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To Charles Williams, "bearing each others' burdens" was not a wish, a goal, or a possibility, but a literal fact. A term basic to his theology as well as his novels is "co-inherence," which signifies both this exchange and the unity of God and the universe which makes it possible. With this interdependence in love, sacrifice is both automatically efficacious and mutually beneficial, from the humblest human favor to that ultimate act of vicarious redemption, the incarnation and crucifixion of Christ.

This theme -- of which, interestingly, C.S. Lewis commented he had "reason to believe that [Williams] spoke from experimental knowledge" [1] -- is central in Williams' two final novels, All Hallows' Eve and Descent into Hell. In the latter, it is clearly explained in a chapter entitled "The Doctrine of Substituted Love." The significantly-named Stanhope tells the significantly-named Pauline (for the doctrine of substituted love is nothing if not Pauline theology) that true sympathy (feeling with) is nothing like the shadow of it most people think of:

"...I think when Christ or St. Paul, or whoever said bear, or whatever he Aramaically said instead of bear, he meant something much more like carrying a parcel instead of someone else. To bear a burden is precisely to carry it instead of. If you're still carrying yours, I'm not carrying it for you -- however sympathetic I may be. If you give a weight to me, you can't be carrying it yourself; all I'm asking you to do is notice that blazing truth. [2]

This same simple but effective image is used by Williams in propris persona in a 1941 essay, "The Way of Exchange," one of the essays in Williams' collection The Image of the City which explain and foreshadow these themes: "Compacts can be made for the taking over of the suffering of troubles, and worries, and distresses, as simply and as effectively as assent is given to the carrying of a parcel." [3]

Not only can this assent be given, it must be. To refuse this interchange is not only a lack of courtesy (a term which to Williams carries the weight of its much more active and comprehensive medieval meaning) but the denial of a fundamental truth of human nature. Stanhope continues, in Descent into Hell.

"...You must give up your burden to someone else, and you must carry someone else's burden. ...this is a law of the universe, and not to give up your burden is as much to rebel as not to carry another's. You'll find it quite easy if you let yourself do it. (Ibid., p.99.)

Stanhope also says of this exchange, "And anyhow there's no need to introduce Christ, unless you wish. It's a fact of experience." (Ibid., p.98.) Indeed, part of the strength of both All Hallows' Eve and Descent into Hell is that they show by demonstration, as only novels can show, just how pervasive a fact of experience it is. It is not a matter of religion only, but of any affection and allegiance. While it is not only Christian, though, it is in a sense peculiarly Christian, in that Christianity is founded upon ultimate example of vicarious redemption. This is the major point of "What the Cross Means to Me," a 1943 essay printed in The Image of the City as "The Cross." ("The Way of Exchange," p. 152.)
...the mystery of the Christian religion is a doctrine of co-inherence and substitution. The Divine Word co-inheres in God the Father (as the Father in Him and the Spirit in Both), but also He has substituted His Manhood for ours in the secrets of the Incarnation and the Atonement. ...In that sense He lives in us and we in Him, He and we co-inhere. [4]

C.S. Lewis, commenting on Williams, stated, "The Atonement... far from being a mere legal fiction... was simply the supreme instance of a universal law. 'He saved others, himself he cannot save' is a definition of the Kingdom. All salvation... is vicarious." [5]

This kind of substitution is a major theme in All Hallow's Eve, seen in acts of love both personal and Christian. The great power of the book, though -- which many consider Charles Williams' best -- comes from its exploration of not only that covenant, but its dark opposite: magic as an act of selfishness both personal and demonic.

A.M. Hadfield describes the world of goetia (the specific kind of magic) in All Hallow's Eve as, "without co-inherence or the desire for co-inherence," [6] but this is not precisely so. In Williams' universe, co-inherence is a fact, and not something that can be denied; and though the magician named Simon the Clerk is self-deceiving, he is not stupid. Rather, magic is precisely a peculiar and perverted sub-species of co-inherence -- participating in the same mystery, but paradoxically. In Christianity, the sacrifice is freely given; all involved benefit, but especially the giver. In magic, it is taken by force; all involved suffer, but especially the taker. In a metaphor, if Christian substitution is the sacrament of marriage, goetia is rape. As with rape, it is the debasement of something wonderful -- literally so -- which is horrible as the actual damage done.

These two kinds of substitution are played off against each other, and account for the persistent theme of doubling in the novel which many critics have noted. First of all, co-inherence is itself a kind of doubling. Williams, in "The Way of Exchange," quotes Thebiad, a follower of St. Anthony, who says that one taking up a burden for a neighbor is, "to put his own soul in the place of that neighbor, and to become, if it were possible, a double man." ("The Way of Exchange," p. 151.) Secondarily, magic as the parody of the Mystery of co-inherence becomes a double of a double. The novel spins out the opposition of free and imposed compensation in characters, plot, and theme, even presenting paired scenes.

There are basically seven characters in All Hallow's Eve. As Williams himself has pointed out, it is probably the only novel in which two of the main characters are dead when the novel begins. (Hadfield, p. 190.) Lester and Evelyn are two women killed in a plane crash, who find themselves in the City, a venue of eternity which co-exists -- and co-inheres -- with the temporal London in which the other characters exist: Richard who is Lester's husband; Simon the Clerk, who is a magician, anti-priest, and possibly anti-Christ; Lady Wallingford, follower of Simon and mother of Betty; and Jonathan, a painter of some genius who is the friend of Richard and Lester, and in love with Betty.

Betty herself dwells in both worlds, both London and the City. She was literally conceived as a magical tool for Simon, so that he could send her temporarily during her life, and then as a permanent link -- into the realm beyond death. J'nan Sellery states:

In All Hallow's Eve the physical confrontation or combat takes the form of a literal battle of wits between Simon, whose aides-camp are the willing Lady Wallingford and the dead Evelyn, and Lester, whose aides are Richard and Jonathan. Betty is the crux of the battle; for it is the winning of Betty to Lester's side which symbolizes the value of the good or life (ironically despite Lester's being dead) and the evil or death (ironically despite Simon's being alive). [7]

To a certain extent Betty is the prize; to a greater extent she is -- as well as quite strongly an active agent in her own right -- the battlefield.

There is not one action in the plot of All Hallow's Eve which does not depend on co-inherence or compensation, either as a gift of Charity or as a theft by unlawful magic. From Jonathan's painting Simon the Clerk's portrait because he hopes it will make his love with Betty easier, to the spirit of Lester (trapped in the magical construct of a false body) begging coins from a passerby to call Richard and brace him for the shock of her arrival, or Betty's healing of those left invalid after the departure of Simon the Clerk's magic, the main motivating force is the desire to aid one another freely. From Lady Wallingford's ill treatment of her own daughter, to Evelyn's wish to manipulate Lester and terrorize Betty (a wish that Simon is quick to make use of), the secondary motivating force is the desire to exploit another.

Edmund Fuller makes clear the inherent opposition between these two forces:

Exhibited through Simon and his works is the difference between magic and grace. Magic is a direct operation, from without, upon the person or thing that is its object. Grace is a resource of power, operative in any case only when the will, by free choice, reaches out toward or opens itself to it. [8]

All things have their own natures -- their own parts to play in the totality of all existence, co-existence, and co-inherence that Williams calls, in The Greater Trumps, the Dance. Grace provides power to be used in accordance with that nature but magic, imposed from without, must involve a distortion of that nature. For this reason, magic is inherently not only perverted, but less powerful.

This is made explicit in Richard's contrast between two of Jonathan's paintings, one a landscape of the City and one a portrait of Simon the Clerk. The City may have some damage (as its temporal counterpart, post-war London, did), but it was more whole than the followers of Simon, who appeared insectine in Jonathan's portrait:

The very rubble in the foreground was rising; not rising as the beetles were to some exterior compulsion but in proportion and to an interior plan. The whole subject -- that is, the unity; shape and hue; rubble, houses, cathedral, sky and hidden sun, all and the light that was all and held all -- advanced
The imbecile master of the painting, Simon, can perform miracles — but only, as Williams states, "miracles of lowering and loss." (p. 44.)

Both the forces of grace and those of goetia, of willing sacrifice and greedy exploitation are completely individual, yet also completely cosmic. T.S. Eliot points this out in his introduction to this novel, by examining the first pair of doubles we meet, the dead women:

Evelyn is a woman who appears too insignificant, too petty in her faults, to be really 'bad,' but yet, just because she is no more than pettiness, she delivers herself willingly into the hands of evil. Her friend, who makes the other choice, is also a rather commonplace woman; but, having lived just well enough to be able to choose the good, she develops in the light of that good she follows, and learns the meaning of love. [10]

Most of the highest acts of vicarious atonement in the novel are only half-intentional, but it is the right half; when one intends well, the effect is better. When Simon is about to sever Betty's link between mind and body, making her his eternal servant in the City, Lester takes her burden, thinking that it is only some errand she must perform. (p. 154.) However, since any kind of putting herself at another's disposal meant total co-inherence, she is not dismayed at the possibility that the forfeit may be her life. As she offers atonement for Betty, she herself is sustained by the ultimate Atonement; against the rising tide of destructive magic, something which is a cross and yet a bed supports her: "But what of integrity she possessed clung to that other integrity; her back pressed to it. It sustained her." (p. 160.)

Betty, too, speaks better than she knows, and the laws of reciprocity take her at full value. The method by which Simon is undoing Betty is the saying of the reversed tetragrammaton — the Hebrew letters YHVH, or name of God. The goetia is powerful magic; but the doctrine of exchange is more powerful yet. When Betty speaks Lester's name, "It became — hardly the Name [of God] but at least a tender mortal approximation to the Name." (p. 162.) The invocation of the tetragrammaton is quite real, and its parody is banished.

Williams says in "The Way of Exchange," "It is ordinary life which might be, more than it is, shot with this principle; it requires only, I will not say faith, but the first faint motions of faith." ("The Way of Exchange," p. 151.) Perhaps the most striking image of this interchange in All Hallows' Eve is the humblest: Lester, literally offering her life in Betty's place, remembers Richard bringing her water at night so she would not have to get out of bed. (pp. 163-64.) The first awareness of her death that Lester has is when she realizes that she's crying, but cannot borrow Richard's handkerchief, as she always had done, (p. 6) but the thought of Richard is what leads her to begin her spiritual rebirth. (p. 4.)

The magic of Simon the Clerk, however, cannot be satisfied with humility. Simon, as Eliot points out, is characterized by his, "single-minded lust for unlawful and un-limited power." (Eliot, p. xvii.) It is precisely unlawful because it is unlimited — or would be, if it could exist. Sellery states:

Williams once said that 'Power is not something one has, it is something one is.' Mrs. Ridler goes on to observe that 'the good characters in his books have all discovered this, while the evil characters are trying to make power into a possession.' (Sellery, p. 325.)

The basis of this difference, and the specific perversion of co-inherence, is the lack of mutuality in their intentions and actions. After the failure of the reversetetragrammaton, Simon has to call on Lady Wallingford for help — a parody of the redemption that Lester and Betty just provided for each other. "If indeed they had been, with whatever subdivision, allies," Williams writes, "there would have been between them an image of the truth, however debased, which might have helped. There was not." (p. 165.) This lack of mutuality is represented, there and earlier, by Simon's inability to genuinely smile: "One cannot smile at no one, and there was no one at whom he could smile. He was alone." (p. 65.)

Service to the goetic magician is, it is clear in All Hallows' Eve, quite painful to the servant. When Evelyn is sent by Simon to observe Betty, she is forced to transcend the limitations of time and space in a way which, while natural to the City, she has not yet learned. Thus, even though, "She was willing to yield to his command; she did yield," because it was a command made with neither love nor knowledge, she is pained — her soul, still used to its earthly habits, feels the pain her body would have felt being torn in two. (p. 180.) Service in the voluntary compact of Christianity, however, is not only painless but joyful to all involved. On the very next page after Evelyn's pain, Betty asks Lester about what happened when Lester took her place as the object of Simon's reversetetragrammaton spell:

"Betty said, "Darling, what happened?"

"Nothing," Lester answered. "At least, very little. I think he tried to push you somewhere, and then — well, then he tried to push me."

"You're not hurt?" Betty asked, and Lester, with a rush of laughter, answered only "Here!" (p. 181.)

Of course, it is not only a matter of where — even in the City — but how.

The commitment to exclusive superiority is one reason why goetic power is a perversion, painful to its objects and its vessels; it is also one reason why it is a trap, ultimately disastrous to the magician himself. Simon is possessed by power more than he possesses it, as Sellery points out, (Ibid.) although it is also true in two ways: he cannot make use of the full power that free exchange has, and he cannot withdraw even if he knows the course is disastrous — both because of pride, and because there is a co-inherence of evil as well as good, which only his conscious control can keep from inundating him.

Especially if some of the most powerful acts are those that are strongly meant but vaguely conceived, as we have seen, people must be left to implement their
Moreover, in being unwilling to practice free substitution themselves, goetic magicians are unable to see it in others. This consistently proves to be Simon's downfall. He is unaware of Lester's presence at the saying of the reverse tetragrammaton, because he cannot conceive of such a transference. He makes a similar mistake when he uses Evelyn to summon Lester into the magically-created false body, thinking that Evelyn's will is going to prevail and Lester will be trapped: "He supposed, since he thought in those terms, that the coming of this Lester with Evelyn meant that Evelyn had some sort of hold on Lester, and not at all that Lester had merely come. He who babbed of love knew nothing of love." (p. 190.) Simon intends to trap Lester by Evelyn; in the novel, this is a parallel and parody of the voluntary union of Lester and Betty, by which Simon is thwarted. This is the intent; but because Simon's knowledge is limited - a disastrous flaw for a magician - in his ignorance of love, it does not work out that way.

When Evelyn asks Lester to come, she betrays, concisely, the error of magic in thinking that co-inherence can be directed, controlled in ways always rationally known. When Lester says, "Do you want me?" to Evelyn, "Oh yes, yes! The gasping voice said. 'Only you. Do come.'" (p. 186.) But in the co-inherence of the City, there is no "only you" — Lester is not only Lester, any more than Betty was only Betty when the spell to sever her body and soul was being said and Lester came to her aid. A spell, because it is based in inequality, and because it is designed for a certain effect in power over someone or something, must be specific; it must be named, and it must be named precisely. The exchange of redeeming love, because it eschews such demands and humbly submits to the situation, is unlimited.

Once Simon's works begin to go wrong because of the one inherent limitation of magic, he is in deadly danger because of the other:

...When the Clerk saw before him the two shapes, he should have made an end. There had been an intrusion of an alien kind. He would not; say rather, he could not; he could not consent to leave it undominated. "The false slippery descent was opening...." (p. 165.)

As Lester realizes about the dwarf-body, there is a calling together of similarities that characterizes the justice of the City; this demands that a magician's works come back to him, just as the lover's love and the sacrificer's sacrifice do: "It had come from him; it must go to him." (p. 234.) As Simon meets failure after failure, his methods become more crude: from his own will to Lady Wallingford's long-unneeded help, to the creation of the caricature body for Lester and Evelyn, finally to the wax poppet for murdering Betty. As Williams - who, it must be recalled, had a background in magic himself with the Order of the Golden Dawn - states:

...for the greater initiate to fall back on the methods of the lesser initiate was unwise. In sorcery as in sanctity there is no return. ...No lover, of any kind, not even the lover of himself, can safely turn from maturity to adolescence. ...But the magician runs an even greater risk, for if he begins to return, his works begin to return to him. (p. 241.)

After even the poppet fails, all of Simon's magic comes back to him, undone and undoing him in the process: "This was the Return and this the operation of inflexible law." (p. 250.)

This co-inherence of evil functions in another way as well: some acts of magic, because they depend on the identification of the magician and the object of the spell, are as dangerous if they succeed as they would be if they failed. This is not the distancing, which results in no efficacious exchange, spoken of before; rather, the magician will attempt the exchange but, being unwilling to bear the burden of the other, will be unable to see it out. This is what happens to Lady Wallingford, when her thumb is pricked and her own blood joins the poppet used in the murder-spell against her daughter: "She was being, by an operation which her own will had in the beginning encouraged, slowly substituted for Betty." (p. 253.)

This act is an additional turn of the screw for Williams; a parody of a parody, it becomes a redemption - of a sort. Lady Wallingford, though petty and cruel to her daughter, was not self-serving, but functioned through her own will as an extension of Simon the Clerk. This was not love, but took part in some of the same kind of sacrifice as love, no matter what its goals were. Thus, Lady Wallingford does not merit full judgement on her intentions, which would be the death she had intended for Betty; rather, she loses memory and identity, becoming as a baby - to be cared for in a doubling of how she cared for Betty as an infant, though far more kindly:

She had given herself away and her self would be no longer there, or rather (as if it were a newborn child) would have to be cared for and trained afresh. But since in that gift she had desired the good of another and not her own, since she had indeed willed to give her self, the City secluded her passion and took her gift to its own divine self. (p. 270.)

This is the awesome justice, the fearful symmetry, that rules the City.

Mary McDermott Shideler says in The Theology of Romantic Love, "Simon is defeated not by counteracting his black magic with white, nor by the supernatural rites of the church, but by the eternal principles of the universe." [11] This is the co-inherence which asks no response, just as the lover's love and the sacrificer's sacrifice do, but demands payment for what is taken. As Williams states, "Love to love, death to death, breach to breach; that was the ordering of the City, and its nature. It threw between Simon and Evelyn; that was its choice. How it threw was theirs." (p. 141.)

Another essay in The Image of the City deserves much more attention than I can give it here. "The
continued from page 8


continued from page 9

ostentatious display of historical facts. Every word, every gesture of her tenth-century characters seems right. Details of behavior are used eloquently to express the contrast between the Celtic and Norse cultures. Most welcome is her vivid and sympathetic portrayal of Celtic Christianity (although it may be that she gives pre-Roman Church practices a greater prominence than they would have had at that late date).

For this journey back to a pristine ancient Ireland is, in the end, a journey to spiritual sources, to an unveiling of inner truth, wonderfully articulated in the climatic duel of poetry between the Odinist berserker and the Celtic Christian bard. One closes the book with after-images of pure delight. It is hard to imagine a Celtophile who would not be charmed by this story, or indeed any sensitive fantasy reader who would remain cold to its simple, quiet evocation of joy.

continued from page 18

up in last word of Gilraen's lament to Aragorn: "anim" means "for myself" (III, p. 342). #37 is undoubtedly a concatenation of two or more morphemes, but other than "tin" as "spark/star" it is difficult to say.

There are, however, glossings for "nef", "nev", and "niv" meaning, respectively, "on this side of", "hither", and "west". Could it not be that western shore of Middle-earth is the "hither" shore "on this side of" the "sundering sea" between Beleriand and Valinor? Indeed, we are told that it is so (§, p. 343). It is the land and shore of the Sindarin, the Grey-elven, the "twilight elves". They are not Calaquendi, "Elves of the Light" who had lived in Aman; nor were they Avari, the Unwilling, the Darkest of the Moriquendi; they were those who came as far as they could out of the dark without being completely in the light (§, p. 348). Thus, "tinuviel" may simply mean "twilight-spark", a poetic enough kenning for Nightingale (literally meaning "singer in the dark").

A loose, but semantically reflective translation could be:

"O thou rising Moon, Child of the One, magical jewel of the region of stars, thou who hast watched ever shining, I say to thee, Stay! Dwell where thou art! Now flower and tree, listen in silence here beneath. [To Gilraen] O Lord of the Sunset, of the Twilight, Star-kindler, I must sing to thee; for I am, myself, Tinuviel, a spark of the Twilight, a Star ever in Twilight, the Nightingale."

A simple principle "language-legend and legend-language". I am glad Christopher reminded me of it.