ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Name of Candidate HAROLD WAYNE SWINDALL

Address

Degree DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY *Date* JULY 1976

Title of Thesis THE ANATOMY OF ROMANTIC THEOLOGY: A STUDY IN CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS

The paper is primarily concerned with a theory of apologetics from within a romantic perspective. The major sources of the study are Owen Barfield, C. S. Lewis, J. R. R. Tolkien, and Charles Williams. Research proceeds along the lines of apologetics, romanticism, and the imagination. The form of the study takes shape in six sections.

The "Introductory Remarks" state the main thesis, refer to the sources, and outline the course of the thesis' development.

The "Apologetical Perspective" demonstrates the inadequacy of the current attitude toward apology and claims a wider perspective for its operation. The section includes a discussion of the original meaning and use of apologia and a consideration of the metaphorical applications of the term. The section concludes with the suggestion that romantic theology has enlarged the field of operation for apology and that apologetic activity takes place on three levels: classic, assumptive, and intrinsic.

"The Morphology of Romantic Theology" opens with a general discussion of romanticism. It then turns to a demonstration of romantic theology in action as it faces mechanistic attack on one hand and a challenge

Use other side if necessary.

from emergent romanticism on the other. It also supplements today's rationalistic theology. The section concludes with an exposition of the individual contributions to romantic theology by Barfield, Lewis, Tolkien, and Williams.

"Mythopoeic Diction" is an original term and concept advanced by the thesis as a key to understanding the effect of romantic theology. The section includes a brief treatment of myth and a comparison of realism and romanticism. The apologetic effect of mythopoeic diction comprises the section's closing statement.

"Imagination and Theology Reconsidered" challenges theology to come to grips with the imagination as a means of apprehension, objectification, and representation. Causes for the neglect of the imagination in theological study are presented, followed by the claim that the imagination cannot be wholly ignored by theology. The section concludes with a demonstration of the imagination as a means of enlightenment and a discussion of the converted imagination.

"The Summary Observation" considers the timing of the romantic apologetic appeal, and its relation to traditional Christian symbols. Romantic theology as phenomenology of religion is investigated. The effect of romantic theology on the three levels of apology is reiterated and apologia as an aspect of the classical-romantic debate is considered. The section concludes with a statement of the use of knowledge gained from a mature romanticism, romantic theology and Christian growth, and its relation to the concept of a divine continuity.

There is a brief glossary dealing with the particular use of terms in the study.

THE ANATOMY OF ROMANTIC THEOLOGY

A Study in Christian Apologetics

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of Divinity
In Partial Fulfillment for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

---

by

H. W. Swindall

University of Edinburgh

July - 1976



To Marilyn, Hal, Scot, and Tinker

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There is wisdom in allowing acknowledgements to be included in academic papers. This is because granting due credit to sources of assistance is a prime responsibility in the exercise and this is particularly true in a way that never appears in the footnotes or bibliography. I have reference, of course, to debts that are more heartfelt than intellectual.

Therefore, I gratefully acknowledge my parents for their financial assistance. Appreciation is due my wife for her help in proof-reading and typing the final copies of the paper. I am grateful to my sons for their patience, support, and nearness. I express thanks to the Gorgie Baptist Church for providing opportunity for worship and service during my residence in Scotland. I offer gratitude to New College, especially to my supervisors, Professor John McIntrye and Dean D. W. D. Shaw. Their reception and encouragement from the first is not likely to be forgotten. Finally, blessings and recognition goes to those whose role was not so immediate, but nonetheless practical (especially to Jim O' Hara for providing a splendid typewriter). I am also grateful to be out of space because the list could go on and one must stop somewhere.

I declare that this paper contains my original work and that all assistance in degree and kind is acknowledged in proper form.

H. W. Swindall
July 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. i

PREFACE. ii

OUTLINE. iv

I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS 1

II. APOLOGETICAL PERSPECTIVE 33

III. MORPHOLOGY OF ROMANTIC THEOLOGY. 78

IV. MYTHOPOEIC DICTION 137

V. IMAGINATION AND THEOLOGY RECONSIDERED. 180

VI. SUMMARY OBSERVATION. 222

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. 267

GLOSSARY 285

OUTLINE OF THE THESIS

I. Introductory Remarks.

A. The Motivation of the Study.

1. Personal Involvement.

2. General Observation.

3. Awareness of the neglect of romantic tendency and the imagination in theological concerns.

B. The Thesis of the Study.

1. To present a theory of apologetics related to romantic theory.

2. To enlarge the scope of current apologetical involvement.

3. To demonstrate the validity of romantic theology by:

a. a morphological analysis of its structure through its adherents.

b. an explanation of its technique.

c. an identification of its adversaries.

d. a determination of its tools and nomenclature.

C. The Substance of the Study.

1. Material taken from the work of C. S. Lewis and three members of the informal literary circle he established at Oxford: Owen Barfield, J. R. R. Tolkien, and Charles Williams.

2. Material from the forebears of romantic theology who as practioners and critics contributed to its legacy and philosophical justification. This also contributes to the establishment of a "line of inheritance" to the Oxford group.

3. Material provided by contemporary commentators who have contributed to the consideration of the matter of romanticism and theology to date.

4. Original consideration of a mature, ordinate romanticism as an instrument of Christian apologetics.

D. The Form of the Study.

1. Establishment of an apologetical perspective.

2. Presentation of a morphology of romantic theology.

3. Introduction of mythopoeic diction.

4. Discussion of theology and imagination.

5. Summary observation.

II. Apologetical Perspective.

A. Demonstration of the Inadequacy of the Current Attitude toward Apologia in the Following Areas:

1. Confusion in the general and ecclesiastical use of the term.

2. The misunderstanding of the term's semantical intention on the part of theologians.

3. The limitation of apologia to an intellectual defense based on the scientific method.

B. Demand for a Wider Perspective for Apologia.

1. A purely intellectual, scientific approach to apology is severely limiting.

2. Apology is an art concerned with form of expression.

3. Apology is a dynamic activity that requires a broader scope of operation.

C. Original Meaning and Use of Apologia.

1. In the New Testament.

2. In the early Church.

D. Consideration of the Metaphorical Application of Apologia.

1. The judicial metaphor.

2. The martial metaphor.

E. The Place of Apologia as a Theological Discipline.

1. It is a vital contributor to theological study as an intermediate between homiletics and dogmatics.

2. In a true sense apologia is a motivational ground of theology.

3. Loss of the sight of this fact has brought on a disparity of attitude toward apologia.

F. The Romantic Approach has Enlarged the Battlefront of Apologia.

1. It has effected a revolution in apologia from a literary point of view.

2. It has demonstrated the limitations of abstract theology.

3. It has revealed apologetic activity on three levels.

4. Apologia is inextricably bound to evangelism. It must appeal to judgment that includes knowledge outside the scientific sphere.

III. The Morphology of Romantic Theology.

A. General Discussion of Romanticism.

1. Theologians' lack of interest in romanticism.

2. Focusing of romantic characteristics and place in the scheme of things.

3. General agreement that romanticism is a matter of perspective.

B. Birth of Romantic Theology.

1. A meeting of the minds of Lewis and Williams.

2. A distinction between romantic religion and romantic theology.

C. Romantic Theology in Action.

1. From within a romantic perspective opposing a

mechanistic viewpoint in the technological world.

2. From within a romantic perspective supplementing a scientifically oriented theology.

3. From within a theological perspective opposing an emergent romanticism.

D. Differences in Approach among the Romantic Theologians.

1. Barfield, the epistemologist.

2. Williams, the transcendentalist.

3. Lewis, the complete apologist.

4. Tolkien, the mythologian.

IV. Mythopoeic Diction.

A. The Power of a Story to Convey Truth.

1. More effective than grim thought.

2. Fiction necessary to man's understanding of law and principle.

B. Myth.

1. Effect of myth.

2. Purpose of myth.

C. Mythopoeic Diction.

1. Term coined from concepts gleaned from the writings of Lewis and Barfield.

2. Like romanticism, it is not new, but newly realized as an entity.

3. It is not the same as allegory and not a purely literary art.

4. It is addressed to the imagination to evoke a cognitive response.

D. Comparison of Realism and Romanticism (principally fantasy).

1. Limitation of realism.

2. Complementary aspect of the romantic.

E. Apologetic Effect of Mythopoeia.

1. Restoration of perspective.

2. Intrinsic apology.

3. Practical effect.

4. Pattern of cosmological dialectic of myth.

5. Vicarious element.

V. Imagination and Theology Reconsidered.

A. A Lack of Imagination.

1. Theology avoids imagination.

2. Other areas show interest.

a. literature.

b. philosophy.

c. the world in general.

3. Apology must come to grips with imagination.

B. Causes of Neglect of Imagination in Theology.

1. Scripture reflects a low opinion.

2. Modern scholars avoid creative aspect and use psychological interpretation.

a. translations.

b. commentators.

3. Internal cause in the Old Testament is the second commandment.

C. Imagination Cannot Be Wholly Ignored by Theology.

1. As a theatre of temptation.

2. The significance of the inner life.

D. Imagination in Christian History.

1. Church has generally reflected the Scriptural attitude.

2. But even here ontological arguments were raised.

E. The Imagination as a Means of Enlightenment.

1. MacDonald's view.

2. The concept of the creative imagination could cast light on theological categories.

3. Dorothy L. Sayers' view.

a. creation.

b. Trinity: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

4. Objectification and representation in imagination and theology.

F. The Converted Imagination.

1. Salvation of the whole man.

2. Receptacle of revelation.

3. Prophetic vision.

4. Regenerate imagination.

H. Evocative Power of the Imagination.

1. Provides for acceptable experiences not available in other forms.

2. Imagination necessary to theological expression.

3. Concession to theology.

VI. Summary Observation.

A. The Timing of Romantic Theology.

1. Sterile civilization.

2. Rising generation.

3. Puritan typology.

B. Romantic Theology and Traditional Symbols.

1. Opposed to demythologizers.

2. "Original" in approach.

3. The romantic approach does not completely exclude traditional symbols.

C. Romantic Theology and Phenomenology of Religion.

1. The need for "otherness".

2. Objections to phenomenology.

3. Romantic experience is not divorced from daily experience.

4. Romantic experience does not depend on isolated encounters.

5. Romanticism contributes to the meaning of total experience.

D. Romantic Theology on the Three Levels of Apology.

1. Classic apology.

2. Assumptive apology.

3. Intrinsic apology.

E. Classical-Romantic Opposition in Apologia.

1. Naive approach to apology.

2. Sentimentive approach to apology.

F. Apologetic Use of Knowledge.

1. Matured romanticism.

2. Christianity grants a more exact use and definition.

3. All knowledge comes from God.

G. Romantic Theology and Christian Growth.

1. Praeparatio evangelica.

2. Rekindled spiritual awareness.

3. Revival of dim doctrine.

H. Romantic Theology and Divine Continuity.

1. Science and patterns.

2. Romanticism and emergence.

3. Defense, constant and daily.

4. A pebble cast in the pitcher to enable the raven to drink.

I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

"Certainly there are some books whose words, once we have studied them, seem to demand from us a moral, even a metaphysical, assent or dissent."

He Came Down From Heaven
Charles Williams

"A Subject not heretofore discoursed of by any of our Writters; and yet ventured on in an Essay to suppress the impudent and growing Atheisme of the Age, and satisfie the desire of some Choice Freinds." [sic]

The Secret Commonwealth of Elves, Fauns, and Fairies
Robert Kirk, 1691

I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

This study has grown not only from an intellectual interest, but from personal experience on two levels. First, by the personal response to the "Immortal longings" to be found in marvellous literature. This personal involvement began from the time in life when reading began to be a joy, and increased in professional life when reading was a part of vocational responsibility. The second motivation arose from the personal observation of the effect of renewed romantic interest among students on university campuses. This inner personal response and outer observation provided the perspective that led to the firm conviction that it was the romantic upsurge that helped create the milieu in which Christianity has regained a foothold in the rising generation. Finally, there was the awareness that this was no happenstance. There were some who deliberately combined a romantic fantasy and theology for just such an effect. This approach has come to be known as romantic theology.

The great impetus for this upsurge of marvellous romantic literature was the publishing of J.R.R. Tolkien's epic fantasy, The Lord of the Rings. Interest in fantasy per se increased to such a degree that publishers began to print editions of romantic authors that had long been forgotten. Suddenly romantic fantasy was readily

available and now no one looked askance at those who read it.

Briefly, romantic theology emerged in this manner. Through the middle decades of the twentieth century four Oxford men (often referred to as the Inklings owing to the name of the informal literary group of which they were members): Owen Barfield, C. S. Lewis, J. R. R. Tolkien, and Charles Williams produced both by example and commentary a tremendous amount of religious material championing a combination of romantic fantasy and theology. Their books have become a phenomena in the world of religious ideas, both literary and theological. Lewis and Tolkien were professional scholars. Williams was an editor and for a period a lecturer at Oxford. Barfield was a solicitor. All have been recognized as creative writers and literary critics of considerable ability with an authoritative grasp of literary history, philosophy, and form. Moreover, each was a committed Christian who took seriously and personally the command of Christ to his followers to be witnesses. They therefore combined avocation with profession and talent by assuming the role of apologists.

Those who have been initiated into the realm of romantic theology to any degree will have become aware of its loftiness and spiritual value, yet strangely enough bona-fide theologians have had little to do with

it despite the following it has engendered. But then, Christian history will show that theologians have had little to do with revivals. Thus far, most of the scholars who have dealt with the phenomena have been people in the literary field. In the material that follows it is hoped that a more esoteric understanding of romantic theology will be shared and its relevance to modern theological usage may be demonstrated.

The interest of literary men is due to the fact that they have always seen in literature with its creative spirit a sympathetic view with religious matter. But the more scientifically oriented theologian of today fails to appreciate the fact. An indication of such an attitude is that of the many theses that have been written in the last ten years on the work of the romantic theologians, roughly eighty per cent have been approached from a predominantly literary point of view. Theologians for the most part have disdained the "over-simplification" by the so-called popular theologians. To face the situation squarely, it would appear romantic apologetics has not received due attention and respect from theologians because of professional jealousy. None of those generally accepted as romantic theologians were vocational theologians. None, with the exception of a forebear, George MacDonald, held ordination papers.

Now it is here acknowledged that a great number

of individual theologians are aware of the imagination and its products, especially myth. Some have even dealt with fantasy. And such interest is not all that recent. Certainly Rudolph Otto made such references fifty years ago. And A. H. Strong, whose work in systematic theology established his capacity as a scholar of the first rank, was no Philistine when it came to literary contribution to religious understanding. In his work Great Poets and Their Theology, Strong begins as far back as Homer and while not maintaining that poets were conscious theologians, he felt they had glimpses of theological truth and that

> "From their higher point of view, indeed, they sometimes descry truths which are yet below the horizon of other thinkers."[1]

But such treatments are rare enough. Generally

---

1. A. H. Strong, op. cit., pp. vii-viii. For obvious reasons some early reference must be made to Bultmann; not to refute him, others have taken up that formidable task (such as Karl Jaspers), but to acknowledge that some of the few theologians dealing in myth have been among the most influential. But nevertheless most of the treatment of myth is not from a literary point of view, but anthropological and psychological. Lewis faces such critics, including Bultmann, in his essay "Modern Theology and Biblical Criticism" in the collection of papers by Walter Hooper entitled, Christian Reflections. He states his belief that most Biblical critics and theologians lack sufficient literary experience to make their critical judgments in such matters trustworthy: "If he [a critic] tells me that something in a Gospel is legend or romance, I want to know how many legends and romances he has read, how well his palate is trained in detecting them by the flavor; not how many years he has spent on that Gospel". (p. 154)

speaking, theology's handling of the imagination is always in passing. It may be an object of interest, duly noted, but it is not a subject to be pursued.

But the excitement of literary scholars and enthusiastic public response demands more critical treatment from within a theological framework. To a great extent theology, due to its reticence, has been passed by. Admittedly, a few theologians have picked up threads, but no fabric has been woven.

There are two mistakes to fall into regarding romantic theology. The first is to ignore it, or at best to treat it lightly, because it deals in things that are not "true" --- things that have not or could not happen. Second, to think that these men were "romanticizing religion" just for the sake of doing so. What would be the point? Hopefully, the direction of this paper will delineate the structure and aspects of romantic theology to the point that it can be seen as a valid theological entity. Romantic theology is not a mediocre matter to be lightly dismissed. Frye states that mediocre works of art are a random and peripheral form of critical experience, but profound work draws one to a point at which a number of converging patterns of significance emerge.[2]

Thus, the scientifically oriented theologian

---

2. Northrop Frye, Fables of Identity, p. 13.

must face up to the fact that the romantic theologians have evolved a philosophy, established an epistemological stance, and suggested categories to communicate their data.

Certainly one of the main tasks of the apologist is to translate the gospel for his age. It is questionable that from a purely theological viewpoint the current age has seen an effective apologetic. It could be debated whether any age has seen a wholly effective apologetic. But it does seem that the most successful and lasting efforts have been found in the apologists who have illustrated the truth rather than merely attempted to explain in rational terms.

For almost eighteen centuries apology was written without recourse to the vaunted scientific method now considered so fundamental. Yet many modern apologists reflect the single minded attitude that presumes to defend Christian truth only in terms of a scientifically oriented theological language.

This narrow stance has caused apologists to lose sight of their original purpose and relations. Apology has virtually been replaced by its science, apologetics. And science, as Barfield points out, is given the business of finding hypotheses that will save the appearances.[3] And as a science, apologetics has been

---

3. Owen Barfield, Saving the Appearances, p. 64.

given the task of inventing hypotheses that will save the theological appearances. Beyond this it seems to serve little purpose.

So to begin with the paper takes exception to the current role of apology in theological circles, chiefly because it scarcely exists there any more. Real apology with all that the term implies is more likely to be found in literary circles rather than theological. Good apology, after all, is not just a theological discipline, but a literary art, a fact theologians seem to have forgotten. Hurst writes:

> "Christianity is a literary religion. Before the first Christian century was half completed the followers of Jesus Christ had begun to write in the interests of their faith, and, from that time until the present, Christian literature has continued to grow. Today it is a literature as great and as rich as any, and is one of the most remarkable achievements of the Church. It has become naturalised in almost every Western nation, it has laid under tribute almost every European tongue, and many of its makers have been masters of the literary art."[4]

It should not be surprising, therefore, that often the most effective apologists have been literary men. And this has become especially true since modern theology has taken such a rationalistic character. Subsequently, the current effort in apologetics appears obsequious against the force of today's scientific accent. So the most virile apology is to be found in

---

4. George Leopold Hurst, An Outline of Christian Literature, p. 1.

literature as such. Even apology concerning matters of ultimate value and its source is to be found in the ferocious cut and thrust of literary criticism rather than in today's "reasonable" apology.

The paper adopted an approach later discovered in Northrop Frye who in his Anatomy of Criticism based his morphological approach on Matthew Arnold's precepts of letting the mind play freely around a subject in which there has been much endeavor and little attempt at perspective.[5] As Lewis points out, the experience the romantic theologians attempt to exploit is common, commonly misunderstood, and of immense importance.[6] As such, it begs a more detailed examination. The beauty of this situation is that not only did the romantic theologians leave behind a tremendous literary legacy using their approach, but a great corpus of commentary upon it. They have a philosophy as well as a literature. This is one of the reasons it will last.

The paper will seek to illustrate the significance of the fact that when time came for these men to present their ideas to the world that they selected romantic literature as an instrument. To attract the world's attention they did not choose the harsh realism of the modern novel, anarchic poetry (though all were

---

5. Northrop Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, p. 3.

6. C. S. Lewis, Pilgrim's Regress, p. 7.

poets), or today's drama of the absurd (Williams was a successful playwright). They chose the most primary type of literature that man encounters as an individual and as a race --- the fantastic story. They invented tales that appealed to the imagination. They told the kind of stories men first love and reluctantly lay aside because the climate of opinion dictates that they must. These four men, their circle, and those who influenced them appreciated this genre for expression because they saw a relation (even above the surface interpretation of that term) between what they had to say and how it was to be said. They desired their readers to realize their experience beyond ideas expressed in mere abstractions. They sought to stir faculties other than the intellect. For them this romantic approach accomplished some of the key objectives of apologetics that no other form was able to attain. Williams wrote: "Certainly there are some books whose words, once we have studied them, seem to demand from us a moral, even a metaphysical, assent or dissent".[7] He lists along with the Bible, Pilgrim's Progress and The Divine Comedy. This paper deals with such books.

Research proceeded along the lines of three major areas: Apologetics, Romanticism, and the

---

7. Charles Williams, He Came Down From Heaven, p. 10.

Imaginagion. The study is designed to pave the way for an understanding of how certain writers came to combine them to bring about the apologetic effect they desired.

The paper seeks the notions which have given rise to the use of a certain form of literature and determined how it was to be used. Except for occasional references the better known names in the current scene of theological scholarship will be absent. The paper operates more from within the scheme of literary scholarship from the firm conviction that these scholars have dealt more satisfactorily with the aspects of man's religious experience that concern the study.

Apology, if it is to be effective, must be concerned with literary expression. Yet it scarcely seems to have occurred to apologists to apply any of the principles of the literary communication of meaning to apology or to see any parallels. It became apparent through study that with a few notable exceptions, theologians have ignored romanticism and literary critics have ignored apology. Yet (almost too obvious to mention) there are a number of parallels to be drawn between literature and religion. Perhaps this is primarily because they both deal with experience. They both are a kind of perspective of reality. And both have attached to them disciplines that try to stand off to observe the perspective. In literature it is called literary criticism. In religion it is called theology.

Theology is much like criticism in that it is a systematic, organized study that has all the marks of a science. Evidence, authorities, various fields are all employed scientifically. A worthy enterprise, but in studying a critical science one finds that a kind of centrifugal force is drawing him away from the original experience. And nowhere has this become so increasingly apparent than in Christian apologetics. For too long apologetics has been considered a strict "theological" matter, and unfortunately, due to implicit contemporary dictates, restricted to a specific form and approach. As the study progresses it should become apparent that many of the principles of literature and literary criticism employed by the romantic theologians have direct bearing on apologia because it is to a great extent a literary matter.

From within the current theological viewpoint it would seem that there could be little relation between what appear to be two fixed fields. Yet, at the present time the reception of the romantic theologians is most impressive. In publishing these authors have proven to be valuable property. Their following has cultic manifestation. What is needed is a co-ordinating principle which will see the two supposedly fixed fields in this situation as parts of a whole. This principle is the imagination. One of the main concerns of this paper has been the neglect of theology

of investigation and use of matters relating to the imagination. Through the imagination there can be an assumption of coherence between romanticism and theology. Now the assumption is one thing but the realization of a totally intelligible body of knowledge is another. Until this discovery is made, romantic theology cannot be an individual entity, even as a recognizable branch, but must remain on the fringe swallowed up in either one or the other of two fixed fields.

The apologist must attempt to explain the Explanation in the light of shifting categories of knowledge and language, and a detailed examination of one of the ways of performing this task is included in the aim of this paper. In dealing with romantic theology some agreement will have to be reached in order to establish some official nomenclature. Even though the study attempts to view matters from a predominantly theological point of view, a great deal of material will appear in the form of a purely literary viewpoint. From this source a great deal of terminology has been appropriated for theological use as is apology's wont. As Frye points out, if students of a field cannot name his tools the world is not likely to concede much authority to his craft.[8]

---

8. Frye, Fables of Identity, p. 219.

In order to discuss romantic theology it is necessary to have in mind some larger idea about the identity of romantic theologians. But let it be clear from the outset that this paper is not to be a study of certain men's work as such. It is primarily concerned with a theory of apologetics and will discuss and use the work of selected authors only in the light of that theory. No one has really defined romantic theology. Several have discussed what the Inklings were attempting, but no one has really pursued the semantical intention of that phrase. This even included the Inklings themselves. The nearest thing to a definition is Lewis' oft-quoted, now famous, description of a romantic theologian in the introduction of the collection of essays presented in memory of Williams.[9]

On the other hand, the paper cannot help but be to some degree a survey. But it is survey related to theory. It is a survey of an embryonic field with an eye toward moving the field to more definite levels of expression. As far as it is a survey, the study if tendentiously selective.

The literature for the study, therefore, centers in Barfield, Lewis, Tolkien, Williams, and the principal influences in their lives. These will be considered primary sources. Secondary sources are

---

9. This is quoted on page 90.

those who have contributed to romantic theory and religious knowledge, and finally those to date who have commented on the Inklings. Quite enough work on the Inklings from a biographical and critical standpoint has been done already. Some would say too much. The time has come to begin to build on what they have offered.

The rhyme and reason of romantic theology moves from the Inklings. Northrop Frye, dealing with the Romantic Movement and the problem of its timeless characterization, suggests that the movement was an "historical center of gravity" in relation to the development and aftermath of the romantic tendency among civilized men. Borrowing his concept, this paper contends that the Inklings of Oxford are also such an historical center of gravity with regard to the development and aftermath of a peculiar <u>application</u> of romantic tendencies.

Frye's figure of a "center of gravity" is helpful, but while a center of gravity conveys a sound meaning to the imagination, it is difficult to visualize. Perhaps a more helpful mental image for the paper's concept is the well known one of a series of circles within circles. This figure better represents both the development of the genre and the level of seminal influence on the paper's theory. In the very center of the circle is Lewis. Surrounding him are the other three Inklings.

Next come the immediate influences in these four. Then come the more distant contributors, those on the fringe whether in the sense of time or emphasis.

There is one significant alteration to be made in this familiar diagram that renders it closer to a picture. The image of ever-increasing circles would be better seen, not like an onion in which the enclosing sequences of skins are complete circles in themselves, but rather like the mainspring of a clock. The circles are there, but they are all one piece. There are spheres of influence, but also a line of inheritance.

With this picture kept in mind it will be more easily grasped why by far the number of references to "romantic theologians" in the text will be primarily concerned with the Inklings. But at times the context should make it clear that it may be referring to a long line of believers who refused to be tied to only the static doctrinal modes for their expression of a dynamic experience; preferring a suggestive, organic approach to testimony. Or again it may refer to a stance current as well as past that is coming more and more to reflect a mistrust in the highly subjective and complex systems of theological expression.

The Inklings as a center of gravity certainly dealt in nothing new in seeking a creative means of expressing religious truth --- even to the point of

combining it with the world of fairie and myth. They actually stand in a long tradition from primitive mythopoeia in all its naive glory to the point where they granted it philosophical validity and the status of genre. The idea of a developing romantic theology would include principally the literary men that had direct influence upon them. This would include the philosopher-poets: Blake, Coleridge, Wordsworth; the writers who were concerned with fantasy and its power: Lang, Scott, Morris, MacDonald, and Chesterton; the great mythopoeicians and allegorists: Milton, Dante, Bunyan.[10]

It would include writers who are not so well known but who nonetheless walked boldly into the realm of the imagination seeking the riches to be found there. These men had their influence. Such a one would be Robert Kirk, the minister of Balquhidder and Aberfoyle, who in 1691 published a tract entitled, The Secret Commonwealth of Elves, Fauns, and Fairies. This tract was lost and then discovered and published

---

10. Milton makes the apologetic element quite plain in his great poem when he asks "...that to the height of this great argument I may assert eternal providence and justify the ways of God to man" (Paradise Lost, Book I, "The Argument", lines 24-26). Lewis also points this up in a manner of speaking in Preface to Paradise Lost (p. 125): "Milton...though telling a short story about the remote past, wishes our minds to be carried to the later results of that story".

by Sir Walter Scott in a limited edition in 1815 and again in 1893 by Andrew Lang, and finally in 1933, introduced by R. B. Cunninghame Graham. Lang called Kirk in a memorial poem "Chaplain to the Fairy Queen".

Kirk, though he never said so in formal terms, definitely felt that the effect of the conduct of the sleagh maith (the Good People) was no less than apologetic in that "they endeavor to convince us of a Diety". His work was "A Subject not heretofore discoursed of by any of our Writters; and yet ventured on in an Essay to suppress the impudent and growing Atheisme of the Age, and satisfie the desire of some Choice Freinds" [sic].[11]

---

11. op. cit., p. 65, (1933 edition). Though Kirk's treatise could be named more accurately part of psychical research than a relation to romanticism, there is still a relation on two points. First, the obvious one is the apologetic potential of both, and second, both could be placed under a general category of the phenomenology of religion. This second factor is an implicit objection in many detractors of romantic theology and will be discussed in the last section.

    The story of Kirk is a fascinating one. His grave was discovered by Scott in Aberfoyle who pursued the tale of "The Fairy Minister...who went to his own herd". It seems that Kirk held a life-long interest in the world of fairie and "second sight". In the lochs and mountains of Rob Roy he found atmosphere and a belief among the members of his parish to strengthen his enthusiasm for his subject. His tract, published in 1691, is a serious piece of psychical research.

    In 1692 Kirk was walking on an ancient sepulchral mound the people called a dun-shi (fairy hill) when he "swooned" and never regained consciousness. After the funeral Kirk appeared to a kinsman in a dream and told him that he was being held prisoner

Until the Inklings, the world of the marvellous and its religious significance was still a subject scarcely "discoursed of by any of our Writters". Yet it has proven an effective suppression of atheism and as satisfying to "Choice Freinds" as any apologetic ever devised.

In one of the most outstanding critical treatments of the Inklings to date, R. J. Reilly says that he was not so much concerned with the ultimate validity of romantic theology as he was the religious cast of mind that could produce it.[12] Certainly, one sound estimate of the validity of an approach is its reception, and the enthusiastic response romantic theology commands cannot be doubted. This study is directly concerned about how thie reception is

---

by the fairies and that the astounded relation must break the spell. Kirk's second wife had given birth to a child after his death, and Kirk was to appear at the christening. A guest was to cast a dirk over the head of the apparition and Kirk would be restored. According to the tale, all this took place, as the dream foretold, but the guest was so overwhelmed by Kirk's appearance that he dropped the knife and the image disappeared. So he is still presumably the hostage of "the Good People --- Chaplain to the Fairy Queen".

12. R. J. Reilly, Romantic Religion. This paper owes a tremendous debt to Reilly's treatment, especially to his work on Barfield, the most extensive to date. Williams received the most adequate treatment in the work of Mary Shideler, The Theology of Romantic Love. There are a great number of books on Lewis. Clyde Kilby, The Christian World of C. S. Lewis is certainly comprehensive. Paul Kocher has presented an acceptable work on Tolkien in The Master of Middle Earth.

effected.

There have been many groups who have in the shared imaginative and creative interest of their art brought into being a novel perspective and approach to their particular art. An influence and closely related example is the Romantic poets of the nineteenth century. There are, not surprisingly, a great many similarities between the romantic poets and the romantic theologians. The key to both groups lies in the belief that the imagination was a truth-bearing faculty. The creative medium of expression was poetry on one hand and mainly mythopoeic fantasy on the other. Within the medium there are differences as to how the truth is so borne even within the members of each group. But that the imagination was more than an idle, time-wasting, "airy-fairy" faculty was central to both.

There are also striking similarities extending to individuals within the two groups. Lewis and Coleridge, especially, seek not only to possess the gifts that admitted them into their circles, but possessed also the powers of observation that enabled them to articulate the substance that made their respective groups express themselves in their unique fashion.

But when men set out to establish "new" systems of thought or approaches to old problems, it is rare that they are fully accepted. However, there is much that

others who deal with the problems may borrow and use, which is the technique of this paper in constructing its theory. It is readily accepted from the outset that of all the romantic theologians, Lewis' style and immediate aim was the only one that could be described as positively apologetic. Yet it is to be argued that the effect and ultimate value of all the authors will prove to be apologetic.

When one comes to examine romantic theology, it is a matter of gleaning a sentence here and a paragraph there from the writings of the men who practiced the approach. None of the writers ever dealt with the subject as such in detail. Yet it is an attitude they all understood and shared. It is foolish to argue about influence within the group. They all add a string to the bow. Suffice it to say that each romantic theologian may accept romanticism as a mode of cognition but for none is it the final frame of reference. The romantic theologians have this much in common, but the degree to which it is common among them varies considerably. This clearly is reflected in the work of those who have written on the romantic theologians. Reilly chooses to slant his treatment toward Barfield and insists that Williams, Lewis, and Tolkien tend to "romanticize" religion rather than theology, which, as he accurately demonstrates, Barfield does.

Another example is the work of Mary Shideler on

Williams, The Theology of Romantic Love. She calls Dante and Kierkegaard the predecessors of Williams as Christian romantics. Yet most literary critics would not call either of them romantics. At best they would allow Dante the status of a pre-romantic. But what Shideler actually means by this phrase is that all three were cast into their role by an experience of romantic love. Romanticism, more generally defined is not what she had in mind, and neither did Williams.

What must be faced in this situation is that four men sounded off each other within the context of a common interest. As Lewis expressed it to Clyde S. Kilby:

> "To be sure, we had a common point of view, but we had it before we met. It was the cause rather than the result of our friendship."[13]

So even within the circle of friends it is clear that there was a disparity of attitude toward one another's positions. Williams did not seem to affect Tolkien and Barfield the way he did Lewis, nor is there any evidence that Barfield and Tolkien affected Williams or each other to any degree. Lewis said no one ever influenced Tolkien.

What is more, most critics who try to determine influence within the circle of the Inklings fail to

---

13. C. S. Lewis, Letters of C. S. Lewis, (edited by W. H. Lewis), p. 288. Hereafter referred to as Letters.

take into account the "non-canonical" members: Hugo Dyson, John Wain, Canon Fox (whose poetry Lewis admired for its "cool, mellow flavor"), Gervase Matthews, Nevill Coghill, Colin Hardie, and any number of occasional visitors. Also they fail to account for the collegues in the university to whom at least Lewis readily acknowledges a debt.

Tolkien undoubtedly will be marked for a lasting fame as the author of the greatest epic in generations. But his fame rests on that one great work. Williams and Barfield, as Reilly observed, always have enjoyed "an enthusiastic but small public".[14] They will continue to enjoy an enthusiastic, but small public. Barfield will appeal to the esoteric intelligentsia with occultic inclinations. Barfield readily admits that he is aiming at what he calls the educated public. He is an anthroposophist and a considerable amount of orientation is necessary to appreciate his work. Of the four Inklings under consideration, he is the most philosophically inclined. But Reilly did make one mistake in his research when he said that Barfield had not written any "seriously creative fiction". (op. cit., p. 3) Barfield wrote in 1925 a book entitled The Silver Trumpet. This would ante-date his next earliest work, History in English Words (1926).

---

14. Reilly, op. cit., p. 11.

It is not very successful artistically and scarcely to be found.[15]

Williams will never realize a great influence except through Lewis; that is, through the influence he exerted upon Lewis and the publicity he has received through Lewis' criticism. This is not to play down the validity of his ideas or the force of his personality (which seems to be the most lasting impression he made on several, such as T. S. Eliot.)[16]

It will quickly be apparent that this paper is slanted toward the position of Lewis. Not just for personal reasons or convictions; this is primarily a study in apologia and Lewis alone laid positive claim to the title of apologist. His work is not as varied as Williams'. His philosophy is not as carefully constructed from a systematic standpoint as Barfield's; nor does his work possess the mythopoeic force of

---

15. Owen Barfield, The Silver Trumpet, London: Faber and Gwyer, Ltd., 1925, illustrated by Gilbert James. A copy of the work was found in the National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh. Authorship was confirmed by A Dictionary of Literature in the English Language from Chaucer to 1940, p. 141. Perhaps after this effort Barfield realized his limitations in the purely imaginative field and turned to work along more philosophical lines. His approach appears to possess the "virtues and vices of the aristocracy" Lewis ascribed to Milton, "writing for a fit audience, tho' few". (Lewis, Letters, p. 64)

16. Both Dorothy L. Sayers, in The Poetry of Search and the Poetry of Statement, and John Wain in Sprightly Running, record emphatic impressions about the power Williams exuded in personal contact.

Tolkien's. But in the end each was consistent. Barfield was at bottom an epistemologist; Tolkien, a mythologian; Williams, a man of almost unbridled and diverse creativity; Lewis, the complete apologist. All of their work is of a piece.

Farrer said that Lewis possessed a Christian mind.[17] Hooper called him the most thoroughly converted man he had ever met.[18] Lewis was not drawn aside to any sophistries of the mind or to investigate the dark side of the spirit. He sought no new way to faith; he believed there was only one faith and was content to point it out to others. Neither did he seek novel ways to cross the bridge of faith. But he did believe in varying the method of pointing out the bridge. One of the ways he and his circle pointed out the bridge is the subject of this inquiry. Even in his student days Lewis was seeking for "some new and definite formula".

Lewis wrote to Dorothy L. Sayers that he was all for "little books on other subjects with their Christianity latent".[19] He saw the world of myth and romantic fantasy as the area in which he could make such a contribution. "I...wish to conquer for my own

---

17. Austin Farrer, "The Apologist", Light on C. S. Lewis.

18. Walter Hooper, "Preface", Undeceptions, p. xi.

19. Lewis, Letters, p. 208.

(Christian) point of view what has hitherto been used by the opposite side".[20]

The relation of the mythopoeic and Christianity were early discerned by Lewis. In a letter to his brother written only a couple of years after his conversion he speaks of an apologetical work by Law "saturated with delight and the sense of wonder; one of those rare works which make you say of Christianity, 'Here is the very thing you like in poetry and the romances, but this time it's true'...".[21]

In the same letter he discusses problems with proofs for the existence of God; then remarks:

> "...it is arguable that the 'idea of God' in some minds, does contain, not a mere abstract definition, but a real imaginative perception of goodness and beauty beyond their own resources; and this not only in minds which already believe in God. It certainly seems to me that the 'vague something' which has been suggested to one's mind as desirable, all one's life, in experiences of nature, music and poetry even in such ostensibly irreligious forms as 'The Land East of the Sun and West of the Moon' in Morris, and which rouses desires that no finite object even pretends to satisfy, can be argued not to be any product of our own minds."[22]

It is in side remarks like this, or in some introduction to a book, or perhaps a sentence in a piece of literary criticism that Lewis provocatively suggests

---

20. Roger Lancelyn Green and Walter Hooper, C. S. Lewis: A Biography, p. 163.

21. Lewis, Letters, p. 144.

22. Ibid.

the lineaments of a romantic theology. Lewis is often criticized for not thinking romanticism through --- for failing to nail it down philosophically within a Christian framework. Barfield has dedicated virtually all his energy to this end. But when one attempts to build a philosophy on or around a single concept, it is open to refutation. Men may draw knowledge from it, but in time portions of it, perhaps the bulk of it may be proven inadequate. Lewis never sought to justify romanticism beyond its fringe-like or sign-post character in relation to Christian truth. He preferred to use it or let it do its work. He understood better than Barfield what Yeats meant when he said: "You can refute Hegel but not the Saint or the Song of Six-pence."[23]

The major portion of the paper is taken up in four principle sections dealing with apologetics, romanticism in theology, a type of diction employed by the romantic theologians, and the imagination considered as a tool of theological study. There is at the close of the study a summary observation. Needless to say this subject matter is a Pandora's Box. Any one of the four principle sections could be a major study. A dozen concepts involved only lightly considered are worthy of a volume in themselves. Therefore, a

---

23. W. B. Yeats, Letters of W. B. Yeats, p. 922.

determined effort to limit them all to the value and use in apologetics has been undertaken.

APOLOGETICAL PERSPECTIVE.

In this section an attempt is made to demonstrate the inadequacy of the current attitude toward apologia. Apologetics has virtually disappeared from divinity school curriculums on both sides of the Atlantic. Very few ministers and scholars today actively engage in writing apology, a fact which has had unfortunate results.

The section undertakes to re-examine the original use of the term apologia, its semantical intention, and dominant metaphorical applications. A consideration of apologia in the New Testament, the early Church, and current place in theology sets the stage for opening a discussion of the battlefront of Christian apology beyond its contemporary prescribed limits. Apologia, it will be seen, takes place on three levels, and from within the romantic perspective, the romantic theologians actively engage battle on all three.

THE MORPHOLOGY OF ROMANTIC THEOLOGY

The Oxford Companion to English Literature reports on page 706: "Romantic" - A word for which, in connection with literature, there is no generally

accepted definition..." There is (to state the obvious) a heated debate about romanticism which is far from being resolved, and this paper does not propose to resolve it. The approach of this paper is to keep romanticism as much as possible within the scope of the Inklings and those who immediately influenced them; mentioning others who have contributed to the deluge only as they happen to serve as an example of support or opposition to the viewpoints of the major authors and the apologetic theory advanced.

In a number of circles romanticism in various forms does threaten Christianity as a final arbiter of value. Its attack must be met by apologia and "playing on the adversary's turf" apologia must employ the same tactics as romanticism. This approach has helped to meet the problem romanticism has been facing in a Christian context.

"The Morphology of Romantic Theology" attempts to enlarge upon the semantical intention of the term. A morphological study of a subject is concerned with the internal and external causes involved in determining its form. This serves the purpose of interpretation by identifying the attitude, frame of reference, model and orientation being employed and the problems being confronted. In this case it will be shown how the proponents of romantic theology deal with the neglect of romanticism in both a techno-

logical society and a scientifically oriented theology on one hand and the excessive emphasis of an emergent romanticism on the other.

MYTHOPOEIC DICTION.

Mythopoeic diction is a phrase coined in the paper to demonstrate how the literature of romantic theology effects apologetically beneficial realizations beyond the "facts" of religious knowledge that could not be conveyed as effectively in any other form.

The Inklings represent an "historical center of gravity" in an apologetic sense but also to some degree in literary ones by virtue of their implicit recognition of a true qualitative aspect of romanticism, that of mythopoeic diction. This peculiar literary parlance provided the element of unity in a romantic theology which is the basis for a structural analysis. It aids in claiming a formality for romantic theology.

IMAGINATION AND THEOLOGY RECONSIDERED.

This section, briefly, challenges theology to come to grips with the imagination. There is a poverty of material by theologians even mentioning the imagination. To a great extent this neglect of the imagination is due to the current scientific

complexion of modern theology. But it must be granted intellectual theological treatment and also be used in theological study.

The romantic concept of the creative imagination would be quite helpful in shedding light on the principle categories of theological study, most of which are mentioned in this section.

SUMMARY OBSERVATION.

The summary observations consider the causes of the romantic theologians' reception and some difficulties and objections. The timing of any approach is vital to its success and romantic theology is no exception.

The section deals with the criticism that the romantic theologians have turned their backs on the traditional Christian story. Such critics miss the point of their apologetic tactic.

An implicit objection to romantic theology falls under the heading of the phenomenology of religion. This issue related to ontological arguments is met and discussed. A reiteration of romantic theology's effect in classic, assumptive, and intrinsic apology is outlined. Also the fact that resistance to romantic theology in apologetic circles bears resemblance to the classical-romantic debate in literature is considered.

A final discussion of the use romantic apologia

makes of different kinds of knowledge leads into a consideration of its contribution to a perennial philosophy and daily application.

II. APOLOGETICAL PERSPECTIVE.

"Does God draw no lines, then?"

"When he does, they are pure lines, without breadth, and consequently invisible to mortal eyes; not Chinese walls of separation, such as these definers would construct."

David Elginbrod
George MacDonald

"Κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἁγιάσατε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, ἕτοιμοι ἀεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογίαν παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος."

1 Peter 3:15

II. APOLOGETICAL PERSPECTIVE

When one begins to state a case definitions usually are in order, but in the matter of Christian apologia definition becomes an absolute necessity. It is difficult to define to a considerable degree because of the confusion surrounding the popular use of the terms connected with it. Added to this problem is the blatant derogatory attitude arising from the theological discussion of the matter.

The original definition and use of _apologia_ can be stated simply. The English word apology is a derivative of the Greek terms _apo_ and _logos_ which would be translated literally a _speaking away_. It was used mainly in a judicial context. In the procedure of a trial a charge of some sort would be alleged and in the course of justice the accused would be allowed to present an apology or his defense. Perhaps the best known classic example is the _Apology_ of Socrates from Plato's _Dialogues_ in which the famed philosopher answered the charges brought against him that resulted in his death.[1]

---

1. Sir R. W. Livingstone, _Portrait of Socrates_, p. 57. "The _Crito_ and _Phaedo_ are dialogues, the _Apology_ professes to be the speech made at the trial by Socrates in his defense. Indeed, 'Defense' or 'Answer' would be a better title than 'Apology', which, though a literal rendering of the Greek word, _apologia_, is a misleading translation, unless we take it in the sense in which Newman used the word.

The term also included situations outside the actual trial where a defense would be presented in the face of various sorts of accusations. In Christianity it came to be used in the sense of the Church's defense of the truth in Christ.

Today, however, the ordinary citizen (which includes the average Christian) thinks apology means no more than the expression of regret or at best an excuse for a fault. Reid is correct when he says that the prejudices surrounding the popular understanding of the term must be divested first of all.[2] Indeed, as Farrer points out, the name apology will remain so long as hostile criticisms provide the starting point for defense,[3] but to present an apology to an audience that presumes from the outset that such an effort is dealing

---

in his Apologia pro vita sua. Like that book, this 'apology' is an attempt to explain a life and a life work. Touching lightly on the actual indictment, it proceeds to clear away popular misconceptions of what Socrates was, and to expound what he did, why he did it, and why it was right that he should do it."

Anton-Hermann Chroust, Socrates, Man and Myth, pp. 19, 233. There were actually a number of apologies written for Socrates. Xenophon's Defence of Socrates Before His Judges and Memorabilia are perhaps the best known next to Plato's. According to Chroust, there was a vogue of apologetic literature in the fourth century B. C. following the publication of Polycrates' Katagoria Socrates.

2. J. K. S. Reid, Christian Apologetics, p. 9.

3. Austin Farrer, Light on C. S. Lewis (Jocelyn Gibb, ed.), p. 23.

with a flaw, fault, or weakness is defeated before it has begun. Where did this popular concept regarding apology originate?

According to Owen Barfield, the original Greek term was not known in English usage before the fifteenth century and came in with a wealth of terms introduced by the Renaissance.[4] Sir Thomas More used it in his defense before Henry VIII. Barfield further states that the modern definition of apology as a personal and verbal expression of compunction came into use through none other than William Shakespeare.[5] Surely it can be seen how difficult it would be for the more esoteric meaning employed by academic divines to compete with a meaning supplied by a famous playwright of the stature of Shakespeare for the popular definition.[6]

---

4. Owen Barfield, History in English Words, p. 54.

5. Ibid., pp. 138-139.

6. Alan Richardson, Christian Apologetics, p. 23. Richardson quotes an amusing example of the confusion between apology and apologizing. When in 1796 Bishop Richard Watson published An Apology for the Bible, George III commented: "Apology for the Bible! Apology for the Bible! I did not know that the Bible required an apology!"

   An even more adamant and public demonstration of such confusion is offered by Dorothy Sayers in The Poetry of Search and the Poetry of Statement: "I remember how, many years ago, some author was reckless enough to write a book called Apology for England. This roused the fury of one of our brighter dailies, which came out with an indignant article affirming that England needed no apology and had nothing to apologize for. This naturally brought out of their holes a wildernessful of

Beyond the popular misconception, churchmen who by virtue of their training, may be able to offer some form of academic definition rarely think of themselves as involved in its activity. The theologians who train the churchmen grudgingly allow it scarcely more than the role of an "element" in the scheme of theological concerns. For after centuries of apology suddenly apologetics appears on the scene and becomes a distinct theological discipline. This purely intellectual accent accelerated rapidly in the nineteenth century. Apologia underwent vast systemization. It became fashionable for apologetical lectureships to be established, and no divinity school was without its formal involvement in the scientific encompassment that has come to affect all areas of human endeavour. Thus transferred into the realm of theological sciences the matter of apologia became apologetics. But after some generations of scientific stature, its position and relationships are still a matter of heated discussion. Its current close identification with the matter of science tends to

---

grammarians, philogists, and literary men, who wrote heated letters pointing out the derivation and proper meaning of 'Apology', and referring to Xenophon, Plato, Newman's Apologia Pro Vita Sua and other famous examples of a well-established usage. At the end of which, the Daily Blank, bloody, but totally unbowed by all this learning, came back in another article which concluded triumphantly: 'An apology is an apology and there's an end of it'. And since the Editor had complete control over his own column, that was indeed the end of it." (p. 268)

isolate it from the more traditional theological classifications.[7]

One has but to read the comments from the current theological dictionaries and glossaries to realize the low opinion the modern theologian has of apologetics.[8]

In the context of today's technological environment apologetics has been reduced to little more than a rapier used to fence in dialectical swordplay against the scientific barrage that has descended to chase the Church from her shadowy hiding place in revelation. This ought to be done, but perhaps the weightier matters have been omitted. Perhaps others have been left undone. Battle must be engaged in whatever area the enemy attacks. The strategy that limits defense only to the intellect and to the arena of science is far too restricting. The current age, it

---

7. C. H. Dodd, Apostolic Preaching and Its Development. Perhaps it was this fact that prompted Dodd to ignore apologia in his famous central aspects of the New Testament Church, the Kerygma and the Didache.

8. Ronald S. Wallace, "Apologetics", The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church, pp. 56-57. One of the most recent and comprehensive dictionaries published, this work does not even list apology, mentioning it in only quotation marks. The contributor seeks to tone down any "too specific and conscious apologetic approach in our statement of the gospel". G. K. Malone and P. J. Cahill, 'Apologetics' and 'Practical Apologetics', New Catholic Encyclopedia, pp. 669-677. This Roman Catholic work admits to confusion and unpleasant connotation with regard to apologetics stating there is widespread opinion to the effect that it should be replaced as a theological discipline.

would seem, has produced apologists "without chests".[9]

The definition of apologia must be enlarged beyond the conventionally accepted definition of a purely intellectual defense of Christianity. Certainly to be called into question is the even more narrow attempt to limit it to explaining a compatibility between spiritual and scientific truth. Such definitions in the first instance assume that attacks upon Christianity come only at the intellectual level. This simply is not so, and the refutation of such a claim is the heart of this paper. As regards the second Richardson rightly points out that scientific theories and conclusions have no permanence, and Christian apologists who conceive it to be their duty to reconcile the latest theories with Christian truth are beginning at the wrong end of the argument.[10]

It seems that modern man insists on seeing everything close up. He wants a front row seat to see things face to face. He has developed microscopes, telescopes, a multitude of devices that will allow him closer scrutiny. The minute examination of every detail

---

9. C. S. Lewis, Abolition of Man. Lewis referred to the kind of man the modern age was producing as men without chests meaning they were devoid of sentiment.

10. Richardson, op. cit., p. 16.

is his goal. But often he forgets that the more he gains by such proximity the more he loses in perspective. He forgets that the extreme result of distillation is evaporation.

This current fashion of defining through a process of repeated distillation has contributed heavily to the demise of apologia. This practice through a scientific frame of reference, as well as presenting a meaning, must set boundaries. It tends, as it is designed to do, to circumscribe, to delimit. In some instances a necessary and valuable procedure, but often, and especially in cases of subjects of a more dynamic nature, such delimiting definition can have a negative, stultifying side-effect. Heretofore, it appears that no one has really worked at defining apologia <u>per se</u> so much as they have attempted to relegate it as a sub-topic of theology. While it must be accepted that this is convenient from the standpoint of organisation, it is also worth noting that apologia is the milieu for theology in all its forms. It is embedded in the ore of every theological discipline. Is not the fact that men have gathered sufficient data to build a systematic construct a kind of apology? As a result of this fundamentally apologetic intent, there are recognized, universally accepted categories and terminology devised for the purpose of communicating Christian truth.

It is not too wide of the mark to look upon

theology as a kind of fossilized apologia. When the worth of an argument has been proven in battle, it is taken in for a closer scrutiny and confirmation by the theological sciences. When approved, it may even reach the level of some form of official dogma and be put on display. But like the dry bones of Ezekiel, any moment it is employed in existential confrontation with an adversary, it rises up alive as apologia.

Yet to most theologians apologetics is the poor relation in the theological family. The Roman Catholics give it a place of prominence, but in their holding to a natural theology this is to be expected. Borghild Gundersen, in his work on the apologetics of Newman, goes so far as to call it the human counterpart to revelation.[11]

Lewis had a comment to make in a letter to Barfield regarding such an attitude toward the "natural" aspect of man.

> "Have you read Esmond lately? What a detestable woman is Lady Castlewood: and yet I believe Thackeray means us to like her, on the ground that all her actions spring from 'love'. This love is, in his language, 'pure' --- i.e., it is not promiscuous or sensual. It is none the less a wholly uncorrected natural passion, idolatrous and insatiable. Was that the great nineteenth century heresy --- that 'pure' or 'noble' passions didn't need to be crucified and

---

11. Borghild Gundersen, Cardinal Newman and Apologetics, p. 11.

> re-born, but could of themselves lead to happiness?"[12]

It would seem that a natural theology, however "pure" and "noble" would require the same correction before it could hope to contribute to spiritual insight and truth.

This predominately Roman idea of a natural theology has provided the most extreme view of apologetics as a region of human intellectual endeavor. Most Protestants would shy away from such an extreme view, but at the same time, they are reluctant to do so and in today's scientific environment they are further encouraged not to do so.[13]

Still wary of the Roman claim that apologetics is the human counterpart to revelation, Protestants have swung from a more evangelical position to allowing the scientific method to define apologetics for the last two centuries. Farrer observes that such theologians are far too busy learning from their enemies to do much in the defense of their friends.[14]

Reid speaks of apologetics as being the defense of Christianity reduced to a system, and suggests that the principles of apologetics can be distilled only from

---

12. C. S. Lewis, The Letters of C. S. Lewis (W. H. Lewis, ed.) pp. 198-199.

13. Malone, op. cit., p. 676. There is a strong movement toward the scientific method by the Romanists. Gundersen confirms this as well.

14. Farrer, op. cit., p. 24.

or in view of actual situations in which defense is offered.[15] It would be helpful to realize that a system includes a position, frame of reference, or presuppositions upon which an organized assemblage of material may be based. Inevitably, a natural theology would adopt a more intellectual view of apologetics and a recalcitrant Protestantism would insist on the scientific method. As an apologist, Lewis stood, as he always sought to do, within the main stream of traditional Christianity, and looked upon apologetics as the vanguard of evangelism. The apologist was to neutralize the onslaught that effective preaching and sound doctrine might then be offered.

But regarding the human element in apologia, it is human only in the sense that any art is human. Christianity has a divine message, but its preaching may take innovative forms. Associated with the message there is data, but its effectiveness allows for some originality in its teaching.

Apology is the art. It is the existential argument, the case in point, the literal effort of persuasion. It carries within itself the innovative technique, the influential ethos, the elements of proof to bring about the desired effect. Apologetics is the science. It is the study of the mechanics of apology.

---

15. Reid, op. cit., p. 10.

It has to do with the form and context of apology as apology relates to the various fields where battle is to be done. There must be an apologetic for every apology. More will be said about this side of apologetics later on.[16]

In an address on the subject of apologetics,[17] Lewis once remarked that most apologetical work began a stage too far along. The apologists, he felt, assumed too much of their readers. Most writers on apologetics as such are quite as guilty. They seem far too anxious to present their slant to the material and spend scant time properly defining this aspect in the central tradition of Christianity.

So rather than try to isolate apologia in its purest form in terms of what is fashionable, it might serve the interest of a truer interpretation if an attempt at establishing an overall perspective could be made. That is, placing apologia over against related matters on a more common level to obtain a clearer impression of its innate character by considering it in

---

16. Malone, op. cit., pp. 674-677. According to Malone, the Romanists refer to apology as practical apologetics. Generally, there are two segments: scientific (explaining the rationale of the Roman Catholic faith) and pastoral (a practical outworking of the rational principles).

17. C. S. Lewis, 'Christian Apologetics', Undeceptions, pp. 64-76.

the light of its correlatives. Perhaps what is needed is a reconsideration of its original context and the analogical implications. What was its position in the New Testament Church and in terms of its historical development? How exactly does it figure in the theological disciplines? What is really the purpose of apologia?

Answers to these questions might help determine if the current lack of favour is justified. But the argument to be proposed against the popular idea of apologia is hardly a question of logical contradictions between clearly defined concepts. It is more a repugnance of atmospheres, a lack of harmony, and incompatibility of scope.

Since the purest form of apologia, as well as all other Christian concerns, is to be found in the New Testament, this paper assumes the stance that it is the Biblical aspect that should determine the actual position. Apologists who simply try to base themselves on a recent scientific development may find that just as they are putting the finishing touches on their argument, science may alter the theory upon which the argument was perched.

The New Testament shows apologia to be a vibrant, dynamic activity of a living, relevant body. It is as vast as the life of the Church. It conforms itself to every circumstance where the Church performs its tasks.

It stretches the length of the Church's teaching and the breadth of her preaching. It is the Church in the world declaring that it is not of the world. It is the Church salting the earth, giving light unto all the house. It is the Church "standing therefore..." girt for battle. It is the Church contending for the faith delivered once for all to the saints.

Such scope as this cannot be reduced to a single system or a single method any more than a single system of dogmatics could contain all the doctrine. Removed two thousand years of chaotic history from its source, it is difficult to present the pure teaching and preaching of the early church community as well as its apologia. But the purest form to be found is in the New Testament. It is the guide for practice as well as doctrine.

Even bearing in mind that the New Testament was addressed to Christians, it is difficult to understand why scholars have been content to grant apologia the role of a mere element in the New Testament.[18] Failure to see the Church energetically defending the gospel and its claims as well as preaching and teaching truly makes one wonder if the limited interpretation of

---

18. E. F. Scott, The Apologetic of the New Testament. This is a full scale treatment of the New Testament and apologetics. He does an excellent job demonstrating the wide scope of apologetic activity against the foes of the embryonic Church, but nevertheless takes generally the same position authors do who grant apologia only a token place in their introductions.

modern apologetics has not reached back to Christianity's beginnings and forced conformity to substantiate its surrender to the contemporary vogue.

The circulation and preservation of the New Testament documents themselves is an outgrowth of the Church's need to secure a source of authority for its faith and message. The Church required apologetic material against attack; new converts had to be protected from heresy within the fellowship as well as outward attack from the Judaic and Graeco-Roman world. The historical context of the books demonstrates the Church struggling against the legalists, gnostics, the state; recording the stand of Christians in the synagogues, the market places, debate forums and schools against every philosophy that challenged the message of Christ. From Peter's refutation of the charge of drunkenness on the ecstatic Day of Pentecost to the appearance of Paul before kings and governors the New Testament records one incident after another of the Church's "turning the world upside down".

Dodd's point that there were two recognized aspects within the central tradition of Christianity, the kerygma and the didache, has been widely accepted.[19] Others have suggested, however, that there is also an apologetic element in the central tradition. But,

---

19. Dodd, op. cit.

seemingly, no further are they willing to go. Yet it would appear that there is sufficient data and cause in the New Testament to grant apologia a somewhat more substantial and primary role in the concept the Church had of its commission. Indeed, apologia is markedly more than a mere "element" --- a little seasoning in the mixture of the Church's origins and subsequent history. It is a prime constituent in the commission of the Church and in the life of every Christian.[20]

Of the nineteen times that the term apologia and its cognates appear in the New Testament, Luke and Paul use it eighteen and it occurs once in I Peter. As a Gentile, Luke would have been no stranger to the use of the term, and Paul, a learned Tarsus Jew and a Roman citizen, was familiar with the culture that largely produced it. Notably, the term is employed only seven times with reference to a more or less formal judicial situation.

The only two references in the Gospels are both in Luke (12:11; 21:14). These records are ascribed to Jesus and concern admonitions to his disciples as he tells them of impending persecutions and appearances before the world's authorities. He warns against leaning

---

20. Richardson, op. cit., p. 22. Even though Richardson would consider himself a champion of apologetics, he is surprised with an apologetic element in a day where "the need for apology was not obvious". In one sentence he limits apologia to an "element" and to periods when he thinks it is called for.

wholly on their own human resources for their defense and promises to provide through the Holy Spirit a suitable defense couched in such eloquence that it cannot be gainsaid. According to Luke the proper defense is a matter of inspiration based upon the disciple's witness to God's revelation in Christ.

Such clear statements regarding apologia as a concern in the work of the Holy Spirit do seem to be at odds with definitions that look upon apologia as wholly the realm of man's intellect, calling it such things as the human counterpart to revelation.

To face the modern insistence that apologia must consist of rational argument, surely it can be seen that the fact that the disciple's defense is not due solely to a purely intellectual effort does not mean that it is not reasonable. The fact that it cannot be contradicted by the enemies of Christ is due to the eloquence and wisdom with which it is presented, not that it is irrational and cannot be argued.

In the book of Acts, Luke properly applies the term to definite legal scenes (24:10; 25:8,16; 26:1-3; 26:24), but it is not limited to such a use. Paul and the Ephesian Jew, Alexander, defend themselves before mobs (19:33; 22:1).

In his epistles, Paul employs the term with regard to his authority as an apostle (I Cor. 9:3), his right to preach the gospel (Phil. 1:7, 16), and personal

attacks (II Tim. 4:16). He also uses it to demonstrate that man has no defense before God and none to validate his judgement of other men (Rom. 1:20; 2:1,15). He denies that his boasting is meant as a defense for his evangelism (II Cor. 12:19). He also points to repentant apologia as a result of a godly sorrow (II Cor. 7:11).

Peter's admonition (I Peter 3:15) lifts apologia out of a formal concept when he says that his readers are to be prepared at all times to offer a defense for their hope to anyone who asks.

Beyond these explicit uses of the term there are situations within the context of the documents and circumstances producing the documents themselves that are definitely apologetical. Some writers such as Reid take issue with the apologetic purpose suggested in the gospels.[21] Yet (just in passing) all of the gospels are filled with appeals to prophecy, a long-time recognized apologetic tactic. Reid with his modern definition may wish to cast aside such an appeal, but even he would have to admit that it possessed considerable merit for its original audience.

Also it must be remembered that the gospels (Luke's gospel may be an exception) were written for Christians primarily to strengthen in the face of doubt and the threat of heresy. Before the Church had to

---

21. Reid, op. cit., p. 28.

face the world on a more equal footing in a formal sense, it had to contend with its surreptitious infiltration within the fellowship.

Certainly one of the best examples of an apology in the more classic sense is the epistle to the Galatians. Keeping in mind that apologia is not always necessarily addressed to the accuser (Acts 26:2), one sees Paul defend his apostleship, his gospel, his work on behalf of the Gentile Christians, and reiterate his gospel in contrast to the legalist's claims. Note it is not his opponents Paul seeks to convince, but the ones who must judge, the Galatians.

In the New Testament those involved in apologia were ultimately defending the truth in Christ and his gospel. Even though they themselves were on trial, in prison, or in the heat of dispute, they were under no illusions about this fact. Though they were the accused in the historical moment, they saw themselves as witnesses for the defense.

Upon his ascension Christ told his disciples that they were to be his witnesses in every corner of the earth. Most who have dealt with the matter of witnessing generally have associated it with kerygma, but the basic idea behind marturia with its own legal implication of bearing testimony would tend to grant a closer identification with apologia. It is the corollary of apologia as euangelion is the corollary of kerygma.



Most New Testament uses of marturia would show an apologetic situation rather than one of outright proclamation.

Apologia has always been treated by modern scholars with considerably greater liberty than kerygma and didache. While seeking to discover the pure presentation of these latter aspects, they have granted apologia a token role in the substance of church life and then subjected it to the modern use theology seems to have created for it.

As Reid suggests, by the time Peter's epistle was read the Church had advanced to a more sophisticated understanding of what it meant to bear witness.[22] But that was a natural outgrowth of the Church's expansion and experience. Still it was early discerned that the same approach could not be used in all situations. Paul knew better than to use the same apologetic point of contact on Mars Hill (Acts 17:16-34) that he used in the synagogue of Thessalonica (Acts 17:1-3).

So the pattern was set, and as the Church emerged from the Apostolic Age, and gained in some prominence and power, it was obliged to take up the attitude of defense against various opponents. As Hurst states, all

---

22. Ibid., p. 19. Reid makes the ludicrously anachronistic suggestion that from the Gospels to Peter's first epistle the Church was making the transition to the science of Christian defence.

Christian literature is in a sense an apologia,[23] but in the second century the energy of the Church, due to its still precarious position, began to be absorbed in the preparation of special treatises which dealt with the slanderous charges springing from the hostile ideologies that surrounded it. So deeply engaged was the Church in this effort during this stage of its development that it has been named the Age of the Apologists by historians. Little needs to be said here beyond the fact that now the defenders of the faith took it upon themselves to sortie out and meet their adversaries on enemy ground and adapted their apologia to whatever form or matter the attack assumed. Note again that the apologia through the Apostolic Fathers was largely internal and directed at heresy within the Church. It was in this environment that doctrine was hammered out. With the Apologists the doctrine faced its baptism of fire as they had to face more direct external attacks.

Also theology took on a more positive shape as the Apologists took the world's terminology (martial, judicial, commercial, philosophical, metaphysical) and used it in a Christian context. The fact that Christianity was not absorbed into the welter of syncretism engulfing the Graeco-Roman world in its formative years is due to

---

23. George Leopold Hurst, An Outline of Christian Literature, p. 29.

the strict adherence of the Fathers and the Apologists to the "faith...delivered to the saints".

The Apologists became the first philosophers of the faith and the language of Christianity began to assume an even greater literary dimension. It laid the groundwork for the means of refutation of heresy that developed in the more established Church of the following centuries.

In the history of the Church --- New Testament, Apostolic, Mediaeval, Reformation, Modern --- apologia is a key to understanding The Church's role. Richardson states: "It cannot be too strongly stressed that the Church's own life and witness are the true apology for the Christian faith".[24]

Considering the analogical implications of apologia, its antiquity must be included. The idea is probably as old as the first dispute. But even the more formalized application of public answers to criticisms possesses a respectable antiquity as well. Remember that the koinē' of the New Testament borrowed the term and its application from the classical period of Greek.

When a term is carried from one context to another to demonstrate, emphasize, or clarify, it becomes a metaphor or an analogy. Apologia is just such an analogy. Admittedly, such use by virtue of its primitive formulation and application will have limitations when applied to a new field, but nonetheless the implications

---

24. Richardson, op. cit., p. 137.

should be thought out to their furthest limit. Lewis once said that people just don't think things out to the absolute ruddy end.[25] Now, if the use of apologia with its original context and implications were to be thought out, carried to its furthest conclusion, and adhered to and not simply granted token acknowledgement to be subjected to the current style, a better understanding would be reached.

This limiting of apologia by failing to take into account its metaphoric intention prompts one to ask those insisting on a more mechanistic approach if they have really attempted to think out the semantical function of the term to a consistent philosophy.

Metaphorically, the original picture of the court battle is far and away the most accurate depiction of apologia. Perhaps no clearer statement regarding the idea behind apologia has been made than the remark of Festus to Agrippa (Acts 26:16) expressing the Roman judicial practice. From that early scene, Christian leaders came to realize that daily in every age charges are brought stating that the truth as proclaimed by Christianity is false. And as in the actual judicial context, there are judges, prosecutors, defendants, witnesses, claims, and decisions. Constantly, supposed

---

25. C. S. Lewis, "Before We Can Communicate", Undeceptions, p. 213.

new evidence is being brought to light explicitly and implicitly demonstrating that the premises, conclusions and subsequent claims of Christianity have no legal validity. After accusation is made Christianity through its defenders restates the truth, either refuting the accusation or taking it into account and accommodating whatever facts the accusation may have brought to light. Unbiased evidence, it must be noted, is of use to the defense as well as to the prosecution in that the apologists do not so much accommodate the truth to the evidence as the evidence to the truth.

It should be noted as well that not only is the substance of Christian truth under attack, but the claims that are made in the light of such truth. Indeed, in many if not most instances, this is the real cause of antagonism. It grows out of hostile reaction when the effect of Christian truth is felt in the world and in the lives of men.

Pressing the metaphor yet further, a frequent point of confusion is who is the judge in this context? Who is it the prosecution and the defense are trying to persuade? All too many writers on apologetics point to the idea that they are trying to convince each other. This may be true to a certain extent, but it is not entirely the case; it is not even the primary aim. As Bruce states: "A wise apologist instinctively shuns

conflict with dogmatic unbelief as futile".[26] There must be a third party involved. It is, in fact, this third party whom the antagonists are seeking to bring to a decision about the issue under fire. The decision maker in the apologetic situation is the one whose faith hangs in the balance. He is the one who is teetering on the line of commitment one way or the other. He is the potential convert or he is the Christian whose faith has been shaken by the accusation. It is usually conceded by scholars that even apologies that were addressed to a specific individual attack were actually a public answer to charges that were made to prevent the persuasion of those who might be convinced if Christianity did not answer the charges.

As was mentioned earlier, perhaps the key image in the judicial metaphor is the fact that Christians are called witnesses. They are to be prepared to be defendants against all indictments. In this role apologia assumes its most evangelistic stance. As Lewis pointed out, there may have been times in history when the task of the Church was to instruct those brought up in the faith, but now the task is conversion.[27] Perhaps

---

26. A. B. Bruce, Apologetics; or Christianity Defensively Stated, p. 32.

27. Lewis, op. cit., p. 69.

this is another reason why apologia is not held in the highest esteem today; aggressive evangelism is not the style of the modern church.

In the larger context of salvation history and the fight waged by God for the souls of men through his Church against the dark powers (Eph. 6:12), the defenders of the faith never expected to convince or defeat the Accuser, but to share in his complete refutation and overthrow by holding fast the claims of truth established through Christ.

Many apologetical writers mention martial imagery in their treatment of apologia, but as with the judicial metaphor, they rarely complete the full scale of the image. It is quite a legitimate exercise to describe apologia in martial terms precisely because the courtroom is in every sense a diminutive and supposedly more civilized form of battle. Reid's handling of martial terminology is characteristic of the temerity with which modern apologists approach their subject.

> "In what follows military metaphors will occur frequently. But it must be remembered that they are no more than metaphors. No doubt both on the battlefield and in court the objective is victory over the opponent. But the victory is quite different in each case. In the one it means destroy, in the other convince.[28]

Once again, anyone would agree that a metaphor has limitations; however, it would serve better to take

---

28. Reid, op. cit., p. 9.

the metaphor to its limit rather than to impose such constriction upon it from the start. The weakness of this approach is demonstrated by Reid's contrast drawn between the martial and judicial context: In battle one seeks to destroy while in court one merely seeks to convince. What Reid fails to see is that the court decision is won when the defense, in effect, destroys the prosecution's case. And really this is all that is being implied in the martial metaphor he seems to handle with such caution.

Reid's idea that the battle metaphor is limited because it depicts destruction misses the point in a second and more significant way. Militarily, one seeks to destroy in battle by launching an offensive and the apologist by definition is a defender. Bruce based his whole approach to apologetics on the claim that it was Christianity defensively stated.[29] If one were to go a step beyond such a claim, he might well ask: How else can Christians state it? Is not the cardinal claim of Christianity that the offensive for man's salvation is purely a divine prerogative?

Once again, it is a matter of thinking out the implications of a metaphor to the "ruddy end". The New Testament writers, and the Church since, seriously considered themselves to be engaged in a battle. Now

---

29. Bruce, op. cit.

in wars of conquest there are two types of forces employed before victory is complete --- invasion and occupational forces. A land is as much subdued by those employing occupational tactics --- clerks, merchants, administrators, magistrates --- as by the warrior. Britain repeatedly was invaded by a host of enemies, but the most famous and successful was undoubtedly Duke William of Normandy. He crossed the English Channel with a claim to the throne of England which he first established by vanquishing his foe in battle. He then sealed his domain by bringing in those who would hold and defend his rightful claim. Resistance has to be overcome, counter-attacks repelled for the truth and legality of rule to be established.

Watchman Nee, the popular Bible expositor, touches on this vital point in his enlightening treatment of the epistle to the Ephesians.[30] He demonstrates that Christ alone has the power to invade and conquer. He is the offensive warrior. All Christians really can do is hold what Christ has gained. Whatever battle the Church does is performed in Christ. Only Christ can truthfully say: "I have overcome the world". Only Christ can bind the strong man and spoil his goods.

True, Paul likened Christians to warriors in Ephesians 6:10-18, and urged them to don the whole armor

---

30. Watchman Nee, Sit, Walk, Stand.

that God provides for warfare. But even here the weapons in the Christian's arsenal are all of a defensive nature (including the sword with which thrusts are parried). Christians are to "stand therefore..." in Christ even as they sit (1:18) and walk (4:1) in him. This, it would appear, brings apologia within sight of grace.

The Church, therefore, can be likened to occupational forces charged with holding the hard-won gains of the victory in Christ. The Church seeks to establish the rule of the kingdom of God by defending the truth and claims of his sovereignty against any and all usurpers. This may be accomplished in a number of ways, and it is in this effort to convert that the apologists can realize their innovative opportunities. But in every situation the Church is defending. Whatever is thrown at the enemy to check his advance is the Church's possession through the work of Christ. The offensive is God's prerogative. Christians are keepers and no more responsible for their possession than was Adam of the Garden of Eden.

But though the offensive is not in the apologist's power the innovative use of his arsenal is a different matter. The Christian apologist may employ only the Word, but by what means is one of the reasons the Church possesses a diversity of gifts.

This is an important point. The front line guarded by the apologist is a long one and attack might

come from any quarter. What apologetic must be employed depends upon the whole theater of operation: the terrain, the form and scale of attack, the enemy's objective. The very idea behind attack is to catch one's adversary off guard. How many times has the enemy craftily chosen the form, scale, scene of battle to achieve his ends and too slowly are the Church's forces marshalled to repel. But on the frontier smelling out the battle, where the first shots are fired, is the apologist.

Now to consider the matter of apologia's place in theology. As was mentioned earlier, the purest forms of doctrine and practice are to be found in Scripture. Analogically, it could be said that the Scripture is the closest the Church can come to black and white as it most perfectly contains and reflects the truth of God. Now, if these "black and white" spiritual truths are cast against the wall of apprehendable reality and scientifically considered the result could be likened to a sort of chromatic spectrum of theological knowledge.

If the theological disciplines could be thus likened to the chromatic spectrum where the lines of colour are indefinite as they blend into one another to present the various shades of hue until the purer representations of colour can be perceived, apologetics may be found occupying a place between dogmatics and homiletics as a primary colour blending with them to

effect all other theological interests in the spectrum.

Reid does try to make corollaries of apologetics and dogmatics,[31] but as a discipline it has quite as much to do with homiletics. Brunner touches on this relationship when he suggests that dogmatics (Sach-bezogen) is oriented to the matter proclaimed and that apologetics (Hörer-bezogen) is related to the hearer of the proclamation.[32] Brunner fails to follow up the obvious transition between the matter to its proclamation for the moment a hearer is concerned homiletics must be considered.

Barth looks at dogmatics as opposing unbelief and suggests it employ apologetic language.[33] Far better is Farrer's distinction:

> "A systematic theologian may vindicate the rationality of the faith more solidly than any apologist; but he does so simply by thinking it out and articulating the parts. He looks for the heart and sense of the doctrine. The apologist's eye is on the point of attack."[34]

Frye once made an interesting observation when he said that literature was displaced myth; myth being briefly defined as man's imaginative attempt to impose

---

31. Reid, op. cit., p. 13.

32. Emil Brunner, Dogmatik, p. 110.

33. Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics, Vol. I, p. 31.

34. Farrer, "The Christian Apologist", Light on C. S. Lewis, p. 23.

order and meaning on the chaos his senses apprehended. Now, in modern literary academia, myth, though a far vaster concept, is relegated to the position of a sub-topic within literature among many even though it is an element in all of them.

Borrowing this principle, it could just as well be said that theology is displaced apologia --- that aspect of divine commission in which theology lives and moves and has its being. Apologia is an attempt to impose a Christian order and meaning on the existence man experiences. Now, in modern theological academia, apologia is termed apologetics and has been relegated to the role of a discipline within theology among many even though it is an element of them all. And in this technical, compartmentalized age, it is being restricted to a single approach.

Thus what theologians mean when they say apologia is an "element" in the central tradition is not something fundamental, but rather an ingredient, a seasoning, a bay leaf in the theological sauce. It would appear that the purpose is swallowed up in the means.

This matter of a restricted definition is a chief cause of the theologians' failure to man all the battle fronts. As has been shown, apology has a long, venerable, and varied history, but apologetics, the theological discipline, is fairly recent in its development. Naturally, it contains within it the marks

of its birth in the advent of the more scientific approach to all of man's endeavor. And plainly, it is this milieu of the scientific method that has caused theologians to acquiesce and limit the definition of apologetics and thereby limit their apology. It is one thing to fight on the adversary's turf, but it is quite another to allow him to determine one's strategy as well.

It must be remembered that while the definition of apologetics as the science of apology serves a purpose, the current emphasis has a definite academic, analytical, but passive approach that ignores a more practical, synthetic, active aspect of developing a technique of apology --- devising the strategic method of apology. One may study apologetics as a field, but one may also contrive an apologetic in the sense of a modus operandi as a potential contribution to the field.

After seeing what borders on contempt for apologetics in the theological world, it can be seen that the theologians have become preoccupied with apologetics over against apology much as one could read literary criticism and neglect literature. Apology reduced to apologetics has become the ingrown, esoteric intellectual pastime of the academics. Surely it is obvious that when one stops doing something to contemplate what he is doing, in effect, he stops doing it. When people begin to categorize and systemize an activity, they can

be no longer directly engaged in that activity. Preoccupation with the mechanics has an adverse effect on the art. And when the science supersedes the art, the art will decline.

Positive data notwithstanding, no one would deny that apologists must be aware of the current scene. As Dulles says, apologists must master and correct new currents of thought. He points to Origen's dealing with Middle Platonism, Augustine facing Neo-Platonism, and Aquinas writing against Averroistic Aristotelianism.[35] Apologia is vitally concerned with effective communication. Lewis looked upon apologists as translators.[36] He thought that they must convert the truth into the vernacular of their day. He goes further to say they must translate not only in terms, but in images and concepts. Apologists were not only to be concerned with the spread of facts, but also with sentiment --- and ordinancy of attitude and value --- of rightful claims upon life. He said:

> "The process of living seems to consist in coming to realize truths so ancient and simple that, if stated, they sound like barren platitudes. They cannot sound otherwise to those who have not had the relevant experience: That is why there is no real teaching of such truths possible and every generation starts from scratch.[37]

---

35. Avery Dulles, A History of Apologetics, p. 156.

36. Lewis, Undeceptions, p. 72.

37. Lewis, Letters, p. 166.

Reid grants Moltke credit for the sentiment that more important than the opponent who starts the war is the one who makes it inevitable;[38] that is, the one who has brought about a climate in which conflict is assured. A hostile milieu is sufficient cause for the apologist to take up his pen. It could be said that quite as lethal as a specific attack is the hostile milieu that forms the matrix for such attacks. So as well as meeting the specific attack there must be a matrix for defense as well.

Lewis included this idea in his much broader concept of apologetical strategy. He felt that a Christian who was qualified to produce a good piece of work on other subjects not dealing with Christian theology could accomplish a great deal if not more than a book concerned directly with Christianity.

> "We can make people (often) attend to the Christian point of view for half an hour or so; but the moment they have gone away from our lecture or laid down our article, they are plunged back into a world where the opposite position is taken for granted. Every newspaper, film, novel, and textbook undermines our work. As long as that situation exists, widespread success is simply impossible. We must attack the enemy's line of communication. What we want is not more little books about Christianity, but more little books by Christians on other subjects --- with their Christianity latent."[39]

This approach, Lewis proposed, would beat the critics of

---

38. Reid, op. cit., p. 161.

39. Lewis, Undeceptions, pp. 67-68.

Christianity at their own game. According to Lewis, it is not so much the books on materialism that make men materialists, but the materialistic assumptions in all the other books they read. As one steeped in the world's marvellous literature, Lewis was quite prepared to make such a contribution containing Christian assumptions that could be conveyed to more than one of man's powers of reception.

Thus Lewis and his circle with their imaginative inclinations and training were well qualified to produce unique contributions to two kinds of literature. First, the marvellous tale, and second, apologia itself. Apologia has provided a great body of literature. Due to its form, objective, and matter it constitutes a definable collection of literary material with its own history and currents of development. It has been influenced by and has influenced the greater world of letters. Hurst demonstrates the genesis of this claim when he says:

> "Many of the Apologists were deeply in debt to Athens for their culture; they were the philosophers of the faith, and with them the language of Christianity became literary, if not classical."[40]

Northrop Frye has pointed out that revolutions in literature come about through revolutions in literary

---

40. Hurst, op. cit., p. 29.

form. Such revolutions reshape literary convention.[41] With the romantic theologians the literary aspect of apologia has experienced a new form that has been knowingly introduced which has affected its apologetic conventions and thereby embraced a larger frontier in its defensive tactic. The form is called romantic theology.

The modern theologian has come to look at religious meaning almost exclusively from the standpoint of abstraction. As a result the romantic theologians were concerned that the meaning of religious experience was being dried up and "left for dead in the human mind by the operation of a purely discursive activity". No doubt the current attitude and practice of apologetics is an excellent example of what Barfield calls "logomorphic" activity.[42] This is mainly projecting modern concepts backward into original meanings largely by abstraction. According to Barfield one may be logomorphic by "projecting post-logical thought back

---

41. Northrop Frye, Fables of Identity.

42. Owen Barfield, Poetic Diction, pp. 77, 157, 208, 213, 221, 225-226, 236-237.
Lewis hinted rather broadly at the logomorphic activity of de Chardin: "...And what in Heaven's name is the sense of saying that before there was life there was 'pre-life'? If you choose to say that before you switched on the light in the cellar there was 'pre-light', of course you may. But the ordinary English for 'pre-light' is darkness. What do you gain by such nick-names?" (Letters, p. 269).

into a pre-logical age". This is what he calls historical logomorphism. But he contends that there is also a psychological manifestation of logomorphism which takes place when commentators project their mentality into the authors of old philosophy or old literature. Its most common form, again, is abstraction built on assumptions in language and consciousness that did not or could not have existed. It would appear that in the reduction of the Biblical record, religious experience, ineffable spiritual truths to abstractions that modern theology is suspect of a theological logomorphism. The romantic approach wished to go behind such "banality" to a bolder activity of the imagination that would transcend the projections that result in such delusions.

This is a common fault in the formal, intellectual type of apology now prevalent. It has already been mentioned that there are levels of attack other than the purely intellectual. Romantic theology aids apology in fulfilling its tasks which can be defined by the effect it seeks to bring about on three levels of attack. While all three are going on simultaneously, are interdependent, and interact, they are distinct and need to be delineated as such. It has too long been the habit to officially restrict the theatre of apology to the first level. The romantic theologians have expanded the battle front by entering the lists for combat in the second and third. And they are, if

anything, more important.

The first level of attack is the direct attack. This is the form most people think of when they think of apology. It is classic apology in the sense of a classic battle. It is usually two antagonists in direct confrontation. It is a more or less isolated engagement involving two opposing viewpoints representing either individuals or camps. The issues are more or less agreed upon. It is specific, immediate, open; the arsenals of both sides are set forth in full array. It is primarily an intellectual confrontation. History is full of such examples of classic apology: Augustine and the Pelagians, Athanasius and the Arians, Pascal and the Jansenists, Newman and the Anglicans.

The second level of attack comes through the hostile milieu. To some degree it may partake of the nature of classic apology, but it is more subtle. It could be likened to a cold war rather than the classic battle. It is elusive in propangandistic dress, but yet tangible through the constant threat and pressure in terms of attitude and atmosphere. It is opportunistic. It deals in assumption. It involves emotion as well as intellect. It could be described as the "gut-level" attack in that it has a more direct bearing on the work-a-day world of values than the more academic interest of the classic apology. It is a dangerous theatre. As Lewis observed, "the intellect is powerless

against the animal organism".[43] Perhaps this level could be called assumptive apology.

The third level of attack is on the unconscious level. It has the most direct relation to romanticism and is the most subtle of all. It is more like a sneak attack, to complete the military metaphor. It is absorbed unawares. It is presumptious. It deals in the cosmos of imagery --- the world of quality beyond predicate. It operates in the terminus where the boxcars of perception and conception are assembled. It takes effect in that area the average man calls the fringe of being, but is coming more to be seen as the source of being --- the inner man. This is intrinsic apology.

Defense must be offered on each of these levels and in these terms. This paper insists that it is being offered. In the sections that follow, the contribution romantic theology makes to the apologetic effort on all three levels will be examined but the emphasis, of course, will be on the second and third level.

In the effort on the third, or intrinsic level, romantic theology attempts to deal with what Lewis referred to as the "tragic dilemma". This is the seemingly insurmountable difficulty brought about by the incurable tendency to abstraction on the part of

---

43. Lewis, The Abolition of Man, p. 20.

the human mind and the need to convey the reality of concrete experience. Lewis describes the dilemma thus: "...either to taste and not to know or to know and not to taste --- or more strictly, to lack one kind of knowledge because we are in an experience or to lack another kind because we are outside it."[44]

Now apology that could approach a solution to this dilemma would be of great benefit. In contrast to the current mode of apologia it would concern itself with matters of value. Aesthetic capacity is at bottom an apprehension of value. Sometimes it expresses itself in creation; sometimes in appreciation. Though the two are never really separated, the creative side is more distinct in the artistic effort, while the appreciation is found in the presentation sensitive to the finer shades of value. In the circle of romantic theology, the artist setting forth value in creative form and the critic who can determine such value are both present. Such a combination makes for a powerful

---

44. Lewis, "Myth Become Fact", Undeceptions, pp. 41-42. This "tragic dilemma" concept of Lewis is related to Barfield's concept of regaining phenomenal awareness (a lost perspective) while retaining principles evolved from phenomena and Tolkien's concept of a suspension of primary belief. These concepts are a good example of the kind of influence that abounds within the Inklings' circle. A central idea surrounding knowledge and experience was no doubt bantered about and these three approaches, each "original" and shedding its peculiar light on the issue are presented.

apologetic presentation.

Take this a step further. Defense, on this basis, involves more than arguing about facts or the method of applying them. It involves their worth and meaning. Thus, in such an approach an appeal is made to judgement. From here, remembering who is the judge in the apologetic situation, it can be seen from a slightly different angle that apologia is inextricably bound to evangelism. Whether it is accepted or rejected an alternative has been presented.

Such a goal is the primary purpose for undertaking a defense. This again demonstrates the limitation of the strictly scientific method. If sound apologia must appeal to judgement this involves a type of knowledge outside the strictly scientific sphere.

In the sections to follow an approach presenting such an alternative will be discussed, but in closing this section let it be said once again that the central aim of this paper is to enlarge the idea of apologia. Hopefully, it has been sufficiently demonstrated how vital apologia is to the total scene of Christian experience. It is ever present. It has been shown in terms of the central tradition of Christianity to be not just a corollary of kerygma and didache, but a full-orbed correlative. They cannot escape its presence anymore than it can escape theirs. Then further in theological study, it was seen to occupy a place

between homiletics and dogmatics blending with them as a primary colour in the theological spectrum to form the other disciplines. As Brunner says: "...at all times it has proved to be as urgent and as inevitable as the Christian study of doctrine proper..."[45]

But to change the analogy to one of a grammatical nature in order to demonstrate its presence in the existential moment, apologia is interjective. It is an insertion between declarative and imperative statements that covers whatever the primary nature of those statements may admit to strengthen their claim to truth or authority.

Apologia is a portion, root and stock, of any effective effort to present the gospel on every level. There is never a kerygmatic or didactic situation where a defense is not at least implicit. Even if it is worked out mentally by the hearer in the course of the matter without recourse to its being expounded, it is there fulfilling its role.

Apologia is more than just the attempt to bring the hearer to the point of intellectually deciding which of the two abstract proposals is true, it is an attempt to alter the state of mind that it might sympathetically share in a process which will result in total conversion. Admittedly, apology can only go so

---

45. Brunner, op. cit., p. 6.

far toward conversion; preaching and teaching have a role to play. But since it is the hearer being converted, it is no less his changing relation to the truth that determines the character of these three elements as the intrinsic nature of the elements themselves.

Apology holds the line against some form of attack by some form of defense. When this line is passed by the adversary, no longer antagonistic, neutral, or dulled, he becomes a listener, and the apologetic tone recedes and a kerygmatic intent replaces it. Once over this exhortative line the kerygmatic character diminishes and the didactic cast becomes dominant. At no point in this progress is there an absence of any of the three but as the relation of the adversary/ listener/believer alters in his reception of the truth, so, consequently, in some degree, does the character of its presentation from defensive, to exhortative to instructive. But the point emphasized here is that apologia will always play a significant role. Kerygma, didache, apologia --- preaching, teaching, defense --- these are the earth, air, fire, and water of theological and evangelical pursuits. Regardless which of the three may dominate a particular situation, the other two will be present in varying degree.

In any event, apologia is not just a defense of established dogma, but also a means of enabling people to articulate their own current experience. It is a

defense of a dynamic situation. It cannot be cut and dried. Beyond the conversion experience, defense commensurate with experience, ever new, ever more subtle must challenge and shock. It never becomes redundant.

III. MORPHOLOGY OF ROMANTIC THEOLOGY.

"Tiny glints of gold make dull hair romantic."

Advertisement, 1938

"These things are almost romantique and yet true."

Pepys Diary, 1667

"...and to an exposition of my current notions on this maddening subject I shall now turn, only begging the reader to prefix mentally to each sentence, "At the moment I find it useful to employ the following proposition in thinking about Romanticism."

The Triumph of Romanticism
Morse Peckham

"A romantic theologian does not mean one who is romantic about theology but one who is theological about romance..."

"Preface", Essays Presented to Charles Williams
C. S. Lewis

III. THE MORPHOLOGY OF ROMANTIC THEOLOGY

For the proponents of romantic theology this approach accomplishes some of the key objectives of apologetics that no other form has so effectively obtained. Thus far, however, the work of the romantic theologians has quickened the interest of literary scholars more than theologians. Their interest is understandable and laudable. They always have seen in literature with its creative spirit an immediate kinship with religious matter. It is a kinship that the more scientifically oriented theologian of today fails to own, particularly if the literature is of a romantic nature. Currently, some stark, "realistic" treatment with existentialist overtones might claim their attention, but not fairytales. Perhaps the prevalent attitude could be best illustrated by this piece from John Steinbeck's novel, The Winter of Our Discontent:

> "I'll try to explain it to Mrs. Young-Hunt --- to Margie," I said. "Mary comes from a noble, but poor Irish family."
>
> "We weren't all that poor."
>
> "Can't you hear it in her speech?"
>
> "Well, now that you mention it..."
>
> "Well, Mary's sainted, or should be grandmother was a good Christian, wasn't she, Mary?"
>
> It seemed a little hostility was growing in my dear. I went on. "But she had no trouble believing in fairy people, although in strict Christian theology the two don't mix."

And there it lies. The strict theologians stuff their ears against the horns of elfland, and would bind to the mast all who would listen. Indeed the wheels of theological intellectual energy move slowly, for despite all the excitement created by romanticism in art and philosophy, theologians have yet to take it seriously. As Shideler remarks, they do not seem to consider it capable of intellectual treatment. It is to them an emotional matter, or airy-fairy, or it does not deal with the "real world".

But the truth is, theologians as a rule are laymen in matters of romanticism and share the limitation of popular understanding. Even though when directly confronted, most theologians and apologists would allow for some value and grant that it has power, they avoid coming to grips with the why and wherefore of its force.

In the average person the pejorative connotation is even more pronounced. Despite the fact that it is used adjectively in a myriad fashion to countless subjects, by and large, it means that things are not to be taken seriously. Because he does not see things as they "really are" the romantic is not to be trusted. Somehow those afflicted with the malady have lost touch with reality, and it never occurs to those with this opinion that the romantic just has a different grip on reality.

Admittedly a cause for the general contempt toward romanticism is the fact that many romantics have taken its subjectivist tendencies to the point of ridiculous vanity. "Behold the dreamer cometh..." --- can any more contempt be heaped on one who fancies himself the visionary?

Yet as Lewis pointed out, "the counter-romantic movement is so violent it seems almost pathological in its character. The hatred of romanticism has blinded its critics to the fact that there are differences in approach."[1]

So, romanticism, as is the case with apologetics, needs a bit of focusing. But in one sense it is easier to describe than apologetics because it has had its own movement in modern times. Academically, it has been tagged and tucked away. Clear associations make it a handy term of reference. But again, as with apologetics, a little attention will show it to be one of those terms that needs to be defined in accordance with almost every context in which it is used. Further study of its meaning will demonstrate that it was merely at a point in time scholars have termed the Romantic

---

1. Lewis, "The Literary Impact of the Authorized Version", Selected Literary Essays (ed. by Walter Hooper), p. 142.
   Jacques Barzun in his book Romanticism and the Modern Ego cleverly illustrates the differences in approach to romanticism through various quotations taken from a variety of sources in a chapter entitled, "Romantic --- a Sampling of Modern Usage", (pp. 213-230).

Movement that a fundamental aspect of man's nature was isolated, illustrated and labelled. As Northrop Frye said, men tend to look on romanticism with the "bliss of oversimplification".[2]

Romantic characteristics are not the exclusive property of the period during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries scholars have termed "romantic" any more than "progress" is the sole possession of the twentieth century. Chesterton once observed that "an imbicile habit has arisen in modern controversy of saying that such and such a conviction can be held in one age but cannot be held in another...What a man believes depends upon his philosophy, not the clock or the century".[3] He probably would ask when there has been an age in which man was not enamored with the past, stirred by high flown sentiment, or sought that which transcended the mundane? When has the flight of man's imagination not reached seemingly beyond his reason? When the potency of individualism has not been an issue or man failed to be concerned with matters of the soul?

Praz says that a study of romanticism in a nineteenth century context can only avail to explain the intensity, not the nature of the epidemic: "If the nineteenth century constitutes a necessary frame for

---

2. Northrop Frye, The Stubborn Structure, p. 200.

3. G. K. Chesterton, Orthodoxy, p. 133.

the picture I have painted, it is a part which completes, rather than conditions the whole..."[4]

Barfield speaks of the romantic impulse that grew older and crystallized into a philosophy: "Romanticism, when a child germinated as feeling; in adolescence, it achieved self-conscious maturity as thought."[5]

One would willingly grant some validity to Frye's claim that romanticism has an "historical center of gravity", if he means by this that a period of time was preoccupied by a consideration and application of these characteristics men now call romantic.[6] Such a historical-philosophical perspective would grant an identity to an era but would not necessarily limit the subject or phenomena to this specific span of time. Yet in the mind that is exactly what such academic divisions do.

It is not accurate to refer to romanticism as an idea. That is one of the great flaws of "movements". They isolate the essence of a tendancy into an idea for

---

4. Mario Praz, The Romantic Agony, p. xii.

5. Barfield, History in English Words, p. 199.

6. Frye places the "event" of the Romantic Movement around 1790-1830. He claims that his approach removes the problem of timeless characterization. But he denies that romanticism is a historical term such as "mediaeval" because it also has a center of gravity in the creative arts.

popular consumption. It has been said that romanticism was not a movement or a school, but a restless experiment. It is even doubtful that many romantics would have classified themselves as such (Frye says that it is not a voluntary category). In fact it took a critic to turn the term to its modern literary profit. In Germany around the turn of the century a critic named Schiller first used the term to designate a school of literature opposed to the classical.[7]

So romanticism was an "event" in that the poets and the critics during this period distilled the essence of the tendency, and if the term was not coined here, it was re-minted. But it is a mistake to label it as a past movement and shelve it as a serious viewpoint. Frye claims for romanticism the distinction of being one of the most decisive changes in the history of culture.[8] He claims that it was so decisive as to make everything written since post-romantic, including anything regarded by its producers as anti-romantic.

Generally, most historians will agree that romanticism was a change in artistic temperament centering in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in reaction to the neo-classicism of the Augustan age, the Enlightenment, and eighteenth century materialism. But

---

7. Frederich Schiller, Uber Naive und Sentimentalische Dichtung.

8. Frye, Fables of Identity, p. 3.

they also note that movements are generally associated with social upheavals or changes in the philosophical concept of man that may accompany or follow in its wake. Historians now identify romanticism with revolution --- American, French, Industrial --- all of which produced significant statements about the rights of man.

Frye also remarks regarding this effect of romanticism when he says, "one feature...is the way in which the forms of human civilization came to be regarded as man-made rather than God-made".[9] He suggests, for instance, that the "divine right of kings" is an example of a so-called God-made doctrine that fell by the way. Most historians would insist that the idea of a sovereign's divine right was also man-made (Romans 13 notwithstanding) and has been in some form exploited by monarchs since some men have ruled over other men. Perhaps what Frye is suggesting is that man no longer felt the need to depend upon divine sanction for his philosophies. At any rate, this "anthropo-centric" perspective is one that positive romantics readily espouse including Owen Barfield.

The American critic, Morse Peckham, concurs in such exalted claims when he points out that romanticism has affected more than just literary convention ---

---

9. Frye, loc. cit.

philosophy, religion, politics, art have all fallen under its spell.[10] Lewis suggests that the modern attitude toward the Authorized Version was influenced by the Romantic Movement. By this he means far more than the Lake poets. He gives credit to a taste for the primitive and passionate which grew through the eighteenth century. The Bible stories became literary assets by classifying the growing preference for primitive simplicity, abrupt and mysterious manner, and violent passions. Characteristically, he adds that those merely reading the Bible as literature never read the Bible.[11]

Indeed, when one comes to consider the effect of romanticism, some of the most powerful names in the history of thought are encountered. In the mediation of the transition from the Enlightenment's rationalism to romanticism one cannot escape the name of Kant. In his wake follow the outstanding German romantics cresting in Schleiermacher. In France the names of Chénier, Mme. de Stael, and Chateaubriand present themselves to mind. Chateaubriand claimed that his apology was written especially for the men of letters and for the world.

But it is the English romantics the world calls

---

10. Morse Peckham, The Triumph of Romanticism, pp. 3-26.

11. Lewis, op. cit.

to mind when romanticism is mentioned. A legion of names could be listed with various reactions assessing the value of their contribution. Surprisingly, with the exception of Barfield, none of the romantic theologians really dealt to any great degree with romanticism in the light of the poets and critics of the Romantic Movement. The literature of the last one hundred years preceding their school days was not taught at Oxford.

Barfield pursued this interest as a result of the connection between the theories of the creative imagination advanced chiefly by Coleridge and his own theories related to anthroposophic philosophy.

He says that in the Romantic Movement there was realized a need for distinguishing between what were merely "sweet delusions" from the more eternal productions of the romantic spirit. Coleridge achieved this when he termed the power of inventing illustrative imagery fancy ("the playful adornment of nature"); and the power of creating from within terms which themselves become a part of nature, he called imagination.[12]

Williams seems to have been influenced principally by the romantic experience that touched him so deeply through the Beatrician vision of Dante.

---

12. Barfield, History in English Words, p. 199.

Lewis and Tolkien were both primarily mediaevalists and preferred the Northern aspect of romanticism. They found in the Celtic-Scandanavian mythological pattern a satisfactory source for the imaginative apprehension of reality they presented. Lewis said regarding his view of his romanticism's source:

> "The tap-root, Anglo-Saxon can never be abandoned...there we find the origins of that romanticism for which the ignorant invent such odd explanations."[13]

Praz also speaks of this Northern romanticism referring to the German "Sehnsucht" and English "wist-ful": "It is curious to note that these two words have no equivalent in the Romance languages --- a clear sign of the Nordic, Anglo-Saxon-Germanic origin of the sentiments they express."[14]

The importance of a definition of such an influential phenomenon can scarcely be over-estimated. Yet, according to the august Oxford English Dictionary, "'romantic' is a word for which, in connexion with literature, there is no generally accepted definition." Actually this ought not be too distressing. Undoubtedly, Martin Seymour-Smith speaks wisely when he says our understanding of literature does not benefit from attempting to narrow down the meanings of terms too

---

13. Roger Lancelyn Green and Walter Hooper, C. S. Lewis, A Biography, p. 151.

14. Praz, op. cit., p.

precisely. Further, he believes that in such attempts the terms themselves lose their value.[15] Praz states that romanticism is a term among many that are "approximate". They are serviceable makeshifts. They do not give exact definitions.[16]

Most would agree that romanticism is fundamentally a way of looking at things, and perhaps what the romantic theologians have done is not so much re-define romanticism as add another aspect to its already multi-faceted specialty by harnessing its principles in apologia. As Lewis said: "Let a fool bring his experience to the common stock that wiser men may profit from it."[17]

Of all romantic theology authors generally to be considered, one thing is certain. They all see romanticism as a means of placing man within the reach of God. How they accomplish this is quite varied among them, but seen in this light the overall effect of romantic theology is unquestionably apologetic. What is to be expounded is a sort of co-inherent theory (to use a Williams' concept) of apologetics based upon a theory of the meaning and value of romanticism as primarily an apologetic instrument. The four major contributors to the theory will be considered

---

15. Seymour-Smith, op. cit., p. X.

16. Praz, op. cit., p.

17. Lewis, Pilgrim's Regress, p. 8.

in accordance with the way in which they and their mentors shape it and realize it.

The term "romantic theology" first appears in the group destined to become the Inklings in a letter from Williams to Lewis in 1936. It was written in reply to a previous letter by Lewis which was full of praise for Williams' book, The Place of the Lion. The affinity of their minds is clearly evidenced by the last sentence.

> "Do forgive this too long letter but after all to write about your Love Poem and my Lion and both our Romantic Theology in one letter takes some paragraphs."[18]

Later, Lewis expanded the idea of romantic theology in the oft-quoted statement in the preface to the collection of Essays Presented to Charles Williams dedicated to his memory after his sudden death in 1945.

> "He was a theologian: a 'romantic theologian' in the technical sense which he himself invented for those words. A romantic theologian does not mean one who is romantic about theology, but one who is theological about romance, one who considers the theological implications of those experiences which are called romantic. The belief that the most serious and ecstatic experiences either of human love or of marvellous literature have such theological implication and that they can be healthy and fruitful only if the implications are diligently thought out and severely lived is the root and principle of his work."[19]

Williams, according to Lewis (an attitude he

---

18. Green and Hooper, op. cit., p. 135.

19. Lewis, "Introduction", Essays Presented to Charles Williams, p. VI.

obviously shared), identified with the counter-romantic position in that he believed untheologized romance to be sterile and mythological. Williams sought a synthesis between thought and feeling. The feeling (romanticism) had to be reflected upon (theologized) else its effect would be sterile or negative as regards genuine value and growth. He felt the romanticism that the counter-romantics were rejecting to be "immature in its senility". For all the confusion and negative opinion about the term romanticism, Williams decided to maintain it because, as he said, it was convenient, universal and diverse.

Perhaps this is a good place to draw a distinction between "romantic religion" and "romantic theology". The difference between the two can be illustrated by dealing with the nouns that are romanticized. Religion is directly related to belief, closer to experience. Theology is the study of the facts and phenomena of religion. It is, so to speak, one remove from belief and experience. In the first instance, romantic religion, the romantic experience is rendered almost equal with belief.

Williams was not far behind this position with his "technical sense" of the term. Barfield, it will be seen, went even beyond this point in incorporating romanticism and religion, but the other writers of this ilk seem more to romanticise their theology. It was

not so much an essential element of their belief, as a means of clarifying theological statements. At least for them it was a two way street. For these, romantic experience had theological implications and theological matters could be illuminated from within a romantic context.

This section will begin to focus the purpose of the paper: 1) By pointing up the linements of romantic theology, 2) Identifying its adversaries by demonstrating the weaknesses of the scientific method of apologetics, and how the romantic approach may complement it, and 3) Suggesting some dangers inherent within the romantic approach that theology may correct.

Morse Peckham offers a credible method of construction of definition in the published collection of his papers, The Triumph of Romanticism.

> "When we make interpretative predictions about semantic intentions --- or motive --- we are in fact making prediction about what problems the writer is trying to solve and what attitudes or orientations he is using to do so. (p. 76)

Regarding the contemporary situation from which may be inferred the intention of this group of writers it may be seen that in the twentieth century the philosophical concept of man is being altered through scientific technology. The idea of man as a creative individual is being replaced by the concept of man as a cog in a vast mechanical, social complex --- a situation romanticism in general resists. Peckham, defending the

psychological basis for the romantic viewpoint, writes:

> "Who looking about the world could deny the failure of the Age of Progress? The world's society is suffering from such disorientation that it resembles psychosis. It is filled with such contradictions that its chief characteristics are guilt, alienation, isolation, and rootlessness. (op. cit., p. 162)

It could be said that romantic theology is an attempt to deal with theological problems arising from the context of the technological society within the romantic syndrome. As on the broader front of resistance, romantic theology has risen to meet the current challenge of a mechanistic world, not the least of which it sees in the threat to reduce Christian truth to sheer rationalistic theology.

As Frye has pointed out, the contrast between the mechanical and the organic is deeply rooted in romantic thinking.[20] In the romantic scheme the mechanical has to do with the conscious (away from the Cartesian philosophy in which the mechanical has to do with the sub-conscious). What this means is that the romantic sees the mechanical as characteristic of ordinary experience; it is found particularly in the world outside. The superior or organic world is consequently "inside". And although it is still called superior or higher, the natural metaphorical direction of the inside world is downward into the profounder

---

20. Frye, Fables of Identity, p. 204.

depths of consciousness.

The romantic theologians would assent to the general romantic position that man, as well as sensorily encountering objective fact without, has knowledge, wisdom, and understanding within that he must labor to bring out, classify, analyze, and fit into the theories he has built on the exterior knowledge. Undoubtedly were man in possession of a more encompassing perspective such soul-discouraging steps could be immensely simplified. Romanticism is a move toward such a perspective in that it seeks to deal with the impact made on man that takes place on a non-rational level. Most romantics would agree with the Meggid of Barfield's Unancestral Voices who tells the hero Bergeon that "interior is anterior; that is to say, you must look to the interior for the origin".

It is the denial of this "inner space" so vital to man's well-being and understanding of himself that romanticism seeks to challenge. The scientific method carried over into the realm of theology has severe limitations. The total result is that a great void has been created in man's apprehension of reality --- God, himself, and all creation. Bombarded with the quantitative aspects of life man is losing contact with the qualitative aspects. The romantic approach attempts to meet this problem.

The romantic theologians had a thirst for and

saw the need for this aspect of quality in reality. Images, poetic and mythopoeic, contained this essential attribute. Lewis suggested such images were more like adjectives than nouns that thereby were enabled to give theological matters the impact of reality. He writes:

> "All my deepest and earliest experiences seem to be sheer quality. The terrible and the lovely are older than terrible and lovely things."[21]

B. H. Streeter in a straight apologetical work first published in 1926 dealt at length with this need to consider quality in any complete representation of reality.[22] He points out that science deals only with quantity, and quality is the province of art and religion. He, of course, argues that religion is a valid representation of reality, but it is through employing the "methods of art" that religion accomplishes this representation by making man <u>feel</u> the quality which it ascribes to reality. He even suggests that the best test of the truth of a religion is to cross-examine its myths and determine their inner-meaning before looking at the intellectual constructions of its theologians.

Streeter well points out that the higher and more variegated the type of life the more inadequate

---

21. Lewis, <u>Letters to Malcolm</u>, p. 114.

22. Streeter, <u>Reality</u>. Quotations in text.

are the methods of classification, analysis, and reduction to law employed by a purely scientific method. When apologists such as Richardson[23] suggest that apologetics be restricted to the scientific method, the question might be asked: How shall God or his universe be classified that analysis and law might be applied? Within the context of particulars this approach has admirable advantages, but applied to ultimates or even applied to a satisfactory representation of the extent of present knowledge it suffers tremendous lack. As Streeter says: "...the best we can do is find the illuminating metaphor, the picturesque analogy, the symbol or the myth which will help us apprehend some aspects of the truth."

While apologists pay lip service to intuition and imagination, they lay them aside to give full weight to the scientific method. Yet these things must be dealt with. It is obviously the troublesome fact, the apparent absurdity which can't be fitted into any synthesis we have yet made which is the one that should be faced.

It would appear that the spirit of the scientific method in straight apologetics is impatient with analogy and attempts to get behind the analogy to the "literal

---

23. Alan Richardson, Christian Apologetics.

truth". The proponents of the scientific method seem to reflect the attitude that such an approach is an advance beyond what they would term naive mythic and anthropomorphic approaches. But, in fact, they are participating in an approach that has invented a myth of its own.

Streeter demonstrates that the scientific approach, while shunning anthropomorphisms, employs a metaphorical image of the universe as a machine which he names a mechanomorphism. He agrees that the mind-boggling triumphs of science make this an attractive myth and this is even more the case since Streeter wrote his book. But the point his illustration makes is still valid:

> "...every machine is an instrument designed to effect a definitely realized purpose and is itself the expression of the concentrated intelligence of an inventor. It is fallacious to overlook this and then apply the metaphor of a machine to the Universe as if the oversight made no difference."[24]

The mechanomorphic myth is limited because it deals with the phenomenon --- the machine. It fails to account for the designer or his purpose and thereby does not present a total picture of reality.

Now on this basis at best the mechanistic approach must deal with only abstractions corresponding to the concrete reality. It is not "like unto"

---

24. Streeter, op. cit., p. 2.

anything. It is an artificial construction of man. Hence to apply such a construction to anything in Nature as the "literal truth" is to "be guilty of anthropomorphism in a double degree". Thus applied, the mechanistic approach excludes elements in original meaning. It becomes pure symbol and ceases to explain anything.

Theology limited to the form of a doctrinal system is just such an intellectual abstraction. Consequently, it will require more than an apologetic based upon the principles of a mechanistic mode to reconcile the intellectual abstraction to experience.

Thus Frye also suggests that in the scientific method there is a grave intellectual error --- principally the sense of superiority of abstractions to actual things. Here can be applied another principle of Streeter's, Reality. He states that in the scientific approach to knowledge there is a limitation arising from the fact that while reality is dynamic, such knowledge is by nature static. Therefore, to know (in the scientific sense) a living thing it must be conceived of as dead.

Likewise, a purely scientific method of apology must "kill" whatever "specimen" of religious phenomena is under examination --- must pin it like a butterfly.

Even when it describes a process, the best it can accomplish is a series of simulated stop-action

stages. This stop-action cannot take into account all the elements and forces of interplay in the dynamic of life without turning its attention to each of them in the same manner and leaving the other aspects in momentary suspended animation.

This is repelling to not a few. There is a cold, motionlessness to it and the most unfortunate result of reducing religious experience to theological mechanisms is that it often leads to establishing a mechanistic pattern of response to religious experience itself.

The organic (i.e., romantic) approach allows one to see religious experience in a more or less "natural habitat". No doubt this in part accounts for the fascination Nature has always held for romantics. They prefer the synthesis of experience to the analytical treatment for the intellect alone. The romantic allows for what could be called sense, but the emphasis is not placed there. It is put on the constructive power of the mind where reality can be brought into being by experience. In other words, the mechanistic approach of the scientific method is concerned with a mode of thinking, while the romantic at least approaches a mode of being.

For instance, abstract dialectic reduces one to dealing with, say, divine sovereignty and free will from seemingly two opposed positions. Lewis demonstrates how through story one can observe such working dualisms.

He uses as an example stories that turn on fulfilled prophecy. The story of Oedipus, he said, produced feelings of awe in him.

> "We have just had set before our imaginations something that has always baffled the intellect: we have _seen_ how destiny and free will have been combined, even how free will is the _modus operandi_ of destiny."[25]

The Narnia Chronicles are filled with such "turns", notably _A Horse and His Boy_. The reasonableness of Christian doctrine can be well argued in straight apologetical work, but its reasonableness can be shown as operative through romantic fiction. Theology, through abstraction is ever in danger of crystallizing a living process into set fashionable creeds --- a lifeless decoration which men can attach to themselves as belief. There cannot be a genuine "outside" (in terms of creed or doctrine) until there is an "inside" (in terms of meaningful experience). Romantic theology is an attempt to present a picture that would allow a sensitivity to the inside.

Lewis was concerned that the purely scientific approach had smuggled in the idea that the analogy could be thrown away once the method had "got at" the truth behind it. He pointed out that all that could be put in the place of the analogy was a theological abstraction whose value was almost entirely negative.

---

25. Lewis, _Essays Presented to Charles Williams_, p. 101.

> "Our abstract thinking is itself a tissue of analogies: a continual modelling of spiritual reality in legal or chemical or mechanical terms. Are these likely to be more adequate than the sensuous, organic, and personal images?"[26]

Even though by itself it could accomplish little, he admitted that it could warn against drawing absurd consequences from analogical expression. All of the romantic theologians would agree that a comprehensive representation of reality requires both scientific and imaginative expression. Lewis again writes:

> "This talk of 'meeting' is no doubt, anthropomorphic; as if God and I could be face to face, like two fellow creatures, when in reality He is above me and within me and below me and all about me. That is why it must be balanced by all manner of metaphysical and theological abstractions. But never, here or anywhere else, let us think that while anthropomorphic images are a concession to our weakness, the abstractions are the literal truth. Both are equally concessions; each singly misleading, and the two together mutually corrective."[27]

Thus, by employing only a purely scientific method to demonstrate factuality of Christian truth, the apologist assumes the outward look of seeking just to save Christian truth rather than exhibit that Christian truth can save. The former aspect, however integral a part of apologetics, is only half the battle. Standing alone, as has been stated, its effect is a negative one.

Standing alone, its mechanism contributes to the

---

26. Lewis, Letters to Malcolm, p. 74.

27. Ibid., p. 34.

void. But in meeting this very need romanticism can bring about one of the major dangers and objections to its approach.

To illustrate, there is a phenomenon in geology called by its scientists pseudomorphosis. It occurs in this manner: If a crystallizing substance happens to fill a hollow left in geological areas by crystals that have disintegrated, it is forced by the hollow mold to take on a crystal form not its own. Without chemical analysis it could lead an observer into mistaking it for the type of crystal its form indicates. In contacting the mysterious force of romanticism there is a prevalent danger of a kind of theological pseudomorphosis. Romanticism seems to provide so many things that religion promises and one might easily force the phenomenon into the hollow. A romantic seeking to escape from a drily intellectual theology could be betrayed into over-valuing the emotional, imaginative experience too highly.

But it can be carried a step beyond that point. It is the fact that any deeply held romantic conviction could be said to be intrinsically religious that can make it a threat. It has been pointed up by John Lawlor that "emergent (rebellious) romanticism challenges religion as the revelation of final reality".[28]

---

28. John Lawlor, "The Tutor and the Scholar", Light on C. S. Lewis, p. 82.

This is just the step that radical romantics such as Morse Peckham seem to be taking. Speaking of the cultural logic of the birth of nineteenth century romanticism, he writes:

> "The romantic knows from history, his own and man's, that the great human temptation is to regard an orientation as final and that succumbing leads to disaster for Christianity ...had ultimately collapsed."[29]

Peckham's method of treatment in his work on romanticism could be likened to worrying it like a bone (he refers to it as that "maddening subject"). But to give him his due, he has extracted some meat from it and he delineates the basic characteristics (what he terms the values) of romanticism which he lists as: Change, imperfection, growth, diversity, the creative imagination and the unconscious.

These "values" according to Peckham have effected a revolution in the European mind against thinking in terms of static mechanism and the redirection of the mind to think in terms of dynamic organicism. The romantic, therefore, does not see things fixed in a kind of halcyon dormancy. Things are not finished. But from his view neither are there absolute patterns. There are no archtypes. There is in the universe a perpetual unfinished state. Growth

---

29. Peckham, op. cit., p. 34. Following quotations will be listed in the text.

and change are at its center. This state is not to be resisted, but sought --- welcomed. The more varied the expression, the better. And all this flows up from the depths of the unconscious out through the creative imagination of man. Therefore, "the creative artist does not escape from reality; he escapes into it". According to Peckham, the romantic sees self as the source of order: "With or without the aid of Kant, an orientation is now seen not as a discovery but as a projection." (p. 33)

In this view any metaphysic may exist only as a temporary instrument for symbolizing the self. To establish and symbolize the self is to establish the sense of value and explain metaphysical activity. "Creative", according to Peckham, "identified the artist with God or with a surrogate of God. The idea that the artist was inspired of God is an old one, but the Romantic concept was, though dependent upon it, something novel. It metamorphosed the artist from instrument into agent, from sacred vessel into sacred rod, or magic wand." (p. 238)

> "Man, therefore, redeems the world; and since in the poet the imagination is predominant, the poet is the primary source of value --- in traditional language redemption. The Romantic poet thus takes upon himself the role of Christ, he is himself his own redeemer and model for the redemption of mankind." (pp. 32-33)

Thus, this man centered revolution in perspective is the result of the main idea of romanticism for

Peckham from which all its aspects emanate, namely the organic metaphor of the universe. He writes:

> "Now the [romantic] artist is original because he is the instrument whereby a genuine novelty, an emergent, is introduced into the world, not because he has come with the aid of genius a little closer to previously existing pattern, natural and divine."
>
> "In its radical form dynamic organicism results in the idea that the history of the universe is the history of God creating himself. Evil is at last accounted for, since the history of the universe --- God being imperfect to begin with --- is the history of God, whether transcendant or immanent, ridding himself, by the evolutionary process, of evil. Of course from both the old and the new philosophy God could be omitted. Either can become a materialism." (p. 11)

So, now romantic theology must face not only the neglect of the romantic tendency, but its excess. There are terrible dangers writhing in such a concept. Properly directed, properly related, such a power could be of outstanding benefit. Unchecked it threatens to inundate in anarchy. The underground and sub-cultures that are calling to man to destroy existing systems are drawing immense energy from this source. Peckham says the romantic's moral task is to break down an orientation once it has been fully realized. Just when and how this is to be determined he does not say. The means for accomplishing the breakdown, according to Peckham, is self-disorientation. The romantic is to value emotional disturbance as a means to break down an orientation which as a human being he is tempted to preserve, but as a romantic, he knows to be inadequate.

This is the real reason for the use of drugs, alcohol, sex, Asiatic theologies. They are the instruments of dislocating the senses so that new worlds may emerge.

It is odd that Peckham's emergent romanticism seeks the very goal that he condemns the "age of progress" for effecting --- disorientation. But the romantic inclination long has been seen to be an element in revolutionary activity. Most would agree that some things in the world need to be changed, but most would ask before anything be demolished: Changed into what? Left to itself, there is little to romanticism to give it cohesiveness.

There is no end to such anthropo-centric romanticism. Value after value will come and go (perhaps they will accumulate, Peckham is not quite clear), but within what context or to what purpose he does not seem to know. He hints at some kind of redemption (a term he considers antiquated) of Nature. But implicit in the idea of redemption is a settling of a debt incurred in which the "creative mind of man" must share. In this light the poetic redeemer may go on redeeming and redeeming ad infinitum and never fulfil the debt.

Romantic theology would ask if there is any order to the growth, any direction to the change. Is there to be no cohesiveness to the diversity? What makes these concepts values in and of themselves? Wherein lies their quality? Isn't chaos, confusion,

fragmentation, the result? The very things produced by the Age of Progress?

Peckham's romanticism hinges on his concept of dynamic organicism and to illustrate the difference between mechanism and organicism, he presents the example of a tree opposed to a machine. One shudders to think of the kind of tree rampant, emergent romanticism would produce. Can a fig tree bring forth thistles? Of course, Peckham would argue that in certain forms of modern art romanticism has accomplished just that. But even here the artist is not creating new value. He may claim (though this has been questioned) originality as the first to employ already existing concepts in some different form of expression. But unless one can come up with something tantamount to another primary colour, the exalted claims for any emergent creation are suspect.

Too, when Christian doctrine sets forth the idea of changelessness, it does not mean static. It means its change will be consistent. Metamorphosis and growth are not foreign to Christian thought. Its ultimate realization may be as vast as the divine imagination, but it will be consistent and orderly. The egg becomes a larva; the larva becomes a caterpillar; the caterpillar becomes a butterfly. Here is orderly metamorphosis. If the larva had turned into a goldfish or the caterpillar into a peanut butter

sandwich then change in an emergent sense would have taken place. Peckham (it is to be hoped) would deny that his projections of reality would take shape in such an absurd non sequitur. But left to itself this inclination overflowing the banks of the unconscious will yield such a result.

As regards the qualitative aspect of reality, romanticism can accomplish a great deal toward apprehending aesthetic value, but in spite of Peckham's claim (not a very loud one) for a social consciousness, it has very little concern with moral value.

Praz grants to romanticism the role of educating the sensibility, but claims that this has reference especially to erotic sensibility. In his notable work, The Romantic Agony, Praz approaches romanticism from within the Decadent Movement and in his emphasis on the erotic sensibility (which he calls one of romanticism's most characteristic aspects) he points to the work of the Marquis de Sade as a monument. If he meant that romanticism magnifies in sexual idiosyncracies characteristics common to all mankind, he has a valid point. If he means that romanticism is the root and substance, he is at odds with romantic theology. It does not equate romanticism with untrammelled sexual expression.

Nonetheless, since romanticism is associated in the popular mind with the sub-conscious, it is looked

upon with suspicion, and even as evil and brutal since it is sub-moral and sub-intellectual. Actually, it would appear that romanticism morally or intellectually is a neutral matter. It rather depends upon the character of the morals or the intellect that experiences it as to how it is received and expressed. And perhaps it also depends not only on the receiver, but also on the transmitter. But there again it is not so much the effect of romanticism *per se* as it is the effect of one character on another with romanticism as the efficacious device. It is not so much romanticism which has a debilitating effect on character as it is character which has a debilitating effect on romanticism.

If it can be accepted that romanticism as a phenomenon is morally neutral, then perhaps even the claim that it is religious needs explanation. If that is the case, men may be religious in any number of ways. Herein is perhaps the chief difference between the position of this paper and the position of Reilly. He says in *Romantic Religion*:

> "...the result of their work [the Inklings] is a literary and religious construct whose purpose is to defend romanticism by showing it to be religious and to defend religion by traditionally romantic means..."[30]

This is a fairly accurate statement from Barfield's standpoint (which in the main is Reilly's thesis) and

---

30. Reilly, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

probably not too far from Williams' position, but Lewis certainly and more than likely Tolkien would tend to defend romanticism as a "religiously significant phenomenon",[31] and employ it as a medium of apology. It is argued here that regardless of one's views concerning the relation of romanticism and religion, once the "theological implications" have been determined, their effect will be apologetic.

Lewis states in his autobiography, Surprised by Joy, that he early became aware of the "more depraved side of Romanticism". (p. 176) He claims that his own cowardice and Joy itself protected him from that romanticism that manifests itself as the "ravenous desire to break the bounds, to tear the curtain, to be in the secret..." He pointed to the greedy (unholy) desire for spiritual things as one of the chief dangers of romanticism.

In the mad search for new meaning that has led Western man to investigate Eastern mysticisms, mind-expanding drugs, and exotic expressions of underground

---

31. Reilly never comes to grips with the obvious (even explicitly stated) ontological arguments related to romanticism. The paper takes the position of Donovan (developed in section six) that the phrase "religiously significant phenomenon" is to be preferred when dealing in romanticism and religion because it is "less misleading than 'religious experience' or the question-begging alternative 'experience of God'." (Donovan, op. cit., see section six)

culture, several have found some satisfaction and rebellious kinship in a quasi-religious romanticism. It can get one "high". It seems to produce a kind of euphoria, a sense of well-being with yet a peculiar sort of breathlessness attached to it. It will feed an adventuresome spirit. It encourages a kind of recklessness. It presents a unique slant of reality or different perspective that appears to provide a vantage point that conveys a sense of all-encompassing knowledge. It is not unlike being taken to the top of a mountain and being promised the kingdoms of the earth.[32]

But romantic though he was, Lewis struck and struck hard for what he called the "stock responses". He believed in proper sentiment, what he called a sense of ordinancy. Romanticism, emotionally, can become habit-forming. A genuine experience is rare enough, but one may seek, as Lewis did in his search

---

32. This inspirational aspect coloured with the revolutionary character has been recognized by the Communist world as a powerful weapon in propaganda. In a pamphlet entitled, Revolutionary Romanticism, Isobel Hilton writes of Chinese poster art, "...most are produced by artists employed by the state and conform to rules originally drawn up for revolutionary opera and subsequently applied to most fields of creative activity. The officially accepted style is designated 'revolutionary romanticism' --- the message must be obvious and direct in order to fulfil its militant educative or propaganda function and the 'romantic' element is stated in terms of the necessity for art to depict a more advanced state of reality in order to inspire the people to greater levels of achievement". It would appear that romanticism is politically neutral as well as morally.

for Joy, to have it again and again, and to hold on to it longer and longer. There comes a point where one must let go. He finally said: "If only I could leave off, let go, unmake myself, it [the Object of joy he was seeking] would be there".[33] When Lewis finally realized this fact, he was a step nearer conversion. After his conversion, the quest for joy, as such, lost its importance. He had found the Source.

The extreme subjective inclination characterized by radical romanticism has been laid aside by the romantic theologians. What they seek is a circumstance consonant with the unfolding of the eternal pattern or Logos not revealed by "flesh and blood" but demonstrated within it. An existence where the "course of events is not governed like a state, but created like a work of art".[34]

One of the reasons for the differences in the approach of the romantic theologians could be illustrated in an observation by Edwin Muir that "no imaginative writer chooses his theme; it is chosen for him by the experience which has most deeply affected him".[35] This seems to be supported by Frye's contention that

---

33. Lewis, Surprised by Joy, p. 180.

34. Lewis, Letters to Malcolm, p. 79.

35. Edwin Muir, "Introduction", The Castle, Franz Kafka, p. 32.

romanticism is not a completely voluntary category.

As did Lewis, Barfield had a sort of literary "joy" experience which he describes in the introduction to his collection of papers, Romanticism Come of Age.[36] It was a sudden and rapid increase in the intensity with which I experienced lyric poetry". (p. 9) Also it was an elusive experience: "It was something that kept happening to me --- not nearly as often as I should have liked, but still often enough". (Ibid)

Two things were pressed upon him as a result of the experience: 1) The poetic or imaginative use of words enhanced their meanings, and 2) Those enhanced meanings may reveal hitherto unapprehended parts or aspects of reality. (p. 10)

But the ultimate "theme determining" experience for Barfield was his contact with the anthroposophical philosophy of Rudolph Steiner to which he refers as "romanticism come of age". What he mainly suggests by this phrase is that he believes that in Steiner romanticism has been philosophically justified. It has become the life-long goal of Barfield to "set before the educated public the news about Steiner with all the earnestness and sobriety at my disposal". (p. 17)

In a few words Barfield describes anthroposophy as "the concept of man's consciousness as a process in

---

36. Barfield, Romanticism Come of Age, quotations in text.

time". Growing out of the discoveries made in the study of anthroposophy and romanticism, Barfield presents a romantic religion which he sees as the expression of what he calls the evolution of consciousness or the result of the ingodding of man.

What led Barfield to embrace anthroposophy was the search for a satisfactory theory of knowledge. Barfield's approach, as Reilly points out, is an attempt to explain the world that St. John describes as being brought into existence by the Word and sustained by the Word. Barfield reached his conclusions by romantic means and defends them with his interpretation of romantic dogma.

Barfield contends that there is in history a progress from phenomena to principle and from principle back to phenomena.[37] He means this quite literally from a historical point of view. This is the process he calls the evolution of consciousness. He actually points to such historic events as the Reformation and the Romantic Movement to support his claims. Many of his illustrations are taken from his belief that there is in language a demonstration of a growing awareness of man reflected in the creative way man speaks of himself and his world.

He believes that God is present in the

---

37. Barfield, History in English Words, quotations in text.

unconscious of man and is coming to consciousness. What Barfield means by consciousness is not the finite definition, "the opposite of unconsciousness, but rather as including a man's whole awareness of his environment, the sum total of his intellectual and emotional experience as an individual". (p. 72)

From beyond the "beginning" God began a descent ("an involution of the Spirit into the Material")[38] that effected the creation and culminated in the Incarnation at which point He began an ascent that is drawing up man with Him or into Himself. The Incarnation is the point in time when the imagination of man most completely apprehended God's consciousness (or imagination) of himself and set in motion the ever-increasing self-conscious powers of man resulting in redemption.

It can be seen that Barfield's romanticism is indispensable to his expression of the Christian faith. Barfield is a romantic for whom the theory of romanticism and the realization of religion are inseparable. His religious vision is informed by a romantic metaphysic; his romantic metaphysic is informed by a theory of knowledge; his theory of knowledge is informed by a romantic vision.

One might question the literal sense in which he applies the theory, but Barfield is a man of astute

---

38. Barfield, Romanticism Come of Age, p. 18.

literary understanding and religious insight and he has put his finger upon a real need of man. Also the theory can be applied on a less grand eschatological scale. Barfield is saying that romanticism enables man to regain a quality that was lost in the transition from phenomena to principle --- from being drawn away by the centrifugal force of the process. Romanticism enables man to recapture a rapport with a natural cycle and, in some degree to restore his original participation. It might be called a kind of rephenomenalization. But here is a voluntary element that even the original phenomena did not possess. It allows for a deliberate expression of synchronization which produces the lost quality while maintaining the principle. A powerful concept.

Even though Barfield distinctly attempts to put forth new theories of knowledge, his approach includes the traditional tenets of orthodox Christian doctrine. By combining the two he demonstrates how, from an epistemological standpoint, Christian truth can claim to represent final reality.

Reilly is correct when he says that Barfield's work is not purely theological, but that it does present a religious picture of the universe.[39] What theological statements Barfield does make support the

---

38. Reilly, op. cit., p. 3.

main tenets of orthocox Christian doctrine. He would not argue away any of the fundamental truths of Scripture regarding God's role in creation or redemption. But these are not his primary emphases. What he is interested in is how man apprehends and shares in them, and he is convinced that it is through the imagination that this is accomplished. As will be discussed in the fifth section, the imagination is a matter that theology for the most part has left alone. So to learn anything about imagination, Barfield had to go to the romantics and found its most accurate (for him) explanation in anthroposophy. Nothing factual in the Gospel is altered for Barfield; it is illuminated and enlarged. He is concerned that other men understand how its acceptance can be effected.

As an epistemologist, Barfield takes issue with theologians or specialists who confine knowledge to "watertight compartments", each containing a "whole network of unspoken assumptions about the nature of life and the universe", where there is never a meeting of the minds.[40] Barfield is concerned with how that perspective is effected and validated. He strives to answer: "How can these things be? asked, not by an oriental sage steeped in a law based upon mystery and religion, but by a Western, scientific

---

40. Barfield, World's Apart, pp. 9-10.

world founded upon a system of natural law of its own making.

Barfield assumes an even more direct apologetic stance in Saving the Appearances which he wrote because he believed:

> "That certain wide consequences flowing from the hastily expanded sciences of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and in particular their physics, have not been sufficiently considered in building up the general twentieth century picture of the universe and of the history of the earth and man."[41]

To tangle with Barfield is to come face to face with the possibility that romanticism is just as scientifically responsible as mechanism, perhaps more. From his position Barfield attacks the grand fallacy in the popular mind that associates aspects of a romantic approach (e.g., anthropomorphism) with idolatry. He shows romanticism to be the iconoclast in this age of scientific idolatry.

He also faces radical romanticism with his "esoteric Christianity". Barfield says little about actual Christian belief and conversion, but it seems fair to say that Barfield's romanticism led him to the bridge of faith and he may use it to lead others to such a point. It is doubtful that he mistakes it for that bridge in spite of what appear to be definite gnostic overtones in his approach through a higher

---

41. Barfield, op. cit., p. 17.

knowledge.

No theologian believing in petitionary prayer would argue against the claim that God has granted to man the power in some degree to be an agent of causality. Barfield has but contrived a theory explaining how such may be carried out.

In any event, Barfield still stands opposed to radical romanticism when he asks men to believe that all originates with God and finds his final authority where any other Christian view finds it. He writes:

> "I take the Gospels as they stand (whenever they may have been written) as valid records left by wise and deeply responsible men. A good many of the arguments for dissecting them, will, I believe, disappear when the idolatry (as I have here ventured to describe it) which now obstructs our penetration of their deeper meaning."[42]

He suggests that those who would follow in the way of scholars who would dissect the Gospels according to modern belief that great portions were later interpolations of the primitive church...

> "...may care to ponder whether the primitive church is likely to have understood rather more, or rather less, than the twentieth-century commentator of the actual content of [the parables]."[43]

Even the greatest names of Romanticism, Coleridge and Wordsworth, found that the power that seemed to promise "that vast new cosmos which had been blindly

---

42. Barfield, Saving the Appearances, p. 175.

43. Ibid.

forming in the depths"[44] dried up and could carry them no further and they returned to the faith delivered to the saints.

Barfield's treatment is positively intellectual and difficult. Generally speaking, even though there is a great deal in Barfield that several find appealing, and, more truthfully, what they cannot refute, many would still withhold final assent. But those who would attack Christianity on epistemological grounds have to reckon with Owen Barfield.

As with Barfield, Williams' treatment of Christian doctrine is not the traditional interpretation. He saw romanticism as a parallel to Christianity. He seemed to feel that by experiencing a copy one would recognize the genuine article. Whereas Barfield could be said to be "scientific" about romanticism, Williams could be said to be "romantic" about it. He seems to be laying stress on a vision of the romantic. Another difference is that Williams as a transcendentalist begins with certain suppositions, but Barfield as an epistemologist begins with nothing.

Williams seemed to see God everywhere and nowhere. He borrows images and concepts from a score of sources of every description. Paradoxical parallelisms seem to attract him to such a degree that he felt

---

44. Barfield, History in English Words, p. 200.

compelled to contribute a few of his own. He was a pessimist who wanted to see the good, and anywhere he could find a ray of it he sought to build a way to salvation upon it. From a strictly orthodox point of view, he could be accused of articulating a kind of sophisticated, pantheistic casuistry.

His chief terms for describing his position are co-inherence, exchange, and substitution. Briefly stated these terms represent the idea in William's mind of the wholeness of creation. All up and down the ladder of created order through the normal workings of the universe there are instances of vicarious substitution and sharing of burden, and no item in the scheme of things can be isolated from the vast interlocking network of interdependence. These were to Williams spiritual facts related to the Incarnation and Atonement. According to him, in the grand unity of God's creation all things perform these three actions. It is in the Trinity that this pattern is most perfectly realized.

Some of his illustrations lack convicting power. The image of the city as an example of exchange and substitution, while he clarifies his intention, would hardly have the psychological effect he sought. Too many look on the city as an image of indifference and brutality.

Also his attempts to embody his doctrine in

Supernatural shocker novels are a bit bizarre for some tastes. Even Mary Shideler who claims that Williams speaks to her condition admits that his style can be off-putting.[45] More and more critics are beginning to question Williams' contribution to this field. Certainly, the most severe is Martin Seymour-Smith.

> "Charles Williams had his admirers...but his work normally raises grave doubts. His 'cosmic thrillers' are frankly middle-brow written to raise money. In them the 'belief in the supernatural' is insincere and vulgar; he so patently disbelieves in their action. They are nearer the crudely written occult romances of Dennis Wheatley than to literature.
>
> "He was a confused unsatisfied critic... his poetry: no critic, however, has made a satisfactory case for it. Lewis could only call it 'gorgeous' with profound wisdom'.
>
> "Behind all of Williams' work --- particularly the novels --- there seems to be something thoroughly unpleasant: the orthodox Christian apologetics conceal a human rather than merely Christian heresy: one senses Williams hanging masturbatorily over his nasty mid-cult images."[46]

This is unnecessarily harsh. Lewis, though devoted

---

45. Mary Shideler, The Romantic Theology of Charles Williams.

46. Seymour-Smith, op., cit., p. 225. Williams was not the least worried about the negative criticism of writing to earn money. Ridler said he felt such a motive was the mainspring of creative writing. He quotes his view in a piece of verse (Collected Writings, pp. X-XI):

> I saw Shakespeare
> In a tube station on the Central London.
> ...the notes for The Merchant were in his pocket
> Beginning (it was the first line he thought of)
> 'Still quiring to the young-eyed cherims'.
> But his chief wish was to the earning more money.

to Williams, pointed out the issue with Williams' style with his usual candor in a letter to Dom Bede Griffiths:

> "I quite agree with you about what you call his [Williams] affectations --- not that they are affectations, but honest defects in taste. He is largely a self-educated man laboring under an almost oriental richness of imagination ('Clotted glory from Charles' as Dyson called it) which could be saved from turning silly or even vulgar in print by a severe early discipline which he never had.[47]

Reilly makes two correct assessments of Williams' failure as a romantic theologian.[48] First, (startlingly), that Williams' theory does nothing to clarify romantic theology. The only romantic experience that Williams ever developed was romantic love, and recalling the "theme" guide suggested by Muir, it does appear that the most moving experience in Williams' life was his own experience of romantic love. That Williams' love for his wife was somewhat out of the ordinary can be illustrated by the fact that there is a corpus of no less than 675 letters to his wife extant in a special collection in the United States. Second, even his theory appears to be a gloss on Dante. Dante, says Reilly, spoke of love and elevated it as all medieval poets did, and whatever theological implications could be derived from it hardly would warrant the construction Williams used.

---

47. Lewis, Letters, p. 197.

48. Reilly, op. cit., pp. 148-189.

It would appear that Williams' approach is not so transcendental as it is tautological. It is truly questionable that divine love can ever be realized through romantic love. Romantic love and divine love are both ideals, neither of which is perfectly realized in human experience. Lewis pointed out in his Four Loves that none of the natural loves realize themselves until they surrender to divine love. All the loves have unique characteristics and cannot (in Williams' sense) be an exact description of one another.

He supports the general position that man has lost a perspective that must be regained in redemption. But redemption does not consist of new knowledge as with Barfield, but in what Williams terms the Negative and Affirmative Way.[49] The Negative Way is the denial of all images in favour of a direct mystical communion with God. The Affirmative Way is the purely transcendental application. This is accomplished by embracing all images --- theologizing romanticism.[50] It was this last concept that led Williams to form the concept of a romantic theology (still dominated by his concept of romantic love).

But in addition to the debt owed Williams for solidifying the idea that there are theological implications in romanticism, he also supports its implicit apologetic

---

49. Williams, Figure of Beatrice, pp. 8-10.

50. Williams, op. cit., p. 63. Romanticism was a particular method of the affirmation of images.

bent by a demonstration of romanticism's initiatory character. He approaches it from a negative angle by saying that Hell had made three efforts at distorting the Way of Romantic Love by suggesting: 1) That it is everlasting; 2) That it is the personal possession of the lovers; 3) That it is sufficient in itself.[51]

It can be deduced that if "hell" wishes to distort the intention of the romantic experience, the actual purpose must be somewhat in an opposite direction. But the main point Williams is emphasizing is that the experience is not the fulfillment that an untheologized romanticism suggests.

Positively stated, it first needs to be realized that romanticism is primarily an initiatory experience, a beginning, a starting point. It allows a perspective from which something lasting, but different in kind, may be established from the glimpses it provides. Second, it is an objective matter with universal scope. It is not something the one undergoing the experience has created, but it is a qualitative experience of existence that affects all men. Finally, if the new perspective has only rendered the old orientation unsatisfactory, it is not enough; some capital should be made. But in all three this neutralizing, reorienting aspect can be seen as a desired effect of apologetics.

---

51. Williams, He Came Down From Heaven.

Laying aside the critics' thirst for "influence" within the Inklings, it would be agreed by most that the cohesive force in the gathering of these like minds was Lewis. He most readily absorbed the attitudes and feelings of the others, if for no other reason than that the apologist is by nature eclectic.

But, like the others, he was his own man. Romanticism may be the basis of epistemology as Barfield claimed, but he was not inclined to pursue it. It might be a kind of transcendental cognitive model as with Williams, but while Lewis took into account its value as a backdrop of life, he was far more concerned to translate it into life.

Lewis admired the position of George MacDonald, who, according to Lewis, in his romantic experience became vividly aware of mutabilitae as are most romantics. But he did not bewail it; he considered it the starting point and went on to find what it was for.[52]

The most significant experience for Lewis was his conversion to faith in Christ. It coloured everything he ever wrote. Lewis' effectiveness principally is due to the fact that he was consistent with his purpose in his use of romanticism. He saw its role as that of an apologetic medium. He was not out to construct new theories of knowledge that would be attacked and add to

---

52. Lewis, George MacDonald: An Anthology, p. 19.

the general confusion. He stayed on the "immense common ground", which he felt had not been allowed to yield all the fruit it could. His work is the common property of all who would accept the doctrine of the orthodox Christian faith.

Lewis made it clear that he had no intention of building a theological system. Indeed, in his writing, he avoided all systems --- of his own or anyone else's, new or old.

It is a mistake to speak of romanticized religion in Lewis. His romantic experience forced him to face up to the source (as it did MacDonald). According to John Lawlor, Lewis was far from any conviction that the study of imaginative literature, even when undertaken by a first-rate intelligence, could justify some of the exalted claims made for it.[53] He once quoted the "horrible prophecy" of Matthew Arnold that literature would increasingly replace religion. He felt that it had done so and that it had "taken upon itself all the features of bitter persecution, great intolerance, and traffic in relics".[54]

Lewis artfully, even slyly, presents some of his fundamental convictios about romanticism in his preface to the revised edition of Pilgrim's Regress, sub-titled,

---

53. Lawlor, op. cit.

54. Lewis, "Dialogue", Of Other Worlds (edited by Walter Hooper). Recorded conversation between Lewis, Kingsley Amis, and Brian Aldiss.

"A Defense for Christianity, Reason and Romanticism".[55] He begins by complaining about the obscurity of the term "romanticism" and suggests (rather tongue-in-cheek, as he continued to use the term) that because it had become a term of such varying sense it be banished from our vocabulary.

He goes on to list seven things (excluding a love affair) that could be termed romantic: stories of dangerous adventure; the marvellous; Titanic character; indulgence in abnormal or anti-natural moods; egoism or subjectivism; revolt against existing systems and conventions; sensibility to natural objects. He suggests that all may have a common root, but that the qualitative difference is that a liking for any one does not imply a liking for the others. He then states that what he meant by romanticism when he first wrote the book was not any of the seven. He proceeds to describe a recurrent experience which he believes to be "common, commonly misunderstood, and of immense importance". This is not surprising since he appears to be describing the "common root" which he hinted might exist, admitting that it arises under other stimuli and manifests itself under different guises in others who experience it. The result of this kind of longing seems to point to a dissatisfaction with the current situation whether it be

---

55. Lewis, op. cit. Quotations in text.

place, time, the current collective trend, or personal inner disposition. This would account for the so-called revolutionary aspect of romanticism --- that which motivates a search for a more satisfactory condition.

This experience Lewis says is one of intense longing, the very pain of which is somehow felt to be a delight. He then labors to point out the peculiar mystery about the object of longing within the context of his own experience. He strikes off "long ago and far away", eroticism, and intellectual satisfaction. All such things are inadequate to the "Desire". He concludes that if Nature makes nothing in vain then there must be a fulfillment. In classic ontological style, he states:

> "This desire was, in the soul, as the Siege Perilous in Arthur's castle --- the chair in which only one could sit. And if nature makes nothing in vain, then the One who can sit in this chair must exist." (p. 10)

Lewis adopted a phrase that demonstrates the vanguard, apologetic character of his romantic experience. It had been put forth by a counter-romantic critic that romanticism was "spilled religion", and Lewis retorted in Pilgrim's Regress:

> "I accept the description. And I agree that he who has religion ought not to spill it. But does it follow that he who finds it spilled should avert his eyes? How if there is a man to whom those bright drops on the floor are the beginning of a trail which, duly followed, will lead him in the end to taste the cup itself? How if, no other trail, humanly speaking, were possible?" (p. 11)

As Hegel propounded the "dialectic of being" based upon thinking, Lewis propounded a kind of "dialectic of desire" associated with what will be discussed later as mythopoeic diction. Briefly stated, it is the consequence of the proposition that the diction of myth-making born of man's creative imagination corresponds to a cosmological dialectic of myth.

One of the things the dialectic of desire accomplished is aiding to establish the qualitative aspect of reality. To seek to know things qualitatively is not to give full rein to subjectivism. The romantic theologian would claim it has an objective basis. In Letters to Malcolm, Lewis speaks of the "magical" elements of Christianity which he defines as "objective efficacy which cannot be further analyzed".

> "...now the value, for me, of the magical element in Christianity is this. It is a permanent witness that the heavenly realm, certainly no less than the natural universe and perhaps very much more, is a realm of objective fact --- hard, determinate fact, not to be constructed a priori, and not to be dissolved into maxims, ideals, values, and the like. One cannot conceive a more completely "given", or, if you like, a more "magical" fact than the existence of God as causa sui.[56]

Just what experience gave Tolkien the insight into the value of imagined worlds is not certain, but it did make of him the complete mythologian. He has little to offer on any theory of romanticism as such,

---

56. Lewis, op. cit., p. 134.

but rather dwelt on the value of one of its forms of expression --- the fairy tale.[57] Regardless of one's attitude toward Tolkien's work, all would have to admit it is a hallmark of the creative imagination of man.

Reilly states his belief that Tolkien's view of the fairy-story has made explicit and Christian the Coleridgean claim for the worth of the creative imagination.[58] Building on Coleridge's concepts of the Primary and Secondary Imagination, the one being the "living Power and prime Agent of all human perception ...a repetition in the finite mind of the eternal act of creation in the infinite I AM",[59] and the other being an imitative creative capacity used by man as an image of God, Tolkien has presented the concept of a Primary and Secondary Belief.[60] The first is that belief which allows man to accept and operate on the phenomena of the Primary Imagination. The second is belief in the product of a Secondary Imagination. It is more than a willing suspension of disbelief; it is fully participating in the spirit of the matter to receive the maximum benefit of the perspective. It is a working of imagination to imagination. The more

---

57. Tolkien, "On Fairy Stories", Essays Presented to Charles Williams, pp. 38-89.

58. Reilly, op. cit., p. 210.

59. Coleridge, "Biographia Literaria", Coleridge, p. 246.

60. Tolkien, op. cit. Quotations in text.

consistent the mythopoeic art of the author, the more powerfully it can be grasped by the imagination of the reader who practises Secondary Belief.

> "...commanding Secondary Belief, will probably require labour and thought, and will certainly demand a special skill, a kind of elvish craft. Few attempt such difficult tasks. But when they are attempted and in any degree accomplished then we have a rare achievement of Art: indeed narrative art, story-making in its primary and most potent mode." (p. 68)

It is a step beyond a "realistic" story in the narrative art. Its "creation" is higher, purer, freer. If anything this perspective can make things more real. This capacity of the fairy-story that Tolkien referred to as Recovery is supported by two other qualities of the fairy-story: Escape and Consolation. Tolkien does not bother to evade or argue away the criticism of escapism levelled at fairie. He points out that the desire to escape from an unpleasant situation as would a prisoner is not the same thing as desertion which is what most of the critics have in mind. He seemed to feel that to write or read about an unpleasant world that one does not accept is in some measure to contribute to it. He also states that there are various forms of escape and perhaps that escaping <u>from</u> is not so important as what one is escaping <u>to</u>.

This leads to the third aspect of the fairy-story, Consolation. Tolkien points out that the fairy-story seeks the opposite of the Tragedy (which he calls the

true form of Drama); it is what he calls the eucatastrophe --- the joy of the happy ending. The eucatastrophe

> "denies...universal defeat and in so far is evangelium giving a fleeting glimpse of Joy, Joy beyond the walls of the world, poignant as grief." (p. 81)

With mythopoeic power the fairy story presents Recovery, Escape, and Consolation which can be applied to what Tolkien refers to as the archtype of the fairy-story, the Grand Eucatastrophe --- the Gospel story itself. And as Lewis saw it as the Myth Become Fact, Tolkien sees it as the great fairy story that is true in the Primary world.

Thus by bringing into being the complete myth-construction of Middle Earth built on the elements to be found in the Myth Become Fact in the Primary world, Tolkien has contributed to the reservoir of apologia that pierces the armor of the adversary on a sub-intellectual level, and he entertains it unawares. Admittedly many turn away from fantasy, but the inability to appreciate fantasy as a literary medium is not so much due to its possessing an esoteric character as it is the prejudice that has been ingrained against it. But when it is stated that it is for children, Lewis would say:

> "No book is really worth reading at the age of ten which is not equally (and often far more) worth reading at the age of fifty...The only imaginative works we ought to grow out of

> are those which it would have been better not to have read at all."[61]

As for the charge of fantasy being frivolous and not related to the real world, Lewis points out a quite positive value for what might be considered "frivolous":

> "I know that my tendency to use images like play and dance [fantasy?] for the highest things is a stumbling block to you...I do not think the life of Heaven bears any analogy to play or dance in respect of frivolity. I do think that while we are in the 'valley of tears', cursed with labour, hemmed round with necessities, tripped up with frustrations, doomed to perpetual plannings, puzzlings, and anxieties, certain qualities that must belong to the celestial condition have no chance to get through, can project no image of themselves, except in activities which, for us here and now are frivolous...How can you find any image of this in the 'serious' activities either of our natural or of our (present) spiritual life."[62]

It seems impossible to some critics that those who employ a romantic approach are doing so in an effort to speak to the condition of today. But the romantics feel that the world needs a new basis from which to judge the world's condition that will balance the currently top-heavy inclination toward materialism and abstraction.

Based on a direct acquaintance with their own inner life and in view of society, the romantic theologians have asked how the deficiencies of pure science might be, not replaced, but supplemented, in

---

61. Lewis, Essays Presented to Charles Williams, p. 100.

62. Lewis, Malcolm, pp. 120-121.

relation to man's personal sense of equilibrium and that of society. Blake saw the substitution of abstractions for art as culturally disastrous, so it also could be said that the substitution of abstractions for the expressions of theological truth will be, in the long run, disastrous for religious experience.

Opposing the strict mechanistic approach to theological concerns the romantic theologians emphasize the organic, seek to demonstrate the dynamic, and allow for the diversity in them through imaginative apology. This is surely as relevant as the saw-dust like theological works that mostly go on discussing how far some propositions are adjustable to modern thought. This is principally what the so-called realists mean by speaking to the real world. Whether or not the propositions of contemporary thought have the truth to commend them is never quite set forth.

The romantic theologians believed that seen through what little can be discerned of the divine perspective, the realist's view is not the real. It is rather a condition man has wrought because he has fallen short (harmatia) of reality. Therefore any comment that is "relevant" to this condition must share in its falsity. The most it can accomplish is the negative value of exposing the darkness. But then men can grow accustomed to the dark. Light must be shed. And for such light to be found and the real to be depicted, man

must use his imagination. Indeed, without depicting the sublime through the imagination, what can man know of reality? Surely it can be seen that, if through the Primary Imagination man perceives the primary world, then through a converted imagination some men might through the means of a Secondary Imagination offer a representation of a Secondary world in which the eternal truths effecting the total reality could be perceived.

IV. MYTHOPOEIC DICTION.

"Nobody, however, has any doubts about the facts, both that it is pleasanter in some cases to have knowledge communicated through figures, and that what is attended with difficulty in the seeking gives greater pleasure in the finding."

De Doctrina Christiana II
St. Augustine

"It is curious that there seems to be so little mythopoeic theory in Romantic poets, considering that the more expendable critics of the time complained as much about the obscurity of myth as their counterparts do now."

"The Drunken Boat:
The Revolutionary Element in Romanticism"
The Stubborn Structure
Northrop Frye

IV. MYTHOPOEIC DICTION

Martin Luther makes the observation on more than one occasion in his Table Talks that he had more respect for Aesop's fables than he had for Rome's theology. Knowing Luther's opinion of Roman theology might cause one to discount the statement as just another of Luther's sarcasms. But the context and expression of the statement make it clear that the great reformer was sincere and had genuine respect for this ancient collection of moral lessons taught through stories about talking animals with human foibles. Their preservation and continued presence on the shelves of libraries today indicates that he is not alone in his judgment.

The unique power of a story to convey truth cannot be denied. This is obvious; but all too often the obvious is ignored and needs to be restated. Sociological statements, political satires, modern scientisms all have seen powerful expressions of their philosophy in the form of romantic fantasy. Surely Christ spoke wisely when he observed that the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light (Luke 16:8). They have learned that man can apprehend truths and be motivated by them through images when cold reason falls on deaf ears.

Walsh rightly points out that religious language always has been a problem, and that the more complex a society grows, the more difficult it becomes to convey spiritual truths.[1] Theologians caught up in the melee of technical complexity have laid aside even the consideration of any other means of communication and seek to reduce spiritual experience to formula.

Lewis once wrote to his brother:

> "Did you fondly believe --- I did --- that where you got among Christians, there, at least, you would escape from the horrible ferocity and grimness of modern thought? Not a bit of it."[2]

Due to this dreary grimness it would appear that more and more people are reflecting the attitude of Chesterton when he said: "I never read a line of Christian apologetics. I read as little as I can of them now".[3] He arrived at conversion by quite another route which is the subject of this section. Perhaps this selection from the second volume of Lewis' science fiction trilogy, Perelandra,will help to point up the problem. The scene is just after the hero Ransom has returned from Venus and is being questioned by Lewis about his experience in space; Lewis suggests:

> "Of course I realize that it's all rather too vague for you to put into words," when he took me up rather sharply for such a patient

---

1. Chad Walsh , "Forward", The Doctrine of Man in C. S. Lewis, p. 9.

2. Lewis, Letters, p. 177.

3. Chesterton, Orthodoxy, p. 152.

> man, by saying, "On the contrary, it is words that are vague. The reason why the things can't be expressed is that it's too definite for language. (p. 35)

How does one express "things" that are too definite? This is the core of the tragic dilemma.

Bunyan rarely receives attention as a theologian today. Yet he is still the subject of many literary investigations. He conveyed something in his famous allegory. The literary scholar marvels at his power, but may not have as full an appreciation of the message he offers as could the theologian if he ever gave credence to the imagination as a serious and legitimate means of perception. The great works of all ages regardless of the field have been works that grasped the imagination.

There are those who would attack the use of a story as a means of avoiding conceptual argument. But as Barfield points out in "Poetic Diction and Legal Fiction",[4] without fiction man could never come to grips with law or principle as related to life. When this is carried into the realm of ineffable spiritual processes (which are certainly part of life), certain kinds of fiction are more suitable than others due to the kind of meaning they contain by being the kind of fiction they are. The romantic theologians, (Lewis

---

4. Barfield, Essays Presented to Charles Williams, pp. 106-127.

especially, in An Experiment in Criticism), would argue that not only is a story a valuable means of conveying truth, there is a particular kind of story which has a value in itself --- a value independent of its embodiment in any literary work. It is true that such a story can hardly reach us except through words, but this is logically accidental. It could be presented just as well in some other perfected art form. The name most give to this story with meaning within itself is myth.

Myth, according to Lewis, is a partial answer to the tragic dilemma. But as Moorman wryly points out, myth is coming to be used as a sort of universal literary solvent. And there are those who would "demythologize" altogether. From such a view "myth" is out of date. It is an "archaic" diehard that has no place in a technical age. The modern scholar believes that one must strip away the myth to find the truth. He fails to see that truth would be lost with the removal of myth. To do away with myth or to supersede it with other more static forms because it is considered archaic would be to commit a grave error. Its very archaism can serve a purpose as will be seen later. Chesterton spoke quite plainly to the "chronological snobbery" of the modern age:

> "An imbicile habit has arisen in modern controversy of saying that such and such a creed can be held in one age but cannot be held

> in another. What a man believes depends upon his philosophy, not upon the clock or the century."[5]

Perhaps what is most needful for this age is to demonstrate that it too is a period --- that each age is relegated to the role of period by the one that follows. The modern attitude toward the past and time itself needs to be squarely dealt with.

Taking a cue from Lewis in Experiment in Criticism, this paper is more concerned with describing the effect of myth, and is not attempting to account for its origins. As Lewis once wrote his father: "It is the curse and fascination of literary history that there are no real beginnings...the only satisfactory opening for any study is the first chapter of Genesis".[6]

So regarding some general conclusions about the effect and nature of myths, it would do well to consider the points of view of several scholars. Reilly says that myth is the closest thing to prelogical thought, that is, meaning the rational intellect has not yet ordered.[7] Henri Frankfort, speaking of myth and

---

5. Chesterton, Orthodoxy, p. 133.

6. Lewis, Letters, p. 125.

7. Reilly, op. cit., p. 215. To be consistent with Barfield, pre-logical and post-logical are temporal, historic terms. In a sense there now exists no pre-logical thought except perhaps in the few remaining aboriginal situations or in children. Preter-logical is a more metaphysical term having to do with knowledge or meaning beyond logic. The preter-logical may exist in both a pre-logical or a post-logical situation.

ancient man suggests that he had only one mode of thought and language which he described as an intuitive, almost visionary mode of apprehension that attempted to undergird the chaos of experience and reveal the features of a structure that took shape in an undissolved relationship between man and phenomena.[8] Cassirer says that myth was the product of a mind that sees all of experience as a whole rather than as a series of logically classified parts.[9] Again, Moorman says that myth partakes of both the emotional and the rational. It is emotional in the sense that it represents the activity of a preter-logical mode of thought which does not depend upon reason and logic. Yet it is an attempt to order existence and experience.

These references to a kind of synthetic apprehension highlight the point made by many, S. H. Hooke included, that "myth is a product of the human imagination arising out of a definite situation and intended to do something. Hence, the right question...is not 'Is it true?' but 'What is it intended to do?'"[10] All these

---

8. Henri Frankfort, Before Philosophy, p. 262.

9. Ernst Cassirer, Essay on Man, p. 82. To Cassirer myth was vital to philosophy and represented the epic element of religious life as opposed to the ritual element.

10. S. H. Hooke, Middle Eastern Mythology, p. 11. Hooke employed a functional approach to myth that was neither literary nor historical.

observations begin to shape the idea Lewis had about myth when he said that myth is defined by its effect on the reader. He felt that the value of myth was not a specifically literary value, nor was the appreciation of myth a specifically literary experience because the response is extra literary.[11] Now in these preter-logical contexts myth could be said to possess a kind of diction. The concern here is not with myth per se, but with the communication of mythopoeic composition. In order to discuss just how this effect and others are realized the paper will attempt to coin a phrase: mythopoeic diction. The term is a combination of two ideas and was arrived at in the following manner. First of all, it was an effect of something Lewis felt in certain works he called "mythopoeia".[12] The idea behind the term was hinted at in a letter to Barfield. The letter is undated but is placed in a published collection of Lewis' correspondence early in 1939.[13] In the letter Lewis was attempting to help Barfield find a new word for a study he was engaged in on the "science of the nature of myths". (Notice that the issue was not a term for the science of myth, but for the nature of myth.) "Mythopoeics" was among several

---

11. Lewis, Experiment in Criticism, p. 45.

12. Mythopoeia. See Glossary.

13. Lewis, Letters, p. 163.

suggested. Thereafter, neither of them made great use of any of the terms. The letter itself was written in a jocular manner. But occasionally Lewis, at any rate, employed the term, "mythopoeia".

The more familiar adjectival cognate, mythopoeic, is defined briefly as the art of myth-making. Mythopoeia in the context of Lewis' rare usage of the term appears to signify the effect or quality of myth in a work. Lewis defined myth by its effect on a reader. Mythopoeia seemed to hold for him the idea of myth-lore, myth-wisdom, or a kind of mythic traditional knowledge possessing an intrinsic erudition that informs the imagination --- better articulated, perhaps, as mythopoeic diction.

This brief definition leads to the most prolific "suggestions" Lewis ever made of the concept's peculiar powers. It is found in the preface to his anthology on George MacDonald.[14] In the beginning of the introduction, after some biographical notation, Lewis admits to some serious faults MacDonald had as a writer, but then he says:

> "What he does best is fantasy --- fantasy that hovers between the allegorical and the mythopoeic. And this, in my opinion, he does better than any man. The critical problem with which we are confronted is whether this art --- the art of myth-making --- is a species of the literary art." (p. 14)

. . . . . .

---

14. Lewis, George MacDonald: An Anthology, pp. 10-22. Following quotations will be listed in the text.

> "It begins to look as if there were an art, or a gift, which criticism has largely ignored. It may even be one of the greatest arts; for it produces works which give us (at the first meeting) as much delight and (on prolonged acquaintance) as much wisdom and strength as the work of the greatest poet." (p. 16)

The second word in the phrase the paper seeks to establish is borrowed from the well-known phrase "poetic diction". Barfield defines it in his book entitled, Poetic Diction:

> "When words are selected and arranged in such a way that their meaning either arouses, or is obviously intended to arouse, aesthetic imagination, the result may be described as poetic diction."[15]

Reading this passage of Barfield's calls to mind more of what Lewis said in his MacDonald anthology regarding the "ignored art":

> "It goes beyond the expression of things we have already felt. It arouses in us sensations we have never had before, never anticipated having, as though we had broken out of our normal mode of consciousness and possessed joys not promised to our birth. It gets under our skin, hits us at a level deeper than our thoughts or even our passions, troubles oldest certainties til all questions are re-opened, and in general shocks us more fully awake than we are for most of our lives." (pp. 16-17)

Hence, a combination of these concepts produces mythopoeic diction --- a key to understanding the effect of romantic theology. Romanticism is a response to an imaginative stimulus and mythopoeic diction is such a stimulus. Romantic theology operates upon an evocative

---

15. Barfield, Poetic Diction, p. 13.

and intuitive approach arising from mythopoeic imagery. Thus it depends, not on things (abstractions), but on the qualification of things (data); not on didactical system, but on a background of attributes. It emphasizes suggestiveness. It is this power of conveying spiritual truth through and to the imagination of man and thereby arousing response generating the romantic sensibility that enables romantic theology to assume a forceful role as an apologetic approach.

This approach, at once rational and emotional, is aimed at evoking what could be called a mythopathic response. This idea is based on Lewis' remark in his essay "Myth Become Fact".[16] He did not state it, but it seems a fair assumption. If, as Lewis says, God chooses to be mythopoeic and man is mythopathic, does not this situation suppose some kind of diction? Perhaps, if poetic diction can arouse the aesthetic imagination, it could be said that mythopoeic diction arouses a mythopathic imagination.

To paraphrase Barfield's definition of poetic diction it could be said: "When certain events are selected and arranged in such a way that their imagery either arouses or is intended to arouse mythopathic imagination, the result may be described as mythopoeic diction". It is only a matter of working out "events" to

---

16. Lewis, Undeceptions, p. 43.

words and "myth" to language for one to see how meaning is presented to the imagination much in the way metaphor contains new insight through its relationships. Its apologetic possibilities come into view with the romantic claim that mythopoeic imagery has a capacity to evoke a sense of the quality of reality. Now faith itself is a vision of reality (Hebrews 11:1), and mythopoeia residing in such images of reality could be used to point to such a vision.

Mythopathic response is like any pathos. It is a receptivity, a matter of transference, a fellow feeling. It is an attempt to enable one to "look along the beam". In an essay from Undeceptions entitled "Meditation in a Toolshed",[17] Lewis drew a distinction between "looking along" and "looking at" in terms of knowledge and experience. One day he happened to be in his toolshed when he noticed a beam of light shining through a crack at the top of the door. He moved and stood where the beam of light struck his eye and the beam disappeared and the source of light was visible. His point in the essay was that looking at the beam and looking along the beam were illustrations of the current differences of approach in dealing with the validity of knowledge and experience. The current situation favours "looking at", external scientific

---

17. Lewis, op. cit., pp. 171-174.

specialist view to standing inside the experience. Lewis, of course, concludes that everyone must look along and at everything, but the validity of the inside knowledge is in nowise to be discounted in favour of the outside knowledge. His point is that without an inside there can be no outside. He suggests that much of modern thought is explaining about things without knowing what they are because those sharing and receiving have never been inside and looked along the beam. Often this is a shortcoming of apology. It attempts to explain something to people who have never tasted --- been inside the Christian experience. An intrinsic apology approaching an "inside", (i.e., mythopathic) response to Christian truth would be a great benefit.

The realization of this power is not a new thing. Scores of imaginative authors --- Bunyan, Dante, Milton, not the least --- employed mythopoeic diction. It is here argued that a true identification of romantic literature is its mythopoeic character. While these authors, along with scores of others, may not be classed as romantics from an historical point of view, they still have this central matter in common with those who can be in the employment of mythopoeic diction. A number of literary critics, Praz among them, would say that it is due to a romantic education of the modern that causes him to see the romantic in Dante. Yet the presence of mythopoeic diction would tie him to all who

employed the device from Homer to Tolkien. Macauley's estimate of Milton's poetry praising his poetic diction could just as easily be a comment on the mythopoeic diction of the great poet:

> "It acts like an incantation. Its merit lies less in its obvious meaning than in its occult power. There would seem, at first sight, to be no more in these words [images] than in other words [older images]. But they are words [images] of enchantment. No sooner are they pronounced [drawn], than the past is present and the distant near. New forms of beauty start at once into existence, and all the burial places of the memory give up their dead."[18]

MacDonald possessed this gift of diction that makes him a conscious pioneer of the ignored art, and worthy of more attention than he has hitherto been accorded. Lewis said his fantasy hovered between allegory and the mythopoeic. This would make for a combination of freedom and control on both the part of the author and the reader. The more tendentious aspect would provide for the purposed result of the author which the reader could acknowledge whether or not he accepted any conclusions, but the mythic aspect would still allow for a free use of the imagination. This is a powerful concept. Tolkien demonstrates the power of such mythopoeia by example in his epic trilogy and commentary in the introduction to The Fellowship of the Ring. Tolkien disliked allegory, preferring "history,

---

18. Thomas Babbington Macauley, "Milton", Critical and Historical Essays (Vol. I), p. 12.

true or feigned". He felt this provided the reader with an applicability related to his own thought and experience. He said most people mistake applicability with allegory, but "one resides in the freedom of the reader and the other in the purposed domination of the author". Tolkien did, in effect, create that delicate balance of the "ignored art". He has created a new myth or made proper use of an old one in that his myth of Middle Earth is, according to Barfield's dictum the direct embodiment of concrete experience and not his idea of that experience. The embodiment of one's idea of concrete experience is allegory or the allegorical use of a myth.

Lewis wondered whether this art of myth-making could rightly be called a literary art because he questioned whether or not myth actually existed in words. He felt that the mythical story was at the opposite end from lyrical poetry. The pattern of events is to myth the chief matter --- apart from form and content.

He continued his discussion in the MacDonald anthology by saying:

> "In poetry the words are the body and the 'theme' or 'content' the soul. In myth the imagined events are the body and something inexpressible is the soul."[19]

Poetic diction is inseparable from language ---

---

19. Lewis, George MacDonald: An Anthology, p. 16.

the choice of words. Mythopoeic diction is inseparable from imagery --- the arrangement of events. In mythopoeic diction words are logically incidental. Therefore, to call this art a purely literary art is not quite accurate, because it can exist in an inferior art form. But through his realization Lewis undertook to harness this power in a form of apologia that could steal past the "watchful dragons". This attempt recalls a desire that harks back to his school days for "some new and definite formula" through which he could strike a blow against anti-spiritual forces in the world.

Mythopoeic literature is a kind of synonym. It gives a reader one thing in the form of another, and like the synonym, it has two advantages in communication. First, it shares the common goal of the abstraction it is seeking to incarnate, but in this common ground, mythopoeia makes possible that freedom and variety by which the diction of the accomplished author differs from the dreary, wooden conformity of theological abstraction. And as a distinct and specific approach, it enables a master of the style to choose the mythopoeic concept that is the perfect mirror of his own imagination. And as such it can be imaginatively responded to. Even less than allegory, mythopoeia is not a cryptogram to be deciphered. It is to increase a reader's knowledge and heighten his awareness as he responds to the images.

Along this line, Barfield in his essay presented

to Charles Williams, borrowed a German word, Tarnung (traced to the days of Nazi tyranny for the precautionary measure of hiding one meaning in another), and Anglicized it to "tarning", thereby inventing a term for "say-one-thing-and-mean-another".[20] Barfield had reference to poetry and was interested in "new, original, and poetic meaning". But mythopoeia deals in imagined events, so here, perhaps, tarning could be said to be "set-forth-one-image-and-mean-the-inexpressible-something". The better the tarning the more nearly the inexpressible ("the too definite for language") is "expressed".

Returning to Streeter's ideas discussed in the section on romanticism, the romantic theologians' approach seems to realize his ultimate thesis:

> "For if I am right in maintaining that the language natural to religion is more closely akin to Art than Science, then a philosophy of Religion is likely the better to reflect the spirit of that which it endeavors to interpret, the more its exposition avoids technicalities and is expressed in a way that can be imaginatively as well as conceptually realized."[21]

Streeter would support the romantic theologians' stand that theological concepts cannot be satisfactorily explained by abstraction alone. They must be demonstrated to the imagination.

This is true of the Scripture, which claims to

---

20. Barfield, "Poetic Diction and Legal Fiction", Essays Presented to Charles Williams, p. 111.

21. Streeter, Reality, p. XIII.

uniquely reveal the heavenly pattern and therefore is the supremely authoritative revelation. Indeed it could be said that this is the chief purpose of apocalyptic literature. This bizarre, mind-boggling, other-world imagery that possesses the power to simultaneously chill the blood and cause the pulse to race is clearly an attempt to effect the imaginative (mythopathic) response. Frye says that the "Apocalypse or Revelation...has been carefully designed to form an undisplaced mythical conclusion for the Bible as a whole".[22] He looks upon the Biblical Apocalypse as the "grammar of apocalyptic imagery".[23] Frye relates the apocalyptic to his theory of archtypal meaning in the larger context of the theory of myth.

Lewis, in his effort to "smuggle in theology under cover of romance" offers his philosophy most clearly in one of his Narnia fantasies:

> "Dearest," said Aslan very gently, "you and your brother will never come back to Narnia."
>
> "Oh, Aslan!!" said Edmund and Lucy both together in despairing voices.
>
> "You are too old, children," said Aslan, "and you must begin to come to know me in your own world now."
>
> "It isn't Narnia, you know," sobbed Lucy. "It's you. We shan't meet you there. And how

---

22. Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, p. 141. By displacement, Frye means: "the adaptation of myth and metaphor to canons of morality or plausibility". (p. 366)

23. Frye, op. cit., p. 136. Frye also saw it as the "world of total metaphor".

> can we live never meeting you?"
>
> "But you shall meet me, dear one," said Aslan. "Are you there too, Sir?" said Edmund.
>
> "I am," said Aslan. "But there I have another name. You must learn to know me by that name. This was the very reason why you were brought to Narnia, that by knowing me here for a little while, you may know me better there."[24]

Lewis pointed out that while most people entertained a great deal of fantasy, they disliked (or mistrusted) the fantastic. This is generally due to the emphasis psychology has given the term, and while the literary use of the term must take this emphasis into account, it is not the predominant idea. As a literary term fantasy deals with impossibles and preter-naturals.

Those who oppose fantasy because they think it presents a false picture of life due to its content need to see that without a degree of so-called realism no deception could take place. The romantic in a true sense has less power to deceive than the so-called realistic. A false picture of life could be far more effectively conveyed couched in a best selling novel "telling it like it is" than the fantasy which would require from the outset a suspension of primary belief.

Looking again to Experiment in Criticism,[25] Lewis outlines a distinction to be drawn between types of realism. First, there is realism of presentation.

---

24. Lewis, Voyage of the Dawn Treader, p. 129.

25. Lewis, op. cit., pp. 57ff.

This is the art of bringing something close and vivid by sharply drawn detail, whether observed or imagined. Second, there is the realism of content in terms of possibility or probability. This is what is true to life; it could actually happen.

It is possible to have presentation without content as in fantasy. In works like some tragedy, one could have content without presentation. In a novel such as War and Peace, both are present. And one must admit that there is an abundance of work containing neither.

The present trend obviously leans toward realism of content, and Lewis suggested that it was in danger of becoming a principle. It is virtually an overwhelming attitude that the "true to life" has a claim on literature that over-rides all other considerations (Jonathan Livingston Seagull and Watership Down not-withstanding).

Barzun looks at realism as a rebound from the disappointment in romantic hopes that had been all dashed by 1850. He observes that the very word realism "wants to convey that what romanticism desired was not possible, and that the romanticists' methods would not work. Realism is the fox in the fable who said the grapes were sour".[26]

---

26. Jacques Barzun, Romanticism and the Modern Ego, p. 142.

An excellent picture. Especially when one remembers that the fox went away hungry. He may have compensated for his hunger but he failed to balance the situation. Likewise, modern realism has hardened into a stubborn, starving attitude of its own.

What has been the result of this realism now that the pendulum has swung? What do those who insist on it mean by it? Is it the sordid trumpery of the Best Seller List (most of which is disguised cynicism and sadism)? When Farrer speaks of an atmosphere of resistance or hostility that is sufficient cause for an apologetic[27] it can be seen that the world of commercial publishing is just such a theatre. Applying the Moltke dictum to the situation, it can be seen that modern realism is a dominant factor in bringing about a climate where conflict is assured on the second level of attack.[28]

Williams speaks of the atmosphere of courtly love that pervaded the Middle Ages stating that not everybody believed in it, but had to pretend that it existed.[29] It was the fashion. Most people today could not define any of the "isms" floating about, especially realism. Yet they pretend it exists. It is the fashion, and snatches of its philosophy rise in their conversation.

---

27. Austin Farrer, "The Christian Apologist", Light on C. S. Lewis, pp. 23-43.

28. Vid., p. 67.

29. Williams, Arthurian Torso, p. 54.

Everyone is "laying it on the line" and facing up to "what it's all about". It affects their feelings and actions due to its being so substantially a part of the world where they have daily intercourse. Now in the context of literature's current trend, if realism is, as has been defined, verisimilitude to actuality, the question must be asked: How does the author view actuality? Where does he stand? Does he look outward or inward? What is his preoccupation?

It is in this milieu that the philosophical cold war is waged. Here, as much as in the open, frontal challenge the apologist must apply his skill. Conduct and attitude are formed to an extent by suggested norms and ideals ingrained in the consciousness. A constant battle of philosophy is being waged on this front. To meet such attack effort must be made on every level to counteract insidious infiltration.

The demand that all literature should have realism of content cannot be maintained. Most of the great literature so far produced in the world has not. It was the general character of stories before the nineteenth century to be of the "improbable type".

The question may be asked why apology cannot be written in terms of realism. The answer is that it can and should be. The position here is not to deny value to this approach, but to point out its limitation. It

could be said that in terms of literature realism is tantamount to the opposite number of abstraction in terms of science. That is, it seeks to reduce reality to the lowest possible terms. Its apprehension deals, in effect, only with ascertainable phenomenal fact. Restricted to the concise expression of "content", it can only state the obvious as it were and is less fit to incarnate meaning which is always lost in abstraction or eludes such logical confinement.

But like the abstraction its purpose is a vital one. It does prevent the drawing of absurd conclusions about the situation of life that could be drawn if the romantic view ruled supreme. But on the other hand, if a total perspective of reality is to be seen, if qualities beyond what the five senses and sciences can apprehend are to be depicted, then the imaginative work must have its place. Abstraction in its literary counterpart casts the romantic theologian back for the power of the intrinsic meaning which can only be expressed through the imagination. Yet men still insist on a general ordinariness and as accurate a representation of natural law as they can comprehend all the while absorbing coincidence and improbable developments no fairy tale would think of entertaining.

The ridiculous charge that fantastic stories are not true or fix a false picture of life, or, at least, are deceptive is met by Lewis' point that the

unblushing romantic has far less power to deceive in that sense than the apparently realistic. The real danger is in the sober faced novel where all appears to be very probable but all is in fact contrived.

Modern man with his penchant for specialization continues to operate on a single principle or thin explanation and carry it to isolated extremes. Man is one thing to the psychologist and another to the politician. The Freudians have man all figured out, but then so do the Communists. For all of them there is only one pattern in their realism. Viewing the modern scene one somehow feels that the parts are greater than the whole.

Within its complex (the very opposite of its intention) existentialist framework the realism of modern literature is filled with the justification of its characters' struggles with some inexorable. The writers go to impossible lengths to cause the reader to empathize with his characters' foolish fight against the law of gravity or the inevitable result of some difficulty for which the character is more than just partially responsible. There is in the very core of modern fiction a certain morbidity about the way things are as though its very realism wishes realism were false.

No wiser observation has been made than that life could not be endured were it seen in reality, for it is

being so presented --- bombastically --- and it is unendurable. The world yearns for simplicity, and yet it is filled with complex theories with cock-eyed views to restore its sanity.

Sanity, Chesterton says, is a type of equilibrium.[30] And it could be well argued that a mythopoeic apology awakening the imagination to things higher and nobler could equalize the crass realism that frightens, causes insecurity, and brings despair.[31]

Without this "mutually corrective" antidote, how is the totality of reality to be depicted? The romantic theologian is certain that the aesthetic imagination will have to be brought into play. He would ask: Without attempting to depict the ideal, the sublime, the qualitative through and to the imagination, what can be known of reality?

Mythopoeia does not invent the relationships its vast images reveal. They exist independently according to MacDonald and can only be apprehended by the imagination. Myths represent primitive meaning and are not the arbitrary relations of the myth-makers, but the natural expressions of man's being and consciousness.

---

30. Chesterton, Orthodoxy, p. 167.

31. W. H. Auden in Secondary Worlds (pp. 51-52) states his conviction that men create secondary worlds because they are dissatisfied with the primary one. He also observes that realistic novels only dwell on the dissatisfactions.

Barfield called myth the true child of meaning begotten on the imagination.

Regardless of the theory one embraces concerning the nature of myth, it would have to be agreed that one of its characteristics is that of perpetual recreation. Lewis openly admits and demonstrates this in his retelling of the Cupid and Psyche myth from Apuleius' Golden Ass. Lewis suggests that the myth did not originate with Apuleius, but went back beyond even this oldest known account. Even the third volume in his science-fiction trilogy, That Hideous Strength, is a kind of extension of the Arthurian myth. And in this line Williams' War In Heaven could be seen as another chapter in the story of the Grail. Myth can be retold partially or wholly. Major elements can be employed in a story that cause cognitive response. Such imaginative rehandling can shed fresh light on the truth of a theme or an idea as to restore a perspective that has been lost or perhaps never realized.

Once when speaking of stories that turn on fulfilled prophecies, Lewis observed:

> "One sees, and yet one does not quite see, the regularity...we have just had set before our imagination something that has always baffled the intellect: we have seen how destiny and free will can be combined, even how free will is the modus operandi of destiny. The story does what no theorem can quite do. It may not be 'like real life' in the superficial sense: but it sets before us an image of what reality may well

be like at some more central region."[32]

According to all romantic presupposition the source of mythopoeic power is in the sub-conscious. Thus employing mythopoeic diction romantic theology becomes (not to the level Yeats endeavored) the agent of the power which has its basis in the "organically traditional" which will flood the conscious.

This intrinsic apologetic is in a real sense tied to the old myth of the gods being buried under the tyranny of consciousness, reason, and the appearances of civilization. The romantic theologian wishes to move aside the veil of abstraction and appearances and let the deep seated fait accompli come to light. Lewis touches on this very theme in That Hideous Strength. The central theme is the struggle against the scientific super-organization, the N. I. C. E.[33] which seeks to crush the organic, the creative, the ordinate under the weight of its sterile, intellectual, predictable control. Ransom, the hero of all Lewis' science fiction trilogy, acts as the agent to release the anima mundi through the ancient Logres (Matter of Britain) with the aid of Merlin and the cosmic powers by the eldila

---

32. Lewis, Essays Presented to Charles Williams, p. 101.

33. The National Institute for Co-ordinated Experiments ("...the first fruit of that constructive fusion between the state and the laboratory...", p. 22).

(rulers of the planets).

In a true sense, the attempt to depict reality from the modern outlook is damned from the beginning. How can man, whose perception is out of focus present from the "actual" world of his own making any form of genuine reality? The best he can hope to do is present a picture of the condition he has wrought by falling short of reality. This is not to say that such an attempt has no value. If nothing else, it exposes the darkness. But if nothing else, indeed, it becomes a danger, for men can grow accustomed to the dark.

And to a considerable degree this is what has happened. The realists have pointed to more of man's shortcomings, exposed more of his duplicity and infidelity and called it reality. Modern man is so sophisticated in terms of the double-dealing hypocrisy of life that the anti-hero is the ideal and cynical debunking of any qualitative claim in life the norm of response. Little wonder that modern man seeks to trust only what he can weigh and measure. He only believes those who see "with the eye" and looks askance at anyone who would see "through it". Lewis saw this attitude reflected in the lowest kind of literary activity, those who give and demand sensational narrative, but will not accept it unless it is offered as fact.

Chesterton was right when he said that although

modern man looked on himself as avant-garde and radical, he was actually a moderate.[34] Above all modern man is reasonable --- prudent. A result of this in matters of religious experience is a simple lack of courage to believe the orthodox Christian faith. It is not that modern man really sees orthodoxy as a bad thing, unworthy of belief. Indeed, it is too good to be believed. It is, to him, like believing in a fairy tale to believe in such freedom. But what is worse, like the Pharisee who would not enter in (Matthew 23:13), he shuts the door against those who would so venture. Instead he demands such a freedom in a "cut and dried", scientific theology that he controls --- and it is not there.

The romantics have marked more than once a chief characteristic of the modern world in its cynical indifference. All ages have turned to vice in the time allotted to them from a variety of causes and circumstances and the illusions they have wrought from them. But as Chesterton pointed out, the present age suffers from the greatest of all illusions --- the illusion of familiarity.[35] Modern man is bored. He believes he knows it all, or at best it will be only a matter of time before he does. Therefore, the world is stale.

---

34. Chesterton, "Introduction", The Everlasting Man.

35. Ibid.

His scientific knowledge and technical skill have helped bring about this attitude. So as Chesterton remarks, man needs to be delighted as well as instructed. He needs to regain his sense of wonder. He can no longer marvel. Significantly, Chesterton contended that he saw marvels everywhere due to his fairytale convictions.[36] It is the homogeneity of the modern man's mind that makes him dull. He sees no irony.

> "This is also why the new novels die so quickly, and the old fairy tales endure forever. The old fairy tale makes the hero a normal human boy; it is his adventures that are startling; they startle him because he is normal, but in the modern psychological novel the hero is abnormal; the center is not central. Hence the fiercest adventures fail to affect him adequately, and the book is monotonous. You can make a story out of a hero among dragons, but not out of a dragon among dragons. The fairy tale discusses what a sane man would do in a mad world. The sober realistic novel of today discusses what an essential lunatic will do in a dull world."[37]

This loss of wonder represents a most unfortunate predicament. Most people as they begin life possess an affinity with things of a transcendental nature. There is mystery and otherness in all they encounter. As they grow and contact the wisdom of the world such responses and beliefs are tested in the context of new knowledge. People become quite excited about the power of their own intellects. They begin to look at their old beliefs in a new and different light. The sequel of this course is

---

36. Ibid.

37. Chesterton, Orthodoxy, pp. 24-25.

that the beliefs will be questioned and deepened --- integrated with the new knowledge or discarded. Now if the new knowledge and means of gaining it deny a place to the primitive knowledge and even the capacity for it, the sequel can be forseen --- the great loss will occur.

Along these lines Barfield's contention that there is in the history of man a progress from phenomena to principle and from principle back to phenomena makes a contribution. It has been seen that he means this quite literally in an actual historical context. And while one might question the literal sense in which he applies the theory, it is to be seen that Barfield is a man of astute literary understanding and religious insight and he has put his finger upon a need growing from genuine life experience. And, hopefully from the brief presentation above, it can be seen that the theory can be applied in a more existential context. Romanticism enables man to regain that lost quality that was sacrificed in the transition from phenomena to principle --- from being drawn away by the centrifugal force of the process. Man has been pulled away from his preter-logical, intuitive powers of apprehension and has convinced himself that through the development of a technical structure he is nearer the truth. In a real sense, mythopoeic romanticism enables man to recapture a lost rapport with natural cycles. It involves the renewed sensibility of man to qualities of reality that

have been dulled by the repetitive similitude of realism or "killed" by abstraction. But here is a voluntary element that even the original phenomena did not possess and it makes a powerful apologetic tool. It allows for a deliberate expression of synchronization which produces the lost quality while maintaining the knowledge of the principle. How significant it is that Frye speaks of the force of myth as centripetal. One can see how it enhances a mutually corrective approach.

Man's perception depends upon his conception which in turn depends to a considerable degree on the conditions, hereditary and environmental, that shape his personality. Nowhere is this more apparent than in theological thought. Dealing in abstractions (stop-action sequence) it is nigh impossible to consider simultaneously all ramifications in religious experience. It may be helpful to transfer I. A. Richard's position to theology that in ordinary life a thousand considerations prohibit for most people any complete working out of their responses, but in the imaginative experiences these obstacles are removed.[38]

Therefore, works of the imagination, not even suspected of serving apologetic ends have served such ends nonetheless. For instance, what fraction of people have actually read Don Quixote? Yet who does

---

38. I. A. Richards, Coleridge on Imagination.

not know of Cervantes' Mad Knight or refer to a "quixotic" sense of honor? Who, just knowing the linements of his story, cannot identify with his chivalrous ideals, his foolish rationalization, and yet still admire his dogged determination? But if he is not read, how has he come to be so extolled? It is because he has pervaded daily life as an image. He has become a metaphorical fact of existence --- an inheritance of imagery granted by birth. He is a sort of veritable truth that provides example, a comparison, a contrast, a watchword. He is food for the soul.

Chesterton touches this point when he says that one's self-conscious convictions are best set off by the tone and colour of certain tales.[39] And George Eliot once wrote of the "force of the imagination that pierces or exalts the solid fact".[40] It is this evocative, while yet penetrating power of mythopoeia that is the intrinsic apologetic technique of romantic theology. And it is stated again that it is only a technique. Reilly's claim that the romantic theologians felt that the Christian story no longer was sufficient to "carry the tenor" of spiritual truth misses the whole point of their apologetic intent. Not one of them would deny the historical claims of Christianity. But they

---

39. Chesterton, Orthodoxy, p. 113.

40. George Eliot, "Daniel Duronda", p. 340.

would see the need of a means of communicating the truth to their generation in whatever terms their age finds communicable. Coleridge even suggested that the images the author of Hebrews used in describing redemption were metaphors grasped by his Jewish readers.[41] These metaphors were not the *nomina propria*. In every generation a new metaphorical language is needed to translate the truth for its contemporaries.

Mythopoeia is metaphorical almost to the level of the apocalyptic, not necessarily in style, imagery, or the lack of regard for plausibility and ordinary experience, but in the sense that it seeks to approach a high level of identification.

Lewis appeared to accept wholeheartedly Chesterton's remarks in *Orthodoxy* regarding "the need for that mixture of the familiar and unfamiliar which Christendom has rightly named 'Romance'."[42] Chesterton felt that the common ground for Western man was the "desirability of an active and imaginative life, picturesque and full of poetic curiosity".[43] He was convinced that man needed a life of what he called practical romance; the combination of something strange with something that is secure.

---

41. Coleridge, "Aids to Reflection", *op. cit.*

42. Chesterton, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

43. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

Perhaps to some the value of imagined worlds somewhat dissolves in the context of apologetics, yet it is touched on well by Chesterton with his hint at seeing Christianity from a distance. In the Introduction to his The Everlasting Man,[44] he makes a salient point along the lines of modern man's mood about the whole religious tradition. He is, according to Chesterton, in an intermediate state. He does not stand within Christian truth and yet is not far enough away to see it as a whole and thereby be enabled to make objective judgement. He is blighted with a sort of hereditary boredom with he knows not what, and already weary of hearing what he has never heard.

Chesterton felt it was unfortunate that man could not set the Church thousands of miles away in strange skies of morning and judge it impartially. It would be better, he wrote, to see the whole thing as belonging to another continent or to another planet. Here is a chief element in the concept of a romantic approach to apologetics. The romantic theologians did not hesitate to take the eternal verities and set them in another time, another world or another dimension. They accepted and practised this concept readily and also believed the conclusion Chesterton set forth:

"When we do make this imaginative effort to

---

44. Chesterton, op. cit., pp. 3-15.

> see the whole thing [Christianity] from the outside, we find that it really looks like what is traditionally said about it inside...To put it shortly, the moment we are impartial about it we know why people are partial to it."[45]

To what exact degree Chesterton's concepts influenced the romantic apologists is uncertain, but the effect of such a theory can be seen in their work.[46] For instance, Lewis denied that his Narnia chronicles and science fiction trilogy were allegories. He called them supposals which he claimed mixed the real and the unreal in a different way from allegory.

> "Bunyan's picture of Giant Despair does not start from supposal at all. It is not supposition but a fact that despair can capture and imprison a human soul...The Incarnation of Christ in another world is mere supposal; but granted the supposition, He would have been a physical object in that world as He was in Palestine and His death on the Stone Table would have been a physical event no less than His death on Calvary."[47]

But beyond this rather practical effect of such perspective, there is in this romantic approach a somewhat unique means of communication in a stricter

---

45. Ibid., p. 7.

46. Anne Ridler, Collected Writings of Charles Williams, p. liv. According to Ridler, Chesterton was the strongest influence on Williams' thought and style. Lewis' references to Chesterton are too numerous to mention. Barfield and Tolkien also quote him extensively.

47. Lewis, Letters, p. 283. Lewis defines allegory in the letter as "a composition (whether pictorial or literary) in which immaterial realities are represented by feigned physical objects...".

mythical sense that makes it even more valuable as an apologetic instrument. It provides for responses that would aid apologia in fulfilling its overall objective ---initiating steps toward conversion. By quickening the romantic sensibility it can effect a heightened awareness and felt change of consciousness. A recovery of a lost quality in terms of participation and motivating force are also results of its capacity. Also with the aid of imaginative articulation, it can provide a demonstration of self-conscious convictions. Regarding the current situation, it can create an atmosphere of otherness that the modern world has stifled. Moreover, it is a universal medium and as such it is a tool that transcends superficial barriers of communication.

Much of the result that apologia attempts to accomplish would fall into the peculiar effect of a romantic approach. Through mythopoeic imagery one is enabled to see theological issues not only analytically, but creatively. Through the imagination one shares in the realization and application of the truth presented.

A story relating theological or moral truth is important because of the emotional impression the truth embodied in the story makes upon the reader. It is operative --- at work. This is as valuable if not more valuable than simply grasping <u>how</u> it works. Very few people are motivated by purely cerebral means. Only those already dedicated need only to have an issue

clarified before they respond, and the arena of apologia is outside that circle. Men are rarely moved to willed action by the intellect. There needs to be a congruency of the patterns of heart and mind.

In the long run the most effective apologist is the story-teller. The Bible itself is mostly a collection of stories (all sorts of literature) and is itself a story. An apology in the form of a story of which the story is itself a part also frees the reader from speculation --- or at least opens the door to a wider response involving the will. Mythopoeic diction speaks to the imagination, and by employing the imagination more of man's cognitive faculties are brought into play than just his philosophic curiosity. In the mythopoeic art, the meaning, the suggestion, the radiance is incarnate in the whole story. Mythopoeia, therefore, can speak to the will and in the voice of conscience touch the intellect and imagination, humour, fancy and all the affections.

This ignored art, as Lewis points out in the MacDonald anthology, effects a heightened awareness and thus offers prospects and possibilities beyond its immediate subject. It goes beyond the mere intellectual satisfaction of an abstraction in the increased awareness to offer at once a commentary and an alternative. There is no doubt as to the alternative, the romantic

theologians believed that the function of art was to evoke the divine presence. And Lawlor claims for the romantic approach the capacity to grant a status of heightened awareness of the external world as well.[48] Through this experience man can take a step forward in understanding his complex nature.

Barfield, enlarging on the phrase "aesthetic imagination" defined it further as a "felt change of consciousness".[49] By "felt" he meant the change was attended to. Lewis attributed this capacity to mythopoeic diction when "we are shocked fully awake". As Barfield points out, the rational principle cannot expand consciousness. It is only through the absorption of knowledge by the imagination that inner powers bring increased awareness to the "sense-datum which enables one to observe what could not have been observed before".[50]

Such a point would be a primary concern of apologia. Many who look on apologetics as a reconciliation between theology and other fields will quickly see that such a concept includes "reconciliations" and is far vaster in scope.

Lewis always took issue with apologists who

48, Lawlor, op. cit.

49. Barfield, Poetic Diction, pp. 20f.

50. Ibid., p. 153.

attempted to hide elements of the Christian faith for fear they would be called mythical. Lewis seemed to feel that even the pre-Christian hints in pagan myth were a step nearer to realizing Christian truth than spiritually insensitive attitudes produced by purely materialistic societies. He points to the producers of the myths as the "People with the Pictures" contrasted with the "Shepherd People" (the Jews) who had the "Rules". Today, no less than in ancient times, did Lewis see the myth as a means of touching men with thoughts of the divine if they would not heed the Law --- or felt they had risen above it. He presented this conviction graphically in a memorable passage from the Pilgrim's Regress:

> "No one is born able to read: so that the starting point for all of us must be a picture and not the rules..."
>
> . . . . . .
>
> "Even where Mother Kirk is nominally the ruler men can even grow old without knowing how to read the Rules. Her empire is always crumbling. But it never quite crumbles: for as often as men become Pagan again, the Landlord again sends them pictures and stirs them back to Mother Kirk even as he led the actual Pagans long ago."
>
> . . . . . .
>
> "You must not think I am setting them [the Shepherds] up against the Pagans...neither people was well without the other, nor could either be healed until the Landlord's Son came into the country."[51]

---

51. Lewis, op. cit., pp. 152-153.

The romantic theologians were convinced that the world was in danger of becoming Pagan again and the time for the Pictures had come. And the centerpiece of their pictures, even though they may possess the accoutrement of the old pictures, is the Landlord's Son who has the power to heal.

Mythopoeic diction, to the romantic theologians, is the consequence of the proposition that the diction of myth-making born of man's creative imagination corresponds in effect to a cosmological dialectic of myth born in the imagination of God. They came to see that existence unfolds according to the "Myth Become Fact". Any rupture in the dialectical pattern accounts for the Fall and the alienation of man from God. Redemption is due to the manifestation of the Pattern in history.

Through mythopoeia romantic theology tries to turn the principle the more scientific theology has hammered out back into phenomena --- to clothe the abstraction and approach concrete experience.

> "...Compare 'Our Father which art in heaven' with the 'The Supreme Being which transcends space and time'. The first goes to pieces if you begin to apply the literal meaning to it...The second falls into no such traps. On the other hand the first really means something, really represents a concrete experience in the minds of those who use it; the second is mere dextrous playing with counters, and once a man has learnt the rules he can go on that way for two volumes without really using the words to refer to any concrete fact at all."[52]

---

52. Lewis, Letters, p. 147.

Perhaps that is the chief problem with apologetics today. Those engaged in it are more concerned with not falling into traps than they are with referring to concrete experience. Through mythopoeia the possibility of a response to the representation is opened --- a satisfaction beyond that of mere intellectual curiosity. Through such an approach the romantic theologians sought to solve the "tragic dilemma". They attempted to offer an apologetic that would enable man "to know and to taste". The idea of tasting is so exquisitely appropriate. To hear, see, smell, touch --- all of these are vital. But to taste --- to absorb the experience into one's being ("Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood ye have no life in you." John 6:53) --- this is the "proof of the pudding".

Man must at some point be enabled to envision standing within the truth and looking along the beam as well as standing outside and merely looking at it. Job, when he saw the mighty works of God's power, tasted his sovereignty and cried: "I repent me in dust and ashes". Isaiah, beholding the presence of God in the temple, tasted the holiness of God, and cried: "Woe is me for I am undone". Thomas, touching the wounds of the risen Christ, tasted the Vision Become Reality and cried: My Lord and My God".

Romantic apology, combining mythopoeia and

conceptual thought, is an answer designed to lead men to taste the "mythical radiance resting on our theology".

When Lewis says, "we apprehend joys not given to our birth", in reading such literature, he means our natural birth. He believed that if one would surrender to the spirit that presents such a perspective to the imagination such joy could be had in a rebirth. For a thousand and one reasons man has lost the perspective that prevents his receiving such joy. Mythopoeia can convey through the imagination the beginning of such a perspective which if pursued could lead one to participate in it. By allowing the imagination to be baptized one could be enabled from here, not only to see, but possibly to believe. And believing come to possess such joy.

V. IMAGINATION AND THEOLOGY RECONSIDERED.

"A man to be greatly good, must imagine intensely."

A Defense of Poetry
Percy Bysshe Shelley

"...if your soul were in my soul's stead..."

Job 6:14
King James Version

"David saw...David enquired...David sent and took..."

II Samuel 2:2.4.6
King James Version

"What it actually did to me was to convert, even to baptize (that was where the death came in) my imagination. It did nothing to my intellect nor (at that time) my conscience. Their turn came far later..."

George MacDonald: An Anthology
C. S. Lewis

V. IMAGINATION AND THEOLOGY RECONSIDERED

In the closing scenes of his famous play, St. Joan, George Bernard Shaw has one of his characters observe that the problem with the world is a lack of imagination. The romantic theologians agreed wholeheartedly and one of the truly positive contributions they have made is taking a step toward forcing the imagination into the ranks of theological concerns. As Frye points out imagination exists in all areas of human activity, but three of particular importance are the arts, love, and religion. The primary task of this section is to investigate the latter area because this is an area in which theology has had little to say. Virtually no theologian dealing with as related a matter as the doctrine of man includes the imagination. Even a study dealing with the doctrine of man from within the context of romantic theology, The Doctrine of Man in C. S. Lewis, by William Luther White, scarcely mentions it.

Once again it has been the literary men who have dealt most satisfactorily with this mysterious faculty of man. It is slowly coming to be realized that much of their insight can be used by theologians. And when one seriously considers its power in man's life and actions, it remains to be asked how any detailed

doctrinal statement can leave it out.

Popularly, there is such a dichotomy of opinion about the imagination no typical attitude can be expressed. To those with strong opinions it could be either a divine faculty or a diseased faculty most attracted by what is ungodly and immoral. To others, not so involved, it is a matter totally divorced from the practical aspects of life or it is a pleasant harmless instrument of indulgence.

As regards the most common theological stance, perhaps the remark of Hugh Kingsmill regarding the Thomists could be applied to theologians in general when he observes that they seek refuge from the complexity of things in the more manageable complexity of words.[1] To such a position the free exercise of the imagination is a presumptuous attempt to bypass the conventional theological route to truth.

Yet it appears to be a growing conviction that the world man lives in is largely created by the human imagination. Even if one was inclined to draw back from the phenomenal theory of the radical romantics, he would still have to contend with the creation of the world by man in terms of the practical effect their

---

1. Hugh Kingsmill, The Best of Hugh Kingsmill (edited by Michael Holroyd), p. 296. Such a stance clearly demonstrates logomorphic tendencies: "Things are not even what they appear to be, but what we say they appear to be".

imagination has upon it. How many "worlds" have been created through the arts? Men of science, politics, commerce, have wrought astounding things into being by applying imaginative concepts to their fields. As MacDonald wrote: "The man who cannot invent will never discover".[2]

On a personal level each man is limited or released, threatened or lulled, in terror or at peace through his imagination. Even on this so-called secondary level, the imagination is something to deal with.

Hugh Kingsmill once attacked George Bernard Shaw for disparaging the imagination. Most likely the statement that caused Kingsmill's rebuttal was the remark in Shaw's preface to Arms and the Man:

> "To me the tragedy and the comedy of life lie in the consequences, sometimes terrible, sometimes ludicrous, of our persistent attempts to found our institutions on the ideals suggested to our imaginations by our half-satisfied passions instead of genuinely scientific natural history."[3]

If Kingsmill had taken the time to analyze the grammatical structure of that sentence, he would have seen that the great Mocking Iconoclast did not condemn the imagination but the "ideas...suggested by our half-satisfied passions". The imagination works with what

---

2. Macdonald, A Dish of Orts, p. 13.

3. George Bernard Shaw, Arms and the Man, p. 385.

is presented to it. Most people have failed to appreciate the careful distinction that thoughtful scholars have made between the imagination and fancy for the last one hundred years. The imagination is deep, spiritual, essential. It is a complex power more aligned with reason and will than with feeling and superficialities which is the domain of fancy.

Since the nineteenth century fewer subjects have so intrigued philosophers as has the imagination. But even earlier Hume, in his Treatise on Human Nature, said that the imagination was vital to knowledge. (He also said fancy was to be avoided.) Immanuel Kant in the Critique of Pure Reason called imagination the "blind, but indispensable function of the soul, without which we should have no knowledge whatsoever, but of which we are scarcely conscious".

It is generally argued at present that the production of imaginative knowledge is not directly derived from the senses. Particularly what Kant would call the productive imagination which he described as a transcendental synthesis prior to experience. (The reproductive imagination used prior experience for operation, such as seeing only three sides of a cube and supplying all the sides.)

In religion it is interesting to note that many of the great pulpiteers have held the imagination in high regard. Horace Bushnell remarked that the gospels

were the gift of God to the imagination. Andrew D. Blackwood said the use of the imagination was the mark of good preaching. As will be seen later the imagination's role in prophecy is no late come realization. He felt that Isaiah and the prophets embody the inspired imagination.[4] Blackwood also stated that the imagination worked at its lowest level when it was used in description. A higher level was reached when it was used structurally as a synthesizing power. But the highest expression was the creative; the chief example, he suggests, being John Bunyan.

Apologists have addressed themselves to the intellect; they must now address themselves to the imagination. The scientific and technological development has thrown open the doors of the universe and the application of new concepts and new materials is as vast a challenge to man's imagination on every level as has ever been faced. What will Christian truth have to say in this context? It is really astounding that theology has taken so long to approach this faculty that is undoubtedly one man holds in common with God. Apologists will have to do more than make a side observation to the effect that the imagination is a point of contact with God.

---

4. Andrew Blackwood, "Imagination in Preaching," The Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, p. 548.

Frye says that the imagination is the power of constructing possible models of human experience.[5] It is concerned with the identity of the human mind and the world outside it (which would include religious experience). The apologist who employs the imagination attempts to demonstrate a world within a theological perspective completely absorbed and possessed by the human mind.

But what is the cause of the theologians' neglect of the imagination in understanding man and his place in the scheme of things? It seems that they have been more than willing to leave it to other disciplines.[6] Yet it is a recognized faculty of man in the Scriptures. And here lies a part of the answer. The Church at large has always reflected the apparent low opinion the Scripture writers seem to have of the imagination. One

---

5. Frye, The Educated Imagination, p. 22.

6. This is acknowledged as a strong statement; and that it is one among several. No doubt some would be inclined to feel that a legitimate right to overstatement in propounding a thesis has been exceeded. Some would also point to many individual scholars as exceptions to the statement. Indeed, so could the author. But from the perspective the paper is setting forth it would have to be admitted that exceptions is an apt description.

   But in no sense should the statement be construed as a flat denial of the work of any individual scholar. What is being discussed here is a tendency in theology, particularly in apologetics. Also in Chapter II, it was stated that the argument to be proposed was concerned with matters of atmosphere, harmony, and scope. If this gist is kept in mind, the statement achieves a fairer proportion.

does not need to read many references to become aware of the negative attitude toward the imagination in the Scripture. It is rarely spoken of in a positive manner.

Apparently, to draw a conclusion from the references, a great deal of spiritual warfare is accomplished in this theatre. To read the inspired writers the imagination is obviously a tool of all three of the Antagonists in man's spiritual life. Yet if it is their "tool" they did not create it any more than any other natural appetite or capacity in man, they merely use it. And if it was put there by God it must have been intended for his purpose. Further if warfare is waged there is always a possibility that under some condition battle could be won as well as lost.

Since the imagination is a point in some stage at which man is genuinely tempted, it is not surprising that the Biblical writers warn about its dangers. But, if it is a juncture, it does appear that man could be induced to use his imagination for good as well as evil, to demonstrate the power of God as well as sin.

At the present time the difficulty of studying the Biblical concept of the imagination is increasing due to the fact that modern versions rarely use the term imagination in their translations. In the form of a noun (three in the Old Testament; three in the New

Testament) terms generally translated imagination in the older English versions are now defined by scholars as formation, stubborness, reasoning, device, understanding (note that all relate to an activity of the mind). Also in verb form (five in the Old Testament; the only one in the New Testament is a Greek translation of Psalm 2:1 in Acts 4:25), the emphasis of the translation is directed along the lines of meditating, devising, purposing, reckoning. Some of the modern translators render the terms as "hatching futile plots", "muttering slander", all of which would imply some kind of inventive mental activity. The "schemes" of man (in which is implied a design) are "crafty". Despite the translators' efforts to lay it aside, it would appear that imagination still is a fairly accurate term for all this "hatching of crafty schemes" when seen as the capacity for perception and conception in man.

Interestingly, in some contexts terms that are translated imagination in the older versions are also translated mind. Nephesh and ruach, two fruitful words dealing with the essence of man are often translated 'mind'. Terms conveying the idea of a combination of heart and 'mind' are also frequent. But there is still a lack of consistency in the treatment of the concepts of knowledge with regard to heart and mind. Most scholars, however, would agree with Kittel

that gnoein takes place in the heart and this knowledge has religious and moral significance as a function of the central organ in the life of the human spirit.[7] Nous is more the intellectual aspect of knowledge relegated to the mind.

Not only translators, but Biblical scholars pay scant attention to the role of the imagination in man. Standard Bible dictionaries usually grant it only a paragraph merely emphasizing its propensity for evil. One scholar, employing an extremely simplified definition, relates that the terms translated imagination in the older versions did not mean imagination in the current sense of the "power of freely formed images". At least he is right about that. This scholar thinks that terms formerly translated imagination suggest a "prelude to action". He says further that the ancient Hebrew was not given to "fantasy".[8] Even if that were true (and it would be interesting to know how he found out), the ancient Hebrew would know the source of the plottings and contrivings on the part of men. One wonders if both the ancient Hebrew and the translators of the earlier English versions were not a step ahead in their grasp of the mystery of the

---

7. Gerhard Kittel, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. IV, pp. 948-1022.

8. R. C. Dentan, "Imagination", The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, p. 685.

imagination.

It seems that most Biblical scholars and translators accept the general psychological definitions over against the literary-philosophical definition.[9] Imagination is for them no more than mental images, day-dreams; fuzzy, useless products of the sub-conscious. The problem of relating the imagination to man's understanding of God and the universe lies not so much in language and translation, as in applying a modern, scientific definition to the ancient terms so that they would appear even in context not to fit the meaning the writers had in mind.[10] These are just some of the external difficulties imposed by a purely scientific approach to the consideration of imagination in the Scripture.

Also, there are internal causes for the lack of abundant Biblical references to terms hinting at imaginative activity and the negative connotation on the part of those that do so.

Within the Old Testament one must consider, as is usually the case in dealing with the Jews, the Law.

---

9. Lewis remarked that after all was said and done translations were commentaries being by nature tendentious. "The Literary Impact of the Authorized Version", Selected Literary Essays: by C. S. Lewis (edited by Walter Hooper).

10. Barfield suggests that all modern commentators be considered suspect of logomorphic activity until they had given ample proof of their innocence. Poetic Diction, p. 226.

The second commandment (Exodus 20:4-6) regarding the making of images and likenesses for worship is the prohibition for the Jew that would discourage a great deal of the kind of imaginative participation usually associated with the ancient world. But as Sayers points out it did not deter the Jew from building a wealth of anthropomorphisms.

Barfield dedicates a chapter to this issue in Saving the Appearances.[11] Here he describes how the Jew was taught to resist the level of participation in the phenomenal world that encouraged idolatry. For the Jew knowledge of the world did not lead to knowledge of God. He did not see appearances of phenomena as likenesses of God (to what could the Creator be compared), or names for God (He had only one name). He was not in the wind, the fire, or the earthquake.

Anything that opened the door to such participation that could lead to idolatry was sin to the Jew. Therefore, the Jew not only struck at idolatry but the ground for its practice. He did not need such things. In his covenant relation he had his own means for identification. For instance, modifications of the Hebrew verb "to be" produced in one instance the Tetragrammaton and in the other the term for "jew". So the "devout Jew could not name his race without

---

11. op. cit., pp. 107-115.

recalling, nor affirm his own existence without tending to utter the Tetragrammaton".

Yahweh was in every instance "Wholly Other" from all things to the Jew. As God's Chosen, the Jew, also, was set apart and forbidden to use his imagination so as to identify with aught but his Creator. As for the idolators: "They that make them are like unto them: and so are such as put their trust in them" (Psalm 55:8).

It was ever a temptation to the Jew to imagine such vain things, hence the prohibition. Indeed, the kingdom of Israel did revert to idolatry, and Judah was plagued by it until after the Babylonian exile. Notwithstanding, the Jew had to acknowledge as long as the Law was in force that the imagination was a dangerous thing. Total abstinence was preferable to failing temperance.

Most will accept that what proceeds from the "inward man" can justify or condemn, and would agree that there must be an area in which good and evil are conceived. It can almost be seen in operation in the stages of David's mental activity in the interim period between "David saw" and "David enquired" before "David sent and took" (I Samuel 11).

Charles Williams wrote:

> "It was...declared by Aquinas that it was the nature of God to know all possibilities, and to determine which possibility should become fact. God would not know good things perfectly, unless He also knew evil things...for, since evil

> is not of itself knowable, forasmuch as evil is the privation of good as Augustine says, therefore evil can neither be defined nor known except by good. Things which are not and never will be He knows 'not by vision', as He does all things that are or will be, 'but by simple intelligence'. It is therefore part of that knowledge that He should understand good in its deprivation, the identity of heaven in its opposite identity of hell, but without 'approbation', without calling it into being at all.
>
> "It was not so possible for man...to be as gods meant, for the Adam, to die, for to know evil, for them, was to know it not by simple intelligence but by experience."[12]

Williams performs an admirable service in granting, with the help of Aquinas, a glimpse of God's vast imaginative powers, but he places limitations on man's imagination. Man may not "know" (taste) evil save by "approbation" but he too can imagine it.

In any event it is clear that the Old Testament saints saw the imagination as a vehicle of temptation. Now although the new covenant has superseded the Law, the imagination is no less the theatre of temptation. Perhaps the most convenient example is the wilderness temptation of Christ (Luke 4). The second and third temptations best serve the purpose. It is doubtful that Satan literally "led him up and shewed him the kingdoms of the earth in a moment of time" or "set him on the pinnacle of the temple". But these are things which could have been presented to the imagination of

---

12. Williams, He Came Down From Heaven, pp. 17-18.

Jesus (which would have been keen to say the least) as he weighed his messianic charge. Christ, of course, resisted the temptations and achieved his goal as Messiah with an imaginative skill that no such sensational efforts could have ever realized.

Oddly, without taking the imagination into account, it is generally accepted by those concerned that a man can be tempted to a good as well as a bad purpose. Man may be "tested" by God as was Abraham (Hebrews 11:7) or plainly tempted to do evil, a thing God does not do (James 1:13). But it is worth noting that man is tempted either way from within; whether as in the Old Testament he is tempted to follow the "promptings of his stubborn heart" (New English Bible), or in the New Testament where he is "drawn and enticed by his own desires" (James 1:14).

This inward, imaginative life of man of such keen interest to the romantic is not at all out of line with Biblical emphasis. The importance of the inward life is demonstrated by the fact that it is where God desires to find purity and truth (Psalm 51:6; Romans 2:29). Christ pointed out that what proceeded out of man was more important than what went into him. Where else could a man so lust as to commit adultery? Where else could a man so hate as to commit murder? This plainly stated observation of Christ in Matthew 5 certainly appears to lend strength to the claim of

spiritual reality for the imagination. The purport of the saying is that this lustful eye, this act in the heart is beyond mere "fancy". Jesus is declaring that some spiritually concrete thing has taken place; a genuine transgression has occurred corresponding to that of actual commission.

But for so many centuries the Church has never investigated this most significant aspect of the inner life of man --- the imagination. Even in the periods when her pomp and power were at their height and she was numbered among the greatest patrons of the arts, she never seemed to consider how the great masters who served her interests attained their insight or were enabled to present it in artistic form.

No one who has ever walked into a great gothic cathedral could say that the Church did not understand the imaginative effect of certain kinds of art, but such interest was certainly not to be found in her contribution to the world of letters; either as a means or a subject with rare exception. The general acceptance of the widely acknowledged Scriptural attitude toward the imagination accounts for a considerable portion of the lack of interest. But the attitude the Church has had toward myth has also limited any theological consideration of the creative capacity of man. This did not prohibit many "Christian myths" from taking shape and exercising great imaginative power.

The saints and heroes of Christendom (who went about doing pretty much the same things such characters had always done) sometimes appeared to provide more inspiration and motivation than the official dogma. The great legends and romances, such as those of Charlemange and Arthur, are filled with spiritual quests, sacrifice, and a conception of what sin accomplishes. These were in the hands of the people (at least they were in more hands than the Scripture was), and the stories of the saints told around the fire moved more hearts to wonder and praise than most grasp. The "holy knowledge" kept in the cloistered obscurity of the convent and monastery was to be a great light in time, but for the most part during these days only the learned doctors had the wherewithal to deal with it. Even the questionable "creative" doctrines of the Church (purgatory, indulgences, apostolic succession) are based not so much on imaginative treatment as on more prudent considerations. Until quite recently the general attitude could be summed up in Butler's remark from his The Analogy of Religion regarding the imagination as

> "...that forward delusive faculty; ever obtruding beyond its sphere; of some assistance indeed to apprehension, but the author of all error..."[13]

No slight treatment can satisfy such a long and

---

13. op. cit., p. 84.

complex period. But there are some interesting questions that could be asked of some theological positions that seem to anticipate the position of the romantic theologians. For instance, there are striking similarities between the romantic use of the imagination and apprehending God and Anselm's ontological argument.

The matter of imagination related to apprehension is one of the chief burdens of romantic theology. There is a rare work of MacDonald's entitled: A Dish of Orts: Chiefly Papers on the Imagination and Shakespeare, in which he discusses the imagination from a theological (as well as literary) standpoint; principally in two essays.[14] Seeing Lewis' final attitude toward the imagination it is surprising that he did not know of this collection of essays, but he never published a reference to it, not even in his MacDonald anthology. At any rate some of the key ideas set forth by MacDonald were promulgated by Lewis and his circle absorbed from other sources. They followed in MacDonald's wake as he deemed that man should not shy away from the imagination but rather he should determine what it is and what it is for.

To the obvious question: Why forsake facts and

---

14. MacDonald, "The Imagination: Its Function and Culture", pp. 1-42; "The Fantastic Imagination", pp. 313-322. The following quotation references will be in the text.

what may be known for inventions and fancy? MacDonald replied: "To inquire into what God has made is the function of the imagination...It is the faculty in man that is likest to the prime operation of God, and has therefore been called the creative faculty". (p. 2)

Now MacDonald does not mean by this so-called "creative faculty" of man that it is creative in any primary sense. MacDonald stated his belief that man was a thought of God --- that a man was being thought rather than thinking when a new thought arose in his mind. Man did not create thoughts; did not create the form by which he would reveal his thoughts. And when he selected from nature forms to reveal his thoughts, it is because he perceives that in the form there is existing an expression of his thought or feeling. The imagination is the instrument for apprehending the relationship.

Creation and "bringing into consciousness" are not quite the same things. If something already exists even on an unconscious level it cannot be said to have been created in the primary sense. It has been seen that the imagination makes "new" meaning by innovative combinations of present data. It is important to realize that the imagination can only assimilate. Its creativity lies in the novel arrangement of what is known. To say it goes beyond the fringes of reason is hardly a fresh observation. When

men imagined flying, it seemed impossible to reason, but when it was demonstrated as reasonable, it was no longer an impossible "beyond".

In contrast to the radical position, the romantic theologians maintain that when man is spoken of as a creator it can only be done by way of analogy. To them creation is solely a divine perogative and man is one cause in a causal stream. Even when one insists that man's power of creation in an original sense is one of the things man possesses in common with God, it should be interpreted that man as an imaginer possesses another God-like capacity as one made in his image. Nevertheless, whatever man imagines or "creates" from that imagination is an analogy, a copy, a facsimile, itself an image of God's creation. Man cannot bring into being something that has never been in an absolutely original sense. Even if he creates a monster, it is a novel arrangement of existing creatures. Even apocalyptic imagery, which is flamboyant otherworldly imagery beyond ordinary plausibility, employs materials and concepts that are earth bound. The City Foursquare is made of the gold, silver, precious stones, and is contained in dimensions that all men know.

Seeing such a stance in MacDonald it is not surprising that Lewis came to accept such a position "that the whole universe was, in the last resort,

mental: that our logic was a participation in a cosmic Logos".[15] Barfield is given immediate credit for this realization by Lewis (a fact seized upon by Reilly), but Lewis never came "within a hundred miles" of going all the way with the "wisest and best" of his "unofficial teachers" down the anthroposophical path, and it was MacDonald he never failed to own as his master.[16] A comparison of the brief statement above would show Lewis to be nearer MacDonald and Barfield nearer the emergent romantic position on the imagination.

For Barfield, man, through the imagination, is an agent of creation. For MacDonald: "The meanings are in the form already else they could be no garment of unveiling. Man has but to light the lamp from within the form: his imagination is the light, not the form". (p. 5)

Nevertheless the concept of imagination is vast enough to shed light on the entire spectrum of

---

15. Lewis, Surprised By Joy, p. 209.

16. Perhaps one of Lewis' chief objections to anthroposophy would be its tendency toward historicism, which he defined as "the belief that men can, by the use of their natural powers, discover an inner meaning to the historical process". ("Historicism", Christian Reflections, pp. 100-113) He was unalterably opposed to the drawing from historical premises conclusions that were metaphysical, theological, or "atheo-logical". He did not see the validity of an assumption that the course of events manifested themselves according to "some ultimate transcendent necessity in the ground of things".

theological concerns. It would be interesting to consider the imagination related to the principle categories in theology. Just a cursory glance would reveal that understanding of (for example) creation is enhanced when it can be seen that "the imagination of man is created in the image of the imagination of God".[17] Related to Christ, it might be said that the Imaginer became part of his creation. The work of the Holy Spirit could be considered from the standpoint of the operation of God in the converted imagination (Romans 8:16). The Church could be considered as the body of converted imaginations that seek to conform to the image of Christ. Sin could be the failure of man to conform his imagination to the imagination of God --- the vain imagination.

Such an attempt would be challenging. But while most of the matters mentioned above are offered only in passing, there is one directly involved with romantic thought that could contribute no small amount of insight into the theological understanding of God. That is the creative imagination.

Dorothy L. Sayers, famed as a mystery writer, was also no mean religious thinker, and though not officially a member of the Inklings was a close associate of its members, notably Lewis and Williams.

---

17. MacDonald, op. cit., p. 3.

Her work, The Mind of the Maker, deals at length with the matter of God as creator in the light of what can be known about the creative imagination of man. She calls to mind that all language about God must necessarily be analogical.

> "Sceptics frequently complain that man has made God in his own image; they should in reason go further (as many of them do) and acknowledge that man has made all existence in his own image. If the tendency to anthropomorphism is a good reason for refusing to think about God, it is an equally good reason for refusing to think about light, or oysters, or battleships."[18]

Of the various analogies used to interpret the nature of God in accordance with experience of Him must be God the creator no less than God the Father. And in so doing the presupposed limitations of the metaphor for purpose of interpretation is inverted --- man is a father and a creator because he is made in the image of God. But to understand Him whose image he possesses man must look at himself. It has been argued by many that as far as the imagination is concerned it is limited to the materials of the external world. But Sayers points out that in the imagination a work of art has existence apart from its translation into material form. Wundt supports this when he says that some idea of the whole always precedes formation that comes from within. Sayers writes:

---

18. Sayers, op. cit., p. 18.

> "The components of the material world are fixed; those of the world of imagination increase by a continuous and irreversible process, without any destruction or rearrangement of what went before. This represents the nearest approach we experience to 'creation out of nothing', and we conceive of the act of absolute creation as being an act analogous to that of the creative artist. Thus Berdyaev is able to say: 'God created the world by imagination'.
>
> "This experience of the creative imagination in the common man or woman and in the artist is the only thing we have to go upon in entertaining and formulating the concept of creation. Outside our own experience of procreation and creation we can form no notion of how anything comes into being."
>
> . . . . . .
>
> "If all this is true, then it is to the creative artists that we should naturally turn for an exposition of what is meant by those credal formulae which deal with the nature of the Creative Mind. Actually we seldom seem to consult them in the matter. Poets have, indeed, often communicated in their own mode of expression truths identical with the theologians' truths; but just because of the difference in the modes of expression, we often fail to see the identity of the statements."[19]

The central contribution of the imagination to the understanding of creation has great power to illuminate other aspects of theological concern. The major categories of systematic theology though clearly delineated, are not unrelated. Sayers, again working from her concept of the creative imagination, sheds light on the operation of the Trinity:

> "For every work [or act] of creation is three-fold, an earthly trinity to match the heavenly.

---

19. Ibid., pp. 23-24.

> "First [not in time, but merely in order of enumeration] there is the Creative Idea, passionless, timeless, beholding the whole work complete at once, the end in the beginning: and this is the image of the Father.
>
> "Second, there is the Creative Energy [or Activity] begotten of that idea, working in time from the beginning to the end, with sweat and passion, being incarnate in the bonds of matter: and this is the image of the Word.
>
> "Third, there is the Creative Power, the meaning of the work and its response in the lively soul: and this is the image of the indwelling Spirit.
>
> "And these three are one, each equally in itself the whole work, whereof none can exist without the other: and this is the image of the Trinity."[20]

Again, full theological treatment is beyond the scope of this paper, but to narrow the discussion, it could be said that the intent follows along the line of Farrer when he says:

> "But you cannot adore a bare notion, you cannot adore the fact that there is (presumably) providence. Providence must be bodied forth, it must be made visible a la fantaisie if it is to be made sensible au coeur".[21]

Like art, religion, in its various objectifications (e.g. creed, rite, or conduct), is primarily concerned with a qualitative representation of reality.[22] Theology attempts a quantitative representation of this

---

20. Sayers, The Zeal of Thy House, p. 103.

21. Austin Farrer, A Vision of Glass, p. 107.

22. Contrasted with art, religion is also an attempt at a representation of quality including a moral as well as an aesthetic aspect.

quality comparable to science. Religion then attempts a total representation of reality in that it partakes of the nature of art and science, and it employs the methods of both in objectification and representation. It can and does employ imagination to enrich theological meaning. Indeed if theological assertion is to offer a representation of a qualitative aspect of reality it must allow for both creative insight and expression in its construction.

Concerning insight, the imagination can aid theology in gaining new data through creative objectification. Perhaps the chief thing products of the creative imagination and science share is an attempt to objectify reality. The imagination obviously comes into play in both forms of objectification, but science (i.e., theology) offers a representation not so much like a picture, which is the creative method, as a diagram (Lewis called it a map[23]). The value of the representations depends upon the need at a given time. Seeing a range of hills is a concrete experience. If one wishes to recapture or convey the quality of the experience, he turns to the picture. If he wants to wind his way through the hills to a particular place, he turns to the map.

---

23. Stuart Barton Babbage, "To the Royal Air Force", C. S. Lewis, Speaker and Teacher, (edited by Carolyn Keefe), p. 94.

It is all very well to say that these matters complement one another, but the contrast between them needs to be made clear. The chief difference already has been mentioned, that science is limited to a quantitative representation of reality. Here, knowledge is imparted by statement and explanation. The creative method of impartation is to suggest and manifest the inner quality of reality. It is an externalization of an awareness of that quality. Once the objectification has been externalized, it can be used by science as data.

It is generally agreed that imaginative language and concepts fulfil a significant role in religious expression, but they are employed in theological language more than is realized. In a number of instances orthodox doctrine has insisted on maintaining certain metaphors because it is virtually impossible to extend them to pure logic. So the metaphors are incorporated into theological thought and only grasped through suggestion by the imagination.[24] The Trinity is a prime example. Orthodox Christianity states un-

---

24. Even in related matters such as ecclesiology figures levelled at the imagination are used; the overseer of a local body of Christ is called a pastor (i.e., shepherd of a flock). In ritual, the Lord's Supper is an example of quality conveyed to imagination. The significance is not in the elements Christ used or his action, but in the meaning of both. Yet men have repeatedly sought to intellectualize the meaning and substantiate the elements.

equivocally that God is three persons and yet one God.[25] It insists that the Church is the body of Christ. It is vital to note that the Church is not _like_ a body of Christ. Jesus _is_ the Son of God. Arian or docetic statements made in terms of simile or likeness have been declared heretical.

Returning to the experience and thought of the romantic theologians, one would have to agree with the old Biblical adage that the ills of man, personal and collective, are due to his "vain imagination" (James 1:13-16). This leads to the question that arises from the experience Lewis had through his imagination that led to his conversion. What if the imagination were to be converted? What if it were to serve the chief end of man for which all the gifts of God are to serve, i.e., "that he know [God] even as he is known [by God]"? Perhaps as much as anything the imagination could be identified as the instrument by which man discerns the image in the dark glass.

If the goal of salvation is the whole man, it must follow that the salvation of the Living Soul includes the imagination. MacDonald's statement that "The imagination of man is made in the image of the imagination of God" seems reasonable. Then if the

---

25. Frye, _Anatomy of Criticism_, p. 142: "Christianity insists [on the Trinity], whatever dislocations of customary mental processes be involved, God _is_ three persons and yet one God."

image of God is marred in man, it must include the imagination. Therefore, in thinking of the conversion of the total man the imagination must be taken into account as the believer is challenged to "renew" his mind or to let the mind be in him that was also in Christ. Perhaps it is not too far-fetched to suggest that when the imagination appeared in the older versions that the translators more accurately rendered that peculiar knowledge that seems to reside, according to the Scripture writers, in both the heart and the mind of man.[26]

Could it be that the imagination is not so much an activity of the mind as the activity of the mind, and as such abridges and synthesizes all the aspects of mental exercise? Perhaps the Scripture just appears hazy on the imagination because to some degree it allows an interchangeable use of the knowledge of heart and mind that needs to be renewed and conformed to the image of Christ --- the Logos of God.

---

26. Barfield fails to make the synthesis with the imagination with regard to the knowledge of heart and mind. He was persuaded "that in our time the battle between good and evil is pitched in man's mind even more than in his heart, since it is known that the latter will ultimately follow the former". (Saving the Appearances, p. 65) This is not based on a theological consideration but upon anthroposophical doctrine. The reference to "our time" is related to his idea that there is in history an evolution of consciousness and in "our time" the consciousness has reached such a level as to make the mind the theatre of war.

The romantic theologians (Lewis especially) make it clear that the imagination is not something that leads man from unfaith to faith --- to conversion. It, too, needs to be converted. As the instrument of perception and conception, the imagination can serve as a capacity of man for receiving revelation, but it must still undergo regeneration. When it emerges from this experience, it can respond to the same stimuli, but it operates then as part of a surrendered soul.

This fact is central to the use of the romantic inclination and the imagination in the romantic theologians, even in Barfield who seems to be so intent on his epistemological arguments. In Saving the Appearances, he records his feeling that the aspect of man that casts him as much as anything in God's image has been largely ignored in religious thought, especially in a period of history when its power and role are of such interest and significance.

In salvation Barfield speaks of the mind of man coming to share the divine view and declares his belief in its share in the total salvation of man. He adds that "the coming of this light presupposes a goodness of heart which will not have been emphasized in this book, because they are not the subject of it".[27]

It happened to be a subject that Lewis was very

---

27. Barfield, Saving the Appearances, p. 161.

much interested in and on two occasions he refers to the debt he felt toward MacDonald for the effect his book, Phantastes, had on his imagination. In a moving passage from his autobiography he relates the effect of spiritual things emanating from the book that converted his imagination, but that his intellect and conscience were not in tune to recognize them for what they were.[28] A slightly fuller treatment was offered some eight years before in the anthology he published from MacDonald's work. In the introduction Lewis again relates in "Damascus Road" fashion the experience that was as nearly as he could discern the beginning of his conversion. He points out here as well that the conversion of his imagination did nothing to his intellect or conscience.

> "But when the process was complete --- by which, of course, I mean 'when it had really begun' --- I found that I was still with MacDonald and that he had accompanied me all the way and that I was now at last ready to hear from him much that he could not have told me at that first meeting".[29]

Conversion could perhaps be described as agreeing that the process should begin --- a lining up of will, conscience, intellect, and imagination toward the accepted goal. No doubt an appeal may be made through any one of these aspects of man's nature, but in Lewis'

---

28. Lewis, Surprised by Joy, pp. 179-181.

29. Lewis, George MacDonald: An Anthology, pp. 20-22.

case (and in others) it was not until the barriers of his resistance had begun to crumble through the imagination that he was ready to hear more from the man who had appealed to him through it. This emphasizes the power the imagination possesses as an apologetic medium. Lewis goes on to say that when he began eagerly to hear all that MacDonald had to say as preacher and teacher, it was the same thing that he had said as the romantic apologist.

> "But in a sense, what he was now telling me was the very same that he had told me from the beginning. There was no question of getting through to the kernel and throwing away the shell: no question of a gilded pill. The pill was gold all the way through. The quality which had enchanted me in his imaginative works turned out to be the quality of the real universe, the divine, magical, terrifying and ecstatic reality in which we all live.[30]

AS was said earlier, an appeal may be made through any of man's faculties, but God is aiming toward the bringing of the whole man back into the sphere of his sovereignty. Therefore, when speaking of converting the imagination, it does not necessarily mean that this is the proper sequence (Lewis would not say so), but that it is vital in the salvation of the total man if he is to be "saved to the uttermost".

It is to be wondered if Lewis would now change his mind about a caustic stance he adopted toward a remark of his father's before his conversion. Lewis had

---

30. Ibid.

said something about controlling his imagination and his father had replied: "What on earth do you mean by controlling the imagination? One controls one's appetites".[31] He says himself in Surprised by Joy:

> "...I do not think the resemblance between the Christian and the merely imaginative experience accidental. I think that all things, in their way, reflect heavenly truth, the imagination not the least. 'Reflect' is the important word. This lower life of the imagination is not (i.e., not necessarily, and by its own nature. God can cause it to be such a beginning.) a beginning of nor a step toward, the higher life of the spirit, merely an image. In me, at any rate, it contained no element either of belief or of ethics; however far pursued, it would never have made me either wiser or better. But it still had, at however many removes, the shape of the reality it reflected."[32]

The imagination, as with the romantic inclination, can be exploited for any number of ends. And, again, it is not the imagination that has the wicked influence on character, but the character can have such an influence on the imagination. As MacDonald has said:

> "It is only the ill-bred, that is, the uncultivated [unconverted?] imagination that will amuse itself where it ought to worship and work."[33]

However, it is the result of the contrary conviction that has caused many to degrade the imagin-

---

31. Lewis, Letters, p. 126.

32. Lewis, Surprised by Joy, p. 167.

33. MacDonald, A Dish of Orts, p. 12.

ation. Too many see the use of imagination as an escape from reality rather than as a means of apprehending it.

But just how does the imagination accomplish this apprehension? How is it a receptacle of revelation? There are apologists who would state that the imagination is a point of contact with God. But they reflect the spirit of Locke who assumed that the aspect of perception in the mind was passive. Such a position would follow the natural assumption in the mechanical approach of the scientific method.

At the opposite extreme from such a view, Barfield says man will go on to find hard fact through the imagination. But how this is to be realized presents problems. Chiefly, what is to be the instrument for plucking these facts out of the imagination? As Professor Ryle says, man cannot look into his imagination as he would look into a garden for the "looking into is the act of imagining".[34] The way Barfield states it is that the imagination will go beyond rational arguments to discover "clear and distinct ideas" to "new and decipherable meaning". But surely this is nothing new. This has always been its function and no matter what level man may reach in terms of intellectual knowledge, this will always be

---

34. Gilbert Ryle, The Concept of the Mind, pp. 245-272.

its function.

It certainly is not too far fetched to consider the imagination as the receptacle of revelation --- the instrument of clothing God's message. A number of Biblical instances come to mind. Abraham of Ur could have realized some vital things about God hitherto unseen --- unrelated, and what would be the effect upon such a sensitive, intelligent man but to excite his imagination? This could have stimulated his unconscious to a degree that he became aware of a vision --- the call of God to a peculiar covenant.

Elijah, after fleeing the wrath of his enemies, falls exhausted, pleading for death --- the only release he can see for his burden. While in this state of mind he sees the storm and the earthquake. He does not see God here, but after the natural phenomena comes the calm, and in a flash of imaginative inspiration Elijah realizes that herein is God --- this is what he is like.

This seems far more satisfactory than a flat denial of such things as God speaking to the saints. And to give man a "receiver" for God's messages is not to rob the revelations of divine origin or intent. It would seem that this is why God always worked in the first instance through individuals. Nations, whole peoples, could not receive such messages. The forging of a peculiar people would be a long arduous process

--- never accomplished --- completed to whatever degree through individuals of imagination. Such messages would be first presented to the seer, the prophet, the visionary. It would be made apparent to men with the imagination to see the truth in a situation and through their message it could be presented to the imagination of those who would hear it. Hosea and his false wife had a message of rare power for God's people. So did Amos with his plumb line; Jeremiah with his yoke; Christ and the cross.

Is revelation something that can be received by the intellect? Or is the job of the intellect to rationalize and relate the revelation received by the imagination? In a very real sense man cannot grasp the message of God without the imagination. Even if one were to subscribe to the most fundamental doctrine of verbal inspiration, the language employed would be analogical, metaphorical. What would be the nomina propria of heavenly truth? Paul, who had seen it in a special visitation seemed to be at a loss for description (II Cor. 12:1-4). Whatever means of communication God employed to reveal himself to man, it is certain that he did not accomplish it through intellectual abstractions.

Even in matters beyond the consideration of divine revelation the term is used when speaking in a matter of fact way about any new realization. One may

say that such and such was a revelation to him, an obvious analogical use of the term; but even in this context, could it be said that the realization suddenly apprehended was purely an intellectual achievement?

Consider again Lewis' conversion experience. He records that in MacDonald's Phantastes he met holiness. Holiness simply defined is "something other". Its quality of otherness is at the very root of its meaning and appears to effect a creatureliness awareness upon man. It is humbling and purgative. Compare the temple experience of Isaiah recorded in chapter six in which, when beholding the holiness of God, he cried out: "Woe is me; I am undone". In Lewis' case, though the instruments and circumstance were different, the effect was the same regarding the imaginative experience. It is not really wide of the mark to say that Isaiah had his vision by virtue of his imagination; whether it was in Coleridgean primary sense that he literally "saw" the angelic hosts and "felt" the fiery coals on his lips or in the secondary sense that he constructed the truth of God's otherness and his appropriate response as he meditated in the temple. Perhaps the prophets' vision could be said to occur when the secondary is congruent with the primary.[35]

---

35. Encyclopedia Judica, Vol. IV., p. 1290. Most Jewish philosophers generally rated the imagination highly as an instrument of prophecy. Spinoza (not noted for his orthodoxy) stated that imagination alone was the instrument of prophecy.

The apologetic propensity of the imaginative experience is dramatically demonstrated by the great difference between Lewis and Isaiah in the perspective of their experience --- Isaiah was a believer and Lewis was not. Isaiah had the perspective that made his experience a full-blown vision cognizant of holiness to which he could respond. Lewis had only a foretaste, but it haunted him until he too came into that relevant perspective and realized that it was holiness he met that night.

The romantic theologians realized that different kinds of the same phenomenon struck different chords from the imagination. And in imagination where the phenomenon cannot rise to its most abject manifestation in action, the qualitative difference needs to be much stronger. Indeed, the whole quality of imaginative response is determined by the particular kind of phenomenon.[36] For instance, in certain stories giants and pirates are used as opposed to more ordinary types of enemy. This again is the substance of diction.

Lewis pointed out that one of the functions of art was to present what the more narrow and desperately practical perspectives of real life exclude. It seeks to set forth what reality may well be like at some more central region.

---

36. Lewis, Essays Presented to Charles Williams, pp. 94-95.

Thus, the romantic approach may provide for some profound experiences that are not acceptable in other form. It seeks to evoke as an intuition a permanent aspect of human experience. And an imaginative work that can evoke such response is worth a dozen abstractions. To scrap imaginative works simply because they are imaginative and therefore illogical is a grave error and a pandering to conventional attitudes.

William Blake, in correspondence to a Dr. Trussler, once said that the Bible was addressed to the imagination which he defined as "spiritual sensation".[37] By this he meant that through this capacity man can sense the spiritual powers which make and mold the material world. It enables man to see beyond the veils of custom, habit, and tradition and see with some degree of clarity the reality or essential form.

But in any event, if Lewis is right in saying that not only the anthropomorphisms, but also the abstractions are analogies, it would appear that in both instances the imagination is fundamental and without it theological expression would be quite impossible. Theologians, it would seem, are bent on committing an error with regard to the imagination that they made when they fought against the "revelations" of science a century ago. At that time, they seemed to

---

37. William Blake, The Letters of William Blake, p. 63.

fear a world so subject to law that it threatened any idea of human freedom and will. Now in the latter stages of the twentieth century theology has come to feel quite comfortable with her relentlessly logical co-laborer, and even seeks to apply the methods of science to that realm of human experience considered to be her peculiar stewardship. This partnership now resists the appalling possibility of something in human life that insists on being creative. Now there is the threat of too much freedom. There is a danger of rupture in the neatly packaged universe theology and science had so painstakingly molded and agreed had room for just two.

One nightmare has passed and another has taken its place. But in dealing with nightmare, one has but to wake up and consider what it means in the light of day. A real problem with the modern world is its compartmentalization of life. Revelation, if it exists at all for the modern world, is relegated to the sphere of religion. Granted it is the interest of religion, but where is religion's sphere?

But lest the paper begin to list because its argument is too one-sided, let it be acknowledged that the blindness due to such confinement is not the peculiar malady of the theologians. The perspective provided by the joy, sense of wonder, and free spirit of romanticism must be blended with the things that "now

abide". The romantics have well demonstrated that the creative imagination is connected with insight into the hitherto invisible order of things. It is not surprising that such insight would create a lack of satisfaction with the familiar world. But man is a whole and such longing needs to be tempered with ordinate vision. The imagination is, as Lewis said, a "truth-bearing faculty"; not a truth-containing faculty. Flights of the imagination are all very well if they remember to take off and land at a point with some relation to the common world, else they only float in a void. As Bowra says, the imagination must be handled with self-knowledge and self-criticism.[38] And if anything, theology reminds men that they do not live in a private universe.

Men need something "tried and true" to properly direct and even conserve their imaginative powers. The Inklings possessed this very thing. The roots of their thought and inspiration were firmly embedded in a well-established literary and Christian tradition that sustained them from the beginning to the end and enabled them to leave in their wake a great legacy to feed and challenge the tradition that it might both continue and increase.

Standing alone the romantic doctrine is too

---

38. Bowra, The Romantic Imagination.

individualistic and the product of its creative imagination cannot but be vague about the ineffable world. They may be stirring but will lack solidarity and finally be no more satisfying than their dealing with the common world. Only the true believer can use the imagination to convey with clarifying power visions of the world beyond.

VI. SUMMARY OBSERVATION.

"We are to defend Christianity itself --- the faith preached by the Apostles, attested by the Martyrs, embodied by the Creeds, expounded by the Fathers."

"Christian Apologetics"
Undeceptions
C. S. Lewis

"I am a Christian, and so at least should not be suspected of wilful irreverence."

"On Fairy-Stories"
Essays Presented to Charles Williams
J. R. R. Tolkien

"There will be a revival of Christianity when it becomes impossible to write a popular manual of science without referring to the incarnation of the Word."

Saving the Appearances
Owen Barfield

SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS.

It has been wisely observed that it is not categorical attributes which mark a position, but rather the issues it confronts and the modality and instrumentality of its counter-action. When this can be determined a great advance for constructing a basis for an approach can be determined. Effort has been expended to demonstrate how the philosophy and approach of the Inklings owed a great deal to their resistance to the current trends, philosophical, theological and literary, which they rejected as being immature and short-sighted. But no less important than any other consideration is the timing of their approach. The matter of timing is mentioned by Walsh in his chapter, from Light on C. S. Lewis.[1] He suggests that Lewis' appeal in the United States was due to the increase in religious interest following World War II. While this may be true to an extent for all movements have their contexts, it says little about why the specific approach Lewis employed had such tremendous appeal when the essay was written and even less about his current popularity. Perhaps in 1965 when this essay was published the growing swell of enthusiasm that publishers such as Ballantine Books

---

1. Chad Walsh, "Impact of America", Light on C. S. Lewis, pp. 106-116.

sensed was not apparent to Walsh. However, he wisely admits that his statement was an "interim report".

It has been suggested that the romantic theologians saw the unified religious convictions of former times usurped by a growing secularism. This poses an interesting question. When did these "former times" of unified religious conviction exist? If they ever existed, there would have been no apologia. There would have been no need. Therefore, to judge from the amount and quality of apology written and the scope of apologetic interest at large in the current age it is as near unity in religious matters as any. This is, of course, ludicrous.

The real question is: In an age as practically minded and technically oriented as the present one, what place does the marvellous tale with romantic appeal have? One might ask why Milton wrote an epic poem on a Virgilian scale; or, why Bunyan wrote an allegory in a mediaeval mode? The answer is because there was a need for a formula that would have an impact. And it was thus that the romantic apologists rose to do battle when theology was in danger of assuming the reasonableness the world might allow if theology was to remain a part of the current scene---termed by not a few as the post-Christian era.

All of the romantic theologians would reject limiting thought to terms of static mechanism---"the

grimness of modern thought" --- especially in theology. They saw the modern world for all its technical advancement as an arid place. The fact that contemporary civilization is rapidly becoming sterile is a matter of great concern, but conversely, it stands on the threshold of hitherto undreamed of frontiers. Such a challenge is the very stuff of romantic power. But paradoxically, the spiritual life of man is threatened on every hand. To incorporate such rapidly expanding horizons there is, therefore, a need for imaginative theology.

A real problem with the current apologetic is that it speaks out of rather than to the contemporary situation. It merely adds its voice to the whole. There is no strident chord to shock people more fully awake. It contributes to the mechanical quality of conscious life.

The most salient point in Moorman's book[2] is the fact that romantic theologians are not popular writers who reflect the immediate and naturalistic problems and pseudo-realistic techniques currently fashionable. They are extremely learned men who see the contemporary frustrations and dilemmas in relation to the

---

2. Moorman, op. cit., p. 154. Moorman only deals with Lewis and Williams from among the Inklings along with T. S. Elliot, but he probably would concur regarding romantic theology in general.

universal issues of morality and religion of which they are parts, and they are presented to the world in terms that are meaningful to men at all times. Moorman contends that this "aesthetic distance" enables the proponents of such an approach to have more, not less, relevance to their own age.

The world was ripe for such an approach. As Lewis once observed, great myth is rare in a reflective age,[3] and if ever an age was preoccupied with its ailments, it is the present one. Its most consistent pastime is the morbid proddings of its own soul by the sciences invented for this recreation. But the sciences by their very nature can only record the patient's temperature and say: "Yes, you are very sick". And the quackery of the age does a landslide business as the world rushes to purchase every new elixir.

One of the chief reasons the romantic theologians thought the modern world immature was its pursuit of sensual gratification. And they rightly ascertained that this included intellectual pursuits as well as those of the flesh. They saw that this desire for the immediate gratification --- intellectual or gastronomic ---dominates men with no thought as to the far reaching consequences such a course will have. Thus, they

---

3. Lewis, Experiment in Criticism, p. 205.

resisted, and in just as true a sense, so has the rising generation. This particular time and situation bears witness to a most peculiar clasp of hands --- a group of respectable, middle-aged Oxonians (whom the world has judged senile and sentimental) can communicate with angry young men. Romantic theology is tailor-made for the wide-open evangelistic thrust now made at universities largely through powerful student organizations.

Theologians who wish to cast out traditional symbolism and create an esoteric theological jargon to reach the rising generation have misjudged their quarry. True, the apologist must read the times and try to compose an apologetic framework to appeal to his day, but the modern approach has made a great mistake in cutting man off from the past and attempting to create a wholly new foundation. This attempt is alien to man's nature and because it does not reflect the well-spring of common theology has only muddled the issue. Every age must be told all over again what Christianity is all about. But until the imagination is stirred, attention directed, ground prepared, the intellectual didactic approaches will prove to be limited by their esoteric nature.

An apologetic addressed to the imagination tries to avoid the logomorphic habit of modern man of projecting subsequent thought back into the Christian story by enabling him to respond to and with the kind

of mythopathic consciousness that realized it and preserved it. The romantic theologians employed a literary mode that satisfied certain primordial needs of man. And in its very strangeness and archaism provided a form of apologetics that rose above the "conceits" of popular opinion to capture the imagination of the rising generation on yet another level. Already it has been shown that the substance of Christianity has been "watered down" to the point of becoming almost as common to Western man as indoor plumbing. A story of a well at the end of the world would be far more likely to capture his attention and set his imagination free, but the very fact that such a method of apologetics is a break with the current attitude is sufficient to have appeal to the rising generation which is somewhat disillusioned with the "brave new world". Therefore mythopoeic fantasy by appealing to literary techniques that the modern literary scene considers passe' provided a detachment from current thought forms which make the "archaic" approach relevant to an awesome degree.

This is not so paradoxical as it appears. The idea of archaism, as Barfield points out, implies a return.[4] This is so much more exact than "going backwards" as its critics would maintain, and it has

---

4. Barfield, Poetic Diction, pp. 164-185.

powerful appeal. It bears within it a sense of recovery, a restoration to something older, wiser, more solid, less complex.

Romanticism has well demonstrated that the creative imagination is connected with insight into the invisible order of things. It is not surprising that such insight would fit in with a lack of satisfaction with the familiar world. But the romantic theologians knew that a mere dissatisfaction with the world would either lead to unhealthy forms of destruction or to worlds constructed from the substance of the unfulfilled passions of natural man, and that the positive thing was to direct such longing to what they believed to be the true world.

But there are shaping philosophical stances and life-styles beside the rising generation who respond to romantic theology. A contrasting position might be the Puritan. The Puritan has often been attacked for his so-called attenuation of symbols, but this is a false premise, and a study of Puritan typology would easily dispel such an idea. Puritan typology is a method of theological interpretation and is concerned with the concept of shadows and images. A slight acquaintance with Emerson or Melville would demonstrate that the Puritan mind was no stranger to suggestive meaning. No doubt the great influence of Puritan typology in America aids in explaining the tremendous reception of

romantic theology there as much as the blatant romanticism of the so-called sub-cultures. It cuts across the barriers that men have set up for good reasons and bad. It provides an apologetic point of contact as vast as romanticism itself.

Abstract creeds may divide men but the romantic approach apparently transcends creeds. What peoples do not have their gods and heroes enacting much the same dramas for much the same purpose? The themes of mankind's aspirations in his fantastic tales possess a strange similiarity. No one realized this better than the romantic theologians and they saw it as a means to tie the imagination of man to the imagination of God.

There are those who would say that the romantic theologians saw the Christian story as no longer sufficient to carry the "tenor of religious truth". On the basis of this premise they suggest that the romantic theologians could be laid alongside Bultmann and the demythologizers. But it must be remembered that a myth is a thing that can be recreated. It goes on and on. The sequence of events can be clothed in a variety of ways to convey its truth. Even a believed "myth".

Comments such as those of Urang with his idea of didactic fantasy entirely miss the point.[5] The Inklings also wrote didactic works of unexcelled clarity. Why

---

5. Gunnar Urang, Shadows of Ecstacy.

did they bother with mythopoeic work if the stories themselves were not part of the apologetic? It was more than just a case of a "gilded pill". The romantic theologians began and ended with the imagination because it was the imagination they wished to affect. Their ultimate goal in fantasy was admittedly tendentious, but not primarily didactic.

James Russell Lowell indicated that originality consists in the power of digesting and assimilating thoughts, so that they become a part of life and substance.[6] In this sense the Inklings could be said to be original. As a "center of gravity", they could not be said to have done or discovered anything actually novel, but they were certainly "original" in their thinking matters through in an area that has hitherto been given slight intellectual treatment. They made relationships their own and produced some hallmarks of a distinctive genre.

> "Real literature can only be created by madmen, hermits, heretics, dreamers, rebels, and skeptics, not by diligent and trustworthy functionaries."[7]

By this criterion the romantic theologians must

---

6. James Russell Lowell, "Wordsworth", Literary Essays (Volume IV).

7. Yevgeny Zamyatin, "I am Afraid", A Soviet Heretic: Essays by Yevgeny Zamyatin (translated and edited by Mirra Ginzberg), p. 57.

have produced some real literature. Outside the excellence of its craftsmanship and its entertainment value, their literature is madness to theologians who shun imagination on one hand and romantics who balk at their apologetics on the other. None of them ambitiously sought the public eye and on the contrary avoided the laudation that sought them. And when it came, they were shunned by their collegues for being "popularizers". They were rebels to their own and society at large and skeptical of the current "appearances" both contrived. In no wise were they functionaries who "played the game". They persevered, true to the convictions of their vision.

They knew above all that good literature is an ally of religion. As a matter of fact, no serious consideration of one can ignore the other. Frye says that "a rational account of the structural principles of Western literature cannot be discussed outside the context of its classical and Christian heritage...The structural principles of literature are as closely related to mythology and comparative religion as those of painting are to geometry."[8] But he also concurs with the stance of the romantic theologians when he writes: "Literature is not religion and it doesn't address

---

8. Frye, Anatomy of Criticism, pp. 133-135.

itself to belief".[9]

As has been seen language is expressed in a sequence of words and myth is expressed in a sequence of events. Meaning has always existed and only required symbols --- language and myth --- to be apprehended and comprehended by man. So the romantic images in mythopoeic literature are in themselves not truth, not meaning, nor a body of doctrine. They are not something to observe, but something to observe through.

Lewis in his search for "Joy" records:

> "...my own experience had shown that these romantic images had never been more than a sort of flash, or even slag, thrown off by the occurence of Joy, that those mountains and gardens had never been what I wanted but only symbols which professed to be no more, and that every effort to treat them as the Desirable soon honestly proved itself to be a failure."[10]

Tolkien wrote:

> "The road to fairy land is not the road to heaven: nor even the road to hell, I believe... even though some have held that it may lead hither by the Devil's tithe."[11]

"It is not the road to heaven or hell" --- the romantic experience is more like a vista on the only road there is (the road that leads into Jerusalem being also the road that leads out). If one from a vantage

---

9. Frye, The Educated Imagination, p. 80.

10. Lewis, Surprised by Joy, p. 204.

11. Tolkien, Essays Presented to Charles Williams, p. 39.

point while on the road could discern his direction, it could serve a valuable purpose in orientation. From such a height one may catch a glimpse of the true country and be moved toward it, or gain momentum in descent in the other direction.

All depends on the traveler and the source and context of the experience. The revolutionary aspect of romanticism is the effect of conversion of the romantic's world view; it involves a new orientation. This is why falling in love is properly termed a romantic experience. One is never quite the same again. But it is an orientation --- not a destination, good or bad.

The mythopoeic fantasy of the romantic theologians does not so much seek to set forth doctrinal propositions as to incarnate their meaning. Lewis wrote that fantasy when it is known to be fantasy can make a point without arousing a factual curiosity that could not be satisfied any other way.[12] So critics who claim that the romantic theologians felt that the "Christian myth" was no longer sufficient to maintain spiritual truth fail to see that romanticism was just one more perspective (with the exception of Barfield). The romantic theologians were not out to demythologize or to remythologize, but to demonstrate the truth from another light. What they attempted in their use of

---

12. Lewis, The Great Divorce, p. 9.

myth was to invent and maintain a metaphor that would serve to carry in fictional form the basic truth of Christianity and not employ traditional Christian symbols exclusively.[13] This operating within another field not specifically Christian clearly demonstrates the apologetical character of their work. It also fits the picture Lewis had of the apologist as a translator and his desire to use for apology what had always been used against the Christian faith.

To say that the romantic theologians operated on the principle that the "usual approach" (whatever that may be) to Christianity was no longer effective is nonsense. They all believed desperately in the re-birth experience and were seeking in the face of a militant rationalism that threatened to "quench the spirit" (even in the ranks of those who were supposed to be defending the validity of the Church's claims) to build an apologia that not only defended the "mythical

---

13. Reilly, op. cit., p. 233. Reilly has direct reference to Williams and Lewis here. "...they saw it [the traditional Christian myth] as no longer sufficient to 'carry the tenor' of religious truth. And this is the same premise from which Bultmann and the other demythologizers start." Lewis refutes such identification in the plainest terms in Letters to Malcolm (p. 74). He discusses exegetics and the wisdom of trusting the purport of the images over against theological abstractions, declares the organic images of Scripture to be in no wise less adequate than abstraction and observes: "Hence what they now call 'demythologizing' Christianity can easily be 're-mythologizing' it --- and substituting a poorer mythology for a richer."(Author's italics)

radiance" of Christianity but demonstrated its power. And they never lost sight of the fact that the ultimate goal of apology was to contribute toward conversion --- the same end of the "usual approach".

The usual approach to faith was not laid aside, but the current limitation to apology was rejected out of hand. And in this context though new perspectives were offered they sought in their apologia to evoke the fundamental effect of a removal of barriers that hindered the hearing of the usual approach. Lewis openly encouraged those who had the gift of making an effective emotional appeal ("Come to Jesus") to do so with all their power.[14] The romantic theologians just knew that this approach could not reach all and offered their talent to the arsenal.

In any event the traditional Christian symbols were never far away. For instance, Moorman takes Lewis to task for the use of an allusion to the crucifixion to elicit a "stock response".[15] The particular incident Moorman had reference to was the scene from Perelandra where the hero, Ransom, engaged the demon possessing his arch-rival, Weston in mortal combat. To intimidate Ransom before the battle began the demon warned him not to expect help from God

---

14. Lewis, Undeceptions, p. 73.

15. Moorman, op. cit., p. 111.

because God could not even help himself and cried out: "Eloi, Eloi, lama Sabachthani!" Moorman claims it would "put the reader off". Nothing could be further from the case. To tie this cosmic myth to the traditional story and in this fashion was ingenious. The precise shock of the revelation that the ancient story of earth could have solar (and beyond) ramifications adds both a dimension to the Christian story and lends a touchstone of familiarity and perspective for the reader. The scene is a perfect example of the conbination of the strange and familiar Chesterton supports. On the other hand, Mr. Moorman might be shocked to know how many readers had no idea as to the meaning or source of the Aramaic phrase.

Romantic theology takes into account man's need for "otherness". The numinous is overlooked in modern apologetics having been removed from all rationalistic approach. It hardly can be present in didactic apologetics and it is missing entirely from the bulk of modern philosophic systems. Rudolph Otto himself contributed to the suggestive power of the romantic approach.

> "As regards stories, these presuppose the 'natural' impulse to fantasy, narrative and entertainment, and its products. But the fairy-story proper only comes into being with the element of the 'wonderful', with miracles and miraculous events and consequences, i.e., by means of an effulsion of the numinous. And the same

holds good in an increased degree in myth."[16]

Although no such criticism was actually found verbalized in the course of research a great deal of the theologians' objection to romantic theology could fall under the general criticism levelled at the area of the Phenomenology of Religion. Phenomenology of Religion is defined as "the description and interpretation of experiences, behaviour, and other phenomena of life taken by the religious believer as manifestations of divine reality and activity".[17]

In an article discussing the possibility of phenomenology as an apologetic, Donovan rightly points out that the term "religious experience" is notoriously vague, and that most critics interpret it to mean a striking or awesome type of psychological phenomena to which believers appeal to as a proof of supernatural realities. The problem with such claims, say the critics, is that ontological propositions cannot be established on purely "private" psychological premises. Very few objecting to the romantic experiences of the Inklings have gone to such lengths to articulate their

---

16. Rudolf Otto, The Idea of the Holy, p. 126. Lewis developed the numinous factor in religious experience in the introduction to The Problem of Pain.

17. Peter Donovan, "Phenomenology as Apologetics", The Scottish Journal of Theology, Vol. 27, No. 4 (November, 1974), pp. 402-407.

attitude, but undoubtedly most would assent to the trend of this argument. But this paper has discussed at length the position of some sound, intelligent men who have arrived at or confirmed a religious point of view from what appears at a glance just such private phenomena.

Note that in the above criticism the word "private" was emphasized. This is because the romantic theologians make the point repeatedly that it is not private. In the preface to his autobiography Lewis said he had been emboldened to write about his experience because he noticed that a man seldom mentions what he supposed to be his most idiosyncratic sensations without receiving from at least one (often more) of those present the reply, "What, have you felt that too? I thought I was the only one". The whole premise of this particular discussion is contained in Lewis' observation that the experience the romantic theologians undertake to defend is "common, commonly misunderstood, and of immense importance". So from the outset its more than recognized universal character would insist on a more objective examination. It will be recalled that this study itself was prompted by personal experience and personal observation of this "common" phenomena.

To a great extent the arguments for phenomenology advanced by Donovan apply to romantic theology.

In the first instance, Lewis and his circle did not divorce their extraordinary experience from their daily experience. Lewis makes it clear in his autobiography that though he often felt that he led two existences, it was when they at last merged that he knew he had come to the truly relevant perspective. But at no point before or after his conversion did he make his romantic experiences the sole cause for religious belief or the lone basis for a theology.

Also the romantic theologians' experience did not depend on a single or even several isolated encounters, but upon a recurring realization that was seen against accumulative knowledge gained from the experience and related to other kinds of knowledge. Comparison and contrast with intellectual and empirical knowledge also played a role. But Chesterton, Barfield, Williams all trace a growing awareness that the value and validity of their experience takes shape within a religious consciousness.

Finally, all of the romantic theologians placed their experience within the ordinary course of events, personally and historically. The emphasis is not on the unusual aspect of the experience, but from the contribution it made and the relation it had to total experience (i.e., the natural order). But still and all, none of the romantic theologians would turn his back on the claim that his experience provided an

encounter with God; yet, he would not claim for it any "self-authenticating" powers.[18] Donovan says it remains to be seen if a phenomenological apologetic could be made convincing. The romantic theologians certainly have attempted to "commend [their] whole religious enterprise as an interpretation of the world and man's life within it".[19]

For the romantic theologians romanticism made a significant contribution to their spirituality and understanding of God and man. It is an evidence for efficacy in belief and conduct based on their theological conceptions. They would agree with Donovan's projected assumption:

> "...that there genuinely are experiences and phenomena the spiritual significance of which is better grasped by certain religious conceptions than in other ways."[20]

They were thoroughly convinced that the spiritual significance of romanticism and the creative imagination was better grasped by Christian theology than any other way, and in setting out to establish such a position they assume the role of apologists on the

---

18. According to Donovan, "self-authentication" is the chief offending implication in phenomenology to its detractors.

19. Donovan, op. cit.

20. Ibid. The romantic theologians would also agree with Donovan in denying that an appeal to "religiously significant experience" is a short-cut to theistic conclusion.

first, or classic, level of attack. In classic apology they wage war on two fronts. They undertake to demonstrate romantic doctrine as a valid means of theological apprehension and the romantic mode as a valid means of theological expression in the face of a purely rationalistic theology.

As was mentioned earlier, quite a sufficient amount of material has been set down about classic apology to make a great deal of comment about it superfluous. This paper has no quarrel with the direct or classical form of apologetics except the general assumption that in and of itself it constitutes the whole of apologia. It is necessary and vital to Christian defence, and apologia would not be a "tangible" discipline without it. But apologists have fallen prey to a gambit of their adversaries who have insisted on a single method of defence. And it is a method which will not permit as admissible evidence half the Christian apologist's case. Yet even at this late hour, apologists are maintaining that only in science is the main impetus of defence to be found. The result of this attitude has been disastrous for apology, theology, and the Church. The more narrow the scope of apologia, the more narrow the theology which in turn narrows the stance of apologetics as a theological discipline. It has all but disappeared from divinity curriculums.

This situation ultimately affects the Church's

evangelism. Many make the mistake of Moorman when he said that Lewis would seem to advocate a return to doctrinaire orthodoxy. No doubt all the romantic theologians would, but they were not dogmaticians, they were evangelists. They were concerned about man having the "relevant experience".[21] The matter of a vast and positive defence is vital to evangelism. And as far as the life of the Church is concerned evangelism is vascular; cut the Church anywhere and it will bleed evangelism.

Now it is possible for romantic theology to force such an expansion of the concept of apologetics. There is an audience for apology which cannot appreciate the polemics that engage the academic world, but could be reached through other forms. Hopefully, it has been somewhat demonstrated that one form appealing to the greater whole of man could reach such an audience. Men are seldom motivated by purely cerebral means. As Lewis observed, no intellectual justification of virtue will make a man virtuous. The intellect standing alone is powerless against the animal organism.[22] But by "recording a lived dialectic" in myth the romantic theologians have restated to the imagination the questions to which Christian

---

21. Lewis, Letters, p. 166.

22. Lewis, The Abolition of Man, p. 20.

doctrine is the answer.

It is perhaps fair to say that works that embody a mythopathic view are the nearest approach man possesses to a combination of the mechanistic and aesthetic views. And considered with the theological framework a yet further step is taken toward fuller knowledge. Jacques Maritain writes:

> The theological consideration of the working idea clearly shows how foreign to art is the servile imitation of the appearance of nature, for art's most fundamental demand is that the work make apparent not something else already made, but the spirit from which it proceeds."[23]

In assumptive apology the romantic theologians produce an apologetic in the romantic manner to awaken the perspective they possess in others. By stepping into such a perspective they believe one could become sympathetically aware of such evidence on a non-rational level. They also face the radical emergent romanticism with its claims of an alpha and omega for man's creative imagination.

The second area of conflict is the world of practicality. It is not as pure an apologetic in the sense of the first, but it is where the effect of the first is most apparent. It has to do with philosophies of life as they are lived. It mixes in the world of

---

23. Jacques Maritain, "The Frontiers of Poetry", Art and Scholasticism, p. 95.

ideology and frameworks. This is where apologetics must demonstrate the qualitative aspects of the reality theology seeks to portray. Here, it must undertake to defend the ordinancy of attitude and sentiment from within the Christian context.

It is a fierce world with fewer guidelines than the classic confrontation. It is an area that must resist not only overt persuasions but the power of more subtle assumption from which it is difficult to escape. To debunk romanticism as one would any emotion on the basis of commonplace rationalism is within anyone's capacity. The modern world by stifling this sensibility of man has but made him easier prey for the propagandists.

> "Even the spate of futile words that pour out from the ephemeral press and the commercial fiction monger has a real and terrible power; it can become a dope as dangerous as drugs or drink; it can rot the mind, sap the reason, send the will to sleep; it can pull down empires and set the neck of the people under the heel of tyranny".[24]

Secondly, Barfield felt the "young man romanticism had found his identity, but not his vocation". But Barfield, in contrast to the rest of the romantic theologians wished to found a philosophy upon romanticism. The others saw it as a tool, not as an end. And as helpful as Barfield's insights and construction may be, the tide is against this extreme position.

---

24. Sayers, Unpopular Opinions, p. 37.

At least he related it to an absolute divine source and knew that the purely emergent position could not stand alone.

What genuine emergent romanticists fail to see in their writing off Christianity as a failure as a final philosophy is that in accepting the orthodox position one is admitting that as far as man is concerned no final philosophy can be discerned. It is to be set free from any such quest or supposition. If anything, Christianity is more "emergent" than the emergents.

The romantic theologians would agree with the emergent position that if man is the "ultimate and irrefutable arbiter of value", then all that is comes into being through man's creative imagination. So according to such a position the Ideal Man would be the supremely and uniquely creative man. This romantic doctrine takes shape in a score of authors from Shelley to Peckham. The Ideal Man --- the Redeemer --- will be the philosopher-poet. If the "new" or the "transformed" is to be realized through such a creative soul, whose else would it be? But how will new value (if such exists) or its exaltation see incarnation? This "greatest man" can but bring novel thought forms into novel artistic shapes (be it the arts <u>per se</u> or

philosophical constructs or political systems). The greatest man, it would seem, is one who arrives at such truths as these forms may uncover but more consciously applies them to the greatest art form --- the art of living.

This was a fact Yeats recognized. In correspondence he wrote:

> "...It seems to me that I have found what I wanted. When I try to put all into a phrase I say 'Man can embody truth but he cannot know it'. I must embody it in the completion of my life. The abstract is not life and everywhere draws out its contradictions. You can refute Hegel but not the Saint or the Song of Sixpence..."[25]

This doctrine of the divinity of man is a source of inspiration or degradation according to the type of humanity regarded as ideal. The romantic theologian would agree that the ideal man would be uniquely creative, but he would not be the philosopher-poet, but one who was both God and Man.[26]

Christ seems to have effected the synchronization of principle and phenomena --- "I...am come to fulfil the law". In him was the principle observed in a unique, personal life which embodied the universal principle of love.

It is this quality of life the romantic

---

25. W. B. Yeats, Letters of W. B. Yeats, p. 922.

26. Peckham goes so far as to compare his philosopher-poet to a Christ-role (even though he earlier denies "role" in his romantic doctrine).

theologians seek to elucidate. When the radical romanticists strike at what they consider the orthodox position on such matters as diversity, perfection, and change, they "do greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures". As Lewis says, there will be more variety in heaven than in hell.

When the third area of conflict is considered, it must be admitted that the response aroused by the romantic experience is often misunderstood and causes some to devise many theologies and anti-theologies. But all it truly offers is a language of images. Not just visual images, but powerful expositions of pure quality with which each man can clothe his own belief.

Although Christians can use romanticism and imaginative response, it is not a proof that Christianity is true. Those suffering from the "Dark Gods" can also use them. Back behind the immediate confrontation and the pressure of the hostile atmosphere is the world of the spirit in which the ultimate battle is being waged. In the final analysis, says Paul, "we wrestle not with flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers". The romantic theologians would stand fast with all theologians in stating that the true defence against this onslaught is putting on the whole armor of God --- "the Sword of the Spirit", not the least. But the Apostle was addressing Christians about their position in Jesus Christ, the matter

under discussion is apology, battle done on ground where the Word has yet to be sown, or sown, has yet to take root and is in danger of being weeded out.

This third area of conflict is the most ignored by apologists. It is on a level deeper than mere ideology. Technicalities are dealt with on the first level of attack, their manipulation is met on the second, but the qualitative principles associated with meaning itself comprise the third.

The ultimate hope of apology on all levels is for man to have that "relevant experience" that will enable him to synthesize, and synchronize all these aspects of life that he might purposefully increase in consciousness and gain in wisdom.

The opposition to the romantic approach to apologia is not unlike the more familiar opposition of the romantic-classical debate in literature. Martin Seymour-Smith borrowed a concept from Frederich Schiller's essay on Naive and Sentimentive Poetry ("Uber naive und sentimentalische Dichtung"), and modified the distinctions of Schiller for his work dealing with the romantic-classical opposition. Bearing in mind that this paper has insisted that apologia is to a great extent a literary matter, and since an effort has been made to present an approach to apologia other than the classic form, it appears reasonable to modify yet again the Seymour-Smith/ Schiller concepts for this

purpose.[27]

Briefly, the naive (i.e., romantic) approach to apologia is nearer to harmony with the natural. A subjectivism does not intrude. It is more objective because it simply allows a direct view (looks along) the issue at hand. The sentimentive approach to apology has lost this perspective. It attempts to control the experience or phenomena --- to bend it a certain way. Its subjectivity cannot help but be apparent.

The naive apology allows an unsophisticated, uncomplicated view of the experience or phenomena uncluttered by intellectualization. The sentimentive apology is almost purely intellectual. It is sophisticated and trained in thinking. It is (like most modern things) self-conscious and approaches the issue indirectly (looks at).

The naive apology does not proceed purely by thought; it is creative, suggestive, and organic. The sentimentive cannot be creative and is rooted in the naive. It is analytical and increasingly sterile. History will show that a naive apology is reflected in a progressive situation, but the sentimentive as it grows increasingly sterile is found where there is decline.

Now there is no apology absolutely naive or

---

27. Martin Seymour-Smith, op. cit., pp. xiii-xv.

absolutely sentimentive. When the idea of apology enters in a piece of writing subjective control becomes a problem. Actually it is all a matter of degree. Classic apology is, of course, the nearest thing to sentimentive apology, but even among the romantic theologians (who could be said to be generally naive in approach), Barfield is nearer sentimentive than naive, and Tolkien would be the nearest to a naive apology that one could hope to see.

Regarding Barfield's remark concerning "romanticism come of age", a good question would be: What would be the position of a matured romanticism in the realm of Christian theology? Lewis once said that Christianity was religion matured more than it was the true religion among a legion of totally false ones, his idea being that all that had gone before in man's spiritual quest had converged in the "fulness of time". It would appear that the same principle could be applied to the doctrine of romanticism.

Hurst[28] among others bemoans the fact that Wordsworth promised at first to carry the Romantic Movement to its fulfillment, but soon he fell back upon the customary lines of Anglican tradition. Hazlitt considered Coleridge's return to orthodoxy a lapse. Perhaps these and other "lapsarians" could be likened

---

28. Hurst, op. cit., p. 504.

to Chesterton, who, disgusted with all the heresies he encountered, set about to found his own based on the things of his imagination and romantic impulses and discovered, when he added some finishing touches from things he had learned in the nursery, that it was orthodoxy.

Christianity, in apologetical warfare, has taken many things and given them a new flavor, but has also blended them into its own flavor and used them for its own purpose. It seemed a sincere conviction on the part of the early apologists that if the matter of "natural religion" was not found to be in error with Christianity then it must have a common source of truth. The idea being that Christianity with its powers granted through revelation could better employ philosophy and more accurately cultivate its truths than the pagan world. Therefore, the Church could take philosophy and repel the attacks initiated by its enemies. The Church did not so much argue if the nobler, ethically, even religiously minded philosophies were correct as they questioned their sufficiency.

The apologists would argue, therefore, that Christianity's use of any means of knowledge granted it a more exact definition and legitimate application than the pagan mind. And here it must be remembered that as with the old philosophies employed by the first

apologists, romanticism is not a peculiarly Christian phenomena, and it still bares elements of its pagan associations. It must be crucified and raised again before it can truly serve. This is reason for concern, but no undue alarm. It will no more (nor less) be cleansed of the associations than will the pagan himself when he is first converted.

But it is no more than a peculiar sensibility and alone as such it too is limited. Remember that even Williams who appears to grant so much authenticity to romantic love drew a line by warning that hell had made three attacks on the way of romantic love that could be applied to romanticism in general. The first is that the experience is everlasting; the second, that the experience is a personal possession of the romantic; and finally, that it is sufficient in itself. All these claims, says Williams, are a trap, and, in effect, states that the romantic experience is limited in duration and promise, a universal phenomenon, and, in itself, deficient with regard to the mature spiritual life.

Bowra said that after Wordsworth and Coleridge lost their vision and poetic powers they had to turn to a more conventional religious expression. Could it not be that sub-consciously they realized its limitation and matured (however reluctantly) into that which was truly timeless and only used the ectasy of vision to

lead themselves to it. Lewis felt that Wordsworth, all his life, misunderstood that the loss of his vision was a step toward a deeper wisdom. Perhaps intellectually he did understand it and yet continued to long for his "joy" as anyone might pine for a high water mark in his life (at least in his own mind).

In romantic theory it is generally well accepted that words "create" knowledge. And knowledge here means, from all accounts, direct perception in a plenary sense. But according to theologians knowledge comes by way of revelation --- "the fear (the consciousness, the awareness) of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge". From a theological point of view it can be argued that the creative knowledge still represents a natural knowledge (regardless of any "higher" or "inner" claims the romantics may set forth), and the latter represents super-natural knowledge. Natural knowledge, regardless of its source, scientific or artistic, would have to take its place among what has been termed general revelation while the supernatural knowledge is granted the title of special revelation in that it stems only from a knowledge gained from God's peculiar acts in history to make himself know beyond evidences in "ordinary" phenomenon and course of events.

The romantic theologian would argue with most theologians that all knowledge <u>finally</u> depends upon

revelation. And in keeping with good Augustinian doctrine, their idea is not to supplant natural knowledge with supernatural knowledge, but to restore man to the capacity to accept all knowledge as coming from God. It is, in their view, man's alienated state that prevents the proper appreciation of God's hand in general revelation. Therefore, the special revelation in history sets out to accomplish such a restoration, and no knowledge outside that provided by the special revelation can bring man to such a point of realization.

Now as Richardson writes:

> "All truth is one, and all truth is God's truth, for God, if he exists, must be the God of truth...the search for meaning is not the whole of any man's obligation to God...yet the Christian apologist will be quick to perceive that here is a beginning from which such a one may be led to see that there is a God who has other claims upon him."[29]

No apologist would disagree with that statement. But after this general agreement of objective, the romantic theologians part company with most. Richardson reflects the current spirit when he insists that the starting point for apologetics is scientific methodology. He feels firmly that the Christian apologist, if he is to make "vital contact" with the mind of the current age, must come to grips with scientific methodology rather than metaphysics and

---

29. Richardson, op. cit., p. 121.

epistemology. He states that an apology that insists that knowledge can come through art and religion "did not prove very effective in a positivistic age, since the admission that religious and/or artistic knowledge was not scientific was sufficient to condemn it as knowledge altogether".[30] Yet he does grant credit to the power of the imagination and intuition (p. 46) and marvels at "the mind's strange faculty for perceiving analogies and formulating categories" (p. 47). But he obviously does not consider it worthy of intellectual treatment.

It is this kind of knowledge that fascinates the romantic theologian and leads him to seek to find out what it is and what it is for. The strange faculty was found to reside in the imagination and it was to serve as a truth-bearing faculty. They knew that fallen man lacked that direct intuition (ascribed by poets to angels), so he is committed to the imagination for he can only grasp the essence by analogy.

So the romantic theologians sought to identify with, as Shelley put it in his Defense of Poetry:

> "...those who imagine and express this indestructible order...the teachers who draw into a certain propinquity with the beautiful and true that partial apprehension of the agencies of the invisible world which is called religion."[31]

---

30. Ibid., p. 14. Following quotations in text.

31. Percy Bysshe Shelley, op. cit., The Complete Works Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley (Vol. VIII), p. 111.

Romantic theology as the "poetry" of theology seeks to combine apologetically the truth of revelation with persuasive vividness. By dwelling on the "material" aspects of theological matters, the romantic theologians were enabled to overcome the conventional dualism of knowledge and experience (the tragic dilemma). They maintained a kind of uncompromising naturalism. None of them ever gave a thought to ridding Christianity of the miraculous. It was part and parcel of things --- the nature of the beast. It was even one of the things that made Christianity true.

It has been seen that the romantic approach is a forceful tool in praepratio evangelica, but it has force on the other side of conversion as well. Lewis stopped searching for joy when he found its source, but he was ever sensitive to the power of mythopoeia. The essential characteristic to the romantic would seem to lie in giving significance to that which has ceased to command belief in terms of its actual or possible existence.[32] After the initial experience, how often is one "in love" with one's mate? Probably a good deal more than is consciously realized but beside the fact, the mood needs to be rekindled from time to time. So it is with spiritual awareness. It must be rekindled "By the passage from one plane of consciousness to

---

32. Lawlor, op. cit., p. 123.

another. It lives during that moment of transition and then dies, and if it is to be repeated, some means must be found of renewing the transition itself".[33]

Barfield had reference above to the poetic mood, but the similarity is more than striking. Renewal --- change --- growth in a real sense are at the very center of things. When the "awareness" has entered so deeply into our being as to convert the soul (to paraphrase Barfield), its "diction" is no longer a prime concern. To a great extent this is true. Lewis lost his anxiety for joy when he found its Source: "...we would be at Jerusalem". But the power of the mythopoeic still served as a mouthwash for the imagination. The aesthetic experience (if it can be called that) --- the massive, distinct awareness that comes in rare moments is vital to the growing Christian life. Such a life ought to be a series of conversion experiences that stem from the original "relevant experience".

Therefore, a romantic theology has immense value for the Christian faith in the doldrums, when faith and practice become perfunctory, lose their challenge and excitement. Lewis, once when listing some works he considered helpful in theology, also recommended some "mouthwash for the imagination" along with the gritty study.

---

33. Barfield, Poetic Diction, p. 26.

Romantic theology is an aid when a dim doctrine needs to be revived. Romantic theology could be termed the poetry of theology. By dealing directly in the mythic aspects of theology it happens to contain the sort of infinity of the kind of meaning theology is trying to elucidate. It rises up to face the proponents of a scientism that would squash the so-called "immortal longings". Religion has found time and time again that its most effective interpretation of belief has come through the method of art because art can give the representation of the inner meaning of matters and religion is concerned with a total representation of reality --- the inner meaning and the outward manifestation.

One of the great themes of the early apologists was that the old covenant had been fulfilled in the new covenant. This belief both led to the development and was influenced by the allegorical, typological, and pre-figurative approaches to Biblical interpretation. These approaches have been in some fashion since. These factors are appealing to man because the belief contains and the approaches support the idea of a divine continuity.

The modern approach of a scientific demythologizing has broken the thread by substituting a poorer mythology --- a bone-bare imagery. Popular philosophies have failed because they have done the opposite of

their aim. They have robbed man of his relevant perspectives. There are no ties. There is nothing to fulfil. Today has no relation to yesterday or tomorrow.

The scientisms of the age insist on patterns. On every hand a score of disciplines propose some model, some structure, some law in nature to which in actuality they attempt to force nature to conform. The result is disorientation. The radical romantic argues against a pattern and produces a score of mysticisms, existentialisms, and emergent philosophies. Even while the romanticists condemn such "disorientation... that...resembles psychosis" they maintain (at least according to Peckham) that disorientation is the basis and goal of romanticism. It is odd that Peckham seeks the very same end he condemns in the "Age of Progress". But it is not disorientation that man needs or even desires.

It is toward such "self-authenticating" philosophies that intrinsic apology directs its force. Here is the very essence of the tragic dilemma in more macrocosmic proportions --- the seemingly insurmountable difficulty brought about by the incurable tendency to abstraction on the part of the human mind on the one hand and the need to convey the reality of concrete experience on the other.

An indispensable contribution to the dilemma

offered by an intrinsic apology is its contribution toward maintaining the philosophia perennis. It is that philosophy that possesses the sense of continuity springing from a more "central region". It is a circle of defense constantly withholding, providing room and time, preparing the ground for the sowing of seeds for the formulation and presentation of effective proclamation and teaching.

The philosophia perennis also provided the ground for apology on the assumptive level. It can be compared to the Tao[34] as developed by Lewis in The Abolition of Man which was originally the Riddell Memorial Lectures presented at Durham University in 1943.[35] In these lectures he stated his conviction

---

34. Lewis, The Abolition of Man, pp. 16-17. "...the Tao...is the Way in which the universe goes on, the Way in which things everlastingly emerge, stilly and tranquilly, into space and time...This conception in all its forms, Platonic, Aristotelian, Stoic, Christian and Oriental alike, I shall henceforth refer to for brevity simply as 'the Tao'."

35. The Riddell lectures were concerned with a philosophy of education. Lewis attacked the explaining away of moral values in elementary textbooks. He demonstrated how an English textbook undercut remarks containing predicates of value by assuming them to be no more than expressions of personal emotional states. ("It is not a theory they put into his [the schoolboy] mind, but an assumption." p. 9) It was in this context that Lewis presented his famous picture of such debunking making "Men Without Chests" and still expecting virtue and enterprise.

The apologetic theme of The Abolition of Man was demonstrated in That Hideous Strength (see p. 163) which Lewis said was about conflict on three

that preparation through "ordinate affections" and "just sentiments" would enable man to "feel pleasure, liking, disgust, and hatred at those things which are really pleasant, likeable, disgusting, and hateful". Lewis made it clear that in such a device he was not advancing any indirect argument for theism, but he believed that those so prepared would recognize the truth when it came. And so he no doubt would in sentiment support Casserley's statement that the ideal of the perennial philosophy is to be found in "The form of theology that...breathes, so to speak, the same air, and inherits the same ideals and criteria is what in a very general sense we have termed orthodoxy".[36]

The result of standing within such a continuity is that further revelations hereafter apprehended will bask in its light. Irrelevancies will not so much be

---

levels: Grace against Nature and Nature against Anti-Nature (industrialism, scientism, and political totalitarianism). It is also suggested in the Narnia book, The Voyage of the Dawn Treader. Eustace, an ill-tempered child, had involuntarily accompanied the Pevensie children to Narnia and in course of the adventure encountered a situation quite outside his capacity to cope with (he had been changed into a dragon, a creature commensurate with his personality) because he had read none of the right books. The only books he ever read were the type that were full of charts and pictures of fat children performing gymnastics in schoolyards.

36. J. V. Langmead Casserley, Apologetics and Evangelism, pp. 160-183. Lewis would differ with how the perennial philosophy is to be found, since Casserley looks to, among other things, historicism. See footnote 16, page 200.

resolved as superseded. Combined in this perspective is also what Lewis would call "defeated irony". The modern goal, expressed in the two extreme desires "to know" or "to taste", is to reach this height by making man look absurd in the process, but orthodox Christianity begins with the absurdity of man; and in spite of his vanity, grossness, and pride can discern the cause for the absurdity and rejoice in its defeat. To awaken response to an all-encompassing continuity is powerful apology. Something lasting and solid has a positive effect on the mind and spirit.

In the earliest history of the Church, the Acts of the Apostles, Luke records examples of several vital activities that the early Christians performed on a daily basis. One of the things was a result of the others. It was that the Church grew daily (a fact that Luke felt worth mentioning twice, 2:47; 16:5). It is a fact of record that the Church grew numerically, on occasion thousands at a bound. A good case could be made for other kinds of growth as well. The point is that this prosperity came because every day the Church worshipped (2:46), visited (2:46), taught and preached (5:42), ministered to physical needs (6:1), studied the Scripture (17:11). And finally, the significant daily practice as far as this thesis is concerned is contained in Acts 19:9 where Paul and the disciples are found "...disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus".

This is clearly an apologetical situation in which the followers of Christ were taking the initiative. There are numerous accounts of individual apologies in Acts (the apology of Stephen Chapter 7 is an outstanding example) and the emphasis of this text is that it was a daily practice. A narrower view might be stated that the disciples argued daily only for the period they were at the school of Tyrannus, but the total context of the book supports the broader view. In traditional Christian language, the Church went daily into the world to witness and bear testimony.

Defense, constant and daily, is a portion of the very essence of the Church's commission --- a corollary of its very being. Its defense must be wide as well as deep. It is an act of presumption for the modern Church to limit itself by the demand that spiritual truth be apprehended and expressed only in terms of theological abstraction. It is a point worthy of note that the most significant revivals of religious interest realized their impetus outside the so-called established Church. This observation is not meant to demean the Church's traditional function, but to point out the dual aspect of her nature and responsibility to be in the world as well as not of it. So long as the Church maintains a dynamic apologia it will more nearly accomplish these complementary aspects of the nature of her task.

Lewis' splendid essay, "The Literary Impact of the Authorized Version",[37] demonstrates how different periods have responded "literarily" to the Bible. It is the current age, he points out, that has coined the term "the Bible as literature". This would tend to suggest that people, having lost the view of the Bible's sacred character, still enjoy it "as a treasure house of English prose". "It may be so," says Lewis, "but I never meet them." The Bible, apart from its sacred character, appeals most to romantic taste. In an anti-romantic age the question must be asked what certain great passages from the Scripture will have to say to "an unbeliever unless he is a Romantic or to a Counter-Romantic unless he is a believer?"

Perhaps romanticism is no more than a phase in the history of taste. No doubt the current rejection of it is the same. But eyes have seen and ears have heard of the perspective allowing for a response that makes for sympathetic reception of Christianity's message. No more is claimed for it here than that. It is doubtful that the supporters of the scientific method would claim any more. To be sure more understanding and respect would go a long way toward a "mutually corrective" situation. A compromise is not sought, nor is a mixture, (for as Chesterton says, a

---

37. Lewis, Selected Literary Essays, pp. 126-145.

mixture of two things is a dilution of two things), but a balance. When all is said and done the Bible and all sacred things will repel a purely aesthetic approach or a purely rationalistic approach. These things will not always merely give pleasure or square with logic.

Man's nature being what it is makes it doubtful that the right balance between the "mutually corrective" approaches will be struck any too often, much less maintained. But an effort to achieve such a balance has been attempted in this paper. Another pebble tossed into the pitcher to enable the raven to drink.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Primary Sources.

A. Barfield, Owen, The Silver Trumpet, London: Faber and Gwyer, 1925 (Illustrated by Gilbert James).

_____. History in English Words, London: Methuen and Company Ltd., 1926.

_____. Poetic Diction: A Study in Meaning, London: Faber and Gwyer, 1928.

_____. Saving the Appearances: A Study in Idolatry, New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Incorporated, 1957.

_____. Worlds Apart, A Dialogue of the 1960's, London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1963.

_____. Unancestral Voices, London: Faber and Faber, and Wesleyan Press, 1965

_____. Speaker's Meaning, London: Rudolph Steiner Press, 1967.

_____. Romanticism Come of Age, London: Rudolph Steiner Press, 1966.

_____. What Coleridge Thought, London: Oxford University Press, 1972.

B. Lewis, C.S., Spirits in Bondage: A Cycle of Lyrics, London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1919 (under the pseudonym of Clive Hamilton).

_____. Dymer, London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1926 (under the pseudonym of Clive Hamilton); reprinted with a new Preface, as by C.S. Lewis, 1950.

_____. The Pilgrim's Regress: An Allegorical Apology for Christianity, Reason and Romanticism, London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1933; London: Sheed and Ward, 1935; London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1943, with the author's important new Preface on Romanticism, footnotes, and running headlines.

_____. The Allegory of Love: A Study in Medieval Tradition, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936.

_____. Out of the Silent Planet, London: John Lane, 1938.

_____. Rehabilitations and Other Essays, London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1939.

_____. (With E.M.W. Tillyard) The Personal Heresy: A Controversy, London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1939.

_____. The Problem of Pain, London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1942; reprinted with a new Screwtape letter as The Screwtape Letters and Screwtape Proposes a Toast, with a new and additional Preface, 1961.

_____. A Preface to 'Paradise Lost': Being the Ballard Matthews Lectures Delivered at University College, North Wales, 1941, Revised and Enlarged, London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1942.

_____. Perelandra, London: John Lane, 1943. Also published as Voyage to Venus, London: Pan Books Ltd., 1953.

_____. The Abolition of Man, or, Reflections on Education with Special Reference to the Teaching of English in the Upper Forms of Schools, Riddell Memorial Lectures, Fifteenth Series, London: Oxford University Press, 1943; London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1946.

_____. That Hideous Strength: A Modern Fairy-Tale for Grown-ups, London: John Lane, 1945. Also published in an abridged form, with a different Preface, as That Hideous Strength, London: Pan Books Ltd., 1955.

_____. The Great Divorce: A Dream, London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1946.

_____. Miracles: A Preliminary Study, London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1947.

_____. Transposition and Other Addresses, London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1949.

_____. The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe, Illustrated by Pauline Baynes, London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1950.

_____. Prince Caspian: The Return to Narnia, Illustrated by Pauline Baynes, London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1951.

_____. Mere Christianity: A Revised and Amplified Edition, with a New Introduction, of the Three Books 'Broadcast Talks', 'Christian Behaviour', and 'Beyond Personality', London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1952.

_____. The Voyage of the 'Dawn Treader', Illustrated by Pauline Baynes, London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1952.

_____. The Silver Chair, Illustrated by Pauline Baynes, London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1953.

_____. The Horse and His Boy, Illustrated by Pauline Baynes, London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1954.

_____. English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, excluding Drama, The Completion of 'The Clark Lectures', Trinity College, Cambridge, 1944 (The Oxford History of English Literature, Vol. III), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.

_____. The Magician's Nephew, Illustrated by Pauline Baynes, London: The Bodley Head, 1955.

_____. Surprised by Joy: The Shape of My Early Life, London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1955.

_____. The Last Battle, Illustrated by Pauline Baynes, London: The Bodley Head, 1956.

_____. Till We Have Faces: A Myth Retold, London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1956.

_____. Reflections on the Psalms, London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1958.

_____. The Four Loves, London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1960.

_____. Studies in Words, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.

_____. The World's Last Night and Other Essays, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1960.

_____. A Grief Observed, London: Faber and Faber, 1961 (under the pseudonym of N.W. Clerk); reprinted, as by C.S. Lewis, 1964.

_____. An Experiment in Criticism, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.

_____. They Asked for a Paper: Papers and Addresses, London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1962.

_____. Letters to Malcolm: Chiefly on Prayer, London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1964.

_____. The Discarded Image: An Introduction to Medieval and Renaissance Literature, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

_____. Poems (Edited by Walter Hooper), London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1964.

_____. Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Literature (Collected by Walter Hooper), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

_____. Letters of C.S. Lewis (Edited by W.H. Lewis), London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1966.

_____. Christian Reflections (Edited by Walter Hooper), 1967.

_____. Of Other Worlds (Edited by Walter Hooper), London: Geoffrey Bles,

_____. Undeceptions (Edited by Walter Hooper), London: Geoffrey Bles, 1971.

Edited or Prefaced by C.S. Lewis

_____. George MacDonald: An Anthology, London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1946. (Preface by C.S. Lewis and 365 brief excerpts from the works of George MacDonald.

Phillips, J.B., Letters to Young Churches: A Translation of the New Testament Epistles with an Introduction by C.S. Lewis, London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1947.

Sayers, Dorothy L. and others, Essays Presented to Charles Williams, London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1947. (With a Preface and an essay, 'On Stories', by C.S. Lewis).

Lewis, C.S., Arthurian Torso: Containing the Posthumous Fragment of 'The Figure of Arthur' by Charles Williams and a Commentary on the Arthurian Poems of Charles Williams by C.S. Lewis, London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1948.

Davidman, Joy, Smoke on the Mountain: An Interpretation of the Ten Commandments in Terms of To-day, London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1955. (With a Foreword by C.S. Lewis).

C. Tolkien, J.R.R., The Hobbitt, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1966.

_____. The Fellowship of the Ring, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1966.

_____. Two Towers, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1966.

_____. The Return of the Ring, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1966.

_____. The Tolkien Reader (Introduction by Peter Beagle), New York: Ballentine Books, 1969.

D. Williams, Charles, The Silver Stair, London: Herbert and Daniel, 1912.

_____. Poems of Conformity, London: Oxford University Press, 1917.

_____. Christian Symbolism (with Michal Williams), London: Talbot and Co., 1919.

_____. Divorce, London: Oxford University Press, 1920.

_____. Windows of Night, London: Oxford University Press, 1924.

_____. A Myth of Shakespeare, London: Oxford University Press, 1928.

_____. War in Heaven, London: Gollancz, 1930.

_____. Heroes and Kings, London: The Sylvan Press, 1930.

_____. Poetry at Present, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930.

_____. Many Dimensions, London: Gollancz, 1931.

_____. Three Plays, London: Oxford University Press, 1931.

_____. The Place of the Lion, London: Mundanus (Gollancz), 1931.

_____. The Greater Trumps, London: Gollancz, 1932.

_____. The English Poetic Mind, London: Oxford University Press, 1932.

_____. Shadows of Ecstasy, London: Gollancz, 1933.

_____. Reason and Beauty in the Poetic Mind, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.

_____. Descent Into Hell, London: Faber and Faber, 1937.

_____. He Came Down From Heaven, London: Heinemann, 1938.

_____. Taliessin Through Logres, London: Oxford University Press, 1938.

_____. The Descent of the Dove, London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1939.

_____. Witchcraft, London: Faber and Faber, 1941.

_____. The Forgiveness of Sins, London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1942.

_____. The Figure of Beatrice, London: Faber and Faber, 1943.

_____. The Region of the Summer Stars, Poetry, London: Oxford University Press, 1944.

_____. All Hallows' Eve, London: Faber and Faber, 1945.

_____. The House of the Octopus, Edinburgh: Edinburgh House Press, 1945.

_____. The Figure of Arthur, unfinished; published in Arthurian Torso by C.S. Lewis, London: Oxford University Press, 1948.

_____. Image of the City, and Other Essays (Selected by Anne Ridler with a Critical Introduction), London: Oxford University Press, 1958.

Edited and Prefaced by Charles Williams

_____. The Letters of Evelyn Underhill, London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1943.

II. Secondary Sources.

A. Articles.

Blackwood, Andrew D., "Imagination in Preaching", The New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1955.

Dentan, R.C., "Imagination", The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Nashville, Tennessee: The Abingdon Press, 1962.

Donavan, Peter, "Phenomenology as Apologetics", Scottish Journal of Theology, Vol. 27, No. 4 (November, 1974).

Lawlor, John, "Rasselas: Romanticism and the Nature of Happiness", Friendship's Garland: Essays Presented to Mario Praz, Vol. I, (edited by Vittorio Gabrieli), Roma: Edizioni Di Storia E Letteratura, 1966.

Manse, A.R., "Imagination", Encyclopedia of Philosophy, (editor-in-chief, Paul Edwards), New York: The Macmillan Company and the Free Press, Reprint Edition, 1972.

McIntyre, J.L., "Imagination", Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. III, (Editor, James Hastings), Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1914.

B. Books.

Abrams, M.H., The Mirror and the Lamp, Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition, London: The Oxford University Press, 1953.

Auden, W.H., Secondary Worlds, London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1968.

Barth, J. Robert S.J., Coleridge and Christian Doctrine, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1969.

Barth, Karl, Church Dogmatics, Vols. II, 1 and 2; IV, 3, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1957, 1961.

Barzun, Jacques, Romanticism and the Modern Ego, London: Martin Secker and Warburg Ltd., 1943.

Bevan, Edwyn, Symbolism and Belief, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1938.

Blake, William, Letters of William Blake (edited by Archibald G.B. Russell), London: Methuen and Co., 1906.

Bowra, Sir Maurice, The Romantic Imagination, London: Oxford University Press, 1950.

Brett, R.L., Fancy and Imagination, London: Methuen and Co., 1969.

Bruce, A.B., Apologetics, or Christianity Defensively Stated, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1895.

Brumm, Ursula, American Thought and Religious Typology, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1970.

Brunner, Emil, Dogmatics, Vol. I: The Christian Doctrine of God, London: Lutterworth Press, 1949.

Bunyan, John, The Pilgrim's Progress (edited by James Blanton Whorey), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.

Butler, Joseph, The Analogy of Religion (A Preface by Samuel Halifax), London: Henry G. Bohn, 1852.

Casserly, J. V. Langmead, Apologetics and Evangelism, London: A. R. Mowbray and Co. Ltd., 1962.

Cassirer, Ernst, An Essay on Man, New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1944.

Cervantes, Miguel de, Don Quixote (edited by J. W. Clark and illustrated by Gustave Dore), London: Cassell, Petter and Galpin, n.d.

Chesterton, G. K., Orthodoxy, London: John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1919.

_____. The Everlasting Man, London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., n.d.

Christopher and Ostling (compilers), C. S. Lewis: An Annotated Checklist of Writings about Him and His Works, Kent Ohio: The Kent State University Press, June 1972.

Chroust, Anton-Hermann, Socrates, Man and Myth, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957.

Coleridge, S. T., Coleridge, Select Poetry and Prose (edited by Stephen Potter), London: The Nonesuch Press, 1950.

Dodd, C. H., Apostolic Preaching and its Development, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936.

Downing, F. Gerald, Has Christianity a Revelation, London: SCM Press, 1964.

Dulles, Avery, A History of Apologetics, London: Hutchinson of London, 1971.

Eliot, George, Daniel Duronda, Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, n.d.

Farrer, Austin, The Glass of Vision, Westminster: Dacre Press, 1948.

Frankfort, Henri, Before Philosophy, Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1949.

Frye, Northrop, Anatomy of Criticism, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957.

_____. Fables of Identity, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963.

_____. The Educated Imagination, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1964.

_____. The Stubborn Structure, London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1970.

Gibb, Jocelyn (editor), Light on C.S. Lewis, London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1965.

Goodenough, Erwin R., Religious Tradition and Myth, New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1937.

Greaves, Richard L., John Bunyan, Abingdon: The Sutton Courtenay Press, 1969.

Green, Roger Lancelyn and Hooper, Walter, C.S. Lewis: A Biography, London: William Collins Sons and Co. Ltd., 1974.

Gundersen, Borghild, Cardinal Newman and Apologetics, Oslo: I Kommisjon Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1952.

Gunn, Giles B.(editor), Literature and Religion, London: SCM Press, 1971.

Hadfield, Alice Mary, An Introduction to Charles Williams, London: Robert Hall Ltd., 1959

Hatt, Harold E., Encountering Truth, Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1966.

Hooke, S. J., Middle Eastern Mythology, Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, -963.

Hume, David, Treatise on Human Nature, London: Thomas and Joseph Allman, 1817.

Hurst, George Leopold, An Outline of Christian Literature, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., n. d.

Kant, Emmanuel, Critique of Pure Reason (translated by Norman Kemp Smith, Abriged edition), London: Macmillan and Company Ltd., 1934.

Keefe, Carolyn, C. S. Lewis, Speaker and Teacher, London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1971.

Kemp, E. W., Man: Fallen and Free, London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1969.

Kilby, Clyde, The Christian World of C.S. Lewis, Abingdon: Marcham Manor Press, 1965.

_____. Mind Awake: An Anthology of C.S. Lewis, London: Geoffrey Bles Ltd., 1968.

Kingsmill, Hugh, The Best of Hugh Kingsmill (edited by Michael Holroyd), London: Victor Gollancz, Ltd., 1970.

Kirk, Robert, The Secret Commonwealth of Elves, Fauns, and Fairies, (1691), Introduction by R.B. Cunninghame-Graham, Commentary by Andrew Lang (1893 edition), Stirling: The Observer Press (Eneas MacKay), 1933.

Knox, John, Myth, Richmond, Virginia: University of Virginia Press, 1964.

Kocher, Paul H., Master of Middle Earth, London: Thames and Hudson, 1972.

Langland, William, Piers, the Ploughman (Translation and Introduction by J.F. Goodridge), Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1959.

Lawlor, John (Editor), Patterns of Love and Courtesy, Essays in Memory of C.S. Lewis, London: Edward Arnold Publishers Ltd., 1966.

Lindskoog, Kathryn, The Lion of Judah in Never-Never Land, Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 1973.

Livingston, Sir R.W., Portrait of Socrates, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938.

_____. Education and the Spirit of the Age, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952.

Locke, John, An Essay on Human Understanding, (24th edition), London: William Bayner and Son, 1689.

Lowell, James Russell, "Wordsworth", Literary Essays (Vol. IV), London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., n.d.

Luther, Martin, Table Talks (Translated and Edited by William Hazlitt), London: George Bell and Sons, 1890.

Macaulay, Thomas Babbington, "Milton", Critical and Historical Essays (Contributed to the Edinburgh Review), Vol. I, London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1843.

MacDonald, George, Phantastes, London: Smith Elder and Co., 1858.

_____. A Dish of Orts, Chiefly Papers on the Imagination and Shakespear, London: George Newnes, Ltd., 1905.

_____. David Elginbrod, London: Hurst and Blackett, Ltd., n.d.

MacDonald, Greville, George MacDonald and His Wife, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1924.

Maritain, Jacques, "The Frontiers of Poetry", Art and Scholasticism, (Translated by J.F. Scanlan), New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942.

_____. Creative Intuition in Art and Poetry, New York: Pantheon Books, 1953.

Milton, John, Paradise Lost (Edited by Alastair Fowler), London: Longman Group Ltd., 1971.

Moorman, Charles, Arthurian Triptych, Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California, 1960.

Morgan, Charles, Reflections in a Mirror (Second Series), London: MacMillan and Company, Ltd., 1946.

Muir, Edwin, "Introduction", America,by Franz Kafka, London: Secker and Warburg, 1961.

Nee, Watchman, Sit, Walk, Stand, London: Victory Press, 1957.

Otto, Rudolph, Philosophy of Religion (Translated by E.B. Dicker), London: Williams and Norgate Ltd., 1931.

_____. The Idea of the Holy, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Peckham, Morse, The Triumph of Romanticism, Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1970.

Plowman, Max, An Introduction to the Study of Blake, London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1952.

Praz, Mario, The Romantic Agony, London: The Oxford Press, 1933.

Reid, J.K.S., Christian Apologetics, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1969.

Reilley, R.J., Romantic Religion, Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1971.

Richards, I.A., Coleridge on Imagination, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1955.

Richardson, Alan, Christian Apologetics, London: SCM Press Ltd., 1947.

Robbins, Wilford L., A Christian Apologetic, London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1902.

Ryle, Gilbert, The Concept of the Mind, London: Hutchinson and Co., Ltd., 1962.

Sayers, Dorothy L., The Mind of the Maker, London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1941.

_____. Unpopular Opinions, London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1946.

_____. The Man Born to be King, London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1947.

_____. Four Sacred Plays, London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1948.

_____. The Poetry of Search and the Poetry of Statement, London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., (posthumously), 1963.

Scott, E.F., The Apologetic of the New Testament, New York: Williams and Norgate, 1907.

Seymour-Smith, Martin, A Guide to Modern World Literature, London: Wolfe Publishing Co., 1973.

Shaw, George Bernard, St. Joan, London: Constable and Company, 1930.

_____. Arms and the Man, London: The Bodley Head, 1970.

Shelley, Percy Bysshe, "A Defense of Poetry", The Complete Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley, Vol. VIII, pp. 107-142, London: Ernest Benn, Ltd., 1965.

Shideen, Mary, The Theology of Romantic Love, Grand Rapids, Michigan: William Eerdmans Co., 1965.

Smith, Henry B., Apologetics: A Course of Lectures, New York: A.C.Armstrong and Son, 1882.

Steinbeck, John, The Winter of Our Discontent, New York: Bantam Paperbacks, 1970.

Stenson, Sten H., Sense and Nonsense in Religion, Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1969.

Streeter, B.H., Reality, London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1926.

Strong, A.H., The Great Poets and Their Theology, London: Baptist Tract and Book Society, 1897.

TeSelle, Sallie McFague, Literature and the Christian Life, New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1966.

Tuveson, Ernest Lee, The Imagination as a Means of Grace, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1960.

Urang, Gunnar, Shadows of Heaven, London, SCM Press Ltd., 1971.

VanTil, Cornelius, The Defense of the Faith, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1967.

Wain, John, Sprightly Burning, London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1962.

Walsh, Chad,

Warren, Austin, Connections, Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1970.

Wert, Richard C., Tolkien Criticism, An Annotated Checklist (Bibliographies and Checklist no. 11), Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1970.

White, William Luther, The Doctrine of Man in C. S. Lewis, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1970.

Wimsatt, William K., Jr., and Brooks, Cleanth, Literary Criticism, A Short History, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1952.

Yeats, W. B., The Letters of W. B. Yeats, London: Methuen and Company, 1951.

Zamyatin, Yevgeny, A Soviet Heretic: Essays by Yevgeny Zamyatin (translated and edited by Mirra Ginzberg), Chicago, Illinois: The Chicago University Press, 1970.

C. Concordances.

Young, Robert, Analytical Concordance to the Holy Bible, London: United Society for Christian Literature, 1952.

D. Dictionaries.

Brewer, Ebenezer Cobham, Dictionary of Phrase and Fable (Revised Edition), London: Cassell and Co. Ltd., 1963.

Dictionary of the History of Ideas, (Editor-in-Chief, Philip P. Wiener), New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973.

A Dictionary of Literature in the English Language from Chaucer to 1940, Oxford: Purgamon Press, 1970.

The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church (General Editor J. D. Douglas), Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1974.

The Oxford Companion to English Literature (compiled and edited by Sir Paul Harvey), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.

The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church (edited by F. L. Cross), London: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Roget's Thesaurus (New edition revised, modernized and abridged by Robert A. Dutch), Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1974.

The Shorter Oxford Dictionary (revised and edited by C. T. Onions), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel (translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromily), Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdman's Publishing Company, 1962.

A Theological Word Book of the Bible (edited by by Allen Richardson), London: SCM Press, 1950.

Vini, W. E., Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words, London: Oliphants, 1975.

Webster's Dictionary (edited by John Gage Allee), U. S. A.: Literary Press, 1958.

E. Encyclopedias.

The Encyclopedia Americana, Vols. 14, 19, 23, New York: Americana Corp., 1959.

Encyclopedia Britannica, Vols. 11, 15, 19, Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., 1969.

Encyclopedia Judica, Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, Ltd., 1971.

Larousse Encyclopedia of Mythology (Introduction by Robert Graves), London: Batchworth Press Ltd., 1959.

The New Catholic Encyclopedia, Vols. 1, 7, 10, 12, New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1967.

The Oxford Companion to English Literature, compiled and edited by Paul Harvey (4th edition revised by Dorothy Edge), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

The Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1955.

F. Glossaries.

Beckson, Karl and Ganz, Arthur, A Reader's Guide to Literary Terms, London: Thames and Hudson, 1958.

Fernald, James C., English Synonyms and Antonyms, New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1897.

Lord, Eric and Whittle, Don, A Theological Glossary, Oxford: The New Religious Education Press, Ltd., 1969.

G. Lexicons.

Arndt, William F. and Gingrich, F. Wilbur, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.

H. Pamphlets.

Hilton, Isobel, Revolutionary Romanticism (Contemporary Chinese Posters), published by the Scottish Arts Council, 1976.

Preparation of a Thesis, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1961.

Rudolph Steiner and the Modern Age (A Brief Introduction to His Mind and Work), London: The Rudolph Steiner Press, n.d.

GLOSSARY

GLOSSARY

Abstraction

An intellectual attempt to reduce or summarize the essential aspects of a matter to rational terms.

Allegory

A literary form of expression which operates on the basis of personification of concepts or ideas. It could be likened to a sort of imaginative proposition in that it is nearer to a subjective assertion than myth which is nearer to objective presentation.

Anthropomorphism

A method of theological expression which ascribes to God and matters pertaining to him qualities and attributes essentially human.

Anthroposophy

A philosophy developed by Rudolph Steiner who defined it as "a path of knowledge". His followers deny that it is a system and refer to it as a way of thinking.

From childhood Steiner claimed to possess exceptional powers of spiritual perception which he later linked with the world of sense perception.

Upon this synthesis of two worlds (Steiner was influenced by Goethe) he based a spiritual science.

His first audience was found among members of the Theosophical Society. He broke away in 1912 and founded the Anthroposophical Society. One of the reasons was the emphasis on Eastern mysticism among the theosophists while Steiner emphasized Christ and the impact on human evolution now felt in the West.

He taught a path of spiritual development beginning in the powers of thinking, feeling, and willing which led to higher modes of consciousness Steiner named Imagination, Inspiration, and Intuition.

It is a world wide movement with its center at Dornach, Switzerland called the "Goetheanum".

Apologia

An attempt is made in the paper to employ an Anglicized form of the Greek term translated defense in a manner comparable to kerygma and didache. There was a need for a term that conveyed the whole nature of defense --- a type of all-inclusive generic expression that contained the fact, its art and science.

The desired effect sought was a thought pervading concept as kerygma and didache have

become. It seemed reasonable to grant apologia a status comparable to theirs. The "message" (kerygma), the "teaching" (didache), and the "answer" (apologia) is the good news.

Within apologia is apology (concerned with the actual expression which takes place on three levels: classic, assumptive, and intrinsic), and apologetics (concerned with apology as it relates to various fields from the standpoint of devising an approach, and also a theological discipline that studies the mechanics of apology).

Diction

So many have tried their hand at the definition of this vital concept of communication. One aspect that none seems to state specifically yet is implicit in most attempts at definition is that diction is a deliberate technique of enunciation that causes a desired effect in communication. In normal speech it could be the precise pronouncing of syllables. In poetry it is in the arrangement of words. In myth it is the selection of images and events. In all of the modes of communication is formed a simultaneous pattern of meaning through diction.

Eucatastrophe

A term used by Tolkien meaning the satisfaction of the happy ending in fairy story. He saw the story of Christ as the Grand Eucatastrophe, the satisfying end in history. He suggested that in eucatastrophe in fantasy one may glimpse the far-off gleam of the good news.

Fancy

A great deal of discussion is enjoined concerning fancy, fantasy, and the imagination. Fantasy is also listed in this glossary. The paper's application of these terms is in accord with the definitions generally set forth by the romantic theologians.

Fancy is only occasionally mentioned in the paper. It is defined as the forming of mental images or combining them without regard to seriously constructive sense.

Imagination transcends fancy in its power and purpose. Fancy is superficial; imagination is deep and spiritual. Fancy works only with and for the material image; imagination uses the image to convey something greater. Imagination is penetrative and purposively creative.

Since Coleridge, fancy has indicated the power of inventing illustrative imagery. He

granted imagination the power of creating forms which themselves become a part of nature on the levels of cognition or Primary (it's "expression is the face of nature itself", Barfield, What Coleridge Thought, p. 77) and creativity or Secondary ("the very powers of growth and production", Ibid.).

Fantasy

A form of fiction that pertains to impossible or preter-natural stories. It is to be differentiated from fancy or day dreams in that it involves the imagination in a disinterested constructive sense.

Logomorphism

A term advanced by Barfield by which he meant projecting modern concepts backward into original meaning largely by abstraction.

He stated that it appears in historical and psychological forms. The paper suggests that there are also theological forms.

Mechanomorphism

A picture of the universe resulting from a materialistic or mechanistic point of view. It presents the universe as an infinite machine.

Mythopoeia

A generic term concerning the nature of myth-making. It would seem from its infrequent appearances that mythopoeia can be used on two levels: potential and kinetic. Potential mythopoeia is the latent, intrinsic meaning sensed in an experience or a phenomenon which initiates or inspires the imagination to myth-making activity. Kinetic mythopoeia is another way of saying mythopoeic diction. It is the exuding, the movement, the transforming of mythopoeic energy into a form for mythopathic reception.

Naive Apology

A literary concept borrowed from Frederich Schiller to describe an approach to apology that is creative and suggestive. It is in contrast to a sentimentive approach.

Objectification

The externalization (making visible the invisible) of an aspect of reality in a form tangible to the mind.

Organicism

A view of the universe set forth as opposed to mechanism. It sees reality as alive and growing, forever in the process of becoming. This

paper considers the concept mainly from within the position of emergent romanticism.

Realism

This term actually has vast implications in logic, metaphysics, politics, literature, to name but a few fields. The paper, though tending toward a literary application, employs a general definition. It sees realism as a reaction to romanticism which deals with existence according to appearances.

Representation

A depiction of reality that is a secondary level of objectification. It presents quantities based on qualities that have been objectified. As such it is a step removed from reality.

Sentimentive Apology

A concept borrowed from Frederich Schiller to describe an approach to apology that is predominantly intellectual and analytical. It is in contrast to a naive approach.

Tarning

A term coined by Barfield from the German word, tarnung. It comes from the days of Nazi tyranny when double meanings in speech were a matter of course. Barfield Anglicized it for use

in poetry as a term for "say-one-thing-and-mean-another". The paper adapted the term to mythopoeia and rendered it "set-forth-one-image-and-mean-the-inexpressible-something".

Tragic Dilemma

A term used by Lewis to set forth the conventional dualism of knowledge and experience. It is the seemingly insurmountable difficulty brought about by the incurable tendency to abstraction on the part of the human mind over against the need to convey concrete experience.