Lewis' approach to literature was eclectic. His eclecticism stemmed essentially from his independence of judgement. For him taste was the deciding factor in accepting or rejecting a literary concept, not affiliation or loyalty to any school of criticism. For though a romantic he rejected certain romantic concepts and adopted some of those of the New Critics. Yet he also disagreed quite strongly with some of the literary assumptions of the New Critics. Some of his ideas are considered very relevant to the contemporary situation but again he also adopted a very conservative attitude towards psycho-analysis and anthropology as tools of literary criticism. Another prominent characteristic of Lewis was his polemical nature. He had great dialectical skills and he had a tendency to make his disagreements with others public and polemical.

In this chapter, the essays we are going to examine reflect his polemical and eclectic nature. As the essays in this chapter constitute some of Lewis' major views, insights and theories on literature they need to be examined in detail. We shall begin with The Personal Theory, a book which
came out as the result of a controversy between C.S. Lewis and E.M.W. Tillyard on the personal heresy.

The controversy first began when Lewis published an article in *Essays and Studies*\(^1\) attacking the notion that poetry is the expression of the poet's personality. He labelled the supposed offence as "personal heresy" and accused particularly two persons of being guilty of the heresy: T.S. Eliot and E.M.W. Tillyard. Eliot wrote in his essay, "Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca" that "The rage of Dante against Florence or Pistoia, or what not, the deep surge of Shakespeare's cynicism and disillusionment are merely gigantic attempts to metaphorse private failure and disappointment."\(^2\) In the case of Tillyard, the controversy was occasioned by the publication of his book *Milton* in which he contended that the critics who handled Milton properly were the Satanists who "invested the character of Satan with all that Milton felt and valued most strongly".\(^3\) Lewis also quoted another passage from the same book which implied that the real subject of *Paradise Lost* was studying "the state of Milton's mind when he wrote it."\(^4\)

The latter view was even quoted by several of Lewis' pupils. This made him think that he had to do more than reprimand his pupils.\(^5\) So he wrote an article attacking these views, and published it in *Essays and Studies*. A copy of this article was also sent to Eliot but he did not respond. But
Tillyard responded with a rejoinder and the controversy ran into six essays which were jointly published by Lewis and Tillyard in book form as *The Personal Heresy*.

In the first article of the book, Lewis introduces his position by saying "In this paper I shall maintain that when we read poetry as should be read, we have before us no representation which claims to be the poet, and frequently no representation of a man, a character, or a personality at all". Then he goes on to illustrate his claim by interpreting the following passage from Herrick's poem "Upon Julia's Clothes".

*Whereas in silks my Julia goes,  
Then, then, methinks how sweetly flows  
That liquefaction of her clothes?*

If the personal heresy was true the reader should get some impression of the poet's personality, and he should thereby be enriched by learning something of human nature from there. But no such thing is ever experienced in reading the lines. What the reader experiences is an apprehension of silk. The result of that apprehension is the perception of the poet's skill; and then comes the perception of the poet's personality implied by such skill. Thus it is twice removed from the essential poetic experience. But the perception cannot come unless the reader has already apprehended the silk, and a thing presented in a poem can never be the
personality of the poet, but only what the poet has presented
to us to share a part of his experience with us.

... What I am aware of in reading Herrick's poem is silk, but not silk as
an object in rerum natura. But as Herrick saw it; and in so doing, it may be
argued, I do come into contact with his temperament in the most intimate —
perhaps the only possible way. 8

Thus the reader comes into contact with the poet not by
studying his personality in the poem but by sharing his
consciousness on temperament in the poem. The reader has to see with the poet to share his consciousness not by attending to it. So instead of becoming a spectacle himself the poet becomes a pair of spectacles. And as Professor Alexander suggests, the poet is to be enjoyed not contemplated. So the real nature of the role of a poet can be described as follows:

The poet is not a man who asks me to look at him; he is a man who says 'look at that' and points; the more I follow the pointing of his finger the less I can possibly see of him. 9

Lewis explains further the nature of the consciousness of the poet. Lewis contends that this consciousness of the poet is usually not the normal consciousness of the poet but a heightened one which comes only at certain times and not all the time. And thus to the reader,

It was not, in fact, a personality of a person ... It was a mood, or a mode of consciousness, created temporarily in the minds of various readers by the
suggestive qualities which certain words and ideas have taken on in the course of human history, and never, so far as I know, existing normally or permanently — never constituting the person — in anyone.¹⁰

That the poet’s heightened consciousness is not something habitual with the poet and also that the poet expresses something else rather than his own personality in writing poetry has been unequivocally declared by the poets themselves. Homer has to invoke the Muse for inspiration. Herrick confides that every day is not good for verse. Emerson declares that "there is a good deal of inspiration in a chest of good tea". All these show that the words for poetic composition will not come for the asking; but they are wooed with great labour and far from being the poet’s daily temper and habitual self.

Lewis gives another reason why poetry cannot be the expression of the poet’s personality. To him it is the poet’s starting point and his limitation. It is analogous to the position of a window. A window is put there not to study windows but so that you may forget the window and see a landscape through it. In the same way a poet who remains at mere personality, which is his starting point, is no poet. It is his business to start from his own mode of consciousness and lead us to a new mode of consciousness through his personality.
He proceeds partly by instinct, partly by following the tradition of his predecessor, but very largely by the method of trial and error; and the result, when it comes, if for him, no less than for us an acquisition, a voyage beyond the limits of his personal view, and annihilation of the brute fact of his own psychology rather than its assertion. II

Lewis then explains the cause of the personal heresy. He feels that it is a product of the age in which so many are required to talk of poetry but only very few care for beauty. As a result they begin to indulge in gossip and devote their attention to details about a poet's life rather than reading and exploring his poetry. But this is not the only cause. There is a deeper and more serious reason. Moderns have an inability to make up their minds between materialist and spiritual theories of the universe. Both these theories are fatal to the personal heresy. But a personalist finds his opportunity "in the coming and going of the mind between the two". A typical modern critic is a half-hearted materialist who bases his beliefs not on science but on popularised science. He thinks that everything except the buzzing electrons is subjective fancy. So he thinks that poetry is an expression of the poet's "pure, uncontaminated, undivided personality" and everything outside the poet's head is the interplay of blind forces. But he forgets that if materialism is true everything inside the poet's head also should be equally blind and meaningless. Because, for a consistent
materialist what a poet produces is the result of "equally impersonal and irrational causes". Therefore, when a person embraces either the materialist or spiritual view of the universe, the personal heresy is cured.

As the controversy over the "personal heresy" continued it became clear that Lewis and Tillyard had different interpretations of the word "personality". In Lewis' opinion, "The name suggests warmth and humanity, intimacy, the real rough and tumble of human life". And personality is primarily associated with the variegated details such as "a wrinkle or a stammer". Besides, he makes a very clear distinction between our appeal to a real personality in life and our aesthetic response to a work of art which is necessary to avoid confusion between "imaginative delight in a work of art with social or affectional delight in a man". He says, "The appeal of real personality is to the heart to the will and the affections. The proper pleasure of it is called love, the proper pain, hatred. I do not owe the poet some aesthetic response. I owe him love, thanks, assistance, justice, charity — or it may be a sound thrashing."12

But Tillyard sees personality as a mental pattern. It is reached through style and can become the major delight of poetry. This mental pattern is also called by other names like predisposition or temperament or consciousness. This consciousness is definite enough to be habitual to the poet's
normal self "underlying the accidents of quotidian existence", and thus when we read a poem a version of the poet's personality emerges through the poem. So Tillyard says,

... I believe we read Keats in some measure because his poetry gives a version of a remarkable personality of which another version is his life. The two versions are not the same but they are analogous. Part of our response to poetry is in fact similar to the stirring we experience when we meet someone whose personality impresses us.

There is yet one more reason why Lewis objects to the personal heresy: it gives rise to poetolatry. The personalists believe that poetry is the expression of the personality of the poet "considered as an individual, contingent, human specimen". So what we read in Wordsworth's poetry, for instance, is "just Wordsworth's point of view as it happens to him as a psychological fact and that is why modern criticism attends so willingly to psychology and biography". And the personal heretics have fulfilled Arnold's prophecy that poetry would replace religion. Perhaps poetry has not attempted yet the salvation of souls and the enlightenment of the mind. But it has taken some secondary religious characteristics: "the worship of saints and the traffic in relics". Every teacher of English has had pupils who took the study of literature to be having devotions to some dead poets. So the recent spate of
biographies of poets like Keats and D.H. Lawrence. Even a rather tangled divinity has been proposed to us: Christ, Shakespeare and Keats.

This is side-tracking or perverting our response to personality; and the consequence is a movement away from criticism to cultism which is highly lamentable and the only remedy lies in the rejection of the personal heresy. So Lewis suggests:

For the sake of personality, therefore, we must reject the personal heresy. We must go to books for that which books can give us — to be interested, delighted, or amused, to be made merry or be made wise. But for the proper pleasure of personality, that is for love, we must go where it can be found — our homes or our common rooms, to railway carriage and public houses ...

As Lewis was asked to produce his theory of poetry towards the end of the controversy, he had to give one. He defines poetry as "imaginative literature whether in prose or verse". It is an art or skill and its instrument is language. But language is used for different purposes and it can be divided into two types: scientific or philosophical language and poetic language. To illustrate the difference Lewis takes the sentence, "It is cold". He says it can be made more precise by saying, "This is twice as cold as that" or by saying "Ugh! it is something like a smack in the face". The former is scientific language as it is concerned with the
precise measurement of a quality whereas the latter is poetic language as it has an emotive quality which the former lacks. The first process will lead to science which escapes from the sensuous to pure qualities and the second should lead to pure poetry, if any such things exists, "using all the extra-logical elements of language — rhythm, or vowel-music, onomatopoeic, associations and what not."\(^{18}\)

The majority of human utterances fall between the two extremes. Thus it is not possible to say, "This is poetry". All we can say is, "This is more in the poetical direction". Therefore, by a poem "... we mean an composition which communicates more of the concrete and qualitative than our usual utterances do. A poet is a man who produces such compositions more often and more successfully than the rest of us."\(^{19}\)

In a strict terminological sense nearly all men are poets. Because they can exploit the extra-logical properties of poetry to communicate his experiences in a concrete manner. But even if the value of such utterances or writings using verse may be sensibly higher than zero, we don't call them poets as usage bids us to reserve the name only for those who do it specially well.

The difference between scientific and poetical language is not that the first utters truth and the second fancies. Both can utter truths though they may talk about
different realities. The abstractions science and philosophy use are real in their own way, perhaps as real or closer to the timeless realities Plato talks about. There is no organism as such in space or time, there are only animals and vegetables. There are no trees as such except oaks, beeches, elms and so on. In fact there is no such thing as an elm. There is only this particular elm of such a year and such an age at such an hour acted upon by its environments. "A real elm, in fact, can be uttered only by a poem". However, poetry does not tell us whether the one it describes does really exist. That is where science comes in. To prove things science infers and abstracts. Science can tell you where you can find an elm and poetry can describe what that meeting is like. Thus one answers whether a thing exists and the other tells what it is like encountering it. Science can abstract whether God exists, and Dante shows us what it would be like if He did. An abstraction is something like money. It is not real wealth but it does represent real wealth, and poetry is this real wealth which the abstraction represents.

Each of the languages has advantages as well as disadvantages. Each functions admirably in its own sphere. But the philosophic language fails to reach the concrete and poetic language is unsuitable to prove the existence of anything. It is unmitigated evil that you cannot be poetic and philosophical to any high degree at the same moment.
Because in a given treatise a poetical element of the wrong sort may spoil the argument, and an argument may spoil a given poem ....20

After discussing poetic language, Lewis turns his attention to the content of poetry. For the sake of convenience he takes conversation as the base, and he claims that the content of poetry can be the same as that of conversation. But Lewis makes two exceptions here. He says,

Whatever in ordinary conversation is concerned with proving anything is clearly embryonic science or philosophy, and will not be part of the content of poetry. Again, whatever in a conversation has a practical purpose conditioned by the proximity of the speakers in space and time ('Hand me the salt' — Don't be angry' — will not find a place in ... poetry ... though dramatic and fictional imitations of such speech may well occur in it.21

After having eliminated these two, poetry can be written as many things as you can talk about in ordinary conversation. Poetry is a skill of utterances and can be used to utter almost anything: "to draw attention to (though not, of course to demonstrate) a fact, to tell lies, to tell lies, to tell, to describe your own real or feigned emotions, to make jokes."22

In a certain sense poetry is not an art at all. The art or skill employed to say concretely what the poet wants to say is art but the thing said is not art. The skill has all the privileges of art: it is exempt both from moral and
logical criticism and the best judges for the skill are the fellow artists. But the same immunity cannot be applied to the thing said. You may allow the plumber to tell you how capable or incapable his predecessor was in allowing the scullery to get flooded but you may not allow him to tell you whether it is flooded or ought to be flooded.

In a discussion about poetry, a question naturally arises as to who will be the right judge for poetry. As poetry is a skill of utterances "it follows that the best judge of poetry is he who can best judge of human utterances, who can say best what is dull or interesting, what is stale or fresh, what edifies or corrupts, what gives delight or disgust." Lewis has a distrust for the specialist because "he will smell of the shop", and also because of his supposed lopsided sensibility. Moreover, giving the sole responsibility for judging poetry will strip one more privilege of the ordinary man. This ideal judge may be simply called Aristotle’s "best reader". There are no other qualifications for him except general wisdom and health of mind. Of course to make the wisdom effective, among other things "a good knowledge of the language and a wide experience of poetry" are essential.

Lewis, next, deals with the value of poetry. The value of poetry, he says, depends on what it does to the reader. So our second demand on literature is that, apart from being
"entertaining and charming or exciting it should have a desirable permanent effect on us if possible — shall make us either happier or wiser, on better." Thus from reading literature, as it is traditionally believed we derive double benefit — pleasure and profit. Lewis strongly feels that all questions about the poet's attitude to what he says in a poem are irrelevant and expressions 'like sincerity' or 'disinterestedness' should be banished from criticism. Besides, dyslogistic terms like 'insincere', 'spurious', 'bogus' and 'sham' are indications that the speaker has not yet discovered what is wrong with the poem. So "unable to answer the real question, "what, in this series of words, excites a feeling of hostility which prevents enjoyment? he invents answers to the irrelevant questions "What was the poets state of mind when he wrote?"25

Lewis has pointed out earlier that as far as content is concerned poetry shares common characteristics with conversation. What lasts in conversation also has lasting effect in poetry, so he says,

... those utterances, and those only, whose value can survive detachment from their original social content: not the love-making and quarrelling, not the 'contacts', the friendships, and the affections, but on the contrary the stories, the jokes, the reflections. It preserves not primarily what excites love, but what contributes to amusement,
entertainment, wisdom or edification; in fact those parts of conversation which are worth repeating.26

Lewis has a word of caution concerning the status of the poet. Though his theory runs the risk of having a tendency to lower the status of the poet as a poet, he believes that the future of poetry lies in lowering the status of the poet. If the poet does not speedily regain the humility of his great predecessors, poetry may disappear from us altogether.

Regarding Tillyard’s response to Lewis’ theories on poetry, he seems to have agreed with Lewis that the reading of poetry is a sharing with the poet of his temperament or personality and like other sharings it is directed towards a third thing. Lewis admits that many things about a poet can be learned from his works, and his example can reach many generations. They also agree that “exaltation of poets into demigods is all part of modern tendency to live vicariously”.27 Lewis grants that certain kinds of literature such as private letters and certain types of essays give impressions of the poet’s personality. So towards the end of the controversy they come closer and closer and their differences were very much narrowed down though the shifting of camp was not possible for either of them due to fundamental differences in temperament.
Both of them were renowned scholars and each one had articulated his points of view with great skill and conviction. But apparently none of them could claim complete victory as both of them happened to be right and also wrong. So, on the controversy, "Most reviewers agreed that the increasingly biographical approach to literature was regrettable, but most also pointed out that understanding something of an author’s personality could be a pleasure".28

In his Preface to Paradise Lost, Lewis’ approach is again polemical and eclectic. He begins by refuting Eliot’s claim that only practicing contemporary poets can be judges of poetry. He finds Eliot’s claim unacceptable as it is absurd. Because one has to assume that one is a poet though one cannot make that critical judgement before one can answer the question whether one is a poet. This is an exposed petitio and no man of high intellectual honour can base his argument on such a logical fallacy.

Next Lewis defends Milton against detractors. He feels that Milton’s criticism is lost in misunderstanding because many modern readers are unfamiliar with the epic form and they set out to find in Paradise Lost ”little patches of delight” as if they were reading lyrics, and when they are not found the readers get frustrated. This happens because the readers have no idea that in a long narrative poem the line is subordinated to the paragraph, and the paragraph to
the Book and the Book to the whole; and that it takes a quarter of an hour for the poem to have its sweeping effect on the reader. So often we hear people condemning "as faults in *Paradise Lost* those very qualities which the poet laboured the hardest to attain and which, rightly enjoyed are essential to its specific delightfulness".29

Lewis, therefore, feels that the study of Milton should be preceded by an study of the epic in general. And there are two advantages in the procedure. The first advantage is that this was the procedure followed by Milton himself. He did not ask what he wanted to say but what kind of poem he wanted to make from the pre-existing forms such as epic, tragedy and lyric. In choosing the form, it is similar to that of a gardener in choosing whether he would build a rockery or a tennis court or of an architect whether he would build a church or a house. In choosing one thing you will have to lose the specific beauties and delights of one because the aim is not just excellence but excellence proper to a specific thing. The second advantage is that it forces us to attend to an aspect of poetry which has been very much neglected. Every poem has two aspects. What the poet has to say and the thing which he makes. Another way of stating the dual function is "to say that every poem has two parents — its mother being the mass of experience, thought, and the like, inside the poet, and its father the pre-existing \ Form
(epic, tragedy, the novel or what not) which he meets in the public world. It becomes lop-sided if only one aspect is studied and the other left out. So the man who wants to write a love sonnet should be not only enamoured of a woman but also of the form of the sonnet. And Lewis does not believe that in submitting to the form the poet impairs his originality, nor does he believe that inventing a new form means producing a great work as "it is the smaller poets who invent forms", but in submitting to the form that the poet becomes really original; and if a poet makes a conscious attempt to be himself he fails to bring out the best that is in him.

Lewis next gives his views on the classification of the epic. He feels that the traditional method of dividing as epic into primitive and artificial is unsatisfactory as no surviving poem is primitive and all poetry is in one way artificial. So he divides it into 'primary epic' and 'secondary epic'. This is a chronological division and it does not suggest the superiority of one over the other. It simply means that the secondary comes after or grows out of the primary. Good examples of primary epics are the Homeric poems and Beowulf.

Both Beowulf and the Homeric poems belong to the heroic age. We get clues from the way the poems describe practical performances during festivals as well as on other occasions,
and thus studying the literary situations provided within the poems help us to understand the kind of poem and also the age they represent. Now we shall turn our attention first to the literary conditions Homer describes. All poetry is oral and it is delivered to the accompaniment of a musical instrument like a kithara. But oral poetry can be again divided into popular poetry and court poetry. In popular poetry usually dancing boys and girls and a minstrel or a youth playing a stringed musical instrument are involved. But in court poetry the court poet is the central figure though at times dancers are also involved. Again court poetry can be divided into light poetry and serious poetry. In light court poetry "the court poet gets up, steps into a central position in the midst of a troupe of expert dancers and sings a short lay which has three characteristics of being god's, not men, of being comic and of being indecent". But serious court poetry is slightly different. "The poet has a chair placed for him and an instrument put in his hands. A table is set beside him with wine, that he may drink 'when his heart desires'. Presently, without orders from the king, he begins his lay when the Muse prompts him; its three characteristics are that it is about men, it is historically true, and it is tragic".

In Beowulf we find that in the poem we hear nothing of poetry outside the court. But other characteristics are
similar. The court poet sings either a lamentation or a tale of strange adventures or a tragedy. Lewis further points out a special characteristic common to both Beowulf and Homeric poems.

Here, as in Homer, Epic does not mean simply whatever was sung in the hall. It is one of the possible entertainments, marked off from the others, in Homer by the spontaneity and quasi-oracular character of the poet's performance, and in both Homer and Beowulf by tragic quality, by supposed historical truth, and by the gravity that goes with 'true tragedy'.

Thus the epic in the loftiest and gravest poetry about nobles, made for nobles and performed on occasion by nobles in a court when the court was the common centre of many interests. It was the place of festivity, the place of brightest hearths and strongest drink, of courtesy, merriment, news, and friendship. Thus the epic has come down to Milton's time with some of its early associations which have "strange transformations and enrichments". It is this particular aspect or quality that moderns find difficult to understand. But it can be understood by anyone who understands the Middle English word solempe. Lewis explains the term as follows:

Like solemn it implies the opposite of what is familiar, free and easy or ordinary. But unlike solemn it does not suggest gloom, oppression, or austerity. The ball in the first act of Romeo and Juliet was a 'solemnity'. The feast at
the beginning of "Gawain and the Green Knight" is very much of a solemnity ... Feasts are, in this sense, more solemn than fasts. Easter is solemne, Good Friday is not. The solemne is the festal which is also stately, ceremonial, the proper occasion for pomp ... a court ball, a coronation, or a victory march, as these things appear to people who enjoy them.

Thus the epic is oral, solemne, aristocratic, festive, public and ceremonial, and attains its intended effect on the audience through the use of certain techniques. We shall consider the techniques one by one. As epic poetry is oral, one of the most prominent techniques is the use of stock language.

The most obvious characteristic of an oral technique is its continual use of stock words, phrases, or even whole lines. It is important to realize at the outset that these are not a second-best on which the poets fall back when inspiration fails them: they are as frequent in the great passages as in the low ones. In 103 lines of the parting between Hector and Adromache (justly regarded as one of the peaks of European poetry) phrases, or whole lines, which occur again and again in Homer are twenty eight times employed.

This phenomenon is often explained from the poet's point of view. To quote Mr. Nilson, "These repetitions are a great aid for the singer for whilst reciting them mechanically he is subconsciously forming the next verse." But Lewis counters this argument by saying that it is not for
the poet’s convenience but because of the audience’s benefit, and then he explains what actually it does to the audience.

It is a prime necessity of oral poetry that the hearer should not be surprised too often, or too much. The unexpected tires us: it also takes us longer to understand and enjoy than the expected. A line which gives the listener praise is a disaster in oral poetry because it makes him lose the next line. And even if he does not lose the next, the rare and ebullient line is not worth making. In the sweep of recitation no individual line is going to count for very much ... It is not built up of isolated effects; the poetry is in the paragraph, or the whole episode to look for single ‘good’ lines is like looking for single ‘good’ stones in a cathedral. 38

Another technique in oral poetry is the use of a special diction. It should be familiar in the sense of being unexpected but not in the sense of being colloquial or common place. We moderns may like poetry which may be hardly distinguishable from utterances made ex tempore. But “Our ancestors did not. They like a dance which was a dance, and fine clothes which no one could mistake for ordinary clothes, and feasts that no one could mistake for ordinary dinners, and poetry that unblushingly proclaimed itself to be poetry.” 39 Thus poetic diction has to be “a language which is familiar because it is used in every part of every poem, but unfamiliar because it is not used outside poetry”. Lewis compares epic diction to turkey and plum pudding dinner at Christmas. “None is surprised at the menu but every one
recognizes, that it is not ordinary fare". A few examples of Homer remarkable diction are wine-dark sea, rosy-fringed dawn, holy brine and Poseidon shaker of earth. They "emphasize the unchanging human environment. They express a feeling very profound and very frequent in real life, but elsewhere ill represented in literature". The diction also produces unwearing splendour and ruthless pregnancy. But we must not get the impression that the effects were calculated by Homer line by line as a modern poet might do, because

Once the diction has been established it works itself. Almost anything the poet wants to say, has only to be turned into this orthodox and ready-made diction and it becomes poetry. The conscious artistry of the poet is thus set free to devote itself wholly to the large-scale problems — construction, character drawing, invention; his verbal poetics have become a habit like grammar or articulation.

Then Lewis turns his attention to the subject of the primary epic. He says that a primary epic does not have to be on a subject of national or cosmic importance, and all it requires is a heroic story. To support this theory he gives the examples of Homer's Odyssey which is only an adventure story and it has got nothing to do with national interest. And he says to some extent that same thing can be said of The Iliad. Here a great war is involved between two nations — the Greeks and Trojans. But the Trojan war provides only the background for the story. Homer does not even tell directly
the climax of the war — the fall of Troy. Moreover, it is neither a clash between East and West, as traditionally believed, nor is it a story of the battle of the All-Greeks against the barbarians of Asia. It is merely the background to a purely personal story — that of Achilles' wrath, suffering, repentance, and killing of Hector. In Homer even if one surveys the whole poem one will find that the Trojans are nowhere treated as being better nor worse than the Greeks. Besides, there is no anti-Trojan feeling in the story. In fact "The noblest character is a Trojan, and nearly all the atrocities are on the Greek side".42

Thus if The Iliad became a great epic at war not because it was on a national subject but "its greatness lies in the human and personal tragedy built up against this background of meaningless flux. It is all the more tragic because there hangs over the heroic world a certain futility as Achilles says to Priam, 'And here I sit in Troy ... afflicting you and your children, not protecting Greece, not even winning glory, not called by any vocation to afflict Priam, but just doing it because that is the way things have come about'.43 Parallels can be drawn from other epics as well to show that a primary epic does not have to be based on a national subject. Professor Chadwick has remarked about the German epics saying, "how singularly free the poems are from anything in the nature of national interest or sentiment'.44
The greatest hero of Icelandic poetry is a Burgundian. In Beowulf, Professor Chadwick’s statement is very well illustrated. The poem is English. The scene is at first laid in Zealand, and the hero comes from Sweden. Hengest who ought to have been the Aeneas of our epic if the poet had had Virgil’s notion of an epic subject, is mentioned only parenthetically.45

Lewis also discusses the subject of the secondary epic. The subject of the secondary epic was invented by Virgil. He was interested in writing an epic to rival Homer, and he decided upon a national subject to satisfy the Roman spirit. Two earlier poets had written epics on national themes but both of them were unsuccessful because the themes were too vast and they became clumsy and monotonous and ended up as mere metrical chronicles. But Virgil found a solution to this problem by narrowing down his theme to a single national legend and handling it with great skill. Lewis remarks that surmounting this problem made a landmark in the history of poetry, and also proves Virgil as a poet par excellence.

His solution of the problem — one of the most important revolutions in the history of poetry — was to take one single national legend and treat it in such a way that we feel the vaster theme to be somehow implicit in it. He has to tell a comparatively short story and give us the illusion of having lived through a great space of time. He has to deal with a limited number of personages and make us feel as if national or almost cosmic, issues are involved. He must locate his
action in a legendary past and yet make us feel the present, and the intervening centuries, already foreshadowed.46

After Virgil, the above procedure seems quite obvious, but it has become obvious only because "a great poet, faced with an all but insoluble problem, discovered this answer and with it discovered new possibilities for poetry itself." So any further development of the secondary epic is from Virgil, and Milton's *Paradise Lost* is a supreme example of such development. Though the themes are different, Milton also employed the techniques Virgil had employed. Through their style they achieved the solemnity required of an epic though the external aids available to Homer such as a robed and garlanded priest, an altar or a feast in a hall were all lacking. In a way a secondary epic, to be effective, has to achieve even greater solemnity than a primary one as it is meant to be read by a person in his armchair in the privacy of his study who should be made to feel that he is participating at an august ritual. So "To blame it for being ritualistic or incantatory, for lacking intimacy or the speaking voice is to blame it for being just what it intends to be."47

Lewis deals further with the technique of the secondary epic. In general this solemn effect is achieved by the grandeur or elevation of style. In *Paradise Lost* for example the grandeur is produced mainly by three things: (1) The use
of slightly unfamiliar words and constructions; (2) The use of proper names which are suggestions of the splendid, remote, terrible, voluptuous or celebrated things. The purpose is "to encourage a sweep of the reader's eye over the richness and variety of the world"; (3) Continued allusion to what heightens our sense experience such as light, darkness, storm, flowers, jewels and sexual love; and all these are "managed with an air of magnanimous austerity". The effect is a feeling of excitement without surrender or relaxation, a soothing and yet rich quality of experience.

This kind of experience also may be obtained from reading other poems but the main difference is that there is an unremitting manipulation of his readers to make him feel that he is attending an actual recitation. "It is common to speak of Milton's style as organ music. It might be more helpful to regard the reader as the organ and Milton as the organist" playing on his readers. Now let us consider the opening paragraph. When we read it, it gives us the feeling that something great is about to begin. And he succeeds in conveying the feeling by using the following techniques. Firstly, the quality of weight is produced by ending his lines with long, heavy mono-syllables. Secondly, there is the suggestion that he is undertaking deep spiritual preparation for the task by saying, "O spirit who dost prefer before all else a pure heart, what in me is dark illumine". Thirdly, he
reinforces the idea that something great is about to happen by alluding to the creation of the world itself. This also gives us the impression that the epic is going to span the whole of human history. Then a series of images used by Milton in the description of creation is listed.

But notice how cunningly this direct suggestion of great beginning is reinforced by allusion to the creation of the world itself (Dove-like sat'st brooding), and then by images of rising and lifting (With no middle flight intents to soar ... raise and support — Height of this great argument) and then again how creation and rising come potently together when we are reminded that Heaven and Earth rose out of Chaos and how in addition to this we have that brisk, morning promise of good things to come, borrowed from Ariosto (things unattempted yet), and how till one greater Man makes us feel we are about to read an epic that spans over the whole of history with its arch. 48

The images used above have emotional connections but not necessarily logical connections. "Milton's technique is very like that of some moderns. He throws ideas together because of these emotional relations which they have in the very recesses of our consciousness. But unlike the moderns he always provides a facade of logical connections as well. The effect of this is that it lulls our logical faculty to sleep and enables us to accept what we are given without question". 49 This manipulation of images is found in the use of similes, but the similes does not illustrate what they pretend to illustrate. Let us look at a few examples. Fiends
are compared to elves. Here the only point of resemblance is smallness. But it serves a good purpose, as in contrast with the fairies, the Seraphs and Cherubs, who sit in secret conclave grow very huge and lordly. The dwarfish stature of the fiends also has an effect on the hugeness of Pandemonium. Some other images have subterranean connections. Paradise is compared to the field of Enna. Here one beautiful place is compared to another. But what is not explicitly stated is that in both the places "the young and beautiful while gathering flowers was ravished by a dark power risen up from the underworld". Next, Eden is compared to Nysician isle and to Mount Amara. Both these were hiding places, and the names were used to heighten in us the consciousness of Paradise in which things infinitely precious are hidden, guarded and locked up.

Manipulation is not confined to similes alone. It is also extended to sources of heightened interest in our sensual experience especially heat and brightness. But not satisfied with mere description Milton goes beyond them: towards the end of Book III, Milton took Satan to the sun. First of all we have "the picture of the sun gently warming the universe, and a hint of the enormous distance to which this virtue penetrates". Secondly, there is an allusion to sun spots which had been recently discovered by Galileo. Thirdly, we plunge into alchemy and through a mirror made of
gold the properties of the sun are viewed. Next Milton makes us realise the marvels of a shadowless world. Lastly, we meet Uriel who belongs to a category of spirits believed to be God's eyes. "This is not of course, the sun of modern science; but almost everything which the sun had meant to man up till Milton's day has been gathered together and the whole passage in his own phrase 'runs potable gold'". A good deal of what looks like pedantry in Milton is in reality evocation. The numerous similes and allusions from his immense learning are not displayed here for the sake of display but employed in order to guide our imaginations to the right channel.

Another essential quality in the epic style is continuity. "If the mere printed pages is to affect us like the voice of a bard chanting in a hall, then the chant must go on — smoothly, irresistibly, upborne with indefatigable wings'. Thus at the end of each sentence we must not be allowed to settle down, and even a fuller pause at the end of a paragraph must feel like a pause in a piece of music. Even between one Book and the next the momentum should be kept and "we must not wholly wake from the enchantment nor quite put off our festal clothes".

In general Milton avoids discontinuity by avoiding the simple sentence. He uses throughout the poem quite complicated syntax. But "compensates for the complexity of
his syntax by the simplicity of the broad imaginative effects beneath it and the perfect rightness of their sequence". So as you read him you should try to listen to a chanting voice rather than a talking voice. Then the sequences come very well. Let us take one example.

If thou best be — but O how fall’n! how chang’d
From him in the happy Realms of Light
Cloth’d with transcendent brightness didst outshine
Myriads though bright. If he whom mutual league.
United thoughts and counsels, equal hope
And hazard in the Glorious Enterprise,
Joynd with me once, now misery hath joynd
In equal ruin: into what Pit thou siest
From what highth fal’n.

This is a very complicated sentence but despite its length and complexity, if you forget about the syntax, and simply listen to the chant the sequence falls into a natural order: "the lost glories of heaven, the first plotting and planning, the hopes and hazards of the actual war, and then the misery, the ruin and the pit". Besides, it helps preserve the onward flow of the poem with enormous pressure.

Lewis advances additional arguments in defence of the epic style. First he takes up manipulation. Manipulation is a common feature should by both rhetoric and poetry. And Lewis thinks that no civilization ever considers the art of the rhetorician necessarily vile. In itself it is noble though like other arts it also can be misused. "Rhetoric and Poetry are [not] distinguished by manipulation of an audience in the one and, in the other, a pure self-expression, regarded as
its own end, and indifferent to any audience". 54 Because both aim at doing something to the audiences and both use language to control what already exists in our minds. The differentia of Rhetoric is that it calls the passions to support reason to produce some practical resolve in our minds. It becomes vile only when passions are called to support unreason and knows that it is unreason. But when rightly practiced it is lawful and necessary as Aristotle points out that the intellect itself moves nothing, and "the transition from thinking to doing needs to be assisted by appropriate states of feeling". 55 But what poetry aims to produce is "something more like vision than it is like action. But vision, in this sense, includes passions". And poetry plays a role in awakening and moulding the audience's passions or emotions. Lewis elaborates more the role of poetry in rousing emotions.

When we try to rouse some one's hate of toothache in order to persuade him to ring up the dentist, this is rhetoric; but even if there were not practical issues involved, even if we only wanted to convey the reality of toothache for some speculative purpose or for its own sake, we should still have failed if the idea produced in our friend's mind did not include the hatefulness of toothache. Toothache, with that one left out, is an abstraction. Hence the awakening and moulding of the reader's or hearer's emotions is a necessary element in that vision of concrete reality which poetry hopes to produce. Very roughly, we might almost say that in Rhetoric imagination is present for the sake of passion (and, therefore, in the long run, for the sake
of action), while in poetry passion is present for the sake of imagination, and therefore, in the long run, for the sake of wisdom or spiritual health — the rightness and richness of a man's total response to the world.56

However, man's response to the world involves right attitudes if he is to be in wholesome equilibrium and "Poetry certainly aims at making the reader's mind what it was not before. The idea of a poetry which exists only for the poet — a poetry which the public rather overhears than hears — is a foolish novelty in criticism."57

Lewis, next, discusses the use of stock response. He agrees with Dr. I.A. Richard's that a stock response is "a deliberately organized attitude which is substituted for the direct free play of experience". And he believes that responses such as constancy in love and friendship or loyalty in political life or perseverance in general are necessary in life and one of the main functions of art is to assist it. However, he fears that there has been a deterioration of stock response in modern men which is good neither for safety nor happiness nor human dignity. He assigns the following reasons for the decay.

1) The decay of Logic, resulting in the assumption that the particular is real but the universal is not.

2) A romantic primitivism which prefers the merely natural to the elaborated, the unwilled to the willed. So a
loss of conviction in the former universal belief that an experience is not renewable in itself but it has to be mastered and shaped by the will.

3) A confusion between the organisation of a response and the pretence of a response. To illustrate the point he gives the example of Von Higel who says, "'I kiss my son not only because I love him, but in order that I may love him.' This is organisation, and good. But you may also kiss children in order to make it appear that you love them. That is pretence, and bad".58

4) A belief that certain elementary rectitude of human response is given by nature which may be taken for granted as a basis by poets to teach us finer discriminations. Lewis believes that this is dangerous delusion and to illustrate his contention he gives the following examples:

a) Children like dabbling in dirt unless they are taught the stock response to it.

b) Normal sexuality instead of being a datum is achieved only through a delicate process of suggestion and adjustment.

5) The stock response to Pride which Milton took for granted has been decaying since the Romantic movement began. Pride was at that time one of the deadly sins.
6) The stock response to treachery has become uncertain. It has become justifiable even if somebody makes a living through treachery.

7) The stock response to death has become uncertain. It is now even treated as something amusing.

8) The stock response to pain has become uncertain. Lewis finds Eliot's comparison of evening to a patient on an operation table to be in rather poor taste.

Thus stock responses are not given by nature. Rather "it is a delicate balance of trained habits, laboriously acquired and easily lost, on the maintenance of which depends both our virtues and our pleasures and even perhaps the survival of our species. For though the human heart is not unchanging ... the laws of causation are. When poison becomes fashionable it does not cease to kill". In the light of this discovery concerning stock response there is no need to apologise for Milton or any other pre-Romantic poets who have used stock responses in poetry. In fact by using stock response the older poets have rendered valuable service to mankind not only by delighting us with art but also by instructing us in values.

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

Regarding the question of calculated grandiosity in *Paradise Lost*, Lewis admits that there is calculated grandiosity in the poem. But he claims that, that is the way an epic poem should be as it is a ritual style. However, it is not a deception to hide lack of spontaneity. A ritual style is made different from ordinary style by being somewhat stilted, elaborate and grand. So if it is grand, it is out of necessity to meet a requirement, and Milton’s style is true to the epic tradition. So "The grandeur which the poet assumes in his poetic capacity should not arouse hostile reactions. It is for our benefit. He makes his epic a rite so that we may share it; the more ritual it becomes, the more we are elevated to the rank of participants".  

After the discussion on form Lewis turns his attention to subject-matter. In reading a poem like *Paradise Lost*, because of the gulf between the ages, one is immediately confronted with the problem of understanding an archaic language and the cultural values they convey; and this problem hinders proper understanding and appreciation of the poem. So some critics have advanced a theory to bridge the gulf between the ages, namely, the doctrine of the unchanging
heart. According to this doctrine the things which separate one age from another are superficial. "Just as, if we strip the armour off a medieval knight or lace off a Caroline courtier, we should find beneath them an anatomy identical with our own, so, it is held, if we strip off from Virgil his Roman imperialism, from Sidney his code of honour, from Lucretius his Epicurean philosophy, and from all who have it their religion, we shall find the Unchanging Human Heart, and on this we are to concentrate."

However, the problem with this method is that when we attempt to find an LCM in the poem, we begin to twist and distort the poem by forcing certain qualities of it into false prominence and hiding things which the poet intended to highlight. Moreover, if we remove from people what makes them different, nothing is left of them. And this is far from being an ideal way to understand and appreciate the works of the old writers as the spirit in which they wrote has been ignored.

So Lewis suggests another method. In this method instead of stripping the knight of his armour or lace one puts on them and see how one would feel with them. In other words, instead of stripping a man of his honour, or royalism or beliefs and trying to see how he would look without them one situates oneself in his position and see how one would feel with them. Then one can enrich one's experience by re-
living the past but if one cuts oneself off from the past one
unjustly disinherits oneself. Therefore Lewis advises:

You must, so far as in you lies, become
an Achaen chief while reading Homer, a
medieval knight while reading Malory, and
an eighteenth century Londoner while
reading Johnson. Only thus will you be
able to judge to work in the spirit that
its author write and to avail chimerical
criticism. It is better to study the
changes in which the being of Human Heart
largely consists than to amuse ourselves
with fiction about its immutability.63

Lewis has dealt with yet one more problem in Milton
criticism: the Satan hero theory. Though the theory has been
prevailing since the time of William Blake in Milton
criticism, Lewis is of the view that it is due to a
misunderstanding of a series of things such as the epic form,
the intention of Milton in making the character magnificent
and the theological position concerning Satan at the time of
Milton. It is a very old critical discovery that the
imitation in art of unpleasing objects may be a pleasing
imitation". In the light of this discovery, the proposition
that Milton’s Satan is a magnificent character can also be
interpreted in two ways. It can mean that Milton’s depiction
is a magnificent poetical achievement which excites the
admiration of the reader. It also can mean that Satan as a
real being ought to be an object of admiration and sympathy
for the poet or his readers or both. The former was never
denied tell modern times and the latter was never affirmed before the time of Blake and Shelley.

Milton has treated the Satanic predicament in the epic form and thus the absurdity of Satan is subordinated to his misery. Moreover, the portrait of Satan is the best drawn in the poem as it is the easiest to draw a character worse than oneself: one simply releases the bad passions which are straining at the leash in real life. On the other hand, it is also easy to receive Satan well by reader because one has some affinity with Satan: a fallen man is very much like a fallen angel. So a magnificent Satan with great power of appeal emerges.

However, Milton also has made abundantly clear the absurdity of Satan. Satan is the cause of his own predicament. He develops a sense of injured merit often the Messiah was made the head of the angels. He refuses to acknowledge that the Messiah, by virtue of his superior divine nature and also by virtue of merit as the creator of the angels, has every right to head the angels. As Satan is a mere creature his very being is derived from God and his rebellion is analogous to the scent trying to destroy the flower. He deludes himself into thinking that he is at war with God though the war is only between him and Michael. He begins by fighting for liberty but sinks into fighting for honour, dominion and glory. He has become so degraded that
when he comes to the world he turns into a peeping Tom spying on Adam and Eve.

The progression from hero to general, from general to politician, from politician to secret agent is mistaken as making Satan more glorious than intended and then attempting to rectify it. But undoubtedly, it was Milton's intention to show the devil at his height and then trace what becomes of such self-intoxication when confronted with reality. In doing this, there were hardly any chance of being misunderstood when Milton wrote it. Because at that time people believed that there was such a person as Satan and that he was a liar and the father of falsehood. So his speeches were not accepted as gospel truth when he made public speeches to his troops.

To admire Satan is to vote for a world of misery, lies, wishful thinking and incessant autobiography. But Lewis grants that the choice is possible. For "Hardly a day passes without some slight movement towards it in each of us." But Lewis finds it difficult to believe how so systematic and well organised a man like Milton would gravely deceive himself to commit the error. And evidence is certainly stronger that Satan was made magnificent to meet the requirements of an artistic form rather than to be made an object of admiration and sympathy.
From *Paradise Lost* let us turn our attention to Lewis' views on the use of psycho-analysis and anthropology as tools of literary criticism. We shall begin with his essay, "Psycho-analysis and Literary Criticism". He begins the essay by trying to "to contribute to the solution of some frontier problems between psycho-analysis and literary criticism". One of these is a pseudo-problem in which some countries make "use of psycho-analysis to infer the pathology of a poet from his work". But the product of this endeavour becomes a contribution not to literary criticism but to pathology or pathological biography. And when the supposed finding is applied to literary criticism it produces unfortunate confusions. For instance, when the proposition "This poem is an inevitable outcome, and an illuminating symptom of the poet's repression, is somehow treated as an answer to the proposition, "This poem is rubbish". Here the critic has allowed himself to be diverted from the genuinely critical question, "Why and how should we read this?" to the historical question. "Why did he write it?" The first question is asking for the Final Cause and it will have some literary importance but asking for the Efficient Cause has none.

After having disposed of this pseudo-problem, Lewis launches into his discussion on two Freudian propositions: fantasy and symbolism. The first is to be found in the
twenty-third lecture of the *Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis* in which he says that all work of art is to be traced to the fantasies of the artist, that is, his day-dreams or wishfulfilments.

The artist wants 'honour, power, riches, fame and the love of women', but being unable to get these in the real world, he has to do the best he can by imagining or pretending that he has got them. So far, according to Freud, he does not differ from the rest of us. What makes him an artist in the curious faculty he possesses of! elaborating his day-dreams, so that they lose that personal note which grates upon strange ears and become enjoyable to others'. As we others also like a good wishfulfilment dream we are now ready to pay for the privilege of showing his. Thus, for the artist, as Freud says, there is a path through fantasy back to reality: by publishing his mere dreams of honour, power, riches, fame, and the love of women in reality.  

Regarding the above theory, Lewis observes, "If Freud had been content to say that all work of art could be casually traced to Fantasy in the artist, he would be merely stating an efficient cause which we might find difficult to disprove." But the limitation of his theory became severe when Freud went to the extent of considering "all day-dreaming to be of a single kind — that kind in which the dreamer pretends he is a famous man, or a millionaire, or an irresistible lady-killer, while in reality, he is no such thing". Because Lewis believes that there are two kinds of day-dreams: in the first the self is present as the hero, but
in the second the self is absent and there is no personal fulfilment. So Lewis wants to make the following emendations:

There are two activities of the imagination, one free, and the other enslaved to the wishes of its owner for whom it has to provide imaginary gratifications. Both may be the starting point for works of art. The former or 'free activity' continues in the works it produces and passes from the status of dream to that of art by a process which may legitimately be called 'elaboration': inconveniences are tidied up, banalities removed, private values and associations replaced, proportion, relief, and temperance are introduced'. But the other (or servile kind is not 'elaborated' into a work of art: it is a motive power which starts the activity and is withdrawn when once the engine is running, or a scaffolding which is knocked away when the building is complete. Finally, the characteristic products of free imagination belong to what may be called the fantastic, or mythical, or improbable type of literature: those of fantasy of the wisfulfilling imagination, to what may, in very loose sense, be called the realistic type. I say 'characteristic products' because the principle doubtless admits of innumerable exceptions.

Next Lewis discusses Freudian doctrines of symbolism as stated in Freud's tenth lecture. According to the doctrine there are certain images whether they appear in dreams or literature which bear a constant meaning. "These images with constant meaning, he calls symbols — the words, so to speak, of universal image — language. He gives us a few specimens. A house signifies the human body; Kings and Queens, father and mother; journey, death; small animals, one's brothers and
sisters; Fruits, Landscapes, Gardens, Blossoms, the female body or various parts of it." 69

Lewis has no desire to dispute with Freud concerning the facts stated above as it requires specialised professional knowledge to prove them right or wrong. And Lewis grants three things: that infantile sexual experience is common to all human beings; that latent thoughts utilise the images given above; and that whenever such images occur either in dream or literature or imagination they are unconsciously present in the mind of the man concerned. "Lewis grants all these because even if they were all true they would have no literary relevance. Because all sorts of irrelevant unconscious thoughts may occur while reading a book. So he adds, "If latent thought of an erotic character is present in the same way whenever I read about a garden, I have, as a critic, no objection". But he feels that Freud has gone too far in his interpretation of symbols, and raises serious objection to his interpretation of the following symbols.

Freud says, "Does it not begin to dawn upon us that the many fairy tales which begin with the words" once upon a time there were a king and a queen" simply means "once upon a time there was a father and mother"? simply mean is the crucial expression. They do not 'mean' this inter alia; they 'simply' mean this, this is all that they mean, they mean neither more nor less, nor other, than this. 70
Lewis feels that Freud is implicitly making the following claims in the statement.

(1) That the whole of the excitement, pleasure, or interest, occasioned by the image, whenever it occurs, is due to the latent erotic thought.

(2) That the image, as opposed to the latent thought, effects nothing at all except disguise: or, in other words, that if our inhibitions allowed it to become conscious without shock, the latent thought would give us the same kind and degree of satisfaction as the image now does.⁷¹

If Freud doesn't mean this, Lewis has nothing to say. But at least this is what many of Freud's followers believe and this kind of interpretation brings psycho-analytic symbolism into contact with literary values. And for Lewis the contact is not a happy one as he says,

We do not mind being told that when we enjoy Milton's description of Eden some latent sexual interest is, as a matter of fact, and along with it a thousand other things present in our unconscious. Our quarrel is with the man who says 'you know why you're really enjoying this'? It all comes from so and so. What we resent, in fact, is not so much the suggestion that we have interest in the female body as the suggestion that we have no interest in gardens: not what the wiseacre would force upon us, but what he threatens to take away. If it is true that all our enjoyment of the images, without remainder, can be explained in terms of infantile sexuality, then I confess, our literary judgements are in ruins. But I don't believe it is true.⁷²

Lewis further asserts that the Freudism interpretation is not borne out by experience; and he gives the example of
the interpretation that our interest in the garden is because it is a disguise for the female body. He contends that if it is really a disguise we have been looking for all along it should help us reach a climax but instead it rather becomes an interference and ends up in an anticlimax. And a careful examination of a poem like The Romance of the Rose will illustrate clearly why this is so. It seems at first that the poem is an ideal illustration of the Freudian symbolism as it has not only the garden but also the rosebud. But the trouble is that the whole process is the other way round. "The author, and his readers, start with a fully conscious attention to the erotic material and then deliberately express it in the symbols. The symbols do not conceal and are not intended to conceal: they exhibit ... the erotic experience, thus compared becomes somehow more interesting — that it is borrowing attractiveness from the flower, not they from it". Thus instead of supporting the Freudian view it is a refutation of it. So Lewis asks, "If in the Romance of the Rose, the erotic thought owes much of its poetical charm to the garden, why should the garden in Paradise Lost owe its special charm to the erotic thoughts?" Because in both the poems, criticism on the conscious level does not conceal but exhibits and takes its charm from another beautiful object in nature and the thing that decorates by lending its charm must be a beautiful thing in itself and for its own sake.
Therefore it is obvious that the delight in reading *Paradise Lost* Book-IV comes not exclusively from the latent erotic thought as the Freudian's claim but also from the garden which symbolises it and which enhances its attractiveness by lending its charm.

However, Lewis is not against psycho-analysis as such. It depends on the merit of the case and he finds Jung's ideas much more congenial than those of Freud's. Lewis is particularly attracted by Jung's primordial images or archetypal patterns. The doctrine can be briefly stated as follows:

... there exists, in addition to the individual unconsciousness, a collective conscious, a collective conscious which is common to the whole race and even, in some degree, the whole animal world. Being thus common, it contains the reactions of mind or psyche as such to the most universal situations. Being very primitive, it is prelogical and its reactions are expressed not in thought but in images. Myths, or at any rate the older and greater myths, are such images recovered from the collective conscious. 75

Whether it is good or bad science, Lewis perceives at once that the theory is excellent poetry, and it has great emotional appeal. "Something dim and far removed — buried in the depths from immemorial time — stirring beneath the surface coming to life" 76 can very well be a siren call to anybody. Lewis responds to the call enthusiastically as he
exclaims, "I am with Schliemann digging up what he believed to be the very bones of Agamemnon, king of men: I am with Collingwood discovering behind the Arthurian stories some far-off echo of real happenings in the thick darkness of British history, with Asia in the fourth set of Prometheus following her dream down, down to the cave of Demogorgon: with Wordsworth, sinking deep and ascending to regions to which the heaven of heavens is but a veil ..."77

This strong appeal to the human mind leads to another question. Why are primordial images so exciting? Jung says that it is "because they are ancient, because in contemplating them, we are doing whatever pre-historic ancestors did." But Lewis does not agree with this view. Because neither the antiquity of a thing nor the contemplation of it provides adequate reasons for the emotional appeal of the images. Everything of antiquity is not exciting, and if something is to be exciting whether modern or ancient it has to have some intrinsic worth of its own, and Jung’s suggestion does not touch the intrinsic worth of the images at all. So it cannot explain why a myth can appeal powerfully even to a man who is not at all conscious of its antiquity.

So far, thus, the potency of the primordial images remain a mystery. But Lewis feels "the mystery of primordial images is deeper, their origin move remote, their cane..."
hidden, their frontier less accessible"\textsuperscript{78} than suspected and the mystery continues to tantalize us. It may be called "the Recovery Pattern or the Veiled Isis, or the Locked Door or the Lost-and-Found. The Freudians will explain it in terms of infantile sexual curiosity ... but that need not bother us."\textsuperscript{79} Whatever it may be, "It is, indeed, an image inevitably embodying certain absolutely universal features of our experience, religious, intellectual, aesthetic and sexual alike".\textsuperscript{80} And the presence of such primordial images in psycho-analysis has proved to be an antidote to materialism itself.

... psycho-analysis heals some of the wound made by materialism. For the general effect of materialism is to give you, where expected indefinite depth of reality, a flat wall only a few inches away. Psycho-analysis offers you some kind of depth back again — lots of things hidden behind the wall. Hence those who have once tested it feel they are being robbed of something if we try to take it from them.\textsuperscript{81}

If psycho-analysis has contributed to the primordial images, now let us see what anthropology has to offer to literary criticism. There has been a wide spread belief that anthropology can help our understanding of literature. This belief is based on the assumption that the study of the mythical and ritual origins of medieval romances has thrown
new light on them. There is no doubt that literary texts are very useful to the anthropologists. But does it necessarily follow that anthropology can in return make a significant contribution to criticism? Lewis makes an attempt to answer that question in his essay "The Anthropological Approach."

First of all let us take up one by one the claims made by anthropologists concerning their new findings. One of them is the story of Gawain from "Gawain and the Green Knight". It is believed that "Gawain’s property of growing stronger as the sun ascends can be explained as the last vestige of a myth about the sun god." But here we have to make sure first the sense in which the word "explain" is used. "We mean ‘to account for causally’ (as in ‘we can easily explain his behavior by the fact that he was drunk’). The word has a different meaning when we say that someone first explained to us the Deductions of the Categories or the beauties of the Virgilian hexameter. ‘To explain’ in this second sense is to open our eyes; to give us the power of receiving, or receiving more fully what Kant or Virgil intended to give us”. But the explanation of Gawain’s popularity above is a causal explanation and therefore it doesn’t enlighten us in any way in the second sense and it is a complete irrelevance, because

Nothing leads up to it; nothing of any importance depends on it. Apart from it there is nothing divine and nothing solar about Gawain. All that he does, suffers,
or says elsewhere would have exactly the same value if this odd detail had been omitted. The anthropological explanation may be true and it may have an interest of its own; but it cannot increase our understanding or enjoyment of one single sentence in the Morte.  

Bercilak, another knight in "Gawain and the Green Knight" is supposed to have been derived from one eniautos daimon. The discovery is supposed to throw light on our understanding of Bercilak. But we will have to find out which of the two — eniautos daimon or Bercilak — is throwing light on the other. Bercilak is a very vivid and memorable character. "No one who has once read the poem forgets him. No one while reading it disbelieves in him." But eniautos daimon is only a concept constructed from the religious practices of the ancient pagan world and all we can do is to make a guess as to what it was like. "As we have never participated in a pagan ritual we do not know what it felt like ... with its baffling mixture of agriculture, tragedy, obscenity, revelry and clowning, eludes us in all but its externals." Therefore, to expect eniautos daimon to throw light on Bercilak becomes absurd as only the known can throw light on the unknown. Bercilak is a wholly lovely and noble knight and literature has preserved for me in this figure what anthropology can never penetrate. It has given me knowledge by acquaintance (connaître) whereas anthropology could give me at best only knowledge - about (savoir). "If
this is so, then our poetic experience has helped us as anthropologists, but our anthropology has not helped us to read poetry. When savage beliefs and practices inform a work of art, that work is not a puzzle to which those beliefs and practices are the clue. The savage origins are the puzzle; the surviving works of art is the only clue by which we can hope to penetrate the inwardness of the origins. It is art, or nowhere, that the dry to bones are made to live again".85

However, Mr. Speirs maintains that knowing such origins is of literary relevance; because it affects the poet and also the reader. He gives the example of a poet's reaction to the perilous fountain in "Gawain and Gawain", and he connects it conjecturally with a rain-making ritual. Then he asks what happens if the poet was ignorant about the rain-making ritual? He replies that it doesn't matter even if he didn't know about the origin as he had at least inherited the traditional attitude of reverence towards such episodes because of their sense of mystery. But Lewis counters that there is no conclusive proof that the rain-making ritual is what has moved the poet. While reading the poem the reader might have been deeply moved by the poem, but the author's reaction may not be identical with his. Or even if the author was moved there is no evidence that the ritual origins are the only or commonest source of such feeling as even an unexplained magic fountain might have equally awed and
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mystified that poet. So Lewis disapproves of this kind of criticism.

This type of criticism which always takes us away from the actual poem and the individual poet to seek the sources of their power in something earlier and less known — which, in fact, finds the secret of poetic pleasure anywhere rather than in talent and art — has lately received a dolorous stroke from Professor Vinaver. He has cured us, if we can be cured, of the bad habit which regards the finished romances as mere rubble left over from some statelier, non-existent building. This is the reverse of the truth. The romance is the Cathedral; the anthropological material is the rubble that was used by the builders. He has shown as regards one particular story that every step away from the dark origin is an advance in coherence, in suggestion, in imaginative power.

In the second part of his theory, Mr. Speirs explains how the ritual origins or the knowledge of them affects the reader. He says, for example, an awareness of the fact that the perilous fountain has something to do with rain-making makes us feel that it is more than a sport of fancy and thus cures us from taking it too easily. He also has asserted elsewhere that anthropological facts or even guesses make the readers of medieval romance move alert to things which they might otherwise have passed over unnoticed.

What Mr. Speirs has said above is typical of his age as for his generation of anthropologizing critics, "the garden of marvellous romance is — as it was not either for medieval or for nineteenth-century man — a walled and locked up
garden to which anthropology is the key. They become free of it only if they carry the golden bough. This awakens in them a sensibility they otherwise lack. 87

If "anything helps one to read sensitively and attentively it is welcome". But helps can be of two kinds: those that have intrinsic connection with literature and those that don’t have such connections. The first group "consists of knowledge or sympathies which enable the reader to enter more fully into the author’s intentions". Some of such helps can be history, scholarship and experience. But there are other helps which only psychologically dispose us well towards a work of art but which have no intrinsic connections with the subject matter of the work. "They are accidents in the sense that their necessity varies from one reader to another, and for the same reader from time to time, and the best readers need them least. Health, quiet, on easy chair, a full, but not too full, stomach can all help in this way ... some approach a book receptively because it is recommended, others because it is forbidden ... One is attracted and another repelled by the knowledge that everyone is reading this." 88

Helps of the first kind which have intrinsic connection with literature should be discovered, exhibited and supplied more as they are useful in the highest degree. But helps of the second kind which is the merely subjective kind under
which can also come anthropological conjectures have no critical value.

Lewis has elaborated further why anthropology can be dispensed with without any loss to literary enjoyment. Firstly, anthropology is not universally necessary. Now some readers claim they enjoy the romance well and deeply when they came to it via anthropology. But why this laborious and roundabout way? People were free to approach romances directly before and they have enjoyed them enormously. "The ferlies, simply for what they are shown to be in the texts, conquered us at once and have never released us. We stand amazed when juniors think to interest us in the Grail by connecting it with a cauldron of plenty or a pre-historic burning glass, for the Grail as Chretien or Malory presents it seems to us twenty times more interesting than the cauldron or the glass." There is a generation of people whose direct response to literature is inhibited. Lewis is apparently referring to those who have been conditioned to see books only through the spectacles of others and particularly those of the established critical world. So they feel released from their inhibition whey they employ the anthropological approach. But this is only an artificial prop which humanity can dispense with and still enjoy romances.
Thus

... it merely restores to them powers which humanity often has without any such preliminary askesis. The insight into romance which it gives them is new to them, not to men in general. The fact that they needed such therapy is a fact about them, not about the literary quality of the romances. To regard their anthropological approach as a discovery in literary criticism is like regarding insulin as a discovery in gastronomy ... [though] it is a medical, not a gastronomic, discovery. 90

Secondly, the therapeutic value of anthropological askesis does not depend on the fact of its ritual origins. "If a ritual origin worked that way, readers of the romances would receive its exciting effect without knowing its existence" in the way alcohol will intoxicate whether we are aware of having taken it or not. "If that were so, why should we need or learn of it before we can fully enjoy the Romances? And indeed Mr. Speirs does not think we need exactly ‘learn’ in the sense of ‘coming to know’." The connection between the perilous fountain and the rain-making ritual is only conjectural. "Obviously what does the therapeutic work is not the fact that the mere idea of ritual origin; the idea, us an idea, not known to be true, not affirmed, but simply entertained. The case is not like that of a man who gets ... drunk from taking spirits. It is as if a suggestible person ... felt drunk simply at the idea of having done so."91
But those who use anthropology as a prop to read the romances fall into this delusion all the time. The romances create a joyous world full of mystery where nearly everything has a deeper meanings. It is a "a world of endless forest, quest, hint, prophecy ... The hero is a sort of intruder or trespasser; always unawares, stumbling on to forbidden ground. Hermits and voices explain just enough to let us know how completely he is out of his depth, but not to dispel the overall mystery". Till a generation ago, readers accepted this world as the romancers noble and joyous invention. But now there are readers who cannot accept this world and build up a second romance which is a distortion of the first, "It also is a quest story, but it is he, not Perceval or Gawain that is on the quest" and the forests are not those of an enchanted land but that of anthropological theory. "It is he himself who quivers at the surmise that everything he meets may be more important ... than it seemed. It is to him that such hermits as Frazer and Miss Weston, dwelling in the heart of the forest, explain the signification of the ferlies ... And he has his reward" though he wins it in a roundabout way. He rejects the original fiction and re-embraces it mirrored in a second fiction which he mistakes as reality. Perhaps it is better than nothing. "But it might do a good deal of harm to literary and cultural history and even anthropology itself. If it were taken as a serious contribution to any
of these disciplines. And to criticism it has already done some.93

The critical theories we have discussed so far in this chapter range from the personal heresy to *Paradise Lost*; and from theories on stories and science fiction to Lewis’ views on psycho-analysis and anthropology. All these essays, except those on stories and science fiction, are polemical and also eclectic in nature, and they constitute some of his major views on theory and criticism.

In *The Personal Heresy*, Lewis attacks Tillyard’s expressive theory and labels it as heresy. He contends that a poem is not the expression of the poet’s personality because it is produced not by expressing his personality but by transcending it into a new mode of consciousness; and this consciousness is what the poet shares with us when we read a poem. However, this consciousness is only a heightened mode of consciousness and not his normal consciousness and thus it cannot be his personality. Moreover, on reading a poem we see with the poet rather than look at him as an object; and thus his personality is his starting point and limitation, it is analogous to the position of a window. A window is there not to study windows but to see a landscape through it.

In *A Preface to Paradise Lost*, Lewis begins with a discussion on the nature of epic poetry. He feels this is essential because modern readers have no idea that in a long
narrative poem the line is subordinated to the paragraph, and
the paragraph to the book and the book to the whole. They
read epic poetry in the way they read lyrics so in the
process they get frustrated. Epic poetry is a species of the
genus narrative poetry and Lewis divided it into primary epic
and secondary epic. Primary epic is oral, solemn,
aristocratic and ceremonial and attains its effect by using a
special diction which is familiar and yet not colloquial.
Secondary epic is written, solemn, and ritualistic and its
effect is attained mainly by unremitting manipulation of the
reader: he is made to feel that he is participating in an
actual recitation. In A Preface, Lewis refutes two errors
that have been prevailing for more than a century. The first
is the doctrine of the unchanging human heart. According to
this doctrine the differences between the ages are
superficial and if we strip characters of one age of their
traditions, we find the same unchanging heart. But Lewis
contends that this is no solution to the problem because if
we strip tradition from the characters we may be removing the
very essence of the poem or play on which it exists. So Lewis
suggests that we rather situate ourselves in their position
by embracing their traditions and try to feel how they felt.
The second error is the Satan-hero theory. Though Lewis
acknowledges that Satan is a magnificent creation, he does
not believe that Milton intended Satan to be the hero. As
Paradise Lost is an epic, Milton treated the satanic predicament in the epic form by subordinating his absurdity to his misery; and Satan is also drawn well. As a result a magnificent Satan emerges. But this is not all about Satan. Milton also made his absurdity very clear. Satan's revolt against God is a supreme act of folly. As he is only a creature his revolt is analogous to the scent of a flower trying to destroy the flower. He comes to Eden as a spy but soon degrades into a snake. This progression from an angelic hero to a snake fits well into Milton's artistic design as he undoubtedly intended to show Satan at his height and then trace his downfall step by step when he encounters reality.

Lewis had a conservative temperament and his conservatism is reflected in his attitude towards the use of psycho-analysis and anthropology in literary criticism. He is sceptical about the use of psycho-analysis in literary criticism because some critics use psycho-analysis to infer the pathology of the poet instead of concentrating on his work and thus it becomes a digression from genuine criticism. Secondly, Lewis has serious doubts about the interpretation of certain symbols by Freud which are too farfetched to be of any contribution to literary criticism. Lewis also finds no merit in the employment of anthropology as a critical tool. Because anthropology's supposed contribution is the discovery of the mythical or ritual origin of the romances. But these
origins are only conjectural and they may or may not be true. Or even if they are true they have no literary relevance as they simply provide facts about the origin of a poem and do not reveal anything about the literary quality of the poem.