

C. S. Lewis's Theory of Romance

ROSE MARIE BESTON

IN A WORLD THAT is highly mechanized and oriented towards the future, C. S. Lewis strove to revitalize the medieval and Renaissance world and its literature. Lewis's interests in the earlier culture were wide-ranging, including such topics as the nature of allegory, courtly love as a literary and cultural phenomenon, and the meaning and order of medieval cosmology. They also included another topic, one that so far has not received scholarly attention but one on which he made an important contribution to criticism: the nature of the imaginative experience expressed in romance writing.¹

Lewis never formally articulated his ideas on the qualities of romance in any one place, but hints of them are widely dispersed throughout the writings.² It is my aim here first to offer a synthesis of those views. Second, I will indicate how they permeated his criticism, from his writings on Arthurian romance to his writings on certain forms of modern romance. Finally, I will endeavour to define his place and to assess his importance in the twentieth-century study of romance as a genre.

Lewis described the quality and the effect of the romantic imagination in his poetry:

Why should I leave this green-floored cell,
Roofed with blue air, in which we dwell,
Unless, outside its guarded gates,
Long, long desired, the Unearthly waits,
Strangeness that moves us more than fear,
Beauty that stabs with tingling spear,
Or Wonder, laying on one's heart
That finger-tip at which we start
As if some thought too swift and shy
For reason's grasp had just gone by?³

Lewis championed the romantic imagination in literature of all periods, but it was primarily to medieval and Renaissance literature that he turned in his quest for the Unearthly, for Strangeness, Beauty, and Wonder.

One of the qualities of the romantic impulse in man, and one of the three principal characteristics of the imagination expressed in romance, according to Lewis, is *Sehnsucht*. This term he explains in his autobiography when he relates a childhood experience that made him an incurable romantic:

And every day there were what we called "The Green Hills"; that is, the low line of the Castlereagh Hills which we saw from the nursery windows. They were not very far off but they were, to children, quite unattainable. They taught me longing — *Sehnsucht*.⁴

Writing in the preface to the second edition of *The Pilgrim's Regress*, Lewis distinguishes *Sehnsucht* from other longings in two respects:

In the first place, though the sense of want is acute and even painful, yet the mere wanting is felt to be somehow a delight. . . . In the second place, there is a peculiar mystery about the object of this Desire.⁵

The imagination of the romance writer, as Lewis sees it, is forever, in all periods, on a quest for the fulfilment of its *Sehnsucht* in the unexplored realms of earth, space, spirit, or Faerie.⁶ But Lewis also describes *Sehnsucht* as a universal quality, innate within man himself: strong in the romance writer, who gives it form in his characters and plots, and strong in the reader when it is evoked again in him by romantic literature.

The realms into which the romance writer's imagination wanders *sehrend* in search of fulfilment Lewis describes as the world of the Numinous, a second principal characteristic of romance:

suppose that you were told simply "There is a mighty spirit in the room," and believed it. Your feelings would be then even less like the fear of danger, but the disturbance would be profound. You would feel wonder and a certain shrinking—a sense of inadequacy to cope with such a visitant and of prostration before it—an emotion which might be expressed in Shakespeare's words "under it my genius is rebuked." This feeling may be described as awe, and the object which excites it as the *Numinous*.⁷

The imagination of the romance writer would capture and transmit to the reader this feeling of awe:

The romancer creates a world where everything may, and most things do, have a deeper meaning and a longer history than the errant knight would have expected; a world of endless forests, quest, hint, prophecy. . . . The hero is a sort of intruder or trespasser; always, unawares, stumbling on to forbidden ground. . . . The hard, gay colours make this world very unlike that of Kafka, but it has some of the same qualities. You might call it inverted (or converted) Kafka; a Kafka who enjoys the labyrinth.⁸

Thus, the hero of romance is fated to pursue the quest of unattainable desire in a setting invested with an air of mystery: in the awesome world of the Numinous.

In his discussions of romance, Lewis frequently stresses, besides *Sehnsucht* and the Numinous, the quality of imaginative freedom; and his stress links it with the other two qualities as a third principal characteristic of romance. It is precisely through the imagination that the world created in romance writing is freed from the restrictions of realism. Lewis had emphasized imaginative freedom as an element of romance in his very first book of literary criticism, *The Allegory of Love*. There he wrote that when allegory enters a work, romance also slips in:

The poet is free to invent, beyond the limits of the possible, regions of strangeness and beauty for their own sake. . . . Under the pretext of allegory something else has slipped in, and something so important that the garden in the *Romance of the Rose* itself is only one of its temporary embodiments — something which, under many names, lurks at the back of most romantic poetry. I mean the “other world” not of religion, but of imagination; the land of longing, the Earthly Paradise, the garden east of the sun and west of the moon.⁹

In *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century Excluding Drama*, written late in his career, his emphasis on imaginative freedom as the essence of literature provides a unifying theme.¹⁰

In my discussion I have avoided associating romance exclusively with any one period, for Lewis insisted that the romantic spirit is shared by all literary periods, including our own. It wandered more freely in earlier times than it does now, however,

when he found it expressed only in the minor genres of children's stories and science fiction.

Lewis's view of romance is the natural outcome of his interest in the literature of earlier times. In the romance of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, and particularly in the Arthurian romances, Lewis found the ideal illustrations of his critical view. When he discussed Laȝamon's *Brut*, Malory's *Morte Darthur*, and Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, he was guided by the general characteristics of the world of romance as he saw them: *Sehnsucht*, the Numinous, and imaginative freedom.

In the years preceding his death in 1963, Lewis was becoming increasingly interested in the *Brut*, contributing an introduction to a new edition and writing an essay on its mode of composition. Technically the *Brut*, even in its Arthurian section, belongs to the epic rather than the romance, but in important additions to its sources it does foreshadow later Arthurian romances. Lewis viewed Laȝamon's introduction or elaboration of the supernatural as one manifestation of the imaginative freedom of romance at work in the author. Laȝamon's twice mentioning that Arthur "after his last battle was carried to Avalon for the healing of his wounds and that the Britons still look for his return thence," Lewis points out, makes us much surer than Wace had made us that "Avalon is a fairy country, since Arthur is taken thither by Argante, 'the queen,' 'the fairest of all elves.'" Laȝamon's imaginative additions to the character of Merlin as it was depicted by Wace gave "to the account of Merlin's begetting all that renders that story worth telling — the virgin bower, the beautiful ladies-in-waiting, the glimmering golden shape of the aerial ravisher."¹² Lewis suggests then that Laȝamon's treatment of Merlin somehow established Merlin's connection with another Fairy world, the world of the Numinous.

Lewis's interest in Malory predates his writings on Laȝamon by more than a decade. After Vinaver published his edition of *Morte Darthur* in 1947, Lewis was engaged in a lively discussion with him about the nature, themes, and unity of the book. In a series of reviews, articles, and letters Lewis clarified his ideas on Malory as a romancer. "What Malory meant," he admitted in a letter written in 1955,

I have no idea. I doubt if he had any clear intention. To use an image I have used before, I think his work is like one of our old English cathedrals to which many generations have contributed in many different styles, so that the total effect was foreseen by no one and must be regarded as something midway between a work of art and a work of nature. I therefore give up asking what M. meant; we can only ask what his book in fact *means*. And to me it means primarily neither the Grail story nor the Lancelot story but precisely the tension and interlocking between the two.¹³

Lewis's emphasis here is on the relationship between the two great quests (the two examples of *Sehnsucht*) in the *Morte Darthur*. In Lancelot, the longings for human love and for divine vision are tragically irreconcilable. As Lancelot views the past in his last farewell to Guinevere, he laments, "God deffende but that I shulde forsake the worlde as ye have done. For in the queste for the Sankgreall I had that tyme forsakyn the vanytees of the worlde, had not youre love been."¹⁴

Writing of the world in which Lancelot pursued these irreconcilable quests, Vinaver had suggested that Malory eliminated many of the marvellous elements of his sources in order to rationalize the Numinous and so bring the story closer to the world of ordinary experience. Lewis thought, however, that Malory's intention in reducing the element of the marvellous may have been to create a world that was more romantic, not less:

All Malory's "realistic" alterations may have been made in a spirit opposite to that which Professor Vinaver supposes. But even if they were not it makes curiously little difference. It would only mean that wishing to rationalize, he has produced the contrary effect. He laboured in Professor Vinaver's view to thin the romantic forest and make the labyrinth less mysterious; and, for his pains, the impression made on posterity is that which Milton unerringly recalls of

faery damsels met in forest wide
By knights of Logres or of Lyonesse.

By pruning the marvellous he has strengthened its growth. By homely details he has given his story that air of sober conviction in which it excels all other romantic narratives.¹⁵

Although Lewis's discussions of the *Morte Darthur*, as of the *Brut*, are not confined to a consideration of the romantic qualities

of *Sehnsucht*, the Numinous, and imaginative freedom, his praise of these qualities is a continuous and important theme throughout his critical writings on these works. What is emerging is the picture of a critic not simply explaining the romantic imagination but also defending it because it expresses most closely his own imaginative experience, as both a creator and a reader of literature.

The world of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, perhaps more than that of any Arthurian romance written in the Middle Ages proper, deserves according to Lewis to be called the "golden world" of romance.¹⁶ He uses the term golden mostly to describe the themes of the poem, youth and innocence, but occasionally also to praise its style. His Spenserian studies manifest an unswerving love of the *Faerie Queene* as the quintessence of romantic vision, a vision of longings, quests, and the Numinous world of the imagination. The place of composition for the poem, Lewis suggests, was singularly fortunate, for Spenser

may, as a poet, have needed the very country. There is a real affinity between his *Faerie Queene*, a poem of quests and wanderings and inextinguishable desires, and Ireland itself — the soft, wet air, the loneliness, the muffled shapes of the hills, the heart-rending sunsets. It was of course a different Ireland from ours, an Ireland without potatoes, whitewashed cottages, or bottled stout; but it must already have been "the land of longing."¹⁷

The Irish land of longing became the fairy world of Arthur and Gloriana, and in this world of the imagination Spenser sent forth his knights on their quests.

Borrowing a term from Vinaver, Lewis described the relationships of the many quests in the *Faerie Queene* as an example of polyphonic narrative. The method, used also by French and Italian romancers, is one which is "constantly shifting from one story and one set of characters to another, but with a 'dovetail' or liaison at the point where we change."¹⁸ The effect of a multi-layered narrative on the reader is to produce an impression of a world rich in imaginative wonders, and Numinous in imaginative possibilities:

Because the (improbable) adventure which we are following is liable at any moment to be interrupted by some quite different

(improbable) adventure, there steals upon us unawares the conviction that adventures of this sort are going on all round us, that in this vast forest (we are nearly always in a forest) this is the sort of thing that goes on all the time. . . . We lose the feeling that the stories we are shown were arbitrarily made up by the poet. On the contrary, we are sure there are plenty more which he has not time to show us. We are being given mere selections, specimens: instances of the normal life of that wooded, faerie world. The result of this is an astonishing sense of reality.¹⁹

It is clear from Lewis's praise of the *Faerie Queene* that he saw in the poem a vision of romance which was eminently like his own. He admitted that he was biased in favour of the old culture which found such rich expression in the world of Spenser's poem: "We can only say that those who in any degree belong to the old culture still find in the ordered exuberance of the *Faerie Queene* an invigorating refreshment which no other book can supply."²⁰

Two modern genres, children's fairy stories and science fiction, Lewis maintained, express the same imaginative experience as that found previously in romance — and Lewis was himself a practitioner of both these modern genres. In the *Other Worlds of Faerie and Outer Space* (in children's stories and science fiction respectively) the actions are transferred to a new setting, but one which evokes a familiar romantic response. The writer of children's fairy stories expresses a *Sehnsucht* and presents a world of the Numinous; he presents the reader with a

longing for he knows not what. It stirs and troubles him (to his life-long enrichment) with a dim sense of something beyond his reach and, far from dulling or emptying the actual world, gives it a new dimension of depth. He does not despise real woods because he has read of enchanted woods: the reading makes all woods a little enchanted.²¹

The writer of fairy stories, like the earlier romancer, creates freely within the unexplored region of the "enchanted woods," as did Lewis himself in the *Chronicles of Narnia*. Likewise, the writer of science fiction creates worlds beyond our experience with an awe and enchantment of their own. Now that the confines of this planet have been charted, the modern romancer explores the universe beyond. Contemporary science fiction therefore

represents simply an imaginative impulse as old as the human race working under the special conditions of our own time. It is not difficult to see why those who wish to visit strange regions in search of such beauty, awe, or terror as the actual world does not supply have increasingly been driven to other planets or other stars.²²

In contemporary fairy stories and science fiction as in the romances of earlier times, the writer goes beyond the limits of the known world seeking imaginative freedom in the world of the Numinous.

In his view of romance, Lewis belongs with those literary critics who lay stress on the imaginative world of romance where quests and *aventures* are all. His emphasis here associates him with W. P. Ker and Edith Rickert.²³ His position is quite distinct, however, from that of Dorothy Everett, who characterized the spirit of medieval romance as realer than real.²⁴ She maintained that the gorgeous descriptions of food and dress in medieval romances were heightenings of real circumstances, where Lewis would maintain that such gorgeousness was evidence of the freedom of imagination possessed by the romance writer, a freedom that no limits of realism could circumscribe. The views of both groups have in fact their validity, erring only insofar as they exclude one another: if the description of the arming of Gawain in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* belongs to high romance, the description of the preparation for the tournament at Reims in Jean Renaut's *Galeran de Bretagne* is essentially heightened realism.

Lewis disagrees most notably with those critics like Jessie Watson, R. S. Loomis, and John Speirs, whom he sees as adopting "The Anthropological Approach."²⁵ Lewis criticizes their approach and in so doing, presents an eloquent defence of romance:

Until our own age readers accepted this world as the romancers' "noble and joyous" invention. It was not, to be sure, wholly unrelated to the real world. It was invented by and for men who felt the real world, in its rather different way, to be also cryptic, significant, full of voices and "the mystery of life." There has now arisen a type of reader who cannot thus accept it. The tale in itself does not seem to him to provide adequate grounds for the feelings to which he is dimly aware that he is being prompted.

He therefore invents new grounds for them in his own life as a reader. And he does this by building up round himself a second romance which he mistakes for reality. This second romance is a distorted version of the first one. It also is a quest story, but it is he, not Perceval or Gawain, that is on the quest. The forests are not those of Broceliande but those of anthropological theory.²⁶

The anthropological approach cannot, for Lewis, open to readers the full richness of the world of romance; it can only lead to detours away from the real attractions of romance literature. But when he asserts that the romantic experience is innate in men of all ages, Lewis stands apart from all these critics. Their interest in romance lay in its academic study as genre, whereas Lewis's lay in its role in life itself. At times he championed the necessity of a romantic imagination with an almost religious zeal.

Because he sees the romantic imagination as innate in man, Lewis often fails to distinguish between the process of the imagination in the writer and the effect on the reader. We have seen that he uses *Sehnsucht* not only to describe the longings or quests that are the essential actions of the romances created by Malory or Spenser, but also to describe an intense longing that is universal and timeless within man. Similarly, he speaks of the Numinous world of Spenser as having been created deliberately by that writer; but he also speaks of the Numinous world of Malory as if it had come into being without conscious creation by the author. We are not always certain whether Lewis is talking about writer, reader, or the literary work itself. What is blurred here is the conscious role of the romance writer in the world that he creates.

Lewis's view of romance is also limited in its applicability, emphasizing only elements that interest him, like the Numinous, while neglecting elements that link the world of romance more closely with the real world than he would allow. Notable among these elements that link romance to the real world are levelonging, a psychological orientation, noncourtly aspects of life, and a comic vein that keeps resurfacing. During the remainder of this paper, I will discuss these areas of omission in Lewis's theory of romance.

In his discussion of *Sehnsucht*, Lewis does not mention the *Sehnsucht nach Liebe*, the longing for love, which is so important

an element in medieval romances. The lais of Marie de France, for example, derive their appeal as much from the yearning for love as from the elements of the marvellous; and a number of them, like *Les Deus Amanz*, *Laüstic*, and *Chevrefoil*, deal with lovelonging detached from any association with the marvellous. A good many romances, in fact, deal with the theme of lovelonging exclusively, without evoking the Numinous at all. What charms and excites us in the Old Provençal romance *Flamenca*, for instance, is simply the resourcefulness of the hero Guillaume in winning the love of the heroine.

Nor does Lewis attempt to explain the appeal of the psychological orientation of romances such as *Yvain* or the *Mort Artu*. The appeal of *Yvain*, to Chrétien's own audience and to readers since, lies not only in its evocation of the world of the Numinous and of *Sehnsucht* and its imaginative freedom, as Lewis would point out, but also in its analysis of the psychology of love, an aspect that Lewis never discusses. The *Mort Artu*, "un des plus beaux romans du Moyen Age" as Frappier justly calls it, portrays a world in which the figures and passions and deeds are on a grand scale, but a real world nevertheless, not adequately described by Lewis's view. Frappier gives a better account of what the author is doing:

Sans prodiguer les notations concrètes, ce psychologue est cependant un réaliste; il écarte presque complètement le fantastique et le merveilleux, ainsi que le symbolisme mystique.²⁷

Lewis's view of romance accounts well for stories of aristocratic life, but does not comprehend those in which noncourtly elements are strong. One such romance is *Havelock the Dane*. Havelok's early life is spent outside the court in Grim's fishing village, and his introduction to the court is through the kitchen: he is only a court figure when he gains his throne. The occupations of the hero (selling fish, helping in the kitchen) and his activities (stone throwing, fighting with a club) are especially uncourtly. The only notable respect in which *Havelock the Dane* accords with Lewis's view of romance is its suggestion of a Numinous world in the light that, as Havelok sleeps, issues from his mouth or stands above his shoulder in the form of a cross. Lewis's view is drawn

from the more aristocratic aspects of romances and reveals his attraction to a world removed in time and social composition from the real world.

In his concept of the qualities in romance that proceed from a basic need in man, Lewis does not include comic appeal. He does refer to the comic vein of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, but without acknowledging it as one of the poem's main sources of appeal. He stresses the Numinous quality associated with Ber-cilak²⁸ but not his teasing propensities or his animal vitality. The Numinous constitutes only one element in the romance, and at times the author himself undercuts the awe associated with it. The world of the *Gawain*-poet is one in which a sense of humour is as strong as the marvellous; it is a very different world than that of Malory or Spenser. In *Aucassin et Nicolette*, too, the harmonious presence side by side of broader comedy and delicate romance cannot be explained by Lewis's view; the conjoining of farcical comedy in the Torelore episode and the romantic descriptions of Nicolette in no way lessens the appeal of that poem. The comic appeal within these romances proceeds from a need in man as basic as those that Lewis named.

All four strands, lovelonging, psychological interest, noncourtly, and comic link the world of romance with the real world. The world of romance is not exclusively a marvellous one as Lewis would maintain; it is in fact dependent on the world of reality. Its figures are endowed with human emotions, and its adventures reflect human stories already familiar to us. When the romances introduce realistic elements like comedy or situations from non-courtly, everyday life and depict familiar emotional responses, they remind us that although the world they paint is a richer, more exciting one than our own, it is in essence a real world.

Lewis was by temperament more at home within an earlier culture than that of the twentieth century. He saw the times before our own as assigning a higher value to an imaginative response, and he felt an affinity with them for that reason. In his inaugural lecture at Cambridge, *De Descriptione Temporum*, he echoes such nineteenth-century thinkers as John Stuart Mill and Matthew Arnold,²⁹ setting "the greatest of all divisions in the history of the West" at the end of "the age of Jane Austen and

Scott";³⁰ that division would separate the Old Western Culture from our own. The crucial event that brought about the division was the growth of machines and technology, which he seems to have regarded as inimical to the flourishing of romance. It is to the Old Western Culture that he declared his allegiance, seeing its various periods — the ancient, the medieval, and the post-medieval — as possessing in common a strong imaginative appeal in their romance writings. The names of modern writers are conspicuously missing among those whose work he praises; his interest in modern literature, judging by his own references, was confined to Orwell, Tolkien, and science fiction writers. When he himself in his science fiction novels writes of the future, he portrays it as essentially a projection of the past: he uses the myth of the Christian Fall in *Voyage to Venus* and the matter of the Arthurian cycle in *That Hideous Strength*. And Orwell and Tolkien, like Lewis, found inspiration in the past: Orwell made brilliant use of the beast-fable in *Animal Farm* (as did Lewis in his *Chronicle of Narnia*), and Tolkien's trilogy is a kind of twentieth-century medieval romance. Much of Lewis's attraction to these two modern authors, as also to specific romances of the Old Western Culture, lies in the fact that they accord with his own imaginative vision. Lewis's discussion of the spirit of romance, in fact, seems to be a vindication of his personal tastes.

Lewis admits freely his prejudice against realism in modern literature, which he hardly deals with. We have seen that he does not even take adequate cognizance of realistic strains in the romances of the Old Western Culture. Speaking of the interpretation of Old Western Culture from the standpoint of Old Western Man, Lewis is evasive about the disadvantage involved, but eloquent about the advantage:

I myself belong far more to that Old Western order than to yours. I am going to claim that this, which in one way is a disqualification for my task, is yet in another a qualification. The disqualification is obvious. You don't want to be lectured on Neanderthal man by a Neanderthaler, still less on dinosaurs by a dinosaur. And yet, is that the whole story? . . . One thing I know: I would give a great deal to hear any ancient Athenian, even a stupid one, talking about Greek tragedy. He would know in his bones so much that we seek in vain. . . . Ladies and gentlemen, I stand

before you somewhat as that Athenian might stand. I read as a native texts that you must read as foreigners. . . . Speaking not only for myself but for all other Old Western men who you may meet, I would say, use your specimens while you can. There are not going to be many more dinosaurs.³¹

NOTES

- ¹ Although Lewis's bias toward romance and romanticism has been long recognized, it has been hitherto related only to his religious writings and creative works and not to his literary criticism. See for example Corbin S. Carnell, "The Dialect of Desire: C. S. Lewis' Interpretation of *Sehnsucht*," unpub. diss. (University of Florida, 1960), and Robert J. Reilly, *Romantic Religion: A Study of Owen Barfield, C. S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and J. R. R. Tolkien* (Athens, Georgia: Univ. of Georgia Press, 1971).
- ² The closest Lewis comes to any formal articulation of his views of romance is in *An Experiment in Criticism* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1961), pp. 43-44. Here he mentions in a discussion of the nature of myth the numinous world and imaginative freedom. But he blurs the distinction between myth and romance, using the "romances" of Rider Haggard to illustrate myth.
- ³ "Expostulation," *Poems*, ed. Walter Hooper (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964), p. 58.
- ⁴ *Surprised by Joy: The Shape of My Early Life* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1955), p. 7. Lewis does not give any explanation for his use of the German term *Sehnsucht*, perhaps because he assumes widespread knowledge of Goethe's poem *Selige Sehnsucht*, from which he has taken it.
- ⁵ *The Pilgrim's Regress* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1965), pp. 7-8. Lewis's discussion of *Sehnsucht* has clear religious implications here, but, as in his autobiography, he suggests that *Sehnsucht* is innate within man as well.
- ⁶ Throughout this paper "Faerie" will be used to designate the realm of the elf or Fairy. This meaning I am borrowing from J. R. R. Tolkien's essay, "On Fairy Stories," *Essays Presented to Charles Williams*, ed. C. S. Lewis (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1966), p. 42.
- ⁷ *The Problem of Pain* (New York: Macmillan, 1944), p. 5. Lewis also described the Numinous in "Is Theism Important: A Reply," *Socratic Digest*, 5 (1952), 49-50.
- ⁸ "The Anthropological Approach," *Selected Literary Essays*, ed. Walter Hooper (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1969), pp. 309-10.
- ⁹ *The Allegory of Love: A Study in the Medieval Tradition* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1936), pp. 75-76.
- ¹⁰ Dabney Hart, "C. S. Lewis's Defense of Poesie," unpub. diss. (University of Wisconsin, 1959), pp. 104-05.
- ¹¹ *The Discarded Image* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1964), pp. 8-10.

- ¹² "The Genesis of a Medieval Book," *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1966), p. 30; "Introduction," *Selections from Lazamon's "Brut,"* ed. George L. Brook (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1963), p. x.
- ¹³ *Letters of C. S. Lewis*, ed. Warren H. Lewis (London: Bles, 1966), p. 264.
- ¹⁴ Quoted by Lewis in "The Morte Darthur," *TLS* (June 7, 1947), p. 274.
- ¹⁵ "The Morte Darthur," *TLS*, p. 274.
- ¹⁶ On Lewis's use of "golden" see *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), pp. 64, 318.
- ¹⁷ "Edmund Spenser, 1522-99," *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Literature*, p. 126; see also *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 356-57.
- ¹⁸ "Edmund Spenser," p. 133.
- ¹⁹ "Edmund Spenser," p. 135.
- ²⁰ *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century*, p. 393.
- ²¹ "On Three Ways of Writing for Children," *Of Other Worlds* (London: Bles, 1966), pp. 29-30.
- ²² "On Science Fiction," *Of Other Worlds*, pp. 67-68.
- ²³ William P. Ker, *Epic and Romance* (London: Macmillan, 1897); Edith Rickert, "Introduction," *Early English Romances of Love* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1908).
- ²⁴ Dorothy Everett, "A Characterization of the English Medieval Romances," *Essays on Middle English Literature*, ed. Patricia Kean (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1955).
- ²⁵ Jessie L. Weston, *From Ritual to Romance* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1920); Roger S. Loomis, *Celtic Myth and Arthurian Romance* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1927); John Speirs, *Medieval English Poetry: The Non-Chaucerian Tradition* (London: Faber & Faber, 1957).
- ²⁶ "The Anthropological Approach," *Selected Literary Essays*, p. 310.
- ²⁷ *La Mort le Roi Artu*, ed. Jean Frappier (Paris: Droz, 1964), p. xxvi.
- ²⁸ "Arthuriana," a review of *Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages: a collaborative study*, ed. Roger S. Loomis, in *The Cambridge Review*, 81 (February 13, 1960), 355.
- ²⁹ Mill and Arnold are quoted, among others who make essentially the same historical division as Lewis, by Walter E. Houghton, *The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale Univ. Press, 1957), pp. 1-3.
- ³⁰ "De Descriptione Temporum," *Selected Literary Essays*, p. 7.
- ³¹ "De Descriptione Temporum," pp. 13-14.