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Abstract
Entries 42–59 in this series are written by Hammond (Tolkien material) and Christopher (Lewis and other material). See Hammond, Wayne G., for one later entry in this series.

Fleischer's book is a novelization of William Nicholson's script for the movie of the same name, directed by Richard Attenborough and starring Anthony Hopkins as C. S. Lewis and Debra Winger as Joy Davidman. To make a film script into a novel, the writer has to add material, since most film scripts are equivalents of novelettes in length. Fleischer's lack of knowledge of Lewis is very apparent when she is adding material — the prologue, titled “What's Prologue Is Past,” is an obvious example. But most of the time when she is following the script, her narrative is enjoyable — not any more accurate than the script was, but enjoyable.

Some examples from the prologue: (a) Lewis, before meeting Davidman, “thinks of himself as a pretty good chap” (4) — which makes it sound as if he had never heard of pride. (b) “His form of Christianity is a youthful, ardent religion, filled with mystical incense-scented ceremonies in which the soul unites with its Creator” (6) — which does not sound like the parish church Lewis attended. (c) “For this man, there are three forms of love — Charis, which is the divine grace that is the root of the word "charity"; Agape, the Christian feast of prayer and Scripture, also defined as the love of God for humankind. In these two, he believes, and he is steeped in their precepts like a teabag in a cup. But the third love, Eros, . . . [h]e has rejected” (6) — so much for Lewis’s *The Four Loves,* and also for the brewing of tea. (d) “[In] World War I . . . this man saw his best friend killed” (8) — actually, his best friend was in Ireland, and Lewis did not see Paddy Moore killed, since they were not together in the war. An example from the first chapter, “The Dreaming Spires”: “he taught the allegorical medieval love poetry, *amour courtois,* idealistic yet chaste, that was so dear to his scholarly heart” (13-14) — its chastity is suggested, no doubt, by Lewis’s third mark of Courtly Love: Adultery (as listed on p. 2 of *The Allegory of Love*). Many more examples could be cited.

The argument against taking these and other errors seriously is that this is a fiction; it is not a biography. This is true, but it still seems unfortunate that Fleischer did not get even the material correct that was not changed in the script. (For example, it would have hurt nothing to describe Courtly Love correctly and to say that Lewis understood the theory much more than the practice of erotic love.) There is, it should be added, some “backgrounding” of Joy Davidman also — especially her marching in Communist May Day parades in New York City, with a description of the folk singers at the end of the parade (225).

This seems to be fiction also; at least, nothing like it is mentioned in Lyle W. Dorsett’s biography — *And God Came In* — of Davidman.

This book is, in short, a curiosity in Lewis studies; but there is a chance it will influence a large number of people’s perceptions of Lewis. It has two photographs from the film on the cover; but, unlike the usual practice with novelizations, there are no stills from the film bound into the book.

[JRC]


Lowenberg, a professional librarian, indicates in her preface that this book is intended to update Joe R. Christopher and Joan K. Ostling’s *C. S. Lewis: An Annotated Checklist of Writings about Him and His Works* (1974), which covered material on Lewis through mid-1972. She duplicates no items from the earlier work, and she lists the twenty-one indices and bibliographies which she used as sources for her book (vii-viii). When, as happens only occasionally, she has not seen an item, she lists the source of its listing. Her arrangement of items is alphabetical, by year; her annotations tend to be short and objective. (The latter term means that she does not evaluate the items, as did Christopher and Ostling.) She includes in her listing reviews of books by Lewis but no reviews of books on Lewis. She includes doctoral dissertations but not masters’ theses. She does not include fictional, poetic, and dramatic uses of Lewis and his writings (as Christopher and Ostling did, for his cultural influence.) Her index in the back of the book, which is necessary to find items on the same topic, includes the authors of items, works by Lewis, and thematic topics. In short, this is a very professional work and very well done within its limits.

None of the following (or the above) comments should be taken to be an attack on Lowenberg’s work, for this bibliographer was one of those who reviewed her original proposal and recommended its publication; he is very
pleased with the result. But no human work is perfect, and a few comments are in order. (1) Obviously, the index is very important for finding content. There are two problems. First, Lowenberg tends, in her short annotations, to refer to those of Lewis’s books that are being discussed and not to his essays (unless the item is mainly on his essays) — admittedly, some essays tend to scattershot titles by Lewis. Thus both her descriptions and her index miss some citations of essays which a critic might have wanted. Second, the index is very occasionally curiously worded. For example, there is neither a listing of nor a cross-listing under Natural Law; a user has to know to look under Tao. This is no problem for a student of Lewis, but someone unfamiliar with Lewis is going to have problems. (2) Lowenberg’s decision to begin when Christopher and Ostling stopped means that some important items that they missed are still omitted — such as a Lord David Cecil interview that involved a description of the Inklings. (3) Sometimes there are obscurities in Lowenberg’s text, such as the cross-references between 1979.17 and 1979.62 — the former is said to be a reprint of the latter, but the former is an anonymous comparison of three reviews of They Stand Together and the latter is a review of the book by Naomi Lewis; probably Lewis’s review is reprinted, in whole or part, with the comparison, but it is not clear. (4) Lowenberg’s “Introduction: C. S. Lewis — His Life and Work” has at least one error in it — she mentions Owen Barfield as a Christian in the 1920s (p. 3), but he did not make a Christian profession until after World War II. No doubt regular use of this volume will show some other specific problems, but the overall professionalism and completeness need to be stressed.


No doubt with the current movie of Shadowlands and continuing interest in Lewis, productions of Nicholson’s second version of his material (the first was as a British television movie) will continue to be produced. This production was the first this bibliographer had seen, and it was nicely done. The Sewell Theatre in Abilene has a turntable in its stage that allowed the shifts from the Kilns to other scenes quickly, with the actors simply standing for a short time on the outer edges of the stage; the turntable was complemented with electronically-sliding neutral backdrops, which parted for the revolution and came back together for the next scene, while the setting which had rotated off could be changed. The fantasy scenes, in which Douglas Gresham (played by Conrad Hester) finally brings the magic apple to his mother, were handled by the backdrop opening without rotating off the realistic scene in front. The acting in this student production was good, if not as emotionally affecting as no doubt the New York professional production of a few years ago was. The accents were not perfect: the British accents were sometimes slightly Germanic, and Joy Davidman’s New York accent was not really attempted, although the actress certainly spoke faster and more neutrally than the Texas production would suggest. Overall, a good production of this fictionalized part of Lewis’s life.


A science-fiction novel, the sequel to The Mote in God’s Eye (1974). The term Sauron is used without any reference to Tolkien; it refers to a variety of humans bred (or genetically developed) to be warriors (in Tolkienian terms, they would be something like Orcs). The term is first introduced in relation to a character who is “five percent Sauron superman”; one character describes them:

“They were perfect soldiers, the Saurons. March for a week without sleeping. Tolerate any sunlight level, any gravity. Breathe any atmosphere, never mind the stench. Sleep anyway, wake instantly. ... Eat anything organic. Anything.” (189)

Later, there is a reference to “a Sauron Menace game” (209). For the clearest statement of the breeding of Saurons, see p. 251. Note: these two science-fiction novels are set in the "CoDominium" future history of Pournelle, and there may be other references to Saurons there.


Patterson offers a reply to Kath Filmer’s charges of Lewis’s misogyny in That Hideous Strength, as presented in Filmer’s The Fiction of C. S. Lewis, Mask and Mirror. Patterson takes a passage in which the women in the Company at St. Anne’s are not enumerated — “four men, some women, and a bear” — which Filmer had pointed to as indicative of Lewis’s attitude — puts it in context, and, somewhat later, reads it as an echo of New Testament phrasing. But she does more than just answer Filmer. She establishes, on the basis of Elisabeth Schüssler-Fiorenza’s But She Said: Feminist Practices of Biblical Interpretation (1992), two models of Christian community found in the New Testament: (1) a community of friends, and (2) a hierarchical organization (the latter referred to as “the politics of submission” by Schüssler-Fiorenza). Patterson, following Schüssler-Fiorenza, sees these two concepts at odds in the history of Christianity, and Patterson finds Lewis using both in the Company at St. Anne’s in That Hideous Strength. Patterson discusses the Company in these terms — the coming together mainly due to friendship, for example. She also discusses Filmer’s implicit dislike of Ransoms’s emphasis on obedience in marriage; but Patterson complicates that, in terms of the novel, by the mutuality also emphasized. “In my opinion,” writes Patterson,

the whole book is directed toward these interlocked and complementary concepts of equality and reciprocity in
social relationships and in marriage as a dance of mutual
and shared obedience. (6)

In addition to this basic thesis, Patterson offers a number
of other insights. One is in a discussion of Jane Studdock's
experience of God: "we have [in that passage], not the
woman's experience, but the man's, in fact, the experience
of C. S. Lewis himself" (7). Patterson seems to suggest that
a typical feminine experience of God is that of "a deep and
permanent reassurance," while the experience described
in That Hideous Strength (the end of Ch. 14), that of a
demand, is typically masculine. (Typical is an important
word in this claim, for not all men and women have
personalities that are typical of their gender.) [JRC]

A New Scholarship

Fund

A modest amount of money has been made available
for a scholarship to help meet the expenses of a scholar
who wishes to attend, and preferably, to present a paper
at Mythopoeic Conference XXV. This scholarship will be
awarded on the basis of financial need and ability to
contribute to mythopoeic scholarship. To apply for this,
send your request, along with a statement of your finan­
cial status, your academic rank and affiliation, and copies
of the abstracts of any papers you will be submitting to
Carl Hostetter, 2509 Ambling Circle, Crofton, MD 21114.
If you wish to contribute money to this fund, for this
year's Mythopoeic Conference and for future Mythopoeic
Conferences, send a check made out to The Mythopoeic
Society at P. O. Box 6707, Altadena, CA, 91003. Be sure to
mark on your check that the money is designated for the
Mythopoeic Scholarship Fund.

The C. S. Lewis Centenary

1898 - 1998

This past November marked the passing of three dec­
dades since the death of C. S. Lewis in 1963. With the 100th
anniversary of his birth approaching in this last decade of
the millennium, it is not too soon to begin planning for the
C. S. Lewis Centenary. The projected celebration in the
summer of 1998 is only a little more than four years away.
The Mythopoeic Society, the oldest organization devoted
to C. S. Lewis, is making plans to use the 1998 Mythopoeic
Conference as a base upon which to build the Lewis Cen­
tenary Celebration, similar to the seven day Tolkien Cen­
tenary Celebration held in 1992.

The Society is considering various locations, possibly in
the Mid-West. Some think that America has the strongest
interest in Lewis of any nation currently, and therefore that
the Conference might be better attended in the US. How­
ever, we are open to all suggestions.

The Mythopoeic Society is contacting other Lewis or­
organizations, inviting their ideas and participation. You are
asked to please spread the word to your friends who have
an interest in Lewis, and to write the Society with your own
thoughts and ideas. This undertaking will need the input
and execution of many people.

LETTERS

Readers' Letters are an important form
of feedback and exchange, an opportu­
nity to comment on past issues and to
raise questions for others' comments.
Each letter that is printed extends the
writer's subscription by an additional
issue. Please send your letters directly
to the Editor: Glen GoodKnight, 742
South Garfield Avenue, Monterey Park,
CA 91754 USA

Nancy-Lou Patterson Waterloo, Ont., Canada

Do please accept my assurance that Mythlore is a major
publication filling a gap that no other journal attempts to
fill, and that if noting else (and there is a lot else) it gives
all the wonderful folks who contribute to it a glorious
opportunity to express their love for the authors whose
works are celebrated in its pages. To have kept such a
delicate balancing act intact and continuous for all these
years is a fantastic achievement and you deserve vastly
more credit tha you get for have accomplished this feat.
Long live Mythlore, the most enchanting combination of
fandom and scholarship (usually from the same contribu­
tors) ever to find itself in print.