Lewis was a critic who also happened to be a fiction
writer and he drew on his experiences as a creative writer to
formulate theories especially on children's fiction. He was
also possibly the first to analyse science fiction and
classify it into five sub-species. In this chapter we are
going to examine his essays on children's fiction and science
fiction. We shall begin with his theories on children's
fiction. In his essay "On Stories" he says abundant
discussions have been entered into by critics on style and
delineation of character, but on the story itself, which is a
series of imagined events, hardly any serious attention has
been given by critics except by three notable exception:
Aristotle, Boccaccio and Jung and his followers.

As a result, a curious consequence has followed. The
story has been used not for the sake of the story itself but
for other purposes like illustrating manners of characters or
for depicting social conditions. Worse of all not only have
they been despised as fit only for children but the pleasure
derived from them have been considered low in the scale of
modern criticism. So Lewis wants to remedy the second
injustice, as he suspects it is based on a very hasty
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assumption. In order to derive the right kind of pleasure from reading the story, it is necessary to make a division of books and also of readers:

I think that books which are read merely 'for the story may be enjoyed in two very different ways. It is partly a division of books (some stories can be read only in one spirit and some only in the other) and partly a division of readers (the same book can be read in different ways).¹

Regarding the first distinction, as Lewis has said in *An Experiment in Criticism*, what is meant lightly should be read lightly and what is meant gravely has to be read gravely to get the most out of an author. Regarding the second distinction, though two readers read the same story, they may enjoy the story for entirely different reasons. To illustrate this point he tells us about his encounter with an American pupils of his.

We were talking about the books which had delighted our boyhood. His favourite had been Fenimore Cooper whom (as it happens) I have never read. My friend described one particular scene in which the hero was half sleeping by his bivouac fire in the woods while a Redskin with tomahawk was silently creeping on him from behind. He remembered the Breathless excitement with which he had read the passage, the agonised suspense with which he wondered whether the hero would wake up in time or not.²

Lewis thought certainly it was not the sheer excitement, and if it was so, any other scary story would
have done as well. But it must be the atmosphere evoked by the Redskinnery with all its associations — the tomahawk, the high cheek-bones, the feathers, the whiskered trousers, the snow and the snow-shoes, beavers and canoes, warpaths and wigwams, and Hiawatha names. But he was shocked to hear from his pupil that it was only the excitement that mattered, and if the Redskin was substituted by an ordinary crook with a revolver it would have served the purpose equally well. In this case excitement was the sole element that gave him pleasure. But he is not alone; there are many others with similar taste and many believe that excitement is the only pleasure stories can ever give. But Lewis feels that this is not entirely true. Because, for some readers another factor comes in; and that factor is atmosphere. First of all he talks from his own experience as a reader of a great many romance from which he has received an enormous amount of pleasure. So if the love of story is to be equated with the love of excitement he should be the greater lover of excitement. But this is not so. He says *The Three Musketeers* supposedly the most exciting novel in the world did not appeal to him at all; the total lack of atmosphere repels him. There is no country and so there is no difference between Paris and London; there is no weather so you have no sense of season; and it is nothing but a series of event. "There is not a moment's rest from the adventures: one's nose
is kept ruthlessly to the grindstone. It all means nothing. If that is what is meant by Romance, then Romance is my aversion and I greatly prefer George Eliot and Trollope).

Lewis also has given an example in which atmosphere is partially spoiled by an excessive concern for excitement. It is the last scene in King Solomon's Mine which has the right atmosphere but which was altered by the producer in the movie version of it. In the scene "the heroes are awaiting death entombed in a rock chamber and surrounded by the mummified kings of the land". But the film maker substituted this with a subterranean volcanic eruption and an earthquake. If sheer excitement is what one wants, the increase in danger increases the excitement and these two immediate and massive dangers should be better than one single danger of prolonged starvation to death in a cave. But this is not so. So Lewis draws the following conclusion from the scene.

There must be a pleasure in such stories distinct from mere excitement or I should not feel that I had been cheated in being given the earthquake instead of Haggard's actual scene. What I lose is the whole sense of the deathly (quite a different thing from simple danger of death) — the cold, the silence, and the surrounding faces of the ancient, the crowned and sceptred dead."

Atmosphere can be of different types and they can be derived from entirely different sources. As the Redskin evokes a world of its own, so also do giants and pirates. But these are not the only sources of danger for mankind. A
hostile environment or blind natural forces can be equally
dangerous. But now let us examine first the atmosphere evoked
by giants.

Jack the Giant Killer is not, in essence, simply the story of a clever hero
surmounting danger. It is in essence the story of such a hero surmounting danger
from giants. It is quite easy to continue a story in which, though the enemies are
of normal size, the odds against Jack are equally great. But it will be quite a
different story. The whole quality of the imaginative response is determined by the
fact that the enemies are giants. That heaviness, that monstrosity, that
uncouthness, hangs over the whole thing .... The dangerousness of the
giants is, though important, secondary. In some folk-tales we meet giants who are
not dangerous. But they still affect us in much the same way. A good giant is
legitimate: but he would be twenty tons of living, earth-shaking, oxymoron. The
intolerable pressure, the sense of something older, wilder, and more earthly
than humanity, would still cleave to him.

However, the world of giants is entirely different from
that of pirates. The atmosphere stirred up by giants has more
of a physical nature with its heaviness, monstrosity and
uncouthness. But that of pirates is one of moral depravity
and evil and thus is pervaded by an atmosphere of
lawlessness, greed, violence and ferocity. And again danger
alone is not responsible for the sinister atmosphere.

It is not the mere increase of danger
that does the trick. It is the whole
image of utter lawless enemy, the men who
have cut adrift from all human society
and become, as it were, a species of their own—men strangely clad, dark men with earrings, men with a history which they know and we don’t know, lords of unspecified treasure in undiscovered islands. They are, in fact, to the young reader almost as mythological as giants. It does not cross his mind that a man—a mere man like the rest of us—might be a pirate at one time of his life and not, at another, or that there is any smudgy frontier between piracy and privateering. A pirate is a pirate, just as a giant is a giant.

Now let us consider the kind of atmosphere generated when man is pitted against nature. One possibility is being shut in causing claustrophobia, and the other possibility is being shut out causing agoraphobia. In King Solomon’s Mines the heroes were shut in. It was a slow prolonged death, almost a premature burial among the ancient mummified kings. It caused a hushing spell on the imagination and one’s breath shortens as one watches them. But what is it like to be shut out on the surface of the moon. With the setting of the sun, the air and the heat also have gone as well; and the first tiny flakes startles one into a realisation of the enormity of the situation. One has to do something quickly or perish. Finally, one reaches the sphere and is saved. What has kept one enthralled while reading the episode is more than mere suspense concerning the safety of the hero as it makes no difference whether one is frozen to death on earth or on the moon. So it was a mixed feeling of awe and fear as the hero is exposed to an outer darkness of cosmic proportion.
'Over me, around me, closing in on me, embracing me ever nearer was the Eternal ... the infinite and final night of space ...' That airless outer darkness is important not for what it can do to Bedford but for what it does to us: to trouble us with Pascal's old fear of those eternal silence which gnawed at so much religious faith and shattered so many humanistic hopes to evoke with them and through them all our racial and childish memories of exclusion and desolation: to present in fact, as an institution one permanent aspect of human experience.7

Lewis is of the opinion that the emphasis on excitement may pose a danger to the deeper imagination. Because a good idea or theme can be obscured or ruined by the compulsion to provide excitement after excitement. This tendency is often noticed in some inferior American romance which appear in magazines on science fiction. So he remarks: "... we have come across a really suggestive idea. But the author has no expedient for keeping the story on the move except that of putting his hero into violent danger. In the hurry and scurry of his escapes the poetry of the basic idea is lost."8

This happens in a milder degree in Well's War of the Worlds. "What really matters is the idea of being attacked by something utterly outside". So it is more than the mere fact that the Martian invaders are dangerous and can kill us. If this is so a bacillus or a burglar can do the same. So when the hero goes to look at the newly fallen gleaming projectile with unfamiliar hero the whole mystery is laid bare, and the
word "extra-terrestrial" which is the key word of the story loses its power of awe.

In good stories, the supernatural is often introduced and it is more misunderstood than anything else. Once Dr. Johnson remarked that children like marvels because they didn't know that they are not true. But this is a gross misunderstanding of the nature of marvels in stories. To start with all children do not like marvels nor all who are children. Secondly, it is not necessary to believe in fairies or giants or dragons. In fact, belief may be a positive disadvantage. Children know that fairy-tales are not true and enjoy them all the same. So also are adults who enjoy marvels in romances. Thirdly, marvels are not mere arbitrary fictions stuck on to the story to make it more sensational. "The logic for a fairy tale is as strict as that of a realistic novel". Kenneth Grahame did not make an arbitrary choice in making a toad the hero in The Wind in the Willows. A toad is so chosen because its face has some grotesque resemblance to the human face with its fatuous and perpetual grin. "The ludicrous quasi human expression is ... changeless: the toad cannot stop grinning because its grin is not really a grin at all. Looking at the creature we thus see, isolated and fixed, an aspect of human vanity in its funniest and most pardonable form ...".
The characters in *The Wind in the Willows* are all thinly disguised. But why is this disguise at all? It is indispensable. Because when they are completely humanised, we are immediately confronted with a dilemma: are the characters to be children or adults? They can be neither as either will fail to depict the kind of smugness and happiness the author is trying to depict. So it is a mixture of both. The characters are like children in the sense that they have no responsibilities and everything is taken for granted. But they are also like adults in the sense that "they go where they please, do what they like and arrange their own lines".

Another group of stories is based on fulfilled prophecies such as *Oedipus*, *The Man Who Would be King* and *The Hobbit*. In these stories usually the steps taken to frustrate the fulfilment of the prophecy brings about its fulfilment. In the story of Oedipus, for instance, it is prophesied that he will kill his father and marry his mother. To prevent its fulfilment he is exposed on a mountain to die. But that exposure, by leading to his rescue and his consequent life among strangers in ignorance of his real parentage, renders possible the fulfilment of both the prophecies. Such stories produce in us a feeling of awe coupled with bewilderment.

There are certain stories to which the reader can go again and again with interest and pleasure. Lewis gives us a reason why this happens. He says that this is not because the
reader finds excitement every time he re-reads it. In fact, excitement must disappear from the second reading as there is nothing to surprise him anymore. But what attracts him to the same romance again and again is the quality of surprisingness.

The reader is looking not for actual surprises (which can come only once) but for a certain surprisingness ... the surprise works as well as the twentieth as the first. It is the quality of unexpectedness, not the fact that delight us ... knowing that 'surprise' is coming we can now fully relish ... free from the shock of actual surprise you can attend better to the intrinsic surprisingness of the peripeteia.10

In this essay, the internal tension between the theme and the plot engages the attention of Lewis as well. He compares the plot to a net and the theme to a bird. But he finds that it is not always easy to catch the bird with the net because the theme may be something that does not have sequences, as it may be a state or a quality such as giantship, otherness or the desolation of pace. So the net does not succeed always in catching the bird. However, Lewis suggests that "this internal tension in the heart of every story between the theme and the plot constitutes, after all; its chief resemblance to life". Because in life too we meet the same failure and commit the same blunder. For example, the idea of adventure fades when the details of the day-to-day affairs begin to distract us. Other grand ideas like
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homecoming or re-union with a beloved also similarly elude us. So he further comments,

... it seems to me [both in life and art], we are always trying to catch in our net successive moments that is not successive. Whether in real life there is any doctor who can teach us how to do it, so that at least either the meshes will become fine enough to hold the bird, or we be changed that we can throw our nets away and follow the bird to its own country, is not a question for this essay. But I think it is sometimes done — or very very nearly done — in stories. I believe the effort to be well worth making.

In another essay "On Three Ways of Writing for Children", Lewis has suggested three ways for writing for children, and also has defended the fairy tale as a valid and useful form of art. Lewis begins by stating that there is one bad way and two good ones for writing for children. The bad way is to treat children like a special public department and to give them what the public wants no matter whether one likes the story or not. The second way which is a good way is "to let the printed story grow out of a story told to a particular child". One is certainly giving the child what it wants, but the similarity with the first is only superficial as one is dealing with a concrete person, a particular child who is different from all other children and not with children as a species. Moreover, one is telling the child not only what it wants but also what one values and likes. And thus with the child, "A community, a composite
personality, is created and out of that the story grows".13 This is the method used by Kenneth Grahame, Lewis Carroll and Tolkien. The third way, which is also a good way, "consists in writing a children's story because it is the best art-form for something you have to say: just as a composer might write a Dead March not because there was a public funeral in view but because certain musical ideas that viewed to him went best into the form".14

Under the third species comes fantasy or the fairy tale. But there are other sub-species as well. E. Nesbit's trilogy about Bastable family is a good specimen of another kind. It is children's story about the childhood of Oswald. But it is also the only form in which E. Nesbit could have given us a much of the humours of childhood. The book is more realistic reading for adults about children than books about children addressed to them. At the same time it is also more mature reading than children realise as it is the character study of Oswald which is a satiric self-portrait and which children can read and appreciate but which they may not do so in any other form.

Lewis feels that on the basis of what is found in the Bastable trilogy a principle can be formulated thus: "where the children's story is simply the right form for what the author has to say, then of course readers who want to hear that will read the story or re-read it, at any age."15 And
Lewis further adds, "I am almost inclined to set it up as a cannon that children's story which is enjoyed only by children is a bad children's story."¹⁶

There has been some adverse criticism of fantasy or fairy tale by the modern critical world. They use the term 'adult' as a term of approval, and are thus hostile to what they call 'nostalgia' and 'Peter Pantheism'. They scorn the fairy tale and despise and pity those adults who enjoy reading them for arrested development. Lewis — "who admits that dwarfs and giants and talking beasts and witches are still dear to him" — puts up a defence against these charges because they go against his whole view of the fairy tale and also literature. His defence consists of three propositions.

1) Critics who treat 'adult' as a term of approval, instead of only as a mere descriptive term, cannot be adult themselves as to admire the grown up and to be ashamed of being childish are marks of childhood and adolescence. In children this attitude in moderation may be natural and even healthy, but to carry it to middle age it is really a work of arrested development. "When I became a man I put away childish things, including the fear of childishness and desire to be very grown up."¹⁷

2) The modern view apparently involves a false conception of growth. Arrested development consists not in refusing to lose old things but in failing to add new things.
Thus the charge of arrested growth cannot be levelled against those who refuse to lose and still cherish a taste in childhood.

3) In his essay on "Fairy Tales", Tolkien says that "in most places and times, the fairy tale has not been specially made for, nor exclusively enjoyed by children. The whole association of fairy tales and fantasy with childhood is local and accidental ... It has gravitated to the nursery when it became unfashionable in literary circles, just as unfashionable furniture gravitated to the nursery in Victorian houses". Many children do not like fairy tales and many adults do like it. An for those who like it, children or adults, must have a common reason. Regarding the reason, three theories have been formulated by different authors including one by Lewis himself.

1) Tolkien is of the view that fairy tales have an appeal because in writing fairy tales man is exercising mostly his function as a sub-creator by creating a subordinate world of his own. As creativity is "one of man's proper functions, delight naturally arises whenever it is successfully performed."

2) Jung believes that "a fairy tale liberates Archetypes which dwell in collective unconscious" and when we read a good fairy tale we learn about ourselves.
3) Lewis is of the view that beings like giants, dwarfs and talking animals which in some ways resemble human beings act as admirable hieroglyphs and "convey psychology and type of character, more briefly than novelistic presentations". Consider Mr. Badger in The Wind in the Willows — the extraordinary amalgam of high rank, course manners, gruffness, shyness, and goodness. The child who has once met Mr. Badger has ever afterwards, in its bones, a knowledge of humanity and of English social history which it could not get in any other". 20

Periodically some reformer tries to banish the fairy tale on the ground that it gives false impression to the children of the world they live in. But Lewis thinks that this is not true.

I think no literature that children could read give them less of a false impression. I think what profess to be realistic stories for children are far more likely to deceive them. I never expected the real would be like the fairy tales. I think that I did expect school to be like school stories. The fantasies did not deceive me: the school stories did. All stories in which children have adventures and successes which are possible, in the sense that they do not break the laws of nature, but almost infinitely improbable, are in more danger than the fairy tales of raising false expectations. 21

Secondly, there is also the charge of escapism. The charge can be answered more or less in the same way. Both fairy tales and school stories arouse longing and imagina-
tively satisfying wishes. But there is a subtle difference between them. The longing to enter fairy land may stir and trouble one; but it doesn't bring discontent whereas longing aroused by school stories which are often very close to real situations in life can become ravenous and deadly. And when one is confronted with disappointments and humiliations in real life one may run to them to escape problems and return to the real world undivinely discontented. "For it is all flattery to the eye. The pleasure consists in picturing oneself the object of admiration". The longing for fairy land is very different. Though it arouses a longing beyond one's reach, far from dulling or emptying the actual world, it gives a new dimension of depth. Reading about enchanted woods does not make a child despise actual woods but makes all woods a little enchanted. Thus longing for fairy land is a spiritual exercise but the other type of longing aroused by realistic stories is a disease.

Thirdly, there is a more serious attack from those who do not want children to be frightened. Not wishing children to be frightened can mean two things — that we must not give the child phobias, and also that one must keep out of his mind the knowledge that he is born into a world of good and evil. If they mean the first, Lewis agrees but if the second he doesn't. Because agreeing with the second "would give children a false impression about life and would feed them on
escapism in the bad sense". So Lewis makes the following suggestion:

There is something ludicrous in the idea of so educating a generation which is born to the Ogpu and the atomic bomb. Since it is so likely that they will meet cruel enemies, let them at least have heard of brave knights and heroic courage. Otherwise you are making their destiny not brighter but darker.25

But regarding the phobias they cannot be controlled by literary means. Perhaps sometimes a fear can be traced to a particular image in a book. But eliminating that fear does not ensure controlling other fears which may come from all sorts of unexpected and unpredictable sources. Because, "we seem to bring them into the world with us readymade".24 What does one do when a child develops a term for insect or a memorial stone or a particular edition of Encyclopaedia Britannica? So for a healthy and balanced exposure, Lewis suggests the following:

... I think it possible that by confirming your child to blameless stories of child life in which nothing at all alarming ever happens, you would fail to banish the terror, and would succeed in banishing all that can enable them or make them endurable. For in fairy tales, side by side with the terrible figures, we find ... comforters and protectors, the radiant ones, and the terrible figures are not merely terrible, but sublime.26

After having discussed the nature of fantasy and its effects on readers. Lewis gets into the theme proper, namely,
writing for children. But he declines to give outright any advice for writing stories for children on the grounds that there are better story writers than he and also that he has never exactly made a story by deliberately applying a particular technique. He says the process is more like bird-watching than like talking or building. Because he sees pictures and if he keeps quiet and watches they begin to join themselves up. In certain case a whole set might join themselves very consistently to make a complete story, but very often there are gaps which he has to fill up by deliberate invention.

Lewis rejects the approach which asks, "what do modern children like"? He also rejects the moral or didactic approach, "What do modern children need"? Not because he doesn’t like stories to have a moral but because that approach will not lead to a good moral. So he suggests asking, "What moral do I need"? Because what does not concern us deeply will not deeply interest our readers either whatever their age. But the best thing is not to ask questions at all and let the pictures tell their own morals. "For the moral inherent in them will rise from whatever spiritual roots you have succeeded in striking during the whole course of your life". But if the moral is not inherent in them, don’t put any. It will look false and impertinent to the children. "For we have been told on high
authority that in moral sphere they are probably at least as wise as we are ... The only moral that is of any value is that which rises inevitably from the whole cost of the author's mind." 27

Lewis also suggests that we give up the attitude of superiority towards children and write with an attitude of equality and oneness with them as we usually share the same nature with them especially in our imaginative life.

We must write for children out of those elements in our imagination which we share with children ... The matter of our story should be a part of the habitual furniture of our minds. ... We must meet children as equals in that area of our nature where we are their equals. Our superiority consists partly in commanding other areas, and partly (which is more relevant) in the fact that we are better at telling stories than they are. The child reader is neither to be patronized nor idolised; we talk to him as man to man. But the worst attitude of all would be the professional attitude which regards children in the lump as a sort of raw-material which we have to handle ... [But we should treat] them with respect. We must not imagine that we are Providence or Destiny. 28

In yet on more essay "sometimes Fairy Stories May Say Best What's to be said", Lewis has dealt with story writing. As Tasso did, Lewis also makes a distinction between the poet as poet, and the poet as man and citizen or Christian. This distinction is necessary because one without the other doesn't work. "... there are usually two reasons for writing
an imaginative work, which may be called Author’s reason and the Man’s. If only one of these is present, then, so far as I am concerned, the book will not be written. If the first is lacking, it can’t, if the second is lacking, it shouldn’t.”29

Then Lewis describes how he writes his own fairy tales. Contrary to what some people think, he doesn’t start by asking how he could say something about Christianity to children, then fix on the fairy tale, then collect information about child psychology and then draw a list of Christian doctrines and then write allegories to embody them. “This is all pure moonshine”. Because it begins in a much more spontaneous manner than that though it has to go through a process of ferment in the mind of the author before a story emerges.

In the Author’s mind there bubbles up every now and then the material for a story. For me it invariably begins with mental pictures such as fawn carrying an umbrella, a queen on a sledge or a magnificent lion. The images do not have to be anything Christian about them as that element would push itself of their own record. It was a part of the ferment. This ferment leads to nothing unless it is accompanied with the longing for a Form: verse or prose, short story, novel, play or what not. When these two things click you have the Author’s impulse complete. It is now a thing inside him pawning to get out. He longs to see the bubbling stuff pouring into that form as the housewife longs to see the new jam pouring into the clean jar. This nags him all day long and gets in the way of his work and his sleep and his meals. It’s like being in love.
While the author is in the state, the Man will of course have to criticise the proposed book from quite a different point of view. He will ask how the gratification of the impulse will fit in with all the other things he wants, and ought to do or be. Perhaps the whole thing is too frivolous and trivial (from the Man's point of view, not the Author's) to justify the time and pains it would involve. Perhaps it would be unedifying when it was done. Or else perhaps (at this point the Author cheers up) it looks like being good not in a merely literary sense, but 'good' all around.

Lewis is possibly one of the earliest to analyse science fiction as a species. His essay, on "Science fiction" was written at a time when science fiction was having a boom, and all sorts of writers were writing it to avail themselves of the opportunity to "cash in". Though many were commercial trash some were genuine and legitimate works of art. Lewis has analysed them and divided them into the following sub-species.

1) The fiction of Displaced Persons. In this sub-species science fiction is written by commercial writers who write only to take advantage of the popularity of science fiction for financial gain. The writers themselves may have no real interest in science fiction and this becomes apparent in their works as they simply give them a veneer of science fiction to their normal works of fiction. In this sub-species it is common for an author "to leap into an imagined future
in which planetary, sidereal, or even galactic travel take place ... Against this huge sackcloth he then proceeds to develop an ordinary love-story, spy story, wreck-story, or crime story". 31 There is nothing wrong in doing this if the author can "develop a story of real value which could not have been told in any other way." But it becomes tasteless if it is done without a good reason such as leaping "a thousand years to find plots and passions which they could have found at home."

2) The Fiction of Engineer. This sub-species of science fiction is written by persons "who are primarily interested in space-travel, or in other undiscovered techniques, as real possibilities in the actual universe. They give us in imaginative form their guesses as to how the thing might be done." 32 Some good specimens of this kind are Jules Verne's *Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Sea* and Wells's *Land Ironclads*. These stories excited great interest before the introduction of real submarine and real tanks.

3) Speculative Science Fiction. In this form of fiction the interest is scientific but speculative. When we learn about the probable nature of places from science it arouses our curiosity as to what it would be like to go there and to live there. "The scientists themselves, the moment they go beyond purely mathematical statements, can hardly avoid describing the facts in terms of their probable effect
in the senses of a human observer. Prolong this, and give along with that sense experience, his probable emotions and thoughts, and you have at once a rudimentary science fiction.\(^3\)

However, travelling imaginatively to a remote places is not just a modern phenomenon. Men have been doing this for centuries. What would it be like to visit Hades? Homer sends Odysseus there. And Dante takes one to the Antipodes which was believed to be forever inaccessible because of the torrid zone. And "he describes with all the gusto of the later scientifictionist how surprising it was to see the sun in such a position."\(^3\) In The First Man in the Moon you get "the first glimpse of the unveiled airless sky, the lunar landscape, the lunar levity, the incomparable solitude, then the growing terror, finally the overwhelming approach of the night."\(^3\)

This kind of stories can be called special novels and they will have to be judged by their own rules. So it will be absurd to condemn them because they don't have deep or sensitive characterisation as it is a fault if they do. In fact the stranger the story the more ordinary and less prominent should be the character. "Hence Gulliver is a commonplace little man and Alice a commonplace little girl. If they had been more remarkable they would have wrecked their books. The ancient mariner himself is a very ordinary
man. To tell how odd things struck odd people is to have an oddity too much: he who is to see strange sights must not himself be strange."^{36}

Though this particular form of science fiction is capable of many virtues, it cannot endure copious production. Because only the first visit to the Moon or Mars or any star for that matter can be interesting as "it becomes difficult to suspend our disbelief in favour of subsequent visits. However, good they were they would kill each other by becoming numerous".^{37}

4) The Eschatological. This kind of fiction gives an imaginative "speculation about the ultimate destiny of our species". Examples are Wells' *Time Machine* and Olaf Stapledon's *Last and First Men*. Here it becomes imperative to separate this form of fiction from the novel. Take *Last and First Men*, for instance, "it is not novelistic at all. It is indeed a new form of pseudo history. The pace, the concern with broad general movement, the tone; are all those of historiography, not the novelist".^{38} In this form we can include Geoffrey Dennis' *The End of the World*, J.B.S. Haldene's *Possible Worlds* and *The Last Judgement*. All these works are good reminders of our need for a larger perspective on life. We tend to become engrossed in our needs or hopes or fears whether they be individual or social or political and lose sight of the larger perspectives of life. This enslaves
us to the present and makes us forget that we have a whither and a whence. But this kind of work gives us a more balanced view of life and makes us feel the apparent absurdity of many of our fears and hopes producing a sobering effect in us.

Works of this kind gives expression to thoughts and emotions, which I think it good that we should sometimes entertain. It is sobering and cathartic to remember, and now and then, our collective smallness, our apparent isolation, the apparent indifference of nature, the slow biological, and astronomical processes which may, in the long run, make many of our hopes (possibly some of our fears) ridiculous. 39

5) Fantasy and Science Fiction. In the last sub-species, apart from space travel; one will also find stories about gods, ghosts, ghouls, demons, fairies, monsters and so on. Lewis believes that this sub-species represents a deep imaginative need of man to satisfy his desire for the strange, exotic and the marvellous. This desire 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. It is the result of increasing geographical knowledge ... As the area of knowledge spreads, you need to go further afield: like a man moving his house further and further out into the country as the new-building estates catch him up". 40

But in earlier times, it was easier for authors to locate marvels close by without losing their effect. In
Grimm’s fairy tales one will find witches or ogres in a wood which is just an hour’s journey. In Homer’s *Odyssey*, only after several days journey by sea he can meet Circe, Calypso, the Cyclops and Sirens. Swift takes us to remote seas, and Voltaire to America and so on. But now the world has shrunken in size and the unfamiliar in the past has become familiar and only extra-terrestrial regions are strange enough for marvels.

In this kind of story, in order to keep up the pseudo-scientific appearance, a machine or space-ship is used, and only the most superficial appearance of plausibility will do. But Lewis believes that it is more effective to use a supernatural means like an angel rather than a machine for transport in inter-planetary travels. Even after reaching the destination it is not necessary to be tied down to all scientific probabilities. Because, “It is their wonder, or beauty, or suggestiveness that matters.”

The nature of this sub-species is the same as those of fantastic and mythopoeic literature. But the problem is that "sub-species and sub-species break out in baffling multitude." And Lewis remarks that the subject "still awaits its Aristotle to classify them. However, he himself has managed to tame them quite well by bringing them under the following main types.
In the first type it may represent the intellect and it is almost completely free from emotion. Lewis cites Abbot's *Flatland* as the purest specimen of the type where emotion is kept at the minimal level. Another excellent specimen is Robert A. Heintiens "By His Bootstraps". It is "a story of a man who is enabled to travel into the future when he shall have discovered a method of time-travel, comes back to himself in the present (then of course, the past) and fetches him".42

In the second type, the impossible is a postulate which is to be granted before the story gets going. But "within the frame we inhabit the known world and are as realistic as anyone else."43 A good example would be Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. In F. Anstey's *Brass Bottle* the postulate liberates farcical consequences. But there are other works which are far from being comic in consequences. Marc Brandel's *Cast the First Shadow* is a case in point. It is the story of a man who is solitary, despised and oppressed because he has no shadow. Later he discovers a woman who shares the same innocent defect but he turns away from her in disgust as she has the additional defect of having no reflection.

In the third type "the marvellous is in the grain of the whole work. We are throughout in another world. What makes that world valuable is not, of course mere multiplications of the marvellous either for comic effect or
for mere astonishments, but its quality, its flavour. ... give sensations we never had before and enlarge our conception of the range of possible experiences." Works of this type would include parts of the *Odyssey*, *The Fairie Queene*, "The Ancient Mariner" and "Christabel". MacDonald's *Phatastes*, Tolkien's *Lord of Rings*, and David Lindsay's *Voyage to Arcturus*.

Lewis says nobody has so far given a satisfactory exploration as to why such stories can give us keen, lasting and solemn pleasure. Jung went furthest but he ended up producing another myth instead of a convincing explanation. But one thing is sure: those who like fantasy like it with great intensity and those who hate it also hate it with the same intensity. Thus the conclusion he arrives from observing the phenomenon is that "mythopoeic is rather, for good or ill, a mode of imagination which does something to us at a deep level".45

Then, by way of conclusion we may sum up Lewis theories on fiction. One of his theories is on the process of writing stories. In this theory he makes a distinction between the poet as poet and the poet as man and citizen. The author's mind bubbles every now and then with ideas. It is followed by the longing for a form. When the two things click, the author's impulse is complete. Then he longs to put the bubbling stuff into form. The man then decides the
advantages and disadvantages of writing the story. Another theory is on writing for children. He says there is one bad way and two good ways for writing for children. The bad way is to give the children what the public wants; and the good ways are to let the story grow out of a story told to a particular child, and writing a children's story because it is the best way for something you want to say. Lewis also has advanced a theory concerning the fairy tales' universal appeal. He says characters in fairy tales act as hieroglyphs which depict human types even more effectively, at times, than novelistic presentation can do. Lewis was the first man to examine science fiction critically and classify it into five sub-species. He did for science fiction what Aristotle had done for Greek poetry.