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I Introduction

From 1950 to 1956, C.S. Lewis (1988–1963) published a series of fairy tales for children: *the Chronicles of Narnia*. This series consists of seven books of *The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe* (1950), *Prince Caspian* (1951), *The Horse and his Boy* (1954), *The Voyage of the ’Dawn Treader’* (1952), *The Silver Chair* (1953), *The Magician’s Nephew* (1955), and *The Last Battle* (1956), describing the history of an imaginary country, Narnia, from its genesis to apocalypse. The creator of the Narnian world is a lion named “Aslan” (the Turkish word for “Lion”),2) who is said to be “the King of the world and the son of the great Emperor-beyond-the-sea.” (*Lion*, p. 75) He is not only the Creator but also the Lord, the Saviour, and the Judge at the last judgment at the end of Narnian world, being a counterpart of both the Father and the Son in the Holy Trinity.

Yet, despite the obvious parallel between Aslan and the Christian God, Lewis is negative about allegorical interpretations of his stories:

Some people seem to think that I began by asking myself how I could say something about Christianity to children; then fixed on the fairy tale as an instrument; then collected information about child-psychology and decided what age-group I’d write for; then drew up a list of basic Christian truths and hammered out ‘allegories’ to embody them. This is all pure moonshine. I couldn’t write in that way at all. Everything began with images; a faun carrying an umbrella, a queen on a sledge, a magnificent lion. At first there wasn’t even anything Christian about them; that element pushed itself in of its own accord. (“Sometimes Fairy Stories May Say Best What’s to Be Said,” *On Stories*, p. 46)

*The Chronicles* is thus, first of all, a work of imagination. The Narnian World is “supposition” rather than “allegory.” He wrote in 1954 in a reply letter to a fifth grade class in Maryland,

I did not say to myself “Let us represent Jesus as He really is in our world by a Lion in Narnia”: I said “Let us *suppose* that there were a land like Narnia and that the Son of God, as He become a Man in our world, became a Lion there, and then imagine what would happen.” (*Letters to Children*, pp. 44–45)
This way of writing is different from making an allegory. If we read the Chronicles on the assumption that it is a biblical allegory, our reading should necessarily be static and allows us little free response, for it is to be a sort of corresponding-passages-hunt. On the other hand, "supposition" allows for far freer responses.

And yet, on the other hand, there is no denying that, as Lewis's own letter above suggests, in a sense Aslan is the Narnian equivalent of God and Christ. He is the central figure of the whole chronicles in relation to whom all the characters and their behaviours can be assessed. There, we see Lewis's idea of how and when creatures are likely to be right or wrong, and what kinds of characters are in a right or wrong relation to God.

Now, in writing the Chronicles of Narnia in the form of fantasy, Lewis has two advantages in expressing his idea of Reality, especially of the reality of good and evil.

One is that in fairy tales, good and evil are divided so manifestly that the reader may see the difference between them more clearly than in actual life. There, it is possible to present even all the characters either as good or evil without presenting neutral ones, so as to show off their different natures, just as presenting black and white without presenting gray would show off the contrast between the two colours.

In the Chronicles, dichotomy of the good and evil can be seen everywhere. In The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe, for example, Aslan is opposed to the White Witch; Edmund is opposed to the other children when he is on the Witche's side; and all the good animals are opposed to those under the Witch. In Prince Caspian, the old Narnian are against the new comers; Caspian is against Miraz; and Trumpkin is in contrast with Nikabrik, respectively representing the good and evil in some way or other. The Last Battle not only shows us the conflict between Narnia and Calormen but also such oppositions as between the King and the wicked ape, Aslan and Tash, the faithful and the sceptic, and those who are saved and those who are not.

In fairy tales, the good are good and become happy, while the evil are bad and to be conquered and punished. Different from the actual life where the problem of suffering of innocent people who do not deserve it, or at least do not seem to deserve it—disease of newly born babies, death of young people in wars, etc.—presents difficulty in believing God's goodness and omnipotence, fairy tales make one easily and naturally feel God as good and almighty. If this feeling takes root in the reader, it may help him to believe in God's goodness and power in actual life, too, because one's conviction is often affected by his feelings and sensibility as well as by intellectual thinking, especially when the truth of the conviction is hard to prove by reason alone.

Another advantage is that in the fairy tales, Lewis has the best opportunity of directly impressing the reader's imagination with such sense of good and evil as he thinks is disappearing nowadays and necessary to preserve. Lewis says,

The older poetry, by continually insisting on certain Stock themes—as that love is sweet, death bitter, virtue lovely, and children or gardens delightful—was performing a service not only of moral and civil, but even of biological, importance. Once again, the old critics were quite right when they said that poetry 'instructed by delighting', for poetry was formerly
one of the chief means whereby each new generation learned, not to copy, but by copying to make, the good Stock responses. Since poetry has abandoned that office the world has not bettered. (Preface, p. 57)

Thus in the Chronicles, Lewis is sowing the seed of such “good Stock response” by illustrating what the good and evil are like, rather than theologically or theoretically discussing them. As Peter Schakel suggests, the primary appeal of the Chronicles “would be to the heart, not the head.”

Besides, what is characteristically important about Lewis is that he thus shows the good and evil not because he intentionally aims at moral effect but because he, as an author and not as a teacher, just finds it fit for the story he wants to write. He says in “A Reply to Professor Haldane,” “In my romances the ‘good’ characters are in fact rewarded. That is because I consider a happy ending appropriate to the light, holiday kind of fiction I was attempting.” (“A Reply to Professor Haldane,” On Stories, p. 69) Schakel also rightly suggests,

_The Chronicles_ are classics because of the way the intellectual reinforces the imaginative, and there is value for adults in seeing and discussing both aspects together; for them, and for children increasingly as they grow older, a response with the head can and should follow a response of the heart.

In _the Chronicles_, imaginative enchantment is the primary, and the moral follows it naturally.

* * *

In _Mere Christianity_, Lewis lists up seven virtues that have, ever since the medieval church enunciation, traditionally been regarded as necessary for salvation. Four of them are called “Cardinal” virtues which are sometimes classified as four “natural” virtues, they are “Prudence, Temperance, Justice and Fortitude” which are originally found by Plato to be virtues corresponding to the natural constitution of man, that is, “Prudence corresponded to the intellect, temperance to feeling, and fortitude to will. Justice was a social virtue and regulated the others.” The other three are “Theological” virtues which are particularly Christian, representing the Pauline triad of “Faith, Hope, and Charity” that are enjoined in I Corinthians, 13, 13. (_Mere Christianity_, pp. 71 & 113)

Apart from the fact that Temperance in this context does not mean teetotalism nor total abstaining from pleasures but the virtue of “going the right length and no further,” the “Cardinal” virtues do not seem to need further explanation or discussion here. (cf. Lewis, _Mere Christianity_, p. 72) The three theological virtues that St. Paul finds to be essential are of vital importance also in _the Chronicles of Narnia_. Therefore, we shall discuss _the Chronicles_ first in respect of faith, charity and hope, and then consider the problem of disbelief and evil.

* * *

The history of Narnia recorded in _the Chronicles_ is as follows:
In *The Magician's Nephew*, the Narnian world is created by Aslan. Two children, Digory and Polly, come to Narnia by the magic rings made by Digory's uncle, Andrew, and witness the creation. The creation is absolutely good, and yet, already at the time of the creation, an evil Witch has entered the Narnian world, whom Digory on his way from England unintentionally picked up and brought in with him. Aslan tells him to get a magic apple from a garden beyond the Western Wild and to plant it in Narnia so that the tree should keep the Witch away. Digory achieves that task, and a long spell of peaceful time begins in Narnia.

In the age of *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, however, that peace has been broken, and Narnia is reigned by a White Witch, who is keeping Narnia in the winter all the year around. Four brothers and sisters from England, that is, Peter, Susan, Edmund and Lucy Pevensie, come to Narnia through a magic wardrobe. Lucy, who has entered Narnia first, and Peter and Susan at once make friends with good Narnians and begin fighting for them against the Witch. Yet Edmund is enchanted by the Witch's candies, betrays them, runs for the Witch, and is nearly killed by her. In order to save him, Aslan offers himself to the Witch and is killed instead. Yet, the Witch enjoys her victory only for a short time, for Aslan comes back to life and help the children (including Edmund, who has repented and become good) who finally kill the Witch. Aslan enthrones the children as the Kings and Queens of Narnia and they long reign the country very well, till they come back to the human world where only a few minutes have relapsed since they went into Narnia.

In *Prince Caspian*, Caspian, the lawful prince of Narnia, has his throne and life endangered by his uncle Miraz, and calls for help by a magic horn. By its magic, the Pevensie children are drawn into Narnia and help Caspian in his battle against Miraz so as to get him to be the King.

*The Voyage of the 'Dawn Treader'* is the story of Caspian's voyage in search of seven lost faithful lords who have been banished by Miraz. Lucy and her cousin Eustace Scrubb join the voyage.

In *The Silver Chair*, Caspian is now old but his heir, Prince Rilian, is missing. Eustace and one of his school mates, Jill Pole, are called from the human world and, on Aslan's order, find Rilian in custody of a Green Witch and rescue him.

*The Horse and his Boy* begins in Calormen, a next country to Narnia. A boy named Shasta, who has discovered that his father is going to sell him as a slave, starts a journey for Narnia before being sold. A talking Narnian horse, Bree, hoping to go back to Narnia, gives him a ride. On their way, they meet an aristocratic Calormen girl, named Aravis, who has escaped a forced marriage and is now journeying for Narnia with her talking horse, Hwin, and join them. Then they hear that the Calormenes are going to attack Narnia. Shasta runs to Archenland, which is an ally to Narnia, and tells its King about the crisis. Narnia is saved. Meanwhile, it turns out that Shasta is the crown prince of Archenland who was kidnapped when he was a baby. Shasta gets married to Aravis and becomes the King.

*The Last Battle* shows us the eschatological picture of the Narnian world. A wicked ape, Shift, covers a donkey, named Puzzle, with a lion's hide and presents him as "Aslan", assuming himself as his priest. He says Aslan and the Calormene god, the evil Tash, are the same thing and demands worship and offerings from the Narnians. The King Tirian argues against Shift and gets caught.
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As Tirian prays for help, Jill and Eustace are drawn into Narnia by magic and rescue him. A battle occurs between the Narnians and the Calormenies. Tash appears. Yet, Aslan also appears and then, both Tash and all the Calormenies disappear. Aslan opens a door that leads to Aslan’s country, or heaven, and before that door, all the Narnians are judged and divided into two groups: one is to enter through the door into Aslan’s country and the other is to be banished into darkness. All those who love and keep faith in Aslan enter Aslan’s country and find it is a country just like Narnia, as if one reflected in a mirror, yet more wonderful. The children from human world also come into Aslan’s country, never to be sent back, for they are dead in England in a train accident. Yet, their earthly death is not their end: the true story begins here when the Narnian world ends and they begin to live in the Aslan’s country.

II Faith

Terence Penelhum in his *Problems of Religious Belief* points out that the word “faith” means either acceptance of the preposition that God exists (its Latin equivalent is *fides*) or personal commitment to God (*fiducia*). He says that one can believe God’s existence without committing himself to Him; i.e., there is *fides* without *fiducia*.

Lewis, too, is conscious of the difference between these two kinds of faith, though he does not express it as *fides* and *fiducia*. In an essay “Is theism important?” where he discusses utility and necessity of theological proofs, he distinguishes what he calls “faith-A” and “faith-B.” Faith-A is “a settled intellectual assent” that God exists. Faith-B is “a trust, or confidence, in the God whose existence is thus assented to. This involves an attitude of the will.” (Dock, pp. 172–173)

The problem of faith in Narnia is in the main in the realm of *fiducia*, or personal commitment to Aslan. In Narnia, Aslan’s relation to his creatures is easier to be seen than that of God to man in our actual world, because while the Christian God of ours is supernatural, Aslan is not. In Narnia, there is no division between supernatural reality and the actual life. Aslan interferes in the creatures’ life in person. He is the Lord not only metaphysically but also secularly. Or rather, to the Narnians, what we call metaphysical world is not metaphysical at all. In Narnia, then, different from our world where existence of God is often in question, there are only a few who doubt the existence of Aslan. His authority as the Lord is also so obvious that the problem for the most characters is not whether they should obey him but how they should obey him. Lewis is always emphasizing the importance of whole commitment of self to God in all the departments of life. In *Letters to Malcolm*, for instance, he says, “We have no non-religious activities; only religious and irreligious.[...] We have been speaking of religion as a pattern of behaviour—which, if contentedly departmental, cannot really be Christian behaviour.” (pp. 30–31) It is not enough to know that God exists. One should always try to see and carry out God's will. Lewis finds the Lord’s Prayer, “Thy will be done” to be the petition: “not merely that I may patiently suffer God’s will but also that I may vigorously do it. I must be an agent as well as a patient.” He says, “I am asking that I may be enabled to do it. In the long run I am asking to be given ‘the same mind which was also in Christ.’” (Malcolm, p. 26) Thus, true faith should be accompanied by action.

In Narnia, the importance of active commitment to Aslan is expressed by the fact that only those
who are carrying out or at least trying to carry out Aslan's will are able to know him. Even those who believe Aslan fail to recognize him when they are momentarily not ready to see and do what he wants them to do.

In *Prince Caspian*, for instance, when the Pevensie children are hurrying their way to rescue Caspian, Aslan appears. Then, it is Lucy alone that recognizes him at once. She reads his will in his face that they should take a path up the gorge through the forest and go where he is waiting. However, Peter does not see him and chooses the way down in the opposite direction. Susan almost sees Aslan, but she feels too tired to go up and wouldn't let herself see him lest she should have to come up to him. Next day, she confesses this to Lucy after she eventually came to see Aslan:

> I really believed it was him—he, I mean—yesterday. [...] I mean, deep down inside. Or I could have, if I’d let myself. But I just wanted to get out of the woods and—and—Oh, I don’t know. (*Caspian*, p. 132)

It is difficult to keep following Aslan’s will incessantly. The way he points to is not necessarily an easy one, though it is always the right one. Those like Susan, who is not strong enough, are easily tempted to choose the easier way even when they suspect that the harder way should be the one to take. They consciously or unconsciously try not to see him, because they know that once they should meet him they should have no choice but to obey him however hard the way may be. Leanne Payne remarks, “A root meaning of the term to obey is to listen.” Christ always follows the Father by listening to His will. For those in Narnia, too, seeing is following and when they do not want to follow they would not see. Men can shut their mental eyes and become unable to see of their own will. Until they reopen their eyes of faith, their physical eyes do not see Aslan even when he is before them. This is why Susan fails to recognize him in the woods though she fundamentally believes in him. Faith in the sense of *fiducia* calls for the will to follow the Lord incessantly, and she lacks it.

Later, Susan turns out to be the only one who has been to Narnia and yet forgets it. Back in the human world, she gets wholly occupied in her daily life with dresses, parties, etc., and loses interest in Narnia. She comes to regard Narnia as no more than an imaginary country which she made up with her brothers and sister in their childhood just for fun. In *The Screwtape Letters*, Lewis points out that the ordinary every day routine has the power of making people think of the supernatural as something unbelievable and unrealistic. (cf. *Screwtape*, p. 13) The visible worldly life tends to feel more realistic than the supernatural world. It is also true to Susan. As Evan K. Gibson points out, she is the most practical one of the four children. It is Susan who first thinks of provisions against cold and hunger in *The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe* or in *Prince Caspian*—and therefore the one that would most easily feel the practical ordinary life to be the most “real” thing. (cf. *Lion*, p. 54; *Caspian*, p. 98) In *Prince Caspian*, then, it can be said that Peter and Susan come to see through Lucy's perseverance and suffering for them, for Lucy has had considerable difficulty in getting them to see Aslan.

On the other hand, just opposite to Susan who loses sight of Aslan whom she has nearly seen,
Edmund comes to see Aslan when he believes Lucy who says she has seen him, though at first he did not see him at all. Edmund believes her because he remembers that when they first came to Narnia it was also Lucy who first found and told them about Narnia, and that though they did not believe her story at first, eventually they themselves strayed into Narnia to find out that she had been right. When all the Pevensie children meet Aslan face to face afterwards, Aslan says to him “Well done.” (Caspian, p.133) Edmund’s sight of Aslan is a reward for his believing without seeing. As Jesus once said to Thomas, “blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.” (John, 21, 29) Edmund is blessed by Aslan. In Edmund’s case, then, it is his belief that allows him to see.

The reason why Lucy sees Aslan when the others do not is that she alone keeps her eyes, with all her heart and mind, open to him all the time. She never doubts he is good, and follows him unconditionally with love. When she sees him, she runs to him almost before she knows it.

She never stopped to think whether he was a friendly lion or not. She rushed to him. She felt her heart would burst if she lost a moment. (pp. 122–124)

She is an *anima naturaliter Christiana*, a born Christian, who naturally loves God. She believes in Aslan literally “as a child.”

In *the Chronicles*, Lewis repeatedly emphasizes the importance of will to believe. While in his apologetic works such as *Mere Christianiy* and *Miracles* he tries to establish logical arguments for the existence of God, in his fiction, he admits that all that human reason can do for the acquisition of faith is to show the high probability of God’s existence. After all, we need to believe without a decisive proof. In *The Voyage of the ‘Dawn Treader’*, the daughter of a retired star tells Edmund who is wondering whether he can trust her or not,

>You can’t know [...] You can only believe—or not. (Dawn Treader, p. 170)

Though her words in this context do not refer to the belief in God, or in Aslan, they show us what Lewis thinks to be the essence of faith. St. Tertullian is said to hold “*credo quia impossibile est.*” (*De Carne Christi*, V.) And St. Augustine also is believed to say, “*credo quia absurdum.*” (*Confessions, VI. 5*) Ever since then, a long line of philosophers has seen man’s limitations in logical thinking in the attempt to know God’s existence and found the will to believe necessary—Kant, Descartes, Pascal, William James, etc. are all in this line, and Lewis here follows them.

In Narnia, such volitional faith is approved most strongly in *The Silver Chair*. There, two children, Jill and Eustace, with their Narnian guide called Puddleglum, are nearly ensnared by the Witch who has hold Prince Rilian captive underground for years. She tries to make them believe that Aslan and all the upper world are nothing but dreams. She says that Aslan must be a cat transformed in their dream, and that the sun is no more than an imaginary copy of a lump. When she tells them thus, it is impossible for them to produce counter-testimony against her, because in the underground where they are now, neither the sun nor Aslan is ever to be seen. When the
Witch plays an enchanting lyre which deprives them of clear thinking, the children and Puddleglum themselves almost believe the Witch’s words. Puddleglum, however, manages to keep sane by stepping barefoot on her fire of incense and extinguishing it. When the pain of the burned feet awakes him from the enchanted dreamy state, he declares to go on believing in Aslan and Narnia whatever the Witch may say. He says,

Suppose this black pit of a kingdom of yours is the only world. Well, it strikes me as a pretty poor one. And that’s a funny thing, when you come to think of it. We’re just babies making up a game, if you’re right. But four babies playing a game can make a play-world which licks your real world hollow. That’s why I’m going to stand by the play-world. I’m on Aslan’s side even if there isn’t any Aslan to lead it. I’m going to live as like a Narnian as I can even if there isn’t any Narnia. (pp. 156–157)

Puddleglum’s logic is similar to that of Pascal, known as “Pascal’s Wager,” in his Pansées. Pascal’s idea is this: we have either to believe in God or not to believe but our reason is not capable enough to judge which position to take. Therefore, our choice is, as it were, a wager in which we have to chose our side without any guarantee of the result. In the wager of faith, if you bet that God exists and win, you can attain God who is eternal beauty and even if you lose, you lose nothing. Therefore you had better bet on God’s existence, that is, you had better believe in God.¹⁰

This logic may seem mercenary and insincere. Actually, however, it is a positive confession of the will to believe in God while living in a world where His existence is never to be proved definitely. As a basic assumption of this logic, there is at least the belief that a life in God’s world is more desirable than anything else. In the statement that if God does not exist, suppose we lose the world, we lose nothing, it is implied that if God does not exist the world is meaningless. Above all, here there is a will to put the whole self at stake for the belief in God. It is the will for the total commitment to God, and can be called positive “faith” or fiducia. Therefore, in the Chronicles of Narnia, faith is sometimes a matter of voluntary will even on the cognitive level. No one is allowed to remain passive if he is to be in the right relation to Aslan.

On the level of action, it is even truer. In The Silver Chair, Jill is called for to be active throughout the story in her relation to Aslan. At the beginning, in England, she prays with Eustace to Aslan to bring them to Narnia and has that prayer granted. In Narnia, when Jill first meets Aslan, he tells her that he has called them from England for a task. Jill is surprised to hear this because she has thought it was because they prayed to Aslan that they have been brought to Narnia. Yet Aslan says to her,

You would not have called to me unless I had been calling to you. (Silver Chair, p. 28)

Just as Christ said to his disciplines, “Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain,” (John, 15, 16) Aslan is telling her that even in her wish to come to his country, there is Aslan’s providence that she should come and accomplish a good deed. But all the same, it has been necessary for her to call on
Aslan of her own will. Aslan’s providence and her prayer work together. Here, there would be no point in asking whether it is Jill’s will or Aslan’s that she has come to Narnia. Aslan’s initial calling, the unconscious response of Jill who does not know herself that it is response, and Aslan’s response to her respondent prayer—all of them are working together in union. At any rate, even though the first initiative is on Aslan’s side, Aslan demands man’s playing an active part in their relationship.

In *The Horse and his Boy*, Aslan accompanies Shasta on his journey for a long time without revealing himself, like Christ on the way to Emmaus. (Luke 24.13ff.) Shasta notices that some very large creature is following him, gets frightened, and at last ventures to ask “Who are you?” Then Aslan speaks to him for the first time in answer, “One who has waited long for you to speak.” (*Horse*, p. 138) Communication between Aslan and a man has to be on the man’s own will as well as Aslan’s. Revelation of Aslan thus calls for active commitment of the man who receives it.

What is also important is that, to be able to recognize Aslan’s revelation, one should be honest before him. As Lewis is to take up as a main theme later in *Till We Have Faces*, as long as a man hides his sinfulness under the veil of self-justification or self-deception, he can never meet God face to face, because while he hides his true face, he has no face with which to encounter God. In *The Silver Chair*, Eustace falls off from a high cliff soon after their arrival in Narnia. It is Jill’s fault. He falls to save her from falling when she has gone needlessly too near the edge of the cliff just to boast her courage and got dizzy. When she meets Aslan, she confesses that she is to blame for his fall. When Jill says to Aslan, “I was showing off, sir,” he says, “That is a very good answer.” (*Silver Chair*, p. 28) It is her honesty he approves of here. And it is this honesty that has first of all made it possible for her to meet Aslan.

Furthermore, even when one gets Aslan’s revelation, it is not the end. Nor is *Sola fides* enough. The revelation is to be kept alive in the mind of the recipient through conscious effort. In *The Silver Chair*, Aslan gives Jill four instructions to achieve her task and tells her to remember them by heart and repeat them all the time. Revelation, unless it is consciously remembered, will be forgotten sooner or later.

It is also necessary for a man to keep his mind consciously clear. In our actual world, even if there is God, it is difficult to know His will. In Narnia, it is the same. Aslan gives warning to Jill after he has given her the four signs,

Here on the mountain I have spoken to you clearly; I will not often do so down in Narnia. Here on the mountain the air is clear and your mind is clear; as you drop down into Narnia, the air will thicken. Take great care that it does not confuse your mind. (*Silver Chair*, p. 30)

Aslan thus demands continuous effort on the part of man to keep his mental eyes open. The essential thing is invisible. Aslan says to her further,

And the signs which you have learned here will not look at all as you expect them to look, when you meet them there. That is why it is so important to know them by heart and pay no attention to appearances. (*Silver Chair*, pp. 30–31)
In spite of Aslan’s warning, however, Jill neglects to repeat the given signs when she is tired. As a result, she soon forgets some parts of them and confuses others so as to miss three of them. Lewis is conscious that man is “at once rational and animal” (Regress, p. 13) so that one’s physical weakness may sometimes hinder his spiritual faith. In the Chronicles, Jill’s case is an example. Still, people in the Chronicles are called for to get over such difficulty and carry out their tasks. They may go astray but finally would be able to achieve Aslan’s will as long as they are trying to, and as long as they are honest enough to admit their faults and ready to come back to the right way. As Clyde S. Kilby points out, in Narnia, “though evil succeeds it is never quite able to take over completely. Though Prince Rilian was, by normal standards, insane twenty-three hours of the day, he was himself one hour. The suggestion is that a very little bit of genuine reality, with Aslan’s help, is capable of clearing the air of the unreality which fools man most of the time.” This can also be said of Jill when she finally succeeds in finding Rilian and rescuing him after repenting her negligence. The fourth sign—that is the last “bit of genuine reality” to use Kilby’s words—clears the air of Witch’s unreality for her. Robert Houston Smith sees Plato’s theory of recollection in Jill’s forgetting the signs given on the mountain:

It follows from this conception of the soul’s descent into the earthly miasma that the soul will grow forgetful of its heavenly origin during its earthy incarnation.[...] Jill’s mind does indeed grow forgetful and confused, as it must in spite of Aslan’s caution. But, clouded though the soul’s vision of the good is on Earth, there remains in each person a flickering, sputtering flame of divine truth that can be fanned into a clearer, more illuminating light under suitable circumstances. This concept is, of course, Plato’s famous theory of recollection, and Lewis accepted the insight unhesitatingly.

There is a point in this remark. Yet in Jill’s case, it is because of her laziness that she forgets the signs and should not be regarded as a natural consequence of her descent into Narnia as if she were not responsible for that. It is her sin, and what is also important is that it is her repentance and regained will to achieve Aslan’s will that enable her to find the “truth” that has been clouded.

All those who truly wishes to follow a good God is following Aslan. It is also true when an honest man has believed in the wrong god. A young Calormene, Emeth, in The Last Battle has worshipped the god Tash all his life, as he was born and brought up in a country where Tash is believed in as the good deity though in fact he is an evil and awful god. (Lewis expresses the crooked nature of Tash by the description: “having a bird’s head, he couldn’t look at you straight.” (Last Battle, p. 121) When Emeth meets Aslan for the first time in his life at the entrance to Aslan’s country, Aslan tells him,

Child, all the service thou hast done to Tash, I account as service done to me. Not because he and I are one, but because we are opposites. I take to me the services which thou hast done to him. For I and he are of such different kinds that no service which is vile can be done to me, and none which is not vile can be done to him. Therefore if any man swear by Tash and keep his oath for the oath’s sake, it is by me that he has truly sworn, though he know it not, and it is I who reward him. And if any man do a cruelty in my name, then,
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though he says the name Aslan, it is Tash whom he serves and by Tash his deed is accepted. (*Last Battle*, p. 149)

As long as one is trying to do the will of the good god, it does not matter whether the one calls the god Tash or Aslan. A real act of pursuing good is in reality an act of faith in Aslan. Aslan knows better than the young man himself that it is Aslan whom he belongs to; that he is obeying him though unconsciously. The name Emeth must have come from the Hebrew word “emeth,” that means “truth” with the implication of “faithfulness” and “permanence” as Lewis says he has learned from *Encyclopedia Biblica* (1914).[^1] Aslan tells Emeth, “Beloved,[…] unless thy desire had been for me thou wouldst not have sought so long and so truly. For all find what they truly seek.” (*Last Battle*, p. 149)

The salvation of Emeth who has worshipped the wrong god might be seen as implying universalism. However, the point here is not that every believer of any religion will be saved in the long run. What is stressed here in the case of Emeth is that no one who truly seeks for good cannot long keep following what is actually an evil. These words of Aslan remind us of what Lewis refers to as “the dialectic of Desire” in his autobiographical allegory, *The Pilgrim’s Regress*. (p. 10) A man’s true desire to attain what is really vital for his life is never satisfied until he gets the object, which is, in Lewis’s view in the actual life, is God, heaven and Christianity. In the process of “the dialectic of Desire,” anything that is not the true object of the desire betrays its falsity once it is really experienced, even if it has appeared to be the most desirable thing on earth. This is why the long endurance of Emeth’s faith is a proof of its rightness.

Actually, Lewis thinks that the people who never hear of Christianity or who honestly reject it, can be saved, but those who know Christianity and yet without serious consideration chose not to follow Christ, whether from laziness or from easy scepticism, cannot be saved. Discussing the problem whether man can lead a good life without believing in Christianity, Lewis says,

We all know[…] men like Socrates and Confucius who had never heard of it, or men like J.S.Mill who quite honestly couldn’t believe it. Supposing Christianity to be true, these men were in a state of honest ignorance or honest error. If their intentions were as good as I suppose them to have been (for of course I can’t read their secret hearts) I hope and believe that the skill and mercy of God will remedy the evils which their ignorance, left to itself, would naturally produce both for them and for those whom they influenced. But the man who asks me, ‘Can’t I lead a good life without believing in Christianity?’ is clearly not in the same position. If he hadn’t heard of Christianity he would not be asking this question. If, having heard of it, and having seriously considered it, he had decided that it was untrue, then once more he would not be asking the question.[…] The man is shirking.[…] Honest rejection of Christ, however mistaken, will be forgiven and healed[…] But to evade the Son of Man, to look the other way, to pretend you haven’t noticed,[…] this is a different matter. (*Man or Rabbit*, *Duck*, pp. 110–111)

Alan Lee Brewer points out that “Lewis, like Barth, does not, limit salvation to those who are a part of the visible church. Although Christ is the absolute necessity in salvation, this does not mean that
one must have a knowledge of Christ in this lifetime in order to be saved."\textsuperscript{[14]}

His stress lies upon the more personal aspects of Christianity, and most of the references to the church which he does make are in this personal context. Institutional religion is largely ignored, especially in his fiction.[...] One primary reason for this is Lewis's own admission that he had a great deal of difficulty with mainstream movements and with the corporate activities of the church such as worship. Lewis feared the church's tendency to become a club, a social or political organization, rather than place of worship.\textsuperscript{[15]}

John Hick in "The Non-Absoluteness of Christianity" remarks;

The Second Vatican Council (1963–1965) highlighted and consolidated the new thinking that had been taking place for a number of years among some of the more adventurous Roman Catholic theologians. Vatican II in effect—though not of course in so many words—repealed the extra ecclesiam nulla salus doctrine by declaring that there is salvation outside the visible church; the redemption bought by the blood of Christ is offered to all human beings even without their formal entry into the church. Thus, speaking of Christ's redeeming sacrifice, Vatican II taught:

All this holds true not only for Christians, but for all men of good will in whose hearts grace works in an unseen way. For, since Christ died for all men, and since the ultimate vocation of man is in fact one, and divine, we ought to believe that the Holy Spirit in a manner known only to God offers to every man the possibility of being associated with this paschal mystery.*

The possibility of salvation was thus officially extended in principle to the whole world. This extension was reiterated even more strongly in the first encyclical, Redemptor Hominis (1979), of Pope John Paul II, in which it is declared that "man—every man without exception whatever—has been redeemed by Christ, [...] because with man—with each man without any exception whatever—Christ is in a way united, even when man is unaware of it."**

(*Pastoral Constitution on the Church, par. 22.
**Redemptor Hominis (London; Catholic Truth Society, 1979), par. 14.)\textsuperscript{[16]}

From this we may say that in advance of the global ecumenical movement of this century, Lewis here sees the truth outside of the principle extra ecclesiam nulla salus.

Yet, on the other hand, Lewis never holds religious pluralism. Rather, he seems to be nearer to Karl Rahner who sees some truth in pagan religions while admitting, "It is possibly too much to hope, [...] that the religious pluralism which exists in the concrete situation of Christians will disappear in the foreseeable future."\textsuperscript{[17]} Then we see Emeth as a type of what Rahner conceives as "an anonymous Christian" as follows:

God-pleasing pagan was already a theme of the Old testament, and especially since this God-pleasing pagan cannot simply be thought of as living absolutely outside the concrete socially constituted religion and constructing his own religion on his native foundations [...]

— 66 —
if we wish to be Christians, we must profess belief in the universal and serious salvific purpose of God towards all men which is true even within the post-paradisian phase of salvation dominated by original sin. [...] Christianity does not simply confront the member of an extra-Christian religion as a mere non-Christian but as someone who can and must already be regarded in this or that respect as an anonymous Christian. It would be wrong to regard the pagan as someone who has not yet been touched in any way by God’s grace and truth. If, however, he has experienced the grace of God [...] then he has already been given revelation in a true sense even before he has been affected by missionary preaching from without.  

In the Chronicles, faith in Aslan is vital for every creature. And that faith should be both fides and fiducia: belief in Aslan’s existence and authority as the Lord, and commitment of the self to him with the active will to do his will.

III Charity

In Mere Christianity, Lewis points out that “Charity” or “Love” in the Christian sense” is a state not of the feelings but of the will. It is different from natural liking or affection. Natural likings and dislikes are neither sin nor virtue. They are just facts. Charity towards another person or another self is the wish and will to do it good “just because it is a self, made (like us) by God, and desiring its own happiness as we desire ours.” (Mere Christianity, pp. 114–115)

In man’s relation to God, Charity means the will “to do His will:” for, Lewis says, “If we are trying to do His will we are obeying the commandment, ‘Thou shalt love the Lord thy God.’” (Mere Christianity, p. 116)

In this light and from what we have discussed on the problem of “faith” in the Chronicles, we see that in Narnia, charity and faith are indivisible. We may say that what Lewis sees in faith in the sense of fiducia, or the active will and commitment of oneself to do Aslan’s will is in large part what he sees in charity towards God. Lucy’s faith in Aslan is unconditional, childlike love that involves her wish to follow him for ever. In The Last Battle, those who are to follow the way into Aslan’s country are marked not only by their faith but also by their love for Aslan himself. Therefore, it can be said that real faith in Aslan is accompanied by charity, and vice versa.

IV Hope—Into Narnia and to Aslan’s Country

The third of the theological virtue is Hope: that is, the hope for God’s kingdom and for a regenerated life. It is, in Lewis’s words, “a continual looking forward to the eternal world.” (Mere Christianity, p. 116) In Narnia, this hope takes the form of hope for Aslan’s country. In the Chronicles, three worlds exists: Narnia, the human world from which children visit Narnia, and Aslan’s country which is the counterpart of heaven, that is, God’s Kingdom.

When human children go to Narnia, or when Narnian people (or beasts) go to Aslan’s country from Narnia, it is usually Aslan who sends them from one world to another. The comings and goings between the human world and Narnia are either by magic or through Aslan’s direct working. In either case, there is some supernatural power at work. It is said that magic is “the only
way of getting to Narnia,” (Dawn Treader, p. 11) though it is not necessarily magic by a human magician. Actually, except in The Magician’s Nephew where it is by magic rings made by Uncle Andrew that human children go to Narnia, the children are all drawn into Narnia or stray into it by a certain power which is beyond human control. The initiative is on Aslan’s side. Besides, it is always Aslan who decides when they should go back to the human world. Children have no choice even of whether to stay or to go back. Then, there is Aslan’s providence also in the Children’s roles in Narnia. Tasks are always assigned to them, rather than chosen by them, and they have to carry them out readily and voluntarily.

Besides, it is only children who can go to Narnia, which symbolically shows, “Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.” (Matthew, 18,3) Thus, Narnia is not only another world for the children from human world. It is also an entrance to the Real Aslan’s country, or heaven. When Lucy, Edmund, and Peter are killed in our world in a railway accident, they are moved to Narnia and then go to Aslan’s country from Narnia. Narnia is, for them, a world bridging the human world and Aslan’s heaven. As Michael Edwards points out, they “enter it by magic as the figure of grace, and although it is not heaven (it is not Aslan’s own country) all the children who are admitted there know it to be better than this world. It stands between our life on earth and our future life in heaven, and it represents in part[…] the experience of heaven that we have on earth.”

From the genesis in The Magician’s Nephew to the apocalypse in The Last Battle, we see a καταγωγή under Aslan’s providence leading to the coming of his kingdom. After the invasion of evil into the innocent young Narnia in The Magician’s Nephew, a disaster equivalent to the Fall in Genesis, there is a long term of the White Witch’s evil reign. At the same time, there also is a prophecy that “when two Sons of Adam and two Daughters of Eve sit in those four thrones [at the castle of Cair Paravel], then it will be the end not only of the White Witch’s reign but of her life.” (Lion, p. 77) This is a prophecy of the conquest of the original evil in the Narnian world, as there was the prophecy of Jesus Christ’s victory in ours. Also, just as Jesus prophesied his suffering to the disciples, when in The Magician’s Nephew Aslan prophesies Narnia’s hard times under the Witch, he suggests his own suffering to come:

Evil will come of that evil, but it is still a long way off, and I will see to it that the worst fall upon myself. (Magician’s, p. 126)

Aslan’s death on the Stone Table is vicarious death for Edmund. It is a sacrifice of the innocent for the life of the guilty who really deserves death. It is an act of totally disinterested love, and his resurrection with the break of the Stone Table (which has laws on it as Moshe’s tables of testimonies did) symbolizes the victory of love over the mercilessly exacting laws. Here, as Glover points out, “The Deeper Magic of mercy triumphs over the Deep Magic of the law of justice.” Sammons also sees “the stone knife as symbols for God’s law, which requires death as a penalty for sin. When the sacrifice is over, the Table is divided in two as was the veil in the Tabernacle after Christ’s crucifixion.” At the same time, Aslan’s death and rebirth is also a prototype of the death of old
self and regeneration through the atonement, though in Aslan's case, the death he has suffered is not for his own sin but Edmund's. Through Aslan's death and rebirth, Edmund is remade into a good being. Tamnus the Faun's being turned into a stone statue and coming back to life by Aslan's breath signifies most clearly the pattern of death of the old self and rebirth by Aslan (or by God).

If *The Magician's Nephew* is Narnia's genesis and *The Last Battle* is its apocalypse, *The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe* is its equivalent to the story of Jesus's atonement of the original sin. *The Horse and His Boy, Prince Caspian, The Voyage of the Dawn Treader*, and *The Silver Chair* are stories of people who live between that atonement and the end of time when Aslan comes back to judge them. During that time, as in the *anno domini* eras of our world, people may know Aslan and come to live in faith, or they may drift away from him. They are given free choice whether or not to obey him. Lucy and Reepicheep are among those who believe and follow Aslan from the first. Edmund and Eustace are regenerated into his followers. There are also those in Calormen who follow the god Tash instead of Aslan. Yet the people are not forever given that free choice. Aslan opens a door which leads to another world from Narnia twice, that is, in *Prince Caspian* and in *The Last Battle*. Each time, the door divides people into those who follow Aslan and those who do not. Yet it is only in *Prince Caspian* that people have real choice.

In *Prince Caspian*, the door leads to the human world. It is for those Narnian people whose ancestors came from there. Aslan lets them choose whether to go to human world through the door or to stay in Narnia. None do not have to go out through the door if they want to stay in Narnia; neither are those who choose to go out of Narnia condemned for preferring being away from Aslan's world. They are even approved by Aslan for their faith in him to believe his words that the door really leads to the world for men. Aslan says to the first man who has decided to go through the door:

> It is well chosen [...] And because you have spoken first, strong magic is upon you. Your future in that world shall be good. Come forth. (*Prince Caspian*, p.186)

It is probably because Narnia is not made up as an allegory of the Christian City of God that these people are not punished for choosing to live out of it. Or it may be because when one believes in Aslan, Aslan is there with him whatever world he is in.

However, in *The Last Battle*, the case is different. Aslan opens a door to his country from Narnia, and then people (and talking beasts) are devided by Aslan before the door into two groups: those who are going to Aslan's country and those who are not. It is the Last Judgment. This time, no one has any choice which group to join.

But as they came up to Aslan one or other of two things happened to each of them. They all looked straight in his face; I don't think they had any choice about that. And when some looked, the expression of their faces changed terribly—it was fear and hatred [...] lasted only for a fraction of a second. You could see that they suddenly ceased to be Talking Beasts. They were just ordinary animals. And all the creatures who looked at Aslan in that way [...] disappeared into his huge black shadow, which [...] streamed away to the left of the
doorway. [...] But the others looked in the face of Aslan and loved him, though some of these were very frightened at the same time. And all these came in at the Door, in on Aslan's right. (Last Battle, p. 140)

Their love for Aslan may be mixed with fear and yet be true expression of faith. Lewis is here suggesting his belief that God is awful as well as attractive.

It is significant that the judgment is done not through inquiry and answer, but simply by meeting with Aslan face to face. There is no room for pretence or lying. Clyde S. Kilby says, "Narnia is less a place divided into good and bad-acting creatures than those with a 'germ' of goodness or badness developing towards fulfillment." Then, above all, meeting with Aslan has such strange and strong power as to reveal and fulfill that 'germ' and essential character of the one who sees him. In Prince Caspian, when a man beating a boy sees Aslan, he turns to a tree with the beating stick as one of its branch. Pig-like nasty boys become pigs, and a teacher who immediately loves Aslan begins dancing. This meeting with the Lord is then the most crucial thing to determine whether one is to be saved or not, which is to be an important theme later in Till We Have Faces.

<Longing>

Now, many of those who go to Aslan's country or to Narnia have had a special sort of longing for Aslan or for Aslan's country. The longing is the same sort of desire as that "Joy," of which Lewis tells us in his autobiography Surprised by Joy as its theme, a longing that he has had since he was a child, a longing which is "an unsatisfied desire which is itself more desirable than any other satisfaction," (p. 20) and which he sees to have been a desire for heaven.

Shasta in The Horse and his Boy longs for Narnia, which is to the north beyond the hill. He has been brought up like a slave by a Calormene but, in fact, he is a Narnian prince kidnapped by the man when he was a baby. He does not know his own identity, and his yearning for Narnia is an unconscious longing for the place he really belongs to. It is described as this:

[H]e was very interested in everything that lay to the Norse because no one ever went that way and he was never allowed to go there himself. When he was sitting out of doors mending the nets, and all alone, he would often look eagerly to the Norse. [...] Shasta thought that beyond the hill there must be some delightful secret. (Horse, p. 12)

This description reminds us of the young Lewis's own longing for the Castlereagh Hills that he saw from the nursery windows, which he remembers thus:

They were not very far off but they were, to children, quite unattainable. They taught me longing—Sehensucht. (Joy, p. 12)

Jewel, the unicorn, has also a longing for Aslan's country unconsciously. Aslan's country is the real and eternal home for his people, and it is why Shasta, Jewel and others feel such a longing for it. It is a sort of homesickness. Jewel cries out with joy when he comes and sees Aslan's country:
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I have come home at last! This is my real country! I belong here. This is the land I have been looking for all my life, though I never knew it till now. The reason why we loved the old Narnia is that it sometimes looked a little like this. Bree-hee-hee! Come farther up, come farther in! (*Last Battle*, p. 155)

Here, Smith again reads Plato’s theory of recollection. Brewer agrees with Smith and adds to reminds us that “This idea follows the earlier conception of Augustine as well.” Indeed Plato says in *Phaedrus* that “every soul of man has by the law of nature beheld the realities” and “gain from earthly things a recollection of those realities.” (*249E*)

Few then are left which retain an adequate recollection of them; but these when they seen here any likeness of the things of that other world, are stricken with amazement and can no longer control themselves; but they do not understand their condition, because they do not clearly perceive. (*250 A-B*)

Jewel has somehow recognized images of Aslan’s country in Narnia and loved them, though he did “not understand [his] condition, because [he did] not clearly perceive.”

The most conspicuous and straightforward of all who long for Aslan’s country is Reepicheep, the mouse. He got a prophesy when he was still in his cradle:

> Where sky and water meet,  
> Where the waves grow sweet,  
> Doubt not Reepicheep,  
> To find all you seek,  
> There is the utter East. (*Dawn Treader*, p. 24)

Ever since that time, he has yearned for the utter East, believing that Aslan’s country is there. He is glad to join King Caspian’s voyage to the east because he thinks it is the way for realization of his lifelong dream. He rejoices to hear that in order to wake three Narnian lords from enchanted sleep, King Caspian has to sail as near to the world’s end as he can and leave at least one member of his crew there. It is said that the one who is to be left behind “must go on into the utter east and never return into the world.” Reepicheep then eagerly insists that he should be the one who is to be left, saying, “That is my heart’s desire.” (*Dawn Treader*, p. 175) The firmness of his determination to go to Aslan’s country is expressed in his words on his parting from others.

> While I can, I sail east in the *Dawn Treader*. When she fails me, I paddle east in my coracle. When she sinks, I shall swim east with my four paws. And when I can swim no longer, if I have not reached Aslan’s country, or shot over the edge of the world in some vast cataract, I shall sink with my nose to the sunrise[...] (*Dawn Treader*, p. 180)

This obstinacy and courage in the pursuit of Aslan’s country, against every possible hardship, take him there at the end of the voyage.
<Courage>

It is significant that Reepicheep, who is the first in the Chronicles to go to Aslan’s country is so courageous. In fact, his first characteristic has been courageousness all his life. When Caspian and his councils are discussing how to fight with Miraz, Reepicheep and his mice are the first that propose “storming Miraz in his own castle that very night.” (Caspian, p.77) During the voyage in the Dawn Treader, he jumps into the sea all by himself as soon as he sees a group of sea people with long spears in their hands, who look hostile. When the ship comes near the end of the sea, his courage as well as yearning for Aslan’s country keeps him going without fear, while Caspian and Edmund show a little hesitation because no one knows what is beyond that end. Furthermore, Reepicheep chivalrously values his honour most, which fortifies his courageous attitudes although he cares for his honour rather excessively that once Aslan tells him, “I have sometimes wondered, friend, [...] whether you do not think too much about your honour.” (Caspian, p. 177)

In any case, courage is regarded as a necessary condition if one wants to follow Aslan as far as his country. When Susan has failed to see Aslan in the wood because of her unconscious desire to avoid taking the harder road to him, Aslan tells her, “You have listened to fears, child.” (Caspian, p. 133) Without courage, it is difficult to overcome hardships and keep following Aslan.

In Mere Christianity, Lewis points out that the “Fortitude,” or courage, enunciated as a “Cardinal” virtue in Christianity includes not only the kind of courage to face danger but also the courage to stick to virtues under hardships. He says, “You will notice, of course, that you cannot practice any of the other virtues very long without bringing this one[i.e. Fortitude] into play.” (Mere Christianity, p. 73) Susan is an example of those who thus fail to follow Aslan to his country even though having faith and love for him.

<The door to Aslan’s country>

On the other hand, while man need courage and faith, the way to enter Aslan’s country is at least open to everyone of every world, to humans as well as to Narnians. When Aslan sends Lucy back to the human world, he says to her, who says she will miss him in her world,

But you shall meet me, dear one [...] 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, you may know me better there. (Dawn Treader, p. 209)

These words imply that God, Jesus and Aslan are all one under the different names. Lewis believes in God’s Incarnation as a myth that became a fact. As R. J. Reilly points out, not only Narnia but in the human history, too, after the Incarnation,

fact and myth do not necessarily exclude each other: pre-Christian myth (as in Lewis’s scale) may be largely non-factual, but post-Christian history will be not only factual but still mythic
What Aslan says above is that when we have an eye of faith we will meet him here in this world, too. Aslan says, “There is a way into my country from all the worlds.”

John Hick, who has seen people in many races holding different religions and seeming to be saved by their religious belief and practices, says in The Metaphor of God Incarnate that “although our age is increasingly post-traditionally Christian, it may well be receptive to a non-traditional Christianity centred upon the universally relevant religious experience and ethical insights of Jesus when these are freed from the mass of ecclesiastical dogmas and practices [...] Unlike the traditional version, such a non-traditional Christianity must of course see itself, not as the one and only ‘true religion’, but as one authentic spiritual path among others, open to influences from the wider religious experience of humankind.”

Although Lewis himself firmly believes that Christianity is the only way to salvation, in Narnia, he perhaps unintentionally heralds the movement of today’s multi-cultural, religious-pluralism movement. When Lucy asks Aslan how to get to his country from the human world, he says,

I shall be telling you all the time [...] But I will not tell you how long or short the way will be; only that it lies across a river. But do not fear that, for I am the great Bridge Builder. (Dawn Treader, p. 209)

For us human beings, the way to Aslan’s country, or heaven, will open when we die, that is, when we go across the river. Yet, Narnian people, for whom Aslan’s country is not metaphysical but is in the same spatio-temporal dimension, can go there even without once dying. For them, doors to heaven are hidden in quite ordinary places. In The Last Battle, for instance, those who keep faith in Aslan find Aslan’s country in a stable, where those who disbelieve him find nothing extraordinary. Then the fact that it is hidden thus from the unfaithful people emphasizes again the importance of having an inner eye of faith.

Aslan’s country is like Plato’s world of Idea. In it, Narnia looks just like the old Narnia but holds deeper reality; only it is more real. Lewis compares the new Narnia in Aslan’s country to the world reflected in a looking-glass.

the scene in the mirror, or the valley in the mirror, were in one sense just the same as the real one: yet at the same time they were somehow different—deeper, more wonderful, more like places in a story: in a story you have never heard but very much want to know. The difference between the old Narnia and the new Narnia was like that. The new one was a deeper country: every rock and flower and blade of grass looked as if it meant more. (Last Battle, pp. 155–156)

Looking at the new Narnia, Digory says, “It’s all in Plato, all in Plato.” (Last Battle, p. 154) It is the real country of which our world is only “the Shadowlands.” (Last Battle, p. 165) It might seem peculiar that Lewis sees the world in the mirror more real than our actual world, but it is probably
an influence of the medieval model of the universe that he has studied as a literary scholar. In *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Literature*, Lewis says that the Medieval mythical model of the world is "our universe inside out." (*Studies*, p. 62) Conversely, if our universe is inside out, it also follows that, another world which opens inside this actual world naturally seems greater, or sometimes more significant. The light of sky which is outer than the earth in our universe is shining inside in the Real World. Thus, in the eschatological scene in *The Last Battle*, Jewel, the unicorn, leads the others farther and farther into Aslan's country, crying, "Come farther up, come father in!" (pp. 144, 155–157)

In the new Narnia Lucy finds a garden up the hill. Inside it she recognizes yet another Narnia which looks just like the first new Narnia that she has found in the Aslan's country.

Lucy looked hard at the garden and saw that it was not really a garden at all but a whole world, with its own rivers and woods and sea and mountains. But they were not strange: she knew them all.

'I see,' she said. 'This is still Narnia, and, more real and more beautiful than the Narnia down below, just as it was more real and more beautiful than the Narnia outside the Stable door! I see . . . world within world, Narnia within Narnia . . . .' 'Yes,' said Mr Tumnus, 'like an onion: except that as you go in and in, each circle is larger than the last.' (*Last Battle*, pp. 162–163)

Thus, in the Real World, such as Aslan's country, what is in the smallest point inside can also be the greatest. This is sometimes true also in our actual world, in respect of the meaning of the things. Seeing the new Narnia in the stable, Lucy reminds us of Christ's Incarnation:

In our world too, a Stable once had something inside it that is bigger than our whole world. (*Last Battle*, p. 128)

Here Kathryn Lindskoog sees Lewis's claim "that everywhere the great enters the little, and that its power to do so almost proves its greatness."30) Hope in *the Chronicles* is the hope for such a meaningful country of Aslan that lies inside of and at the same time further up the Narnian world.

Besides, Aslan's country is also something like the empirical heaven that surrounds the whole cosmos in the Ptolemaic world picture. In the New Narnia, Lucy finds that "the huge mountain which they had called Aslan's country" is "part of a great chain of mountains which ringed round the whole world." (*Last Battle*, p. 163) In the medieval picture of the universe, the empirical heaven which is spatially the most outside has the most profound, greatest significance. Likewise, Aslan's country which is the most meaningful is, while in the deepest and highest part of the New Narnia, paradoxically, at the outermost as well. Then what is significant here is that, for those who, like Lucy, has real eyes to see, such an outermost reality is not at all a far away thing. She finds "whatever she looked at, however far away it might be, once she had fixed her eyes steadily on it, became quite clear and close as if she were looking through a telescope."(Ibid.) As Lucy's words above suggest, in our world, too, things and moments of great importance may be hidden in a
quite ordinary place and time, and we may notice them if our minds are open; and once we notice them, however far away they may seem at first, if we keep our eyes on them, they will become near and clear to us.

V Disbelief

<Open scepticism>

Though most of the inhabitants of Narnia believe in Aslan, there are a few that are sceptical about him. Trumpkin in *Prince Caspian*, who is a dwarf and subject of Caspian, is one of the few that take Aslan for a superstition. When Caspian is going to blow the magic horn which is said to bring Aslan’s help, Trumpkin does not believe its power and says to the prince, “Your Majesty knows I think the Horn [...] and your great King Peter—and your Lion Aslan—are all eggs in moonshine.” (pp. 85–86)

And yet, his scepticism is different from a final disbelief. He eventually meets Aslan and comes to believe in him. When he first sees Aslan, though he is afraid of him, he totters towards him instead of getting away. This is a deed of self-surrender. At a glance, he apprehends the authority of Aslan as the Lord and follows him at once. Thus, since as we have seen above only those who are ready to trust in Aslan have an inward eye to recognize him as the Lord, Trumpkin is a type who is already on the way to faith even while he is still doubting Aslan’s existence.

Virtually, Trumpkin has already been obeying Aslan since the time when he was still a sceptic. Having once told the Prince that he thinks Aslan and the magic of the horn to be mere superstitions, when he sees the Prince still keep his belief in Aslan and in the power of magic horn, he not only agrees that the Prince should blow it but also willingly offers to go on an errand to meet the saviour or saviours who are expected to come by the magic. He says,

> I know the difference between giving advice and taking orders. You’ve had my advice, and now it’s the time for orders. (p. 87)

Through this obedience, he is obeying Aslan through Caspian. It is this readiness to act in obedience to the orders of the one he has once decided to follow, even in face of occasional doubt about the virtue of the orders, that is characteristic of him and that eventually leads him to the faith in Aslan. When he meets Peter, Susan, Edmund and Lucy who have been drawn to Narnia by the horn, he does not at once recognize their capacity as saviours, since they appear to be merely ordinary children. But once he finds their fighting ability in archery and sword to be even stronger than his, he comes to believe that they are the true ancient Kings and Queens brought back by the magic as saviours; and once he believes, he becomes a most faithful subject of the four children.

Trumpkin’s scepticism, then, can be called “open scepticism.” It is scepticism of those who have an open mind, ready to admit the mistake in its disbelief and accept belief when sufficient evidence turns up.
<Closed scepticism>

On the other hand, there is such scepticism as can be called “closed scepticism” that would never lead to faith. Nikabrik, who is also a dwarf, is one with this sort of scepticism. He somehow misconceives that the dwarfs are not treated rightly in the Narnian society, and this misconception has nurtured hostile feelings in him towards other species. His inner hostility keeps him from collaboration and sympathy with others in the critical moment of his country. He thinks that they might as well call on the Witch for help if the Witch could be stronger than Aslan. If the Witch is evil and Aslan is good, it does not matter to him at all. In that sense, he is amoral. For him, the only thing that is important is such power as is strong enough to bring his party victory. Besides, he doubts that Aslan is really on their side. When the help does not come for some time after Caspian has blown the horn, he says to the Prince,

If there ever was a High King Peter and a Queen Susan and a King Edmund and a Queen Lucy, then either they have not heard us, or they cannot come, or they are our enemies [...] Either Aslan is dead, or he is not on our side. Or else something stronger than himself keeps him back. And if he did come—how do we know he’d be our friend? (Caspian, pp. 143–144)

When he says this, he has brought two friends with him, who are allegorical figures of “hatred” and “hunger” that express Nikabrik’s inner hatred and dissatisfaction. He projects these negative hostile feelings on other people and suspects enemies in Peter, Susan, Edmund, Lucy and Aslan, for those who are fundamentally opposed to the outer world should necessarily see enemies everywhere. After all, Nikabrik is killed by Edmund and Caspian who prevent him from calling up the Witch by black magic. Hatred makes people go astray. Caspian shows sympathy for Nikabrik who died out of hatred:

I am sorry for Nikabrik [...] though he hated me from the first moment he saw me. He had gone sour inside from long suffering and hating. If we had won quickly he might have become a good Dwarf in the days of peace. (p. 149)

His scepticism is in clear contrast with the firm faith of Trufflehunter, a badger. Trufflehunter never doubts the power of the horn when the help they are expecting does not come soon. He says “The help will come [...] I stand by Aslan. Have patience, like us beasts. The help will come.” (Caspian, p. 141)

In Narnia, animals are often more faithful than man and dwarfs. The animals who believe do so firmly to the end. Trufflehunter takes such obstinacy in belief for granted. He says,

No credit to me, your Majesty. I’m a beast and we don’t change. I’m a badger, what’s more, and we hold on. (p. 149)

There is nothing proud about him here. The fact that men and dwarfs often fall into scepticism
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when animals hold on to faith shows that in Narnia, man is not necessarily superior to animals. Yuko Noro sees the theme of Prince Caspian as the battle against disbelief. Caspian says to Trumpkin who asks ‘But who believes in Aslan nowadays?’  

I do,[...] And if I hadn’t believed in him before, I would now. Back there among the Humans the people who laughed at Aslan would have laughed at stories about Talking Beasts and Dwarfs. Sometimes I did wonder if there really was such a person as Aslan: But then sometimes I wondered if there were really people like you. Yet there you are. (p. 65)

The most obstinate sceptics in *the Chronicles* are the dwarfs in *The Last Battle*. When they have once been deceived by shift, they get determined no longer to believe in anyone rather than believe and be deceived again. Even when they meet the real Aslan, they reject him, saying,

No thanks. We’ve been fooled once and we’re not going to be fooled again. (p. 69)

They have decided to live their own life not depending on any authority. Their principle now is: “The Dwarfs are for the Dwarfs.” (p. 135) If we remember that in Christian doctrine man’s original sin is essentially the sin of falling away from God in an attempt to be on his own, the dwarfs with this principle are guilty of the same sin as Adam’s. This sin is such that they come to see only darkness even when they are in the bright field that leads to Aslan’s country.  

In *Mere Christianity*, Lewis says,

God[...] shows much more of Himself to some people than to others—not because He has favourites, but because it is impossible for Him to show Himself to a man whose whole mind and character are in the wrong condition. (p. 140)

Those who reject Aslan cannot recognize any blessing Aslan is offering to them. Dwarfs therefore have really made themselves blind to any light from Aslan when they have closed their spiritual eyes to him. Lucy feels sorry for them and asks Aslan to do something for them. Yet, while Aslan treats them to a great feast on her request, he says to her, “I will show you both what I can, and what I cannot, do.” (*Last Battle*, p. 134) When the dishes, such as pies, tongs and good wine, appear, they eat them, but they are tasting those delicious dishes only as a raw cabbage leaf or an old turnip or dirty water. Here again, it is shown that by rejecting Aslan altogether, they have abandoned the capacity for tasting Aslan’s blessing properly. They physically receive the food, but cannot receive spiritual good, that is the enjoyment of eating, which is to accompany the physical good. Aslan says of them who have spiritually imprisoned themselves in the darkness:

They will not let us help them. They have chosen cunning instead of belief. Their prison is only in their own minds, yet they are in that prison; and so afraid of being taken in that they cannot be taken out. (p. 135)
William James in his *The Will to Believe* stresses the importance of the will to believe in God, pointing out that in our relation to God we cannot remain neutral:

We cannot escape the issue by remaining sceptical and waiting for more light, because, although we do avoid error in that way *if religion be untrue*, we lose the good, *if it be true*, just as certainly as if we positively chose to disbelieve.[...] Scepticism, then, is not avoidance of option; it is option of a certain particular kind of risk. *Better risk loss of truth than chance of error,* —that is your faith-vetoer’s exact position.\(^{32}\)

The dwarfs, who “have chosen cunning instead of belief” are precisely among such faith vetoers as are debunked by James. After all, the dwarfs never again accept Aslan either as their Lord nor as their Creator, nor enter Aslan’s country. This is the result of their closed scepticism.

**<Scepticism about Aslan’s goodness>**

The scepticism of Trumpkin and Nikabrik is about Aslan’s existence and power as the saviour. In *The Last Battle*, the King Tirian and others suffer from another kind of scepticism, that is, scepticism about Aslan’s goodness.

The wicked ape, Shift, pretends to be Aslan’s priest and begins to have the animated Narnian trees cut down and sold to Calormene. As the trees are cut down one by one, the dryad of each tree falls dead, crying for help of Tirian, the King. Tirian also hears that a Narnian horse has been harnessed and whipped by a Calormene. When he hears that these awful deeds are all done by Aslan’s order, he cannot but lose confidence about the nature of Aslan’s goodness. When his unicorn Jewel asks him how Aslan could command such dreadful things, he can only say,

*He is not a tame Lion [...] How should we know what he could do?* (p. 28)

This is not the expression of his doubt about the righteousness or rationality of Aslan. Neither does he doubt that Aslan is the absolute Lord. Yet, he has now come to fear that Aslan’s absolute transcendence and freedom beyond all human prediction are such that Aslan’s good might be something that has been called evil in human ethics. He says,

*Do you think I care if Aslan dooms me to death [...] That would be nothing, nothing at all. Would it not be better, to be dead than to have this horrible fear that Aslan has come and is not like the Aslan we have believed in and longed for? It is as if the sun rose one day and were a black sun.* (pp. 28–29)

A man’s concept of good and evil decides the way he lives. His ethical, moral, and much of his social principles depend on it. Therefore, if he comes to suspect that God’s goodness might be different from what he has believed to be good, he should lose himself not knowing whether he should obey God or follow his own conscience. Thus, though Tirian is ready to obey Aslan whether or not Aslan’s demands appear to him good, he fears that his ethical standards should be
overturned. Tirian’s doubt about Aslan is different from Nikabrik’s. Nikabrik, though he suspects that Aslan might be their enemy, does not care whether Aslan is good or evil at all.

Tirian’s doubt and fear are soon cleared when he has discovered Shift’s tricks, and he is reassured that Aslan is good and absolute the same way as he has believed him to be. However, this problem of scepticism about Aslan’s goodness deserves further consideration. Especially, the recognition that “He is not a tame lion,” has a special importance when we consider Lewis’s idea about God.

Throughout the Chronicles, it is emphasized that Aslan is “not tame.” Already in The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe, Lucy is told so. When she first hears that Aslan is a lion, she asks Mr. Beaver, “Then he isn’t safe?” To her question, Mr. Beaver definitely answers, “Safe? . . . don’t you hear what Mrs. Beaver tells you? Who said anything about safe? ’Course he isn’t safe. But he’s good. He’s the King. I tell you.” (Lion, p. 75)

Lewis’s God is always awful as well as good. Jung thinks that God has an evil side besides the three Persons,33 but in Lewis’s opinion God is awful because He is God of righteousness as well as God of love. He is not such a maternal, tender God, as is thought of by Shusaku Endo, a Japanese Catholic novelist.34 Lewis is aware that in the Bible, “All the most terrifying texts come from the mouth of Our Lord.” (Duck, p. 232) He says in Letters to Malcolm that “a safe god, a tame god, soon proclaims himself to any sound mind as a fantasy.” (Malcolm, p. 76)

Lewis’s God is described as “good and terrible.” (Lion, p. 117) Martha Sammons points out, “This paradox of being at the same time both “terrible” and “good” is a key idea in Charles William’s Descent into Hell, where “terrible” means “full of terror.”35 Thus, in The Magician’s Nephew, when Polly and Digory first see Aslan, they are fascinated by Him, while at the same time afraid of Him.

[T]hey were terribly afraid it would turn and look at them, yet in some queer way they wished it would. (p. 100)

In The Last Battle, the statement “He is not a tame lion” is repeated even three times in exactly the same words. In the first context, it refers to the complete freedom of Aslan, that his comings and goings are unpredictable by such things as movement of stars because he is “not a slave of the stars but their Maker.” (p. 20) This recognition of Aslan’s freedom gradually comes to involve the fear that his freedom might be something tyrannous. When Tirian is dismayed at the news that Narnian trees are being cut down by Aslan’s order and asks Jewel, “Is it possible?” Jewel answers him, “I don’t know [...] He is not a tame Lion.” (p. 24)

In the third context, Tirian expresses his own doubt about Aslan’s goodness, as we have seen above, that since Aslan is not tame, then his goodness might not necessarily agree with such ideas of goodness as conceived by mortal, finite, minds.

From the ancient days of Greece, man has been asking questions about God’s goodness as well as His existence. Lewis summarizes the problem in The Problem of Pain:

If God were good, He would wish to make His creatures perfectly happy, and if God were
almighty He would be able to do what He wished. But the creatures are not happy. Therefore God lacks either goodness, or power, or both. (p. 14)

Even if evil is theoretically explained, for example, by the orthodox Augustinian doctrine of Free Will, actually men do not think of their own miseries or unhappiness in terms of Adam's fall when they are actually suffering.

Lewis has interpreted man's suffering as God's "megaphone to rouse a deaf world, "which calls men's attention back to God Himself, preventing man from settling in earthly happiness apart from Him. (Pain, p. 81) Sometimes, Lewis compares God to a dentist who gives his patient pain in order to cure him, (Mere Christianity, p. 169) or to an artist who never gets tired of rubbing and scraping so as to improve his work. (Pain, pp. 30–31) He says that we are as it were God's patients or artifacts. And yet, when he has lost his beloved wife, Joy, of cancer, he finds it hard to keep such straight forward faith in God's goodness, though, as the case with Tirian, he does not doubt God's existence or genuine authority. Lewis's feelings of those days are expressed in A Grief Observed, written soon after Joy's death:

If God's goodness is inconsistent with hurting us, then either God is not good or there is no God: for in the only life we know He hurts us beyond our worst fears and beyond all we can imagine. If it is consistent with hurting us, then He may hurt us after death as unendurably as before it.[...] No, my real fear is not of materialism.[...] Sooner or later I must face the question in plain language. What reason have we, except our own desperate wishes, to believe that God is, by any standard we can conceive, 'good'? Doesn't all the prima facie evidence suggest exactly the opposite? What have we to set against it? (Grief, pp. 25–26)

Eventually, Lewis resumes his trust in God as he has reflected on his sceptic feelings about God and found them to be testimony of weakness of his faith. Then he comes to understand the pain he has suffered from his wife's death as God's ordeal:

God has not been trying an experiment on my faith or love in order to find out their quality. He knew it already. It was I who didn't.[...] He always knew that my temple was a house of cards. His only way of making me realize the fact was to knock it down. (Grief, pp. 42–43)

This problem of pain leads to the problem of evil as we shall discuss in the next section.

VI Evil

<Nature of Evil in the Chronicles>

As is always the case in Lewis's works, the core of evil nature in the Chronicles is pride. Especially, self-centredness of those who are proud is emphatically illustrated.

In the Chronicles the one that is most proud is Queen Jadis, the Witch, in The Magician's Nephew. She has made war with her sister for the throne, and, finding it hard to win, ruined her sister
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together with the whole world by destructive spells of magic. She would rather destroy everything than let others dominate it. When she has ruined the world, however, she does not feel guilty at all. In her opinion, the one to blame is her sister. She says,

It was my sister’s fault. [...] At any moment I was ready to make peace—yes, and to spare her life too, if she would yield me the throne. But she would not. Her pride has destroyed the whole world. (*Magician’s*, pp. 59–60)

Actually, it is Jadis herself who is proud. A proud man, or woman, would find it unbearable to see any other person assume a superior position to him- or herself.

In *The Magician’s Nephew*, Uncle Andrew is presented as another proud person. Likewise as Jadis, he is self-centred, and thinks himself to be especially privileged to do anything. He does not care whether or not others may suffer from it at all. He says to Digory,

Men like me, who possess hidden wisdom, are freed from common rules just as we are cut off from common pleasures. Ours, my boy, is a high and lonely destiny. (*Magician’s*, p. 23)

Digory at once sees through his conceit and says to himself, that “all it means [...] is that he thinks he can do anything he likes to get anything he wants.” (*Magician’s*, p. 24) Andrew, who regards himself as above all laws, is practically amoral and does not feel guilty when he kills guinea-pigs in his experiment. In his opinion, he has a proper right to do so because they are his own, which he bought for himself. To him they are no more than materials for his experiment. He does not see these animals as God’s creatures that have been given a right to live. Not only that, he even uses human children for his experiment as if they, too, were nothing but materials. In order to prove that his magic rings really have power to send people into other worlds, he deceives Polly into putting one on by deception, and that, without having any guilty conscience. He gives her one of the rings as if it were an ordinary ornamental one. When Polly has disappeared from his room, though Digory condemns him for playing such a nasty trick on a girl, he even boasts about himself:

I am the great scholar, the magician, the adept, who is *doing* the experiment. Of course I need subjects to do it on. (p. 27)

He treats her as an object, having abandoned humane relationship with her. He sees others not in what Martin Buber calls an “*Ich und Du*” relationship but in that of “*Ich und Es*.”

Besides, here we see Lewis’s criticism on experiments on living animals in laboratories. In a pamphlet, “Vivisection,” he says that those who vivisect animals are usually materialists who do not believe that animals have souls. Yet, he also points out that the very same materialists in other contexts often do not see any radical difference between man and the other animals.

Once the old Christian idea of a total difference in kind between man and beast has been abandoned, then no argument for experiments on animals can be found which is not also an
argument for experiments on inferior men. If we cut up beasts simply because they cannot prevent us and because we are backing our own side in the struggle for existence, it is only logical to cut up imbeciles, criminals, enemies, or capitalists for the same reasons. Indeed, experiments on men have already begun. We all hear that Nazi scientists have done them. We all suspect that our own scientists may begin to do so, in secret, at any moment. (Dock, p. 227)

One of the characteristics of fairy tales is that, in them, evil can be shown, without seeming unrealistic, in such an emphatic and obvious form as it would never be seen in our actual life. Here also, Andrew’s false logic is presented in such emphasized words as cannot be seen other than in stories. But we may as well notice that the same sort of logic as Andrew’s sometimes passes for valid in the actual life, where experiments are made on animals, or even on human beings as in hospitals and various other places. Only, in the actual life, the evil is hidden under the pretext, for example, of the contribution to the progress of science or medical treatment.

The self-justification of Jadis for having destroyed the world with all the people in it is exactly the same as Andrew’s. The people of Charn are her people, and because they are her own, she has a legitimate right to kill them if she likes. She says to Digory,

You must learn, child, that what would be wrong for you or for any of the common people is not wrong in a great Queen such as I. The weight of the world is on our shoulders. We must be freed from all rules. Ours is a high and lonely destiny. (Magician’s, p. 61)

Though the queen looks more majestic and her words at first sound truer than Andrew’s, Digory soon sees that what she is saying is nothing different from what his uncle said. Jadis and Andrew are wrong in believing that the one who is in a position above others and has powers to control their destiny has a right to do anything to them. They have abandoned the moral law, or the laws of human nature, which one must keep in order to remain human. Through their pride, Jadis and Andrew have strayed out of the natural way, and gone outside of humanity.

In our life, men sometimes approve of pride when it seems to be an expression of self-respect. However, in the Chronicles of Narnia, pride is without exception treated as serious evil and it is never regarded so trivial as can be condoned. For instance, it is only a little bit of pride on the part of Jill that makes her show off on the cliff and causes Eustas fall off, and yet she has to make up for it later by carrying out a task given by Aslan. In The Magician’s Nephew, Digory strikes the mysterious bell to see what would happen, though he knows by a warning poem that the stroke might bring about something terrible. Jill has tried to prevent him, but his curiosity has been too strong. Curiosity is one of Digory’s characteristics and in itself not a bad thing. When grown up, he becomes “a famous learned man, a professor, and a great traveller.” (Magician’s, pp. 170–171) However, too much curiosity is a wish to overreach human limitations and a sin known as hubris ever since the days of Sophocles. As with the case of Oedipus, Digory wants to know even what he should not know. As a result, he wakes Jadis from an enchanted sleep and causes her to come into Narnia. The same as Jill, Digory has to atone for the sin by carrying out a task which is assigned by
Aslan. Lewis says in The Problem of Pain, "The guilt is washed out not by time but by repentance and the blood of Christ." (p. 49) The mere passing of time does not take away any man's sin. A man who has committed a sin needs to make up for it before he can get atonement. In Narnia it is the same.

In The Horse and his Boy, pride of Aravis and Bree shows off its falsity in contrast to the humble modesty of Shasta and Hwin. Aravis comes from a house of high rank in Calormen. Bree is a talking horse who has served as a war horse. They are both strongly conscious of their lineage and proud of it. However, their pride is in fact nothing more than vanity. At the city gate of Tashbaan Aravis feels unhappy because she thinks she deserves great reverence from the people in the city, which she fails to get in her disguise as a common travelling girl. She complains to Shasta,

I ought to be riding in on a litter with soldiers before me and slaves behind, and perhaps going to a great feast in the Tisroc's palace (may he live for ever)—not sneaking in like this. It's different for you. (Horse, p. 51)

In this, we see "the sense of injur'd merit" which Lewis sees as a conspicuous characteristic of Milton's Satan.\(^{37}\) Shasta does not understand her feeling. The pride of Aravis and Bree is shown nothing more than mere vanity. Bree says to Hwin,

I think, Ma'am [...] that I know a little more about campaigns and forced marches and what a horse can stand than you do. (Horse, p. 117)

However, actually the stronger one is Hwin who insists on going even when Bree says he is too tired to walk. She says,

I feel just like Bree that I can't go on. But when Horses have humans (with spurs and things) on their backs, aren't they often made to go on when they're feeling like this? and then they find they can. I m-mean—oughtn't we to be able to do even more, now that we're free. It's all for Narnia. (Horse, pp. 116–117)

Then, it is Shasta who runs by himself to help Aravis from a lion which is almost tearing her with its claws. That time Bree frees himself away from the danger, betraying his cowardice, and Aravis is saved by the one whom she has despised. Humbleness is the opposite of pride. It is a great virtue of Jesus who "humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross," while pride is the greatest vice of Satan. Shasta and Hwin are humble, but being humble does not lessen their courage in the face of hardship. It is the proud ones who are in reality weaker and inferior.

Bree's vanity is also seen in the fact that he is much too anxious about his appearance. As he was brought up in Calormene away from Narnia, he does not know much about the way talking horses behave themselves. When he comes near to Narnia, he gets nervous just because he is afraid that his manners would be different from those of other talking horses in Narnia so that he might look foolish among them. When he hears that in Narnia no one mounts a talking horse, he does not feel
like rejoicing:

This reminded poor Bree again of how little he knew about Narnian customs and what dreadful mistakes he might make. So while Hwin strolled along in a happy dream, Bree got more nervous and more self-conscious with every step he took. [...] “Do Talking Horses roll? Supposing they don’t? I can’t bear to give it up.” (Horse, p. 176)

Hwin, who is much wiser and less self-conscious, answers rightly:

I’m going to roll anyway [...] I don’t suppose any of them will care two lumps of sugar whether you roll or not. (Horse, p. 176)

* * *

If pride is the greatest sin and the essence of evil as Lewis conceives of, another conspicuous characteristic of evil is alienation from others, especially self-alienation from anything good. In Letters to Malcolm, Lewis writes that “pleasures are shafts of the glory as it strikes our sensibility.” (p. 89) All pleasures come from God. It is natural then that those who reject that source cannot possibly taste what is overflowing from it. Therefore, those who reject Aslan in the Chronicles are cut off from enjoying pleasures. Thus, in The Last Battle, we have seen that the dwarfs who have chosen to live by themselves away from Aslan lose the power of enjoying the good as it really is, and taste the most delicious dishes as almost uneatable food. It is for the same reason that they see nothing but darkness when they are bathed in the light which comes from Aslan’s country.

It is also the same with Andrew. He hears nothing but a lion’s roaring when he is actually hearing Aslan’s songs of creation. Although at first he nearly understood it to be a song, he hated the song and tried hard to make himself believe that it is only roaring so that eventually he really comes to hear it as he wanted. Lewis makes a comment on this:

Now the trouble about trying to make yourself stupider than you really are is that you very often succeed. (Magician’s, p. 117)

God has given man the freedom of will, enabling him not to obey God. Andrew also has this freedom not to hear Aslan’s voice. Though he is not exactly Aslan’s creature, we may regard Andrew’s attitude towards Aslan as an example of the way evil people behave themselves towards God, since Aslan once tells Lucy that he is also in our world under “another name,” which we see must be “God” or “Jesus Christ.” (Dawn Treader, p. 209) Those who want to avoid encounter with God’s reality, as Andrew who dislikes to hear Aslan’s song, would in the end lose the power of seeing it.

Self-alienation from the good means not only alienation from good things but also from good people. When Andrew says to Digory, “Ours, my boy, is a high and lonely destiny,” (Magician’s, p. 23) he is right though only partly. he is indeed lonely though he is deceiving himself in regarding
himself higher than other people. He is lonely not because he is surpassing others but just because he is self-alienated from them by seeing them not as human beings but as tools and materials to use. Edmund in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* is in a state of alienation from the other children while he is bribed by the Witch with candies.

The most conspicuous example is Eustace Scrubb in *The Voyage of the 'Dawn Treader.'* He is so self-centred as to care nothing about other people. When drinking water is running short on board, he thinks it is quite fair that he should be provided enough even when the others are having their rations cut down. He tries to steal some water, and even in that act, actually believes he is right. He writes in his diary:

Woke up in the night knowing I was feverish and *must* have a drink of water. Any doctor would have said so. Heaven knows I'm the last person to try to get any unfair advantage but I never *dreamed* that this water-rationing would be meant to apply to a sick man. In fact I would have woken the others up and asked for some only I thought it would be selfish to wake them.[...]. I always try to consider others whether they are nice to me or not. (p. 66)

A really self-centred person like Eustace here sees everything according to his own measure. Therefore, he always thinks himself to be in the right even when it is obvious to the others that he is wrong. To the self-centred, it is always the others that are wrong. Eustace thinks others to be unfair and ill-natured to him when they actually treat him as well and kindly as they can. When he is sea-sick, Lucy comes to give him some cordial but he only aggressively growls to her, "Oh, go away and leave me alone." (p. 28) He finds his room "the worst cabin of the boat, a perfect dungeon" and complains that he has to share it with Edmund and Caspian while Lucy, who is the only girl, keeps a room to herself.(p. 31)

About himself, he does not see any faults or weak points. For instance, though he is a coward, he does not admit it even to himself. He gets frightened when large waves wash the ship. Yet, finding the others take such waves for granted, he can even regard them as cowards with the following distorted logic:

I have seen the boat nearly go under any number of times. All the others pretend to take no notice of this, either from swank or because Harold [Eustace's father] says one of the most cowardly things ordinary people do is to shut their eyes to Facts. (p. 31)

As Jadis projects her own pride on her sister, Eustace projects his own self-centredness and cowardice on others. And thinking himself in every respect right while seeing others wrong in almost every point, he has alienated himself from them all. The fact that he turns into a dragon in an island shows this in a visible form. As Payne points out, "A dragon is not only a selfish monster that hoards treasures, but it is also a very lonely creature. One cause of its loneliness is that it likes nothing better to eat than fresh dragon as well as other animals and human beings."38 A dragon lives alone away from human society. It is a symbol of alienation from others. The figure of a dragon that Eustace has changed into is an externalization of his inner self which has been cut
from all the others.

*     *     *

Another characteristic of evil that Lewis perceives is its effect to make people unable to distinguish the right from the wrong nor understand either of them while good people understand both. Eustace thinks himself good and right when he is especially bad. His condemnation of others is written in his personal diary, which shows that he really believes in the faults of others. As Green Lady in Perelandra says, “it is waking that understands sleep and not sleep that understands waking,” (Perelandra, p. 209) those who are in the wrong do not understand that they are wrong. And this blindness strengthens the evil ones’ self-centred conviction that everything they do is approvable. It is an intrinsic weakness of the evil that it even lacks self-knowledge.

In Lewis’s work, evil is always weaker than the good. Though in the Chronicles, evil fights against the good, and though the evil is never completely extinguished, it is always the evil side which is defeated in the end. For example, in The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe, when Aslan comes into Narnia which has long been suspended in winter by the White Witch’s magic, the spell is broken and snow begins to thaw even before Aslan works anything against the Witch. His mere presence is strong enough to break her magic. At one point she makes an agreement with Aslan that she will spare Edmund’s life on the condition that Aslan be killed instead. However, when she tries to make sure that Aslan will keep his promise, she is fiercely growled at by him and cannot but run away for her life. Furthermore, though the Witch has once killed Aslan and appeared to have won, Aslan comes back to life, and she is defeated. After all, in killing Aslan as a sacrifice, she has done nothing but help Edmund’s atonement. Once, Christianity says, Satan’s temptation brought about Christ’s Incarnation, Suffering, Death and Resurrection, which opened for every man possibility of becoming a son of God. In this, Satan’s work turned out to be a contribution to God. Lewis says,

A merciful man aims at his neighbour’s good and so does “God’s will”, consciously co-operating with “the simple good”. A cruel man oppresses his neighbour, and so does simple evil. But in doing such evil, he is used by God, without his own knowledge or consent, to produce the complex good—so that the first man serves God as a son, and second as a tool. For you will certainly carry out God’s purpose, however you act.” (Pain, p. 99)

In the Chronicles, too, such an evil one as the Witch works for the good without any intention to do so.

Another characteristic of evil as Lewis conceives of is the loss of speaking ability. In the last of Lewis’s science-fiction trilogy, That Hideous Strength, proper speech is taken away from the evil party of the N.I.C.E. (pp. 343-351) There, Lewis uses language as something which symbolizes the proper relation between the giver of the language, i.e.God, and the creatures who are given it. In Narnia, too, the power of speech is a token of blessing of and selection by Aslan. At the beginning of Narnia, Aslan chooses a pair from each species of animals and give them words, giving a
warning not to lose them:

Creatures, I give you yourselves.[...] The Dumb beasts whom I have not chosen are yours also. Treat them gently and cherish them but do not go back to their ways lest you cease to be Talking Beasts. For out of them you were taken and into them you can return. Do not so. (Magician's, p. 109)

Adam was made from earth, and when he disobeyed God, he was doomed to return to ashes. What Aslan tells the animals not to do is to turn away from him as Adam did from God. As long as they are Aslan's people they will hold speech. When they cease to be so, they should lose it. The loss of speech then shows the loss of his blessing. This is a sort of testament between Aslan and the beasts. Thus in The Last Battle, a cat named Ginger that pretends to believe in Aslan without any real faith, using Aslan's name in an act of cunning, goes dumb. For, by committing perjury and profanity, he has broken the original testament with Aslan.

When the creatures are wrong, even when they are not positively evil, their speech may be affected, if not altogether taken away. In The Horse and his Boy, when Shasta talks as if there is little difference between riding a horse and riding a donkey, Bree gets offended because he thinks himself to be better than donkeys. It is a sign of his pride, and because this pride is wrong, his words become more like the neighing of an ordinary horse, rather than speech.

Lewis depicts evil unmistakably hateful (e.g. the witches and shift) and often absurd (e.g. Andrew) as well. Not only the hideousness but also the absurdity of the evil is from his conviction about the evil nature, for, Lewis says “the Devil is (in the long run) an ass.” (Preface, p. 95) David Holbrook criticizes the Chronicles for being “so full of hate” and invoking “The enjoyment of hurting"39) the evil ones. Yet I believe the Chronicles, showing the evil not only hedious but also despicable and powerless before the good, gives the reader courage to face the seemingly unconquable evils in life.

VII The Problem of Suffering

As we have seen in our discussion on the scepticism about the goodness of Aslan, what is closely connected with the problem of evil is the problem of suffering. In the Chronicles, suffering is often tribulation or redemption of sin. Evil causes suffering, but Aslan also makes people suffer when it is necessary. As Yahweh has given the people of Israel a lot of suffering and tribulation, so Aslan also gives the chosen ones hard times for their good.

Shasta is given a hard task of running to the King Lune of Archenland to tell him that Rabadash, the Prince of Calormene, is invading Archenland so as to make it a foothold to make war with Narnia. Shasta is at that time exhausted from fighting with a lion to save Aravis's life, but he has to do the errand all the same.

Shasta's heart fainted[...] for he felt he had no strength left. And he wretched inside at what seemed the cruelty and unfairness of the demand. He had not yet learned that if you do one good deed your reward usually is to be set to do another and harder and better one. (Horse,
Shasta's suffering here is taken as good for his own spiritual growth as well as for the good of Archenland.

Likewise, Digory also grows through suffering. When he goes to the paradisaical garden on Aslan's errand to take a magic apple for Narnia, he meets Jadis, the Witch, who tries to seduce him to take one for his mother instead of bringing it back to Aslan. It is a great temptation for him because his mother is now ill in death bed and the magic apple would cure her. The errand is, first of all, redemption of his sin to have brought evil, i.e. Jadis, into Narnia. Yet at the same time, it is a tribulation for him. After a severe inner conflict, he finally rejects the Witch's words and comes back to Narnia with an apple, without having taken one for his mother or for himself, for he knows that his mother would approve him of keeping his promise with Aslan, rather than of getting her the healing apple in the wrong way. When he meets Aslan again for the first time after the errand, he finds himself having changed. "This time he found he could look straight into the Lion's eyes. He had forgotten his troubles and felt absolutely content." (Magician's, p.154) It shows that through the hard task he has made atonement for his sin of too much curiosity and resumed the right relationship with Aslan.

Jill in The Silver Chair also grows through her task of rescuing Rilian, acquiring humbleness to admit her fault in neglecting Aslan's order, and learns to believe in Aslan even when he does not seem to exist. The hard task is a tribulation for her as well as the atonement for her pride that made Eustace fall off the cliff.

It is important that Jill and Digory get helps from Aslan in their tasks. Jill is given signs and a great helper Puddleglum, and Digory is given Fledge, a winged horse to carry him. Aslan calls for atonement, but at the same time helps people in making it. Furthermore, when Digory has lost the hope of curing his mother and is feeling desperately sad, Aslan rewards him for his suffering and honesty with a magic apple which he has resisted getting wrongly. The apple is a gift that is more than Digory deserves. Yet, it is also given rightly. Aslan tells Digory that if he had stolen an apple in the garden, it would have cured his mother, but things more terrible than death would have fallen on her and Digory. He says also that now that the apple is given properly from his own hands, it will bring her joyful happiness. Here we see an important conviction of Lewis that God not only demands people to make up for their sins, while helping them in that atonement, but when the atonement is made, gives them more than they deserves. His belief that God is not only just but more than just is to be a central theme of his last novel Till We Have Faces.

When we think of Aslan's love that is more than justice, we must think of his death for Edmund. Edmund would have been killed by the Witch as the result of his sin of betrayal. For, as the Witch reminds Aslan of "the Magic which the Emperor put into Narnia at the very beginning," she can rightly say, "every traitor belongs to me as my lawful prey and that for every treachery I have a right to a kill." (Lion, p. 128) Yet, though Witch does not know, even in that apparently merciless law, there is a hidden mercy of God, for it is not necessarily to be the traitor (in this case Edmund) himself that is killed; and in fact, it has been God the Emperor's providence that Aslan should die.
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for him. As the Witch says, her right is to “a” kill, so, when Aslan prophesied in the creation of Narnia, “I will see to it that the worst falls upon myself,” he is referring to his death to ransom Edmund. (Magician’s P. 126) Furthermore, “though the Witch knew the Deep Magic, there is a magic deeper still which she did not know. [...] that when a willing victim who had committed no treachery was killed in a traitor’s stead, the Table would crack and Death itself would start working backwards.” (Lion, p. 148) This deeper magic is, as Kayoko Kawasaki remarks, surpassing the Deep Magic, while fulfilling it. Aslan has come to Narnia to fulfill the law just as Christ has “not come to destroy, but fulfill” the law. (Mattew, 5,17)

In Narnia, the deeper magic of love has been there since before the dawn of time when the deep magic of the law was set. This signifies that love is more fundamental and of more radical importance than the law of justice. The law is for the peace of the world and cannot have been there before the world; yet the love of God is eternal and the first principle of all the relations. St. John says “God is Love” (1 John, 4,8.) and Lewis in *The Four Loves* also stresses the same by calling God “Love Himself.” (p. 7) Besides, what is also important about Aslan’s death is, as John Willis points out, “Aslan died only for the boy Edmund. Similarly, the passion of Christ must be understood as applying to the single individual. It would be quite false to infer that the extreme suffering of the Passion was due to the large number of people who needed saving. It would have been just the same even if only one individual had been involved.”

Thus, Aslan’s relation to the creatures is also individual, and since Aslan does not destroy but fulfills the law, not only does he show mercy to everyone that obeys the law but also does he do justice to every individual, and that, without breaking even natural (i.e. scientific physical) laws of cause and effect. The Witch had an apple by stealing it and he does not prevent it from bringing her eternal life. Yet, it does not make her happy. Aslan says,

> Things always work according to their nature. She has won her heart’s desire; she has unwearing strength and endless days like a goddess. But length of days with an evil heart is only length of misery and already she begins to know it. All get what they want: they do not always like it. (Magician’s, p. 162)

Lewis shows that nothing in Nature is in itself good or bad or evil. Each is good when it is used properly and in right relation with God; it becomes evil when its relation with God goes wrong or when it is used wrong way. Here, the apple goes evil for the Witch who has got it wrongly. It makes her suffer, while it works good for Digory who has got it rightly.

* * *

In *The Problem of Pain*, Lewis says that the pain is God’s “megaphone to rouse a deaf world.”(p.81) When everything seems all right, we tend to be contented with ourselves as well as with the world around us. However, it would be a self-deception to think that our earthly life apart from God is enough to make us happy. Yet, Lewis says, when we have pain we cannot deceive ourselves but are forced to reflect on what it is that is wrong with us. Through reflection, we might
notice that it is God alone that can give us real lasting happiness. Consequently, pain will lead us to God.

In the Chronicles pain as Aslan’s megaphone works on Eustace. He has been so self-centred that he could not have possibly heard others if they had tried to change him. However, when he has transformed into a dragon he feels lonely for the first time and begins to wish to have company. It is then that he realizes how he has been wrong all along.

He realized that he was a monster cut off from the whole human race. An appalling loneliness came over him. He began to see that the others had not really been fiends at all. He began to wonder if he himself had been such a nice person as he had always supposed. He longed for their voices. (Dawn Treader, p.83)

After this recognition, he becomes considerate for the others, positively ready to help them. Thus, when he becomes a dragon outside, he becomes human inside. As Payne says, “Eustace begins to experience how lonely it is to be a monster. He begins to realize what kind of person he has been.” It is the first step for his regeneration. The pain of loneliness in his heart has been a “megaphone” to awake his humanity and conscience, forcing him to reflect over himself.

Besides, as C. N. Manlove points out, “the islands are potential symbols of selfishness, cut off from one another.” Then the voyage of the Dawn Treader can symbolically be seen as the children’s pilgrimage of getting over the selfishness, and this is especially true of Eustace.

Conversely, it is also true that in the Chronicles where pain is Aslan’s tribulation or “megaphone” for the good of the sufferers, it is only good people, or people belonging to Aslan, that have capacity for feeling pain in their heart. The evil ones, such as Jadis, Andrew and the White Witch never feel it. They are simply defeated by Aslan or physically perished.

* * *

Lewis follows St. Augustine in believing that the origin of evil and sufferings in this world is man’s disobedience to God through misuse of free will. Yet as John Hick in his Evil and the God of Love points out, in the Christian tradition, there is another view of the problem of evil which is as noteworthy as that of St. Augustine. It is St. Irenaeus’s view. Irenaeus, unlike with Augustine, sees the original sin as the result of misuse of free will. However, different from Augustine, who sees the original paradisical state of man as nearly perfect, Irenaeus sees man in his original state as infantile and imperfect. He thinks man is intended, by God, to grow into maturity through experiences.

God had the power to give man perfection from the beginning, but man was incapable of receiving it, because he was an infant.[...]

Man had received the knowledge of good and evil.[...] Through the magnanimity which God gave him, man has known both the good of obedience and the evil of disobedience, so that the eye of his mind, having experienced both, might with discernment choose the
better, and be neither slothful nor neglectful of the commandment of God. He learns from experience that disobeying God, which robs him of life, is evil. [...] But how could he have discerned the good without knowing its opposite? For first-hand experience is more certain and reliable than conjecture.  

In Irenaeus's view, experience of evil is even necessary to a man's spiritual growth. Therefore, it becomes natural that through the bitter experience and following tribulation, a man may come into the right relation with God. Although in Augustine's view, which Lewis follows in his avowedly Christian apologies, there seems no necessity of tribulation for a man's salvation, in *The Chronicles*, Lewis takes in Irenaeus's view of sufferings as well and treats the tribulation also as God's tool for the spiritual growth of the creatures. This is especially true of Shasta, who does not seem to have committed any particular sin to atone for when he is given a hard task by Aslan.

**Notes**

1) For Lewis's texts and their Abbreviations, see the bibliography below.
2) Lewis, *Letters to Children*, p. 29. (This is written in a letter to his goddaughter, Sarah.)
9) It is popularly held that St. Tertullian says this in *De Carne Christi*, V; and St. Augustine, in *Confessions*, VI. 5., yet, in fact there is no exact equivalent passage by Tertullian; and as far as I see in the Loeb edition, there cannot be found the passage by Augustine, either. 


22) Kilby, pp. 141–142.
23) Smith, pp. 188–189.
24) Brewer, p. 12n.
29) In this context "real" means "actual" and not in Platonic sense of having idealistic reality.
34) cf. e.g. Shusaku Endo, Chiminoku (Shincho, 1981.)
36) Martin Buber, Ich und Du (Verlag Lambert Schneider, 1979), p. 9 et passim.
38) Leanne Payne, Real Presence (Cornerstone Books, 1979), p. 64.
40) Kayoko Kawasaki (川崎佳代子)『ライオンと魔女』—衣装だんすの冒険』 [ナルニア国時代記] 読本], p. 117.
42) Payne, p. 64.
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