faun. And when he saw Lucy he gave such a start of surprise that he dropped all his parcels.

“Goodness gracious me!” exclaimed the Faun.

Source: C. S. Lewis, *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*
Extract from Chapter 1: *Lucy Looks into a Wardrobe*

Appendix 3 – Lesson Plan 1 – Worksheet

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Aargh | Expression of displeasure, unhappiness |
| Cheers | Used as ‘thank you’ or as a toast |
| Oops | Reaction when something goes wrong |
| Yipee | Exclamation of celebration |
| Ouch | Exclamation of pain |
| Phew | Expresses relief at a positive situation |
| Eww | Something unpleasant, disgusting |
| Shh | An indication for silence |
| Uh-huh | Expressing agreement |
| Er | Not knowing what to say |
| Moo | Sound for a cow |
| Woof - woof | Sound for a dog |
| Oink - oink | Sound for a pig |
| Eeh - aah | Sound for a horse |
| Meow | Sound for a cat |
| Croak | Sound for a frog |

Appendix 3 – Lesson Plan 2

Subject: ESL

Level: A2 – 6th - 7th Grade of Lower Secondary School

Time: 45 - 135 min

Aim: Reading: comprehension; Speaking: communication; Cross-curriculum: drawing, video-making.

1. Introduction

- a. Look at the text – what is its title?
- b. Describe the picture to your partner.

2. Drama

- a. Students read the following extract in pairs after which the teacher goes through vocabulary and understanding with them.
- b. Teacher divides students into pairs and asks them to role-play the conversation incorporating the properties into the play.
 - i. Additionally: Students film themselves and make a short video.

3. Creating my world (Cross-curriculum)

a. Theatre properties (Art)

- i. Plan what requisites to make/use (one for background, one for each character)
- ii. Students are asked to draw, write or make a presentation about their imagery/ideal world or to make Narnia/space maps and name the countries/planets

b. **The outcome is displayed on a school board/web-pages.**

Appendix 3 – Lesson Plan 2: The text

The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe

by C.S. Lewis



“GOOD EVENING,” said Lucy. But the Faun was so busy picking up its parcels that at first it did not reply. When it had finished it made her a little bow.

“Good evening, good evening,” said the Faun.

“Excuse me - I don’t want to be inquisitive - but should I be right in thinking that you are a Daughter of Eve?”

“My name’s Lucy,” said she, not quite understanding him.

“But you are - forgive me - you are what they call

a girl?” said the Faun.

“Of course I’m a girl,” said Lucy.

“You are in fact Human?”

“Of course I’m human,” said Lucy, still a little puzzled.

“To be sure, to be sure,” said the Faun. “How stupid of me! But I’ve never seen a Son of Adam or a Daughter of Eve before. I am delighted. That is to say -” and then it stopped as if it had been going to say something it had not intended but had remembered in time.

“Delighted, delighted,” it went on. “Allow me to introduce myself. My name is Tumnus.”

“I am very pleased to meet you, Mr Tumnus,” said Lucy.

“And may I ask, O Lucy Daughter of Eve,” said Mr Tumnus, “how you have come into Narnia?”

“Narnia? What’s that?” said Lucy.

“This is the land of Narnia,” said the Faun, “where we are now; all that lies between the lamp-post and the great castle of Cair Paravel on the eastern sea. And you - you have come from the wild woods of the west?”

“I - I got in through the wardrobe in the spare room,” said Lucy.

“Ah!” said Mr Tumnus in a rather melancholy voice, “if only I had worked harder at geography when I was a little Faun, I should no doubt know all about those strange countries. It is too late now.”

“But they aren’t countries at all,” said Lucy, almost laughing. “It’s only just back there - at least - I’m not sure. It is summer there.”

“Meanwhile,” said Mr Tumnus, “it is winter in Narnia, and has been for ever so long, and we shall both catch cold if we stand here talking in the snow. Daughter of Eve from the far land of Spare Oom where eternal summer reigns around the bright city of War Drobe, how would it be if you came and had tea with me?”

“Thank you very much, Mr Tumnus,” said Lucy. “But I was wondering whether I ought to be getting back.”

“It’s only just round the corner,” said the Faun, “and there’ll be a roaring fire - and toast - and sardines - and cake.”

“Well, it’s very kind of you,” said Lucy. “But I shan’t be able to stay long.”

“If you will take my arm, Daughter of Eve,” said Mr Tumnus, “I shall be able to hold the umbrella over both of us. That’s the way. Now - off we go.”

And so Lucy found herself walking through the wood arm in arm with this strange creature as if they had known one another all their lives.

Source: C. S. Lewis, *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*
Extract from Chapter 2 – *What Lucy found there*

Resumé

Závěrečná práce se zabývá vztahem mezi logickým myšlením a představivostí autora C. S. Lewise (1898-1963). Jeho rozsáhlá sbírka literatury faktu společně s bohatým souborem beletrie odhaluje, že se spisovatel nebál kombinovat tyto dva pojmy a dokázal oslovovat své publikum celostně: jak kognitivně, emocionálně, tak i po duchovní stránce. Práce se zaměřila na rozbor dvou děl, a to fantasy románu *Lev, čarodějnice a skříň* (1950) a novely *Dokud nemáme tvář* (1956). Práce poskytuje autorův životopis a krátký úvod do každého díla. Nejen, že se zabývá racionálním významem příběhů, jejich událostmi, postavami, dialogy a symboly, ale nabízí i pohled na to, jak Lewis podává své racionální poznatky skrze příběh a jak skrze představivost přibližuje abstraktní ideje. Diplomová práce se dále zabývá přesahem do vzdělávání ve dvacátém prvním století, a to problémem spirituality a hodnot ve vzdělávání. Práce obsahuje dva plány výukových hodin postavených na textu z díla *Lev, čarodějnice a skříň*.

Annotation

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Jméno a příjmení: | Bc. Eva Hřibová |
| Katedra: | Ústav cizích jazyků |
| Vedoucí práce: | Mgr. Petr Anténe, Ph.D. |
| Rok obhajoby: | 2017 |

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Název práce: | Logické uvažování a představivost C. S. Lewise |
| Název v angličtině: | Reason and Imagination of C. S. Lewis |
| Anotace práce: | Závěrečná práce se zabývá vztahem mezi logickým myšlením a představivostí autora C. S. Lewise (1898-1963). Jeho rozsáhlá sbírka literatury faktu společně s bohatým souborem beletrie odhaluje, že se spisovatel nebál kombinovat tyto dva pojmy a dokázal oslovovat své publikum celostně: jak kognitivně, emocionálně, tak i po duchovní stránce. Práce se dále zabývá přesahem Lewisových myšlenek do vzdělávání ve dvacátém prvním století, a to problémem a hodnot ve vzdělávání. |
| Klíčová slova: | C. S. Lewis, hodnoty, spiritualita, vzdělávání, logické uvažování, představivost |
| Anotace v angličtině: | This thesis deals with the notions of reason and imagination in the work of a scholar, a teacher and a writer C. S. Lewis (1898 – 1963). His extensive non-fiction together with far-reaching fiction reveal that he was not at all afraid to combine the two concepts and to approach his audience holistically – cognitively, emotionally and spiritually. Drawing on the author’s message the thesis elaborates on the concepts of spirituality in education and values in education. |
| Klíčová slova v angličtině: | C. S. Lewis, spirituality, values, education, reason, imagination. |
| Přílohy vázané v práci: | 2x plán výukové hodiny angličtiny |
| Rozsah práce: | 77 |
| Jazyk práce: | Anglický jazyk |