The Charles Williams Society

NEWSLETTER

No. 34, SUMMER 1984

MEETINGS OF THE CHARLES WILLIAMS SOCIETY

IO November I984: Canon Raymond Hockley will speak on "Heavenly Exchange - an exploration into the theology of Charles Williams"

23 February I985: Joan Wallis will speak on "Charles Williams and the poets - Wordsworth".

II May I985: A.G.M. - location and speaker to be announced.

Meetings will be held at Liddon House, 24 South Audley Street, London W.I., starting at 2.30pm.

LONDON READING GROUP

No meetings have been fixed at the moment.

OXFORD READING GROUP

For details contact either Anne Scott (Oxford 53897) or Brenda Boughton (55589).

LAKE MICHIGAN AREA READING GROUP

For details contact Charles Huttar, I88 W.IIth St., Holland, Michigan 49423, USA. Telephone (6I6) 396 2260.

CENTENARY CELEBRATION

The centenary of CW's birth falls on 20 September I986. Your Society is making preparations to celebrate his centenary in at least four centres, London, Oxford, St Albans and USA.

In London we are in touch with both the BBC and Channel 4 about possible programmes and have ideas for a centenary lecture at King's College. In Oxford we hope to arrange a service on or close to his birth date at Holy Cross Church where CW worshipped while at Oxford and where his grave is. The Bodleian and OUP will be asked to join in with special exhibitions. By permission of the Dean of St Albans Cathedral, a commerative Eucharist will be held there at I2 noon on 24 May I986 followed by a reception in the new Chapter House. We hope to arrange a visit to St Albans School which CW attended and that there will be other events in St Albans during the year. The Society is negotiating for a memorial plaque to be affixed at the site of 36 Victoria Street , St Albans, where CW lived between I894 and I9I7.

In USA we shall ask the Curator of the Marion Wade Collection at Wheaton College to say in what way the centenary can be marked there.

A fitting celebration of the centenary and the provision of a plaque will cost money and the Council of the Society have decided to launch a special appeal to members for funds from I January I985 with an initial target of £500. Further details will be given in a later Newsletter.

The Council urgently requires help in organising publicity for the centenary. Would any member with experience in this field please get in touch with the Chairman.

I984 AGM

The AGM of the Society was held on Saturday 7 July I984 at Pusey House, Oxford. The main points of discussion were the plans for the Centenary as outlined above, and the possibility of a television programme on CW being shown on Channel 4. When presenting the accounts the Treasurer gave advanced warning that with the ever-rising printing and postage costs, it would be necessary to raise subscriptions next year. The Editor asked for any suggestions for improving the Newsletter to be sent to her. The eight Council members were re-elected for one year. The full minutes are available from the Chairman to any member.

SUBSCRIPTIONS I984-85

Members who have not yet paid their subscriptions for this financial year will find a reminder notice enclosed with this Newsletter. We would be grateful if you would respond to this.

NEW MEMBERS

A warm welcome is extended to the following:
Mrs Marilyn Hull, 90 Bournbrook Road, Selly Oak, Birmingham B29 7BU
Roger McDougie, 90I-B Avalon Road, Lawrence, Kansas 66044, USA
Ray Ware, 400 West Poppyfields, Altadena, California 9I00I USA
Simon Manley, 20 Ashley Road, Taunton, Somerset TAI 5BP
Wyatt A Paul, I24 Foxberry Road, Brockley, London SE4
John Withrington, I2 Park Street, Cambridge
Rev Canon Barrington-Ward, C.M.S., I57 Waterloo Road, London SEI 8UU

+ +

Members may be interested to read Gillian Lunn's thoughts on three books recently published that are relevant to CW. She says "three books have recently enthralled me. Stephen Knight's Arthurian Literature and Society (Macmillan I983, ISBN 0 333 30052 I. £20. 229pp.) aims specifically to be '... a history not of the legend itself, but of its integration in history .... to press it towards social relevance..' He uses several ancient texts, Malory, Tennyson's Idylls, Mark Twain's Connecticut Yankee at King Arthur's Court and some modern treatments of the Arthurian material. Naturally I turned quickly to the CW reference. It is a tribute to the great interest of Professor Knight's book that I enjoyed it a lot despite his very unsympathetic and inaccurate remarks on CW's life and poetry and despite an occasional infelicitous textual coarseness (e.g.: use of the word 'passion-play' on p.2II.
Beverly Taylor's & Elisabeth Brewer's evident enjoyment of their vast selection of texts is well-communicated in their erudite and delightful The Return of King Arthur. British & American Literature since I800 (D S Brewer, Barnes & Noble I983. ISBN 0 8599I I365. £19.50. 382pp.). Detailed and sympathetic study is made of CW's Arthurian poetry and War in Heaven. As it is presumably intended for 'the general reader' and they use the recent American compendium-edition of the poems - plus - Arthurian Torso it would perhaps be carping to object too strongly to the use of C S Lewis' ordering and interpretation as definitive. The indexing of these books must have been difficult. Knight praises two books in his introduction without publication details. Taylor & Brewer just give 'London' for the first editions of CW's works (and similarly sparse details for other authors') - but theirs is an enchanting book, I thought.
Martin Israel's The Spirit of Counsel. Spiritual Perspectives in the Counselling Process (Hodder & Stoughton I983. ISBN 0 340 287I5 2. £4.50 pbk. I92pp.) has no index. In his chapter 'Bearing One Another's Burdens' he writes of '... coinherence, to use a word beloved by Charles Williams', and there were parts of the book where CW's thoughts and ideas seemed absorbed and embedded in Dr Israel's profound but lucidly-expressed teaching of theories and practice of Christian spiritual healing."

+ +

Following the Society's I984 AGM, Rev Dr Ralph Townsend, Chaplain of Lincoln College, Oxford, gave the following talk which we are pleased to be able to reproduce.

Charles Williams and Lancelot Andrewes - Practitioners of the Prose of Belief.

Preface - I gave as the original title of this lecture 'Charles Williams and the Anglican Tradition'. When I came to look more closely at its sources, I felt it better to examine something more specific within the general area: for I was struck, when I came to it, by the correspondence in thought and expression between Williams and Lancelot Andrewes. They both seem to me to be concerned with matters of theology and their expression in such a way that their prose has a method and character distinctively Anglican. Their use of language and concept, methodical but not enslaved to system, produces what I shall call 'a prose of belief', a blend of the analytical and the poetic, the discursive and the contemplative.

That Charles Williams was a High Anglican in spiritual allegiance is a matter of fact. That he relates as a writer and thinker to the Anglican tradition must be a tentative proposition. This lecture is intended as an attempt to probe the idea. Glen Cavaliero in *Charles Williams - Poet of Theology* has explored the relationship between Williams as poet and Williams as theologian. It is of the connection between the poetic and the theological that Anglicanism has been self-consciously aware. The theology of the Caroline Divines manifests an intention to steer a middle course between Rome and radical Protestantism. This middle course was not in the nature of a compromise or of hesitation to commit themselves to conviction, but was governed by a positive determination to preserve the just balance between fundamentals and accessories which was threatened by an authority vested in the infallibility either of scripture or tradition. P E More, in *Anglicanism* (1935), ventures upon a further step in the definition of Anglicanism: if we are looking, he argues, for a single term to denote the ultimate law of Anglicanism, we cannot do better than refer to the title 'pragmatism'.

This pragmatism defends ideas as facts more real than the objects of nature by showing that there is a spiritual intuition larger than the realm of physical sensations. Such a pragmatism, More argues, applies to the Anglican ways of doing theology. The theologian must answer a series of prior questions. Did the person of Jesus ever live: was he born as our records assert and did he suffer death on the cross? Did he, again as the records assert, think and speak of himself as the Messiah, the Son of God? These plainly are questions of simple history the answers to which depend on the weighing of documentary evidence, exactly as in the case of any other recorded event of the past. To this extent the truth of the narrative may be granted without commitment to any supernatural creed. The real problem of Christianity begins with a question of a different order: when Jesus thought and spoke of himself as the Messiah, the Son of God, was he what he proclaimed himself to be or was he suffering a delusion? This also is a question of fact, *pragma*, but obviously the answer is to be sought otherwise than in the mere weighing of documentary evidence. We pass from the province of history to theology. All Christians believe in the actuality of this fact. Where Anglicans might be seen to differ from Roman Catholics and Calvinists is in their concern to justify belief by the pragmatic test of experience. Does it work? This is not to opt for unchecked individualism: personal experience is no more than a fragment of the larger experience of mankind, and must be controlled by the accumulated wisdom of the Church. But it is the Anglican way to ask the consequences of believing or not believing. How does acceptance of the doctrine of the Incarnation work out in practice?

The Anglican approach to Christian doctrine may be described as the insistence that the final and clinching proof of the Christian faith, which raises probability to certainty, for intellectual and simple alike, lies in verification through simple first-hand experience of God in Christ, and of Christ in the Church and the sacraments. It is not solely in the statement of dogmatic propositions that theology discovers itself, but in the authentication of these propositions in experience. It is perhaps for this reason that the Anglican tradition of theology discloses itself as much in poetry or in the prose of belief as in dogma, canon and systematic argument. For poetry and the prose of belief are organic in themselves, processes of reflective experience; personal, because they are the imaginative construction of the writer, yet incorporative in their appeal to a body of doctrine through which the human experience of God may be interpreted. The prose of belief is an uncovering of the process by which experience has passed into belief. The result of experience may be of such a kind as to bring the believer, writer and reader alike, to a conviction that doctrine is true. He may come to know by effects which leave for him no doubt that Christ in whom he trusts is not dead but living, and that faith has brought him into touch with fact. The prose of belief entails at once an unfolding of the writer's own self-persuasion to faith, and an invitation to the reader to give assent in faith by engagement in that process of persuasion and appeal to reflection upon his own experience. It is the individual's persuasion to the corporate truth of Christian tradition and doctrine.

The prose of belief, then, is the theme of this exploration of Charles Williams' identification with the theological tradition we call Anglican. It is not simply a matter of Williams' having been an Anglican, but that he approached doctrine, particularly the doctrine of the Incarnation, in a particular way. I shall compare Williams' He Came Down From Heaven, which is his most coherent working-out in prose of the implications of the doctrine of the Incarnation, with the sermons of a key figure in seventeenth-century Anglicanism, and in the whole of the Anglican tradition, those of Bishop Lancelot Andrewes. T S Eliot says of Andrewes' sermons that 'they rank with the finest English prose of their time, of any time'. Different as they were as men, different as their historical contexts were, their status as practioners of the prose of belief is at once a bond between them and a pointer to the character of the wider tradition to which they belong.

The doctrine of the Incarnation is a thing approached by Williams first and foremost as a mystery; a constructive, fulfilling mystery, not mystery as mere baffling wonder. Williams is aware that we cannot understand all that is involved in God being God, nor can we expect to understand why he is God or how he can succeed in being God. We must be content to accept the mystery of his being God, because we have kindled within us the faith and the awareness that he is God. Because he is concerned to have to do with us there are offered to us ways of understanding his reality, both that he is and also the true significance of his existence as far as we are concerned. We understand him not in the structure of his nature but in what he has done. So, Williams points out, the experience of pardon is a way into the reality of the Incarnation. Pardon, he says,

> 'is the name now given to the heavenly knowledge of the evil of earth; evil is known as an occasion of good, that is, love. It has always been so known on the side of heaven, but now it can be so known on the side of earth also. What mankind could not do, manhood did, and a manhood which was at the disposal of all men and women. It was therefore possible now for mankind itself to know evil as an occasion of heavenly love.'

We understand the mystery of the Incarnation as an unfolding of God's loving and responsible activity, 'not by infusing grace only, but by himself becoming what himself had made.' Lancelot Andrewes shares this powerful sense of the constructive mystery of the Incarnation. The theology of Anglicanism as we find it in the seventeenth century centres upon the idea of Christ as the head of redeemed humanity, of the Church as his body, of Christians as those who live in him. The purpose of God's taking flesh was that we might be incorporate in Christ. The nature of this mystery is one that effects a change in us. 'The manifestation of God in the flesh,' says Andrewes,

> 'the Evangelists set down by way of an history ... a man may hear a story, and never wash his hands, but a mystery requireth both the hands and the heart to be clean that shall deal with it.'

This is the mystery of glory which is the master-theme of the writings of Andrewes and Williams. For them the Incarnation is not the mystification arising from loose talk about love; still less is it the muddle arising from romantic escapism indulging in fantasies about love. It is concerned with the concrete presentation of the mystery which is love-in-action, seen in its fulness as the embodiment of the forgiving God in the crucified man, and experienced in its beginnings by every human being who has begun to share his or her essential reality with another in the first faltering steps of the interchange of love.

The essence of mystery, then, lies in a mutually-related pattern of giving and receiving. This pattern Williams called co-inherence, a theme of the writings of the Greek Fathers on the Trinity and in developing his principle of co-inherence he quarried the deep recesses of the doctrine of the Incarnation. Andrewes also enunciates a theology of co-inherence as a way at once of probing and preserving the mystery. Of the nativity he says this:

> 'And here now at his word, "made of a woman", He beginneth to concern us somewhat. There groweth an alliance between us; for we also are made of a woman. This now is full for the union with our own nature, to be "made of a woman".'

Co-inherence has to do with persons. The pattern of the human personalness of Jesus, God Incarnate, was determined by the obedience of love expressed in love. This was perfectly matched by the pattern of divine personalness which is transcendent love likewise expressed, in relation to history, as the service of love. The doctrine of the Incarnation, that Christ is two natures in one person, recognises that when the love of God and the love of man really get down to it they come to the same thing. Or rather, since love is so highly personal and personalness so bound up with love, when God, who is truly love, and man, who can find his true reality only in love, express their true selves in material history, it comes to the same person. Jesus Christ is the person who is the perfect pattern of personalness determined by the human service of love and the divine service of love. 'The union of history and the individual is', says Williams,

> 'like that of so many other opposites, in the coming of the kingdom of heaven, historic and contemporary at once. It was historic in order that it might always be contemporary; it is contemporary because it was certainly historic'.

Because we are confronted with the co-inherence of patterns of personalness, determined and defined by love, we encounter in the end a personal union. The mystery is perceived yet preserved. God is the loving man: the man is the loving God. Andrewes assembles the pattern of co-inherence thus:

> 'And now, if we will put together *natus* and *Servator*, *Servator* and *Christus*, *Christus* and *Dominus*, *Dominus* and *natus*; "born and Saviour, Saviour and Christ, Christ and the Lord, the Lord and born", take them which way you will in combination, any of the four, then we have his two natures in one Person. In *Servator*, His Godhead; none but God is a Saviour. In *Christus* His Manhood; God cannot be anointed, man may. In *Dominus*, His Divine again, "the Lord from Heaven". In *natus*, his human nature directly, born of a woman; both ever carefully joined, to be joined together.

We see here that the Incarnation reveals through perfect love the perfect interchange of existence which is the height and depth of personal union. The existence of Jesus Christ depends wholly on the living God, while the existence of Jesus is expressed wholly as the loving man. Williams projects this pattern of personal co-inherence expressed in the Incarnation into the collective human world:

> 'Into the chaotic experience of good as evil the first pattern of order is introduced; every man is to answer for the life of his brother. As the Omnipotence so limits man, it limits itself, and for the first time characterises itself by limitation - the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth.'

This makes it clear that it is perfectly possible for the reality of the transcendent God to be expressed as a function of, and in terms of, total involvement in the events of history. The principle of co-inherence holds together the transcendence and the immanence of God. Williams locates here an absolute definition of poetry:

> 'The union of flesh and spirit ... is credible everywhere; indeed, that union which so much poetry has desired to describe, is understood as more profound and more natural, than the dichotomy, of experience of expression, which has separated them. She is inclusive of both, and exclusive of their separateness'.

And so, 'it is a result of the Incarnation that opened all potentialities of the knowledge of the kingdom of heaven in and through matter'.

For both Andrewes and Williams, then, the mystery of the Incarnation is elucidated by a principle of co-inherence, of material and spiritual, immanence and transcendence. This leads them to another common theme, the experience of mystery evoked in worship. It is in worship that we are faced with both the offer and demand of transcendence, of the immeasurable distance which goes with the intimate closeness of the living God whose life is love. For both writers, worship is the way of experiencing the infinite openness of the possibilities of the personal. This openness is the practice of the response of love to the love of God, who in the infinite openness of his love is endlessly and gloriously worshipful. There is no end to the possibilities of being human, for the endless possibilities exist already in and as the glory of God. 'And what is it to worship?' asks Andrewes:

> 'Some great matter sure it is, that Heaven and earth, the stars and Prophets, thus do but serve to lead them and conduct us to. For we all see ends in *adorare* ... the Scripture and world are but to this end, that He that created the one and inspired the other might be worshipped ... *Tanti est adorare*. Worth the while, worth our coming, if coming we do but that, but worship and nothing else.'

Worship is different from mere ceremony. 'A ceremony', says Andrewes,

> 'represents and signifies, but works nothing; a mystery doth both. Beside that it signifieth, it hath its operation; a work it doth, else mystery is it none.'

Williams makes the same point when he suggests that the Bible 'is concerned with *what happened*, the Rituals with *what is happening*. There is a ceremony of word and movement, thought and language, invoking the experience of worship and belief. Religious prose runs parallel to liturgical worship, as Williams suggests in this passage: 'The "sweet reasonableness" of Christ is always there, but it is always in a dance, and its dancing hall is from the topless heavens to the bottomless abyss. Its balance is wholly in itself ...'.

In Andrewes' *adorare*, in Williams' dance, there is a contemplative gaze. There is a great deal that is to be said about belief, a great deal that is communicable, but the core of the matter is something you must apprehend for yourself. For belief is concerned neither exclusively with the truth of certain doctrines, nor with the validity of a certain way of life, but with the response of worship to the revelation of God's glory, a response that involves an orientation of our whole being, a way of life, and the articulation of that glory in what we call doctrine. Both Andrewes and Williams engage in a prose of contemplation, for it is in contemplation that belief and experience, theology and spirituality, co-inhere. Yet contemplation is not something acquired but given, our response to God's loving gaze, a gaze centred on and concentrated in the mysterious co-inherence of God in man, of life and death. For Williams it is again expressed in the image of movement:

> 'It is as if, from moment to moment, he withdrew and returned, swifter than lightning, known in one mode and another mode and always new ... the coming and the going one, the going and the coming one, and all is joy'.

It is only worship that can preserve the givenness, the prevenience, the reality of the Christ to whom we respond in love. Worship limits a tendency for Christ to become domesticated, one who is merely familiar, in the hearts of those who love him; and also a tendency for the prevenience of God's grace to become simply an abstract pre-supposition. God is not merely sovereign, but one who comes; he *has* come and *does* come. And what he was in Christ, self-emptying, defenceless, sustaining an irrevocable love for men, that he really is.

The life-giving mystery of the Incarnation, a mystery of co-inherence contemplated in worship, these themes demand of the writer a particular prose of belief which somehow demonstrates and contains within itself the contemplative ingredient of worship. Belief is not so much analytically and systematically proved as contemplatively received. This, I would suggest, is the approach to religious inquiry that characterizes the High Anglican tradition in which Andrewes and Williams think, feel and write. In his essay on Lancelot Andrewes, T S Eliot quotes F E Brightman on the structure of Andrewes' prayers:

> '... the structure is not merely an external scheme or framework: the internal structure is as close to the external. Andrewes develops an idea he has in mind: every line tells and adds something. He does not expatiate, but moves forward: if he repeats, it is because the repetition has a real force of expression; if he accumulates, each new word

> or phrase represents a new development, a substantive addition to what he is saying'.

Eliot provides a gloss on this in a well-known passage:

> 'Andrewes may seem pedantic and verbal. It is only when we have saturated ourselves in his prose, followed the movement of his thought, that we find his examination of words terminating in the ecstasy of assent. Andrewes takes a word and derives the world from it; squeezing and squeezing the word until it yields a full juice of meaning ...'.

In a passage which closely echoes this, Williams argues that in an approach to the study of the Bible

> 'it is precisely good literary criticism that is needed, for those of us who are neither theologians, higher critics, nor fundamentalists ... the illumination of phrase by phrase, by the discovery (without ingenuity) of complexity within complexity and simplicity within simplicity ... to extract the utmost meaning out of words.'

At the heart of this tradition is a concern for and awareness of the way in which language serves religious inquiry and communicates belief. Images, perhaps especially, as Andrewes and Williams suggest, the images of the Bible, are more than just concepts, to be apprehended by the analytic intellect alone. Andrewes' sermons demonstrate again and again that even the simplest words can operate on many levels at once - informative, emotive, evaluative - so that images touch the whole personality down to the very deepest levels of the psyche, and involve our bodily life as well. Religious language customarily comes to us in a context of actions loaded with significance; and we receive its meaning not just mentally but sacramentally. Andrewes is able to take the name of a place, for example, and give it elevated significance by associating it with Bread:

> 'We speak of the transeamus usque Bethlehem ... That we may even locally do and never go out of this room, in as much as here is to be had the "true Bread of life that came down from Heaven"... the Church in this sense is very Bethlehem no less than the town itself ... Not till this Bread was born there, which is Panis Angelorum ...'.

The images of religious language are also symbols of a larger non-verbal reality, and come alive only where that total reality is involved in our openness to the truths which they mediate. It is precisely because of this quality that religious language can exercise a healing and unifying influence on the whole personality and act as a means of grace.

It is clear from Williams' writing that he is aware of the difficulties of religious language. If we apply words to God in their ordinary literal sense, then we all too easily make God in our image and fall into idolatry; if we use them in an entirely different sense, then we have no reason for using one word rather than another, and we are lost in agnosticism. One way of handling this problem is to apply the principle of analogy to what we say about God. Williams does this in each of the seven essays of He Came Down From Heaven. Our ideas are based on the perfections and excellences we can see in God's finite creatures. It is because these are real perfections and excellences, reflecting and communicating something of the goodness and nature of God, that God is known to us at all. But in order to be able to apply these visible perfections to God, we must first remove from them all that belongs to them only on virtue of their finitude and creaturehood; and then the concept thus purified must be raised to be applicable to God. 'The God of nature', says Andrewes, 'is not bound to the rules of nature'. 'The kingdom came down', says Williams, 'and was incarnate; since then and perhaps (because of it) before then, it is beheld through and in a carnality of joy':

> 'The beloved - person or thing - becomes the Mother of Love; Love is born in the soul; it may have its passion there; it may have its resurrection. It has its own divine nature united with our undivine nature.'

It is in connection with this matter of the language of belief that Cavaliero makes one of his best insights into the theological books of Williams. 'To use doctrine as myth', he argues,

> 'is to put it to its proper use; it relates to the responsive imagination.

> He recognizes that people have an emotional need for metaphysics; but he insists that metaphysics, inevitably, involves the use of imagery. Like poetry, it is a way of seeing, not itself sight or knowledge'.

The essays in He Came Down From Heaven affirm that religious language must be poeti without suggesting that religious beliefs need have no definite content. To say that all religious language is inadequate, or to say that we are dealing with image and symbols of a transcendent and ultimately inexpressible reality, does not mean that anything goes. Williams is clear that doctrinal models are pointers, pointing in certain directions and not in others. We may not be able to gather all that they include, but we do know that there are quite a lot of things that they exclude

The mystery of the Incarnation, a pattern or ceremony of co-inherence, the Word making demands upon the language of belief: these draw from Andrewes and Williams a prose of belief. The prose of belief communicates a sense of the total mutual dependence of every aspect of reality, recognising the necessity of both a scientific (i.e. analytical) method and the findings of poetic intuition. In Cavaliero' words they 'will have no schism between the two, for both are methods of discriminating among connections which make reasoning life possible'. In the pattern of the Incarnation is ultimately an invitation to glory. Williams dedicates He Came Down From Heaven 'to Michal, by whom I began to study the Doctrine of Glory In the true worship of the true God which is the way to fulfilment, to the glory of man, grace must be scientific. We return to a theological tradition which is pragmatic. To be human and personal, as God is to be human and personal, is to be open to whatever is given, to all data. We are in the image of God, but this describes our potentialities more than our present realities. Our potentiality is glory. 'The word glory', says Williams,

> 'to English ears, usually means no more than a kind of mazy bright blur. But the maze should be, though it generally is not, exact, and the brightness should be that of a geometric pattern. It is this which becomes a kind of key problem - what is the web of the glory of heaven as a state? It may be said, roughly, that certain patterns in the web are already discernible; the recognition of the good, the reflection of power, the exercise of the intellec the importance of interchange, and a deliberate relation to the Centre ... knowledge of good, knowledge of joy. The glory is the goodness, but even the goodness is not he.'

We must not anthropomorphically think of God in our image. We must not be trapped in any symbol, picture or definition of God. The mystery of God is yet unfinished: we await the day of the Seventh Angel. 'Then shall the mystery be finished', says Andrewes, 'when He that was this day "manifest in the flesh", shall manifest to the flesh the fulness of his mystery, His eternity, glory and bliss'. The image we have of God, still less the image we have of ourselves, is never a decisive definition of God. Similarly, no present theory of the universe must finally shut in our understanding of that universe, of our place within it, and of the reality of the God who is making us for himself in and through the stuff of that universe. 'Glorify God with your bodies', preached Andrewes, 'for Christ hath now a body with which to do him worship with our bodies. Williams re-expresses this principle of carnality in his scheme of Romantic Love:

> 'Here, surrounded by angels, prophets, evangelists, virtues, Romantic Love is seen to mirror the Humanity and Deity of the Redeemer'.

'The glory is apt to dazzle the beholder', says Williams, 'unless he already has a mind disposed to examine the pattern of glory ... The effort after the pattern make the difference'. Theology is 'the effort after the pattern', the communicati of the prose of belief. The mind disposed to examine the pattern must be at once scientific and poetic, in a word, theological. Such minds we find in Andrewes and Williams. Theirs is a prose of belief which insists that we must not be trapped in mythology, theory or fragmentation: rather, we must seize an opportunity of hopefu openness to the future, in the development of science and in the loving development of personalness. The prose of belief is in the end an invitation to the worship of the transcendent God in dependence upon the immanent God. The key signature of He Came Down FromHeaven is Glory, for glory is the ambience of the Incarnation.

Andrewes boldly signs the stave of the sermons on the Nativity:

> 'Glory to be first, and then Peace. There is much in the order. Glory to be first, else you change the clef, - the clef is in Glory, that the key of the song ... no Pax in terris, unless it be first considered how it will stand with Gloria in excelsis.'

We may, even after force of argument, analytic and poetic, of the prose of belief, wish to ask, 'what does Andrewes mean? What does Williams mean?' This is what we should ask, and what we must always ask, for Andrewes and Williams have not dissolved the mystery. If it is true that the fulfilment of our human personalness lies in union with the personalness of God, then we can never in this life suppose that we have reached the end of meaningfulness. The Incarnation of God is a sufficient statement of our hope and definition of our direction. As Williams put it:

> 'The appearance of the glory is temporary; the authority of the glory towards pure love is everlasting; the quality of the glory is eternal, such as the heavens have in Christ'.

I have established, I hope, that there is a definite relationship between the religious prose of Lancelot Andrewes and Charles Williams. There may even be a direct influence. The relationship suggests a common theological tradition, the character of which discloses itself particularly in their approach to the doctrine of the Incarnation. Theirs is a way of doing theology which at once probes and preserves mystery; understands divine creation through a principle of co-inherence; expresses itself in worship and contemplation, aware of the limitations of religious language; and which sets as its goal a vision of the glory of God in man and man in God. This service they perform as practitioners of the prose of belief.

+ +

In April 1984 Corbin Carnell, Professor of English at the University of Florida, spoke to the Society on The Friendship of C S Lewis and Charles Williams: Its Felicity, Small Tensions, and Literary Benefits, and we are very pleased to be able to reproduce his talk in the Newsletter.

In Anglo-Saxon cultures men rarely have close friendships among themselves in the manner in which women do. Men are business associates, academic colleagues, sports partners but seldom just friends who build a close association based on intellectual and spiritual sharing. This is not to say such exchange need be self-conscious or mawkishly reflective. C S Lewis writes in his essay on Friendship in The Four Loves:

> 'Lovers are always talking to one another about their love; Friends hardly ever about their Friendship. Lovers are normally face to face; Friends, side by side, absorbed in some common interest.'(1).

And it was common interests which drew together C S Lewis - an Oxford don literary critic, and Christian apologist - and Charles Williams - editor for the Oxford University Press, novelist and poet. In March 1936, when Lewis was 37 and Williams was 49, the two men discovered each other's work and exchanged letters, Lewis thanking Williams for his novel The Place of the Lion, and Williams thanking Lewis for his study of medieval tradition The Allegory of Love. Lewis was drawn to the beauty and mystery of hierarchy and Platonic order in Williams' thought and Williams was drawn to Lewis' attempts to be theological about romance. When Williams replied to Lewis' letter about The Place of the Lion, he wrote:

> 'My dear Mr Lewis, if you had delayed writing another 24 hours our letters would have crossed. It has never before happened to me to be admiring an author of a book while he was at the same time admiring me. My admiration for the staff work of the Omnipotence rises every day. To be exact, I finished on Saturday morning looking - too hastily - at proofs of your Allegorical Love Poem [published as The Allegory of Love] I regard your book as practically the only one that I have ever come across, since Dante, that shows the slightest understanding of what

> this very special identity of love and religion means. As to your letter, what can I say? The public for these novels has been so severely limited (though I admit in some cases passionate) that it gives me very high pleasure to feel that you liked the Lion. You must be in London sometimes. Do let me know and come and have lunch or dinner. Very gratefully yours, Charles Williams.' (2).

This exchange of letters, almost crossing in the mail, which some Jungians would call a divine synchronicity, sets the tone of the friendship: appreciation, rejoicing in shared ideas, and high civility. The two men did soon meet for lunch in London and Lewis wrote to Arthur Greeves, his friend in Belfast, that Williams 'emanates more love than any man I have ever known ... He sweeps some people quite off their feet and has many disciples. Women find him so attractive that if he were a bad man he could do what he liked as a Don Juan or a charlatan.'(3). On the subject of CW's many female friends, it is interesting to see his comment to his wife Michal, written after he had developed a circle of male friends at Oxford: 'Am I only to be followed by the feminine? No; you will be attended - you - by the masculine minds: great minds, strong males, brothers of our energy - those who know our work - Lewis and Tolkien ...'(4). This letter written at least three years after Williams and Lewis met shows how much Williams had come to value Lewis' friendship and there is ample evidence of how much Lewis enjoyed Williams'. There were many things upon which they agreed, as if by some miracle two from such different backgrounds could somehow have discovered independently the same pair of lenses with which to view the world. Lewis was from Belfast and had spent most of his adult life as student and teacher at Oxford. Williams had grown up in St Albans and London, had no higher education degrees and had worked since his youth in the publishing business. Lewis was still a bachelor and Williams was married, with one son; Lewis was a great lover of nature and Williams a great lover of cities, especially London. And there were tensions in their outlooks - they didn't agree on everything - which I will explore later in this paper. Yet their friendship thrived.

Because Williams died after the two men had known each other for only nine years (from 1936 to 1945), we have more commentary on Williams by Lewis than on Lewis by Williams. That commentary illuminates some of their profoundest ideas.

Fortunately for the friendship Williams was transferred by the Oxford University Press to Oxford in September of 1939 because of the nightly bombings of London. And Williams had a chance to develop friendships not only with Lewis and Tolkien but with Hugo Dyson, W H Lewis (C S Lewis' brother), Fr. Gervase Mathew, the Lewis family doctor, R E Harvard, and others who made upon the group who called themselves the Inklings. They met on Tuesday mornings at the Eagle and Child pub in Oxford and then in Lewis' big sitting room at Magdalen College on Thursday evenings. Humphrey Carpenter observes that in the weekly gatherings of the Inklings, Williams found himself for the first time in many years 'arguing and discussing in the company of men who were his equals as debaters'.(5). Indeed, Williams sometimes found himself talking to people whose knowledge was often greater than his own. In the introduction to Essays Presented to Charles Williams, where Lewis writes about Williams in affectionate detail, he says that though Charles 'talked copiously one never felt that he had dominated the evening', that Williams would always stand in Lewis' mind as a 'cheering proof of how far a man can go with few languages and imperfect schooling. On the ancients and on the early Middle Ages there were one or two present with whom he could not compete, nor had he an exact knowledge of any of the great philosophers: but in history, theology, legend, comparative religion and (above all) English literature from Shakespeare down, his knowledge was surprising ... He delighted to repeat favorite passages, and nearly always both his voice and the context got something new out of them'.(6). Both Lewis and Williams were adept at reciting long passages from a wide variety of poetry. Lewis speakes of himself as having been the chief 'conduit' of passages in the Inklings till Williams joined the group.

It is all the more unfortunate that we have so little in the way of comment on Lewis by Williams because Lewis was on his side most generous and appreciative. In the Festchrift he writes that Williams was a true genius, who looked when he was speaking like 'masculine angel, a spirit burning with intelligence and charity'. He also says Williams 'was a man fitted by temperament to live in an age of more elaborate courtesy than our own. He was nothing if not a ritualist. Had modern society permitted it he would equally have enjoyed kneeling and being knelt to, kissing hands, and extending his hand to be kissed ... But ... even while watching such high pomps, he would have been aware of them as a game'.(7). On those rare occasions when Williams didn't show up for a gathering of the Inklings, Lewis says 'it became clear that some principle of liveliness and cohesion' was missing. 'Lacking him, we did not completely possess one another'. While others have spoken of Lewis as the leader of the Inklings, it is significant that Lewis saw Williams as the catalyst. Williams, he says, was 'in the Coleridgean language ... an esemplastic force'.(8). This catalyst- like tendency in the two men is related to the fact that both were highly gifted teachers who operated in different styles but with a dedication and care for those they taught. Both believed that philosophical and religious studies need to be done with some involvement of heart and will and not as mere research. Both believed that there are metaphors and images which seem to come to us from early life and which prove fundamental in verbalizing or conceptualizing the deeper experiences, especially religious experience. Both believed in 'the feeling intellect' of Wordsworth's phrase, though as will be later developed, Lewis went for a different kind of clarity than did Williams.

Tolkien seems not to have responded to Williams' ideas with the same warmth Williams held for Tolkien. (Tolkien was evidently not easily affected by others; as Lewis once observed, 'No one ever influenced Tolkien - you might as well try to influence a bandersnatch').(9). One still gets the impression that Williams was genuinely appreciated by the Inklings, perhaps in part because of Lewis' response to C.W. Characteristically, Lewis comments in his essay on Friendship, 'In each of my friends there is something that only some other friend can fully bring out ... Now that Charles is dead, I shall never again see Ronald's reaction to a specifically Caroline joke. Far from having more of Ronald, having him "to myself" now that Charles is away, I have less of Ronald. Hence true Friendship is the least jealous of loves. Two friends delight to be joined by a third, and three by a fourth'.(IO). The Inklings were indeed a cohesive, merry group and it is no wonder Lewis came to think of 'we few' against the world, to believe that as long as one had a few good friends, the insensitivity or even abuse of the power structure and other vicissitudes could be borne. Lewis, in the I940s especially, seemed to feel embattled at Oxford, because his theological interests and some of his literary interests were not acceptable to his colleagues (and probably because he was not adept at academic politics). He found in Williams a friend, not from Academe, who shared many of his convictions and whose company he enjoyed immensely. It must have given Lewis great pleasure to see Williams invited to lecture at Oxford from time to time and to see him who had spoken so memorably on Milton awarded an honorary MA by Oxford. But the camaraderie he enjoyed with the group was not the greatest benefit of the Inklings to Lewis. This group whose original nucleus had been a weekly meeting of Lewis and Tolkien was important in developing two friendships which were to influence Lewis' thought - the friendship of Tolkien and of Williams. (Owen Barfield was an important friend to Lewis but Barfield was seldom at gatherings of the Inklings since he lived in London.) Lewis wrote in The Four Loves: 'Friendship arises out of mere Companionship when two or more of the companions discover that they have in common some insight or interest or even taste which the others do not share and which, till that moment, each believed to be his own unique treasure (or burden). The typical expression of opening Friendship would be something like,"What? You too? I thought I was the only one".'(II). With Tolkien Lewis explored the nature of myth and its relation to Christianity (Carpenter discusses this ongoing exchange in ch.4 of Tolkien). With Williams Lewis was preoccupied with being theological about Romance and with Williams' idea of the Co-inherence. The task of the next section of this paper is to explore these and other key ideas which Lewis and Williams share and to suggest ways in which their work may have been improved by their friendship.

When Charles Williams moved to Oxford in 1939, Nevill Coghill observes that Williams and Lewis 'quickly became fast friends: they seemed to live in the spiritual world'. Coghill believes that Williams was the only one of the Inklings, except perhaps Ronald Tolkien, from whom Lewis 'learnt any of his thinking'.(12). Williams read aloud to Lewis and Tolkien in Lewis' rooms at Magdalen College from his commentary on his Arthuriad - two of the five chapters of The Figure of Arthur. Lewis dedicated his Preface to Paradise Lost to Williams and Williams dedicated The Forgiveness of Sins (published in 1942) to the Inklings. The two men continued to meet at least once or twice a week for the five and a half years that Williams lived in Oxford.

They believed similarly about many things, not the least of which was the theory of Platonic forms as a basis for thought, art, and language. Lewis wrote in Arthurian Torso:

> 'For Williams, as for Plato, the phenomenal world - the world studied by the sciences - is primarily a reaffirmation or copy or adaptation of something else.' (13).

Robert Houston Smith believes that through Williams Lewis came to a richer awareness of the relevance of Platonism for his Christian world view, that under Williams' influence Lewis' earlier love of Platonic thought and the influence of Barfield on Lewis 'came to fruition'. (14). This seems accurate but it is also important to say that even as a young don, Lewis had come under the spell of the Greene-Bradley type of Hegelianism which owes much to Plato. It is true, however, that some of Lewis' most stirring affirmations of the Platonic order come in The Silver Chair, chapter 12, which is entitled "The Queen of Underland" and in The Last Battle, chapter 13, "How the Dwarfs Refused to be Taken In". (15). These were written after Lewis had come to know Williams. Smith says Lewis enfolded Platonism into his Christianity, not simply as an intellectual system but as 'a satisfying window upon reality'. It is observable not only in the Narnian tales but also in the space trilogy.

Certainly this same Platonism is visible in Williams' The Place of the Lion and All Hallow's Eve and, in fact, in one way or another, taken almost for granted in much of his work. Does Williams get this understanding from the English Romantics, especially Wordsworth and Coleridge? Wherever he gets it, it is as important in his thought as it is in Lewis' - almost a kind of 'common sense' whereby one approaches phenomenal reality.

Aside from Plato, there were other common influences: first, Dante (as a young man Lewis had taught himself Italian in order to read Dante and Williams had plunged deep into Dante's world as a consequence of reading proofs of a new translation of The Divine Comedy). Second, William Law - both men quote from him. And third, Julian of Norwich. And Glen Cavaliero lists these and a fourth theological master of Williams, William Blake, (15) though Blake was of less interest to Lewis. Both friends were persons in whom thinking and feeling were so well fused that they moved easily among works of devetional, expository and narrative literature. Furthermore, because of this fusion and their interest in the will, they have a way of addressing the reader at a deep level without the reader feeling 'preached at'. They accepted Classical Christianity, as Alice Mary Hadfield says of Williams, 'not for the joy it brought him, or for any consolation, but that he found it alone existing and operating in every extremity'. (17). Lewis makes a similar point in Surprised by Joy when he describes his conversation as that of one who approached Christianity reluctantly and forlornly but who was led toward it nonetheless through seeking to be intellectually honest. Williams saw Christian belief 'as the necessary accommodation of the self to the fact' and Lewis spoke of having to acknowledge the truth, even when it is found in religion.

In addition to their Platonism and Classical Christianity, both authors sought to be theological about romance. For Williams the Beatrician Moment was a genuine awakening both to Woman and to God. It seemed to be one of God's ways of connecting His world, enabling the person to be more open to divine love through attending in a good way to the reality of another. Lewis develops a similar idea, clearly under Williams' influence, in the new relation of Mark and Jane at the end of That Hideous Strength and in A Grief Observed. (I8). Furthermore, as Lewis says in Arthurian Torso: 'The Beatrician experience may be defined as the recovery (in respect to one human being) of that vision of reality which would have been common to all men in respect to all things if Man had never fallen'. (I9). Lewis says that Williams believes this experience is what it professes to be. 'The "light" in which the beloved appears to be clothed is true light; ... in her (at that moment) Paradise is actually revealed, and in the lover Nature is renovated.' (20). The danger, of course, is that the lover will take this vision to be not the inception of a journey but rather the Goal, that he will mistake the vision of Paradise for arrival there.' When the vision of romantic love is thus absolutized, one finds all sorts of profanations and lust. Lawrence Wentworth in Descent into Hell wanted Adela on his own terms and thereby lost the true Adela. While it can be argued that Wentworth never experienced the true Beatrician moment, I would maintain that he experiences a perverted form of it. In any event, Lewis and Williams agree that the misuse of the Beatrician moment can lead to self-indulgence and the lustful use of the imagination.

Lewis develops a similar point in chapter II of The Great Divorce, where lust in the guise of a red lizard is finally killed and thereby becomes a magnificent stallion. The narrator's guide tells him: 'Flesh and blood cannot come to the Mountains. Not because they are too rank, but because they are too weak. What is a lizard compared with a stallion? Lust is a poor, weak, whimpering thing compared with that richness and energy of desire which will arise when lust has been killed.' (2I). The Beatrician Moment is also like Lewis' concept of Sehnsucht, that bittersweet longing which leads the soul from one experience to another, searching for the Blue Flower, the Greener Hills, the Well at the World's End. Both experiences lead the seeker to move through beauty toward God.

There are other ideas in Williams' fiction especially which show up in Lewis' fiction. Tolkien once complained that though Lewis was a good friend, 'he borrows, he borrows', referring to Lewis' tendency to lift names and story ideas from his friends' narratives and adapt them for his own use. (Humphrey Carpenter shows how Lewis' choice of the names Elwin (first name of Ransom), Tor and Tinidril in Perelandra, and Numimor all echo Tolkien's name creations. (22). In Lewis' writings there are specific Christian ideas also developed by Williams: i. Nature and Arch-Nature, which I have already dealt with in the discussion of Platonism, ii. the Terrible Good, iii. the double nature of every person, iv. being romantic in theology and theological about romance. Lewis also understood Williams' teaching about the Way of the Rejection of Images and the Way of the Affirmation of Images. But all these ideas are also part of Classical Christian tradition and while Williams no doubt pointed them up for Lewis, it is quite possible Lewis would have been drawn to them on his own.

In terms of Williams' influence on the somewhat younger Lewis it should be pointed out that Lewis unabashedly and gratefully made use of the following in That Hideous Strength: i. the idea of the inconsolable wound, found in

Williams' Arthuriad and used by Lewis to describe his hero Ransom; ii. the notion of Britain and Logres (explained in Hadfield, p. 162); iii. the theological thriller quality of the third novel in Lewis' space trilogy, different from Out of the Silent Planet and Perelandra in that That Hideous Strength has a contemporary, this-worldly setting; iv. the Williams-like multiple plot lines and shifts of scene not found in Lewis' earlier fiction; v. the character of Jane Studdock, depicted in a way similar to Williams' female characters (Lewis had not earlier described a female character of any significance if we omit the allegorical Green Lady in Perelandra); vi. Jane's dreams, which have a clairvoyant quality, similar to Margaret Anstruther's perceptions in Descent into Hell. (For some of these ideas on That Hideous Strength I am indebted to a conversation with Charles Huttar and Peter Schakel.)

Perhaps the idea for which Lewis is most clearly indebted to Williams is the notion of Co-inherence or Substituted Love. This idea is explained in part in chapter 6 of Williams' Descent into Hell where Peter Stanhope offers to carry Pauline's fear and tells her that she must carry someone else's burden. The idea is implicit in much that Williams wrote and it is significant that in response to his friends' pressure to form an order concerned with Williams' idea of Co-inherence, Substitution, and Exchange, Williams wrote seven sentences describing this teaching (to be found in Hadfield, p. 174). He also dedicated The Descent of the Dove (1939) to the Companions of the Co-inherence. This doctrine made a deep impression on Lewis. He understood that Co-inherence is not simply comforting and reassuring, but that it indeed underscores the tragic unity of humankind. As Lewis writes in Arthurian Torso:

> 'Who can seek the Grail without damaging the Round Tale? ("Son, why hast thou thus dealth with us?") The tragic unity of Man decrees that the sanctification of each should be costly not only to Christ, not only to his fellow Christians, but more bewilderingly, to those whose shattered parental ambition or wounded natural affection reproach him with dumb pain and total misunderstanding - Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us?' (23).

In That Hideous Strength the group at St. Anne's is a real community of exchange whereas the group at Belbury, the N.I.C.E., are a parody of community, with their 'elastic' authority, unclear lines of responsibility, and selfish deceit. In the Narnia tales characters learn to give of themselves for others. In The Voyage of the Dawn Treader Lucy ventures into the Magician's room to free the Monopods (chapter 11); Prince Caspian sails to the world's end to break the spell on the three sleeping lords (chapter 13). In The Silver Chair Puddleglum burns himself voluntarily in order to break the spell wrought by the Queen of Underland. In Till We Have Faces Orual and Psyche find a unity in suffering and Orual is brought to truer selfhood as she participates in the miracle of Co-inherence at the end of the novel.

It should be added that Williams' understanding of Co-inherence was not just a literary idea to Lewis. Nevill Coghill tells of how Lewis, believing that one had the power, through Christian love, to accept into one's body the pain of someone else, was allowed to ease the suffering of his wife, a cancer victim. In speaking to Coghill of his happy marriage Lewis was to tell him of being allowed to accept Joy's pain. "You mean", said Coghill, "that the pain left her, and that you felt it in your own body?" "Yes," Lewis had said, "in my legs. It was crippling. But it relieved hers." (24).

In Arthurian Torso Lewis summarises Williams' understanding of the great web of exchange thus: In the Co-inherence there are three degrees of membership: first, those who live 'by a frankness of honourable exchange' on the social and economic level, 'those, in fact, who willingly accept and honourably and happily maintain that complex system of exchanged services on which society depends.' Second, those who practice Substitution as Williams explained it in He Came Down from Heaven and illustrated it in Descent into Hell: 'silently, secretly, "wary of much chatter" (Williams' phrase), with a certain shyness and yet, in the last resort, "neither ashamed of taking nor chary of giving."' (again Williams' phrase). And on the third, highest level, some people experience

> 'above and beyond particular substitutions, that total reciprocity or Co-inherence which first exists in the Blessed Trinity and descends thence into Man who was made in the image of the Trinity and is lost in Man by the Fall and restored to Man by 'the one adored substitution of Christ.' What the Co-inherence means is best seen in the instance of the Blessed Virgin: Christ is born(and borne) of her; she is born (and borne) of Christ. So in humanity as a whole there is not merely an interchange of symmetrical relations (as when, A being the brother of B, B is also the brother of A) but of those unsymmetrical relations, which seem incompatible on the level of 'rational virtue'. Each is mother and child, confessor and penitent, teacher and pupil, lord and slave to the other. Each is his neighbour's priest - and victim.'(25).

This understanding is perhaps Williams' greatest gift to Lewis. Now in the last and briefest section of this paper I would like to examine some of the significant differences between these two friends with a word on literary benefits.

Someone has said there can be no true fellowship without differences, that indeed without differnces, friendships can deteriorate into self-admiration and narcissism. The friendship between Lewis and Williams was rich enough to include differences. First, Williams had a larger range of tastes and interests, at least in some directions which Lewis treated with indifference or outright rejection. Williams enjoyed modern poetry more, while Lewis disliked anything like "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock" and such poets as Ezra Pound. Williams was one of the first people in England to appreciate Kierkegaard while Lewis said that reading Kierkegaard was like walking in sawdust. Williams was interested in the work of D H Lawrence while Lewis regarded some of Lawrence's fiction as the effluent of a fertility cultus. Yet Lewis says in Arthurian Torso that Williams has a higher view of the body than that which influenced his own Allegory of Love and seems to regret some of what he had written of the sensual and supersunsual. (p.I9I). Williams was much more interested in the occult than was Lewis, who while he admired the best of Paganism, tended to be cool toward both white and black magic. Lewis was also less interested in semi-private symbolism and esoteric imagery and hence was less drawn to Blake and Yeats than was Williams. As Lewis himself wrote of Williams in the Festschrift:

> 'He excelled at showing you the little grain of truth or felicity in some passage generally quoted for ridicule, while at the same time he fully enjoyed the absurdity: or, contrariwise (he excelled also) at detecting the little falsity or dash of silliness in a passage which you, and he also admired. He was both a "debunker" and ... a "rebunker". (26).

Williams was thus either a man of somewhat wider sympathies than Lewis or a thinker whose ironic intelligence kept him from too easily dismissing something of possible value. Lewis, while far from being a snob, could be quite terse in giving short shrift to what he did not like.

Second, Williams was in many respects a High Church mystic, for whom the

Blessed Virgin, consciousness of the sacramental, and ecclesiastical history were all very important. Lewis, on the other hand, remained clearly the Ulster Protestant, not much at home with ritual, hymns and church-going. He had what he called a gaucherie in some aspects of worship, something which he saw as a defect in himself. But on the subject of the advantages of 'mere Christianity' Lewis speaks clearly. One can study his work in great detail and not find in it any pronouncements on what he regarded as the peripheral issues: church government, a fixed interpretation of the Eucharist, the role of the Blessed Virgin, mode of baptism. Lewis sticks with remarkable self-control to what he sets out in Mere Christianity as the primary doctrines on which most Christians have agreed through the centuries. (There is one exception, his essay raising questions about the ordination of women.)

Third, Williams' vision is probable a bit less sanguine than Lewis'. In some ways, Williams seems to have had a more skeptical mind. Alice Mary Hadfield records his temperamental disinclination to believe in immortality and his statement that 'it is in the Gospels that all the really terrifying attacks on the Gospel lie' (e.g., Jesus' comment on Judas: it were good for that man if he had not been born). (27). And Lewis writes of Williams' preoccupation with the darker side of things:

> 'It one of the many paradoxes in Williams that while no man's conversation was less gloomy in tone - it was, indeed a continual flow of gaiety, enthusiasm, and high spirits - no man at times said darker things. He never forgot the infinite menaces of life, the unremitted possibility of torture, maiming, madness, bereavement, and (over all) that economic insecurity which, as he said in War in Heaven, poisons our sorrows as well as modifying our joys. (28).

Lewis goes on to say that Charles Williams did not believe that God wanted that

> 'frightened, indignant, and voluable creature (i.e., his doubting self) to be annihilated; or even silenced. If it wanted to carry its hot complaints to the very Throne, even that, he felt, would be a permitted absurdity. For was not that very much what Job had done? ... Job's impatience had been approved. ... The weight of the divine displeasure had been reserved for the "comforters, ... the sort of people", he said, immeasureably dropping his lower jaw and fixing me with his eyes - "the sort of people who wrote books on the Problem of Pain." (29).

In a review in Theology of Lewis' book, The Problem of Pain, Williams had written: 'All my own emotions rebel against the pattern of this book. I do not want to be shown that pain is, or may be, a good; that (given our present state) its inevitability is good.' (30).

Lewis can also record his dark thoughts, as when in bereavement over the death of his wife Joy, he wrote A Grief Observed. But even when he had Orual cry out against the gods in Till We Have Faces, her honesty compels her to write: 'I saw well why the gods do not speak to us openly, nor let us answer. Till that word can be dug out of us, why should they hear the babble that we think we mean? How can they meet us face to face till we have faces?' (31). Both writer's outlook could be characterized as both severe and sanguine, but I give a slight edge to Lewis on sanguinity.

A fourth and final tension in the thought of the two men has to do with the kind of clarity they sought. It seems to me that though both delighted in certain kinds of argument, Lewis for the careful distinctions of the debater and the teacher, while Williams goes for the clarity of the poet. When Williams read his nativity play, The House by the Stable, to the Inklings in late 1939, Lewis remarked that it was 'unusually intelligible' for Williams. And Lewis once said of his cherished friend: 'He is largely a self-educated man, laboring under an almost oriental richness of imagination'. (32). And in his conclusion to Arthurian Torso Lewis says that as much as he loves Williams' Arthuriad, he must admit it suffers from obscurity and lack of shared background. He also mentions having contended with Williams about syntactical obscurity. Lewis was willing to go out of his way to be clear. He even added running headlines to each page of a new edition of his Pilgrim's Regress in order that the reader is able to follow. And he abridged That Hideous Strength down to two-thirds of its length for an extra edition which might attract a different set of readers. Cavaliero observes that while Lewis is clearly the teacher in his writings, in Williams' work 'the Christian myth is undisguisedly the theme: all his writing springs from his assent to it. And this assent, being imaginative as much as intellectual, both energizes the work ... and also prevents it from being directed at the reader'. (33). Thus one could argue that the kind of clarity Williams aims for will include some obscurity partly because his imagination is so bent on 'energizing the work' (to use Cavaliero's phrase) and maybe some obscurity is a small price to pay in order to avoid a heavy didacticism.

It is difficult to say how Williams would have been different without Lewis' friendship, but it seems clear that were it not for Williams' influence, Lewis would have been a narrower thinker. I should also add that the earlier influence of the 19th century Scottish writer, George MacDonald, on Lewis also broadened his outlook. Both MacDonald and Williams helped to prevent Lewis from being too ardent a rationalist and both helped him become a more compassionate thinker. (Of course, it can be argued that Lewis might have taken the broader, more mystical direction anyway. Other thinkers - Plato, Aquinas and Spinoza among them - have begun as rationalists and ended as mystics.)

So much for some key differences in Williams and Lewis. However deeply these were felt, it is clear that these two friends encouraged each other as writers. Lewis seems to seize any opportunity he gets to commend Williams' work to others and it is possible that Williams also commended Lewis' work to others. Of Williams' death Lewis says:

> 'This experience of loss was "the greatest I have yet known. ... No event has so corroborated my faith in the next world as Williams did simply by dying. When the idea of death and the idea of Williams thus met in my mind, it was the idea of death that was changed"'.(34)

I would like to conclude this paper with the poem Lewis wrote in tribute to his friend. It is written, either deliberately or unconsciously, in a style reminiscent of Williams' own and it bespeaks the deep and abiding friendship of these two men:

"To Charles Williams"

Your death blows a strange bugle call, friend, and all is hard
To see plainly or record truly. The new light imposes change,
Re-adjusts all a life-landscape as it thrusts down its probe from the sky,
To create shadows, to reveal waters, to erect hills and deepen glens.

The slant alters. I can't see the old contours. It's larger world
Than I once thought it. I wince, caught in the bleak air that blows on the ridge.
Is it the first sting of the great winter, the world-waning? Or the cold of spring?
A hard question and worth talking a whole night on. But with whom?
Of whom now can I ask guidance? With what friend concerning your death
Is it worth while to exchange thoughts unless - oh unless it were you?(35).

Footnotes

I. The Four Loves (New York: Harcourt. Brace. Jovanovitch, I960), p.9I.
2. Humphrey Carpenter, The Inklings (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., I979), pp. 99 - I00.
3. Ibid., p. I0I.
4. Ibid., p. II9.
5. Ibid., p. II6.
6. Essay presented to Charles Williams (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, I966), p. xi.
7. Ibid., pp. ix-x.
8. Ibid., p. xi.
9. Humphrey Carpenter, Tolkien (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, I977), p. 20I.
I0. The Four Loves, p. 92.
II. Ibid., p. 96.
I2. "The Approach to English" in Light on C S Lewis, by Jocelyn Gibb (New York: Harcourt Brace and World, I965), p. 63.
I3. Arthurian Torso (London: Oxford University Press, I948), p. I0I.
I4. Patches of Godlight: The Pattern of Thought in C S Lewis (Athens, Ga. University of Georgia Press, I98I) pp. 4-5.
I5. See the argument developed by John D. Cox's Epistemological Release in The Silver Chair in The Longing for a Form: Essays on the Fiction of C S Lewis ed. by Peter J. Schakel (Kent State University Press, I977).
I6. Charles Williams: Poet of Theology (New York: Oxford University Press, I983), p. I48.
I7. Alice Mary Hadfield, Charles Williams: An Exploration of His Life and Work (New York: Oxford University Press, I983), p. 2I3.
I8. A Grief Observed (New York: Bantam, I976), pp. I8-I9, 39, 55-58, 70-74.
I9. Arthurian Torso, p. II6.
20. Ibid., p. II6.
2I. The Great Divorce (New York: Macmillan, I952), p. I06.
22. Tolkien, p. I7I.
23. Arthurian Torso, pp. I76-I77.
24. "The Approach to English", in Light on C S Lewis, p. 63.
25. Arthurian Torso, p. I43.
26. Essays Presented to Charles Williams, p. xi.
27. Hadfield, p. 2I4.
28. Essays Presented to Charles Williams, p. xiii.
29. Ibid., p. xiii.
30. Theology, 42 (Jan., I94I), 63.
3I. Till We Have Faces (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, I966), p. 294.
32. The Inklings, p. II5.
33. Charles Williams: Poet of Theology, p. I73.
34. Essays Presented to Charles Williams, p. xix.
35. C S Lewis, Poems, ed. by Walter Hooper (London: Geoffrey Bles, I964), p. I05.

+ +

Our apologies to those looking forward to the second part of Stephen Metcalf's talk. It will be printed when it becomes available.

OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY

Chairman: Richard Wallis, 6 Matlock Court, Kensington Park Road,
London WII 6BS (22I 0057);

Secretary: Mrs Gillian Lunn, 26 Village Road, Finchley, London
N3 ITL (346 6025);

Treasurer: Richard Wallis, address as above;

Membership Secretary: Miss Hilda Pallan, I67 Holly Lodge Mansions,
Oakeshott Avenue, Highgate, London N6 6DU (348 3903);

Lending Librarian: Rev Dr Brian Horne, IIb Roland Gardens, London SW7
(373 5579);

Newsletter Editor: Mrs Molly Switek, 8 Crossley Street, London N7 8PD
(607 79I9).

+ +

COPYRIGHT

Everything in the Newsletter (unless otherwise stated) is the copyright of the Charles Williams Society. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the Editor.

© Charles Williams Society I984