

# C. S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and Esemplastic Friendship

by Paul E. Michelson  
Huntington University  
pmichelson@huntington.edu

## I. Introduction

The sudden death of Charles W. S. Williams on May 15, 1945 (the first member of C. S. Lewis's immediate circle to pass away) had a deep and paradoxical impact on Lewis. On the one hand, he was grief-stricken at the untimely (Williams was only 58) loss of a friend who had become integral to his life and work. On the other, despite the pain, Lewis did not experience depression over the situation or doubts about his Christian faith. As he wrote to Mary Neylan on a few days after Williams' demise:

"I also have become much acquainted with grief now through the death of my great friend Charles Williams, my friend of friends, the comforter of all our little set, the most angelic. The odd thing is that his death has made my faith ten times stronger than it was a week ago. And I find all that talk about 'feeling he is closer to us than before' isn't just talk. It's just what it does feel like—I can't put it into words. One seems at moments to be living in a new world. Lots, lots of pain, but not a particle of depression or resentment."<sup>1</sup>

Lewis—along with Dorothy Sayers, J. R. R. Tolkien, Owen Barfield, Gervase Mathew, and W. H. Lewis—responded to Williams' death by putting together a commemorative volume of *Essays Presented to Charles Williams*.<sup>2</sup> "We had hoped," Lewis wrote in the preface, "to offer the whole collection to Williams as what the Germans call a *Festschrift* when peace would recall him from Oxford [where he had spent the war] to London [where he worked at Oxford University Press]. Death forestalled us; we now offer as a memorial what had been devised as a greeting."<sup>3</sup>

---

1 C. S. Lewis to Mary Neylan, 20 May 1945, in C. S. Lewis, *The Collected Letters of C. S. Lewis, Vol. II: Books, Broadcasts, and the War, 1931-1949*, edited by Walter Hooper (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002), pp. 652-653. The "odd thing is" that Lewis's faith does seem to have been heavily impacted by the death in 1960 of Joy Davidman. See C. S. Lewis, *A Grief Observed* (London: Faber and Faber, 1961). Perhaps this reflects a difference between *eros* and *philia*, a subject for another discussion.

2 C.S. Lewis, ed., *Essays Presented to Charles Williams* (London: Oxford University Press, 1947), reprinted by Eerdmans, Grand Rapids MI, 1966.

3 Lewis, *Essays Presented to Charles Williams*, 1966, p. vi.

Lewis went on to describe Williams' role in the wartime meetings of their informal literary circle called the Inklings:<sup>4</sup>

“Such society, unless all of its members happen to be of one trade, makes heavy demands on a man's versatility. And we were by no means of one trade. The talk might turn in almost any direction, and certainly skipped ‘from grave to gay, from lively to severe’<sup>5</sup>: but wherever it went, Williams was ready for it. He seemed to have no ‘pet subject’. Though he talked copiously one never felt that he had dominated the evening. Nor did one easily remember particular ‘good things’ that he had said: the importance of his presence was, indeed, chiefly made clear by the gap which was left on the rare occasions when he did not turn up. It then became clear that some principle of liveliness and cohesion [coinherence?] had been withdrawn from the whole party: lacking him, we did not completely possess one another. He was (in the Coleridgian [sic] language) an ‘esemplastic’ force....”<sup>6</sup>

Lewis's views on friendship are well-known from his widely-read 1960 book *The Four Loves*,<sup>7</sup> which has an entire section dealing with *philia* or “friendship” (though perhaps this section is less read than the naughty bits on *eros*). The contention of this paper is that Lewis's more systematic thoughts about friendship published near the end of his life as well as our understanding of his friendship with Charles Williams can be usefully illuminated 1) by looking at how Williams functioned as an esemplastic force,

---

4 On the Inklings, see Humphrey Carpenter, *The Inklings. C. S. Lewis, J. R. R. Tolkien, Charles Williams, and their friends* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1979); Walter Hooper, “The Inklings,” in Roger White, Judith Wolfe, and Brendan N. Wolfe, eds., *C. S. Lewis and His Circle. Essays and Memoirs from the Oxford C. S. Lewis Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 197-213; Colin Duriez and David Porter, *The Inklings Handbook* (London: Azure Press, 2001); Diane Pavlac Glyer, *The Company They Keep. C. S. Lewis and J. R. R. Tolkien as Writers in Community* (Kent OH: Kent State University Press, 2007); Colin Duriez, *The Oxford Inklings. Lewis, Tolkien, and Their Circle* (Oxford: Lion Books, 2015); and Philip Zaleski and Carol Zaleski, *The Fellowship. The Literary Lives of the Inklings: J. R. R. Tolkien, C. S. Lewis, Owen Barfield, Charles Williams* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2015).

5 The allusion is to Pope's *Essay on Man*, Epistle IV.

6 Lewis, *Essays Presented to Charles Williams*, 1966, p. xi. Lewis, ever the optimistic pessimist, had noted in 1939 that “Along with these not very pleasant indirect results of the war, there is one pure gift—the London branch of the University Press has moved to Oxford so that Charles Williams is living here.” C. S. Lewis to Warnie Lewis, 10 September 1939, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2004, Vol. II, p. 272.

7 First published as C. S. Lewis, *The Four Loves* (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1960), paperback edition, London: Collins Fontana, 1963. The origins of *The Four Loves* was in a series of ten radio lectures that Lewis recorded in August 1958 at the request of the American Episcopal Radio-TV Foundation of Atlanta, Georgia that Lewis had received in January 1958. They were supposed to be broadcast nationally on the weekly Episcopal Hour program from March 29-May 31, 1959, but because Lewis “brought sex” into his talks on *Eros* it was decided to broadcast them only on individual stations. However, the Foundation did make the entire series available on recordings, which are still available today on CD. See Walter Hooper, *C. S. Lewis: A Companion and Guide* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996), pp. 86-90, 367.

and 2) by examining what Lewis had to say about friendship in his correspondence and other sources prior to the publication of *The Four Loves*. In addition—though it is not a purpose of this paper to systematically survey or to critique Lewis’s ideas on friendship in *The Four Loves*<sup>8</sup>—some attention will be given to looking at how Lewis’s 1960 exposition squares with the ideas that emerge in this paper.

## II. The Esemplastic and Friendship

“Esemplastic” is a word invented by Samuel Taylor Coleridge in his *Biographia Literaria* (1817) to describe what he called “secondary imagination,” the creativity that produces poetry and art.<sup>9</sup> Let’s call this sense A of Esemplastic. Coleridge’s motivation? “I thought that a new term would both aid the recollection of my meaning, and prevent its being confounded with the usual [i. e. prosaic] import of the word, imagination.”<sup>10</sup> Coleridge also included in *esemplastic* the sense of shaping as in “moulding my thoughts into verse.”<sup>11</sup> It is through the *esemplastic* power of imagination that the writer/artist transcends mere perception and normality by creating or shaping literature and art.

This was a problem that Lewis had long wrestled with, including a reading—no

---

8 Which has been analyzed by others, including Gilbert Meilaender, *The Taste for the Other. The Social and Ethical Thought of C. S. Lewis* (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1978); Michael Malanga, “*The Four Loves: C. S. Lewis’s Theology of Love*,” in Bruce L. Edwards, ed., *C. S. Lewis. Life, Works, and Legacy. Vol. 4: Scholar, Teacher, and Public Intellectual* (Westport CT: Praeger, 2007), pp. 49-80; and William L. Isley, Jr., “C. S. Lewis on Friendship,” *Inklings Forever*, Vol. 6 (2008).

9 Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria or Biographical Sketches of My Literary Life and Opinions* (London: Rest Fenner, 1817), Vol. 1: Ch. 10 and Ch. 13. Source: Project Gutenberg, [www.gutenberg.org/files/6081/6081-h/6081-h.htm](http://www.gutenberg.org/files/6081/6081-h/6081-h.htm), last accessed 23 May 2016. The title of Ch. 13 is “The imagination or the Esemplastic power.” In Ch. 14, Coleridge was the first to use the phrase “willing suspension of disbelief.” And in Ch. 15, he describes how the secondary or *esemplastic* imagination functions as it “dissolves, diffuses, dissipates, in order to recreate,” which clearly has affinities with Tolkien’s celebrated discussion of “sub-creation” in his “On Fairy-stories,” in J. R. R. Tolkien, *On Fairy-stories*, Expanded Edition with Commentary and Notes, edited by Verlyn Flieger and Douglas A. Anderson (London: HarperCollins, 2008), pp. 42, 59 ff, 78. Cf. Paul E. Michelson, “The Development of J. R. R. Tolkien’s Ideas on Fairy-stories,” *Inklings Forever*, Vol. 8 (2012), pp. 115-127. On Coleridge, *esemplastic*, and fantasy literature, see Gary K. Wolfe, “Fantasy from Dryden to Dunsany,” in Edward James and Farah Mendlesohn, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Fantasy Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 7 ff.

10 Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria*, 1817, Vol. 1: Ch. 10.

11 Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria*, 1817, Vol. 1: Ch. 10.

surprise here—of Coleridge’s *Biographia Literaria*. In January of 1927, Lewis wrote in his diary, “Was thinking about imagination and intellect and the unholy muddle I am in about them at present: undigested scraps of anthroposophy and psychoanalysis jostling with orthodox idealism over a background of good old Kirkian rationalism. Lord what a mess!”<sup>12</sup> The following day, he wrote: “Still puzzled about imagination, etc....Decided to work up the whole doctrine of Imagination in Coleridge as soon as I had time....That’s the real imagination, no bogies, not Karmas, no gurus, no damned psychism there. I have been astray among second rate ideas too long...”<sup>13</sup>

In a letter a few months later to his brother, Warnie Lewis, in April 1927, we find that Lewis was spending mornings reading *Biographia Literaria*, though he often found Coleridge incoherent: “As an attempt at a book (as opposed to mere Coleridgean talk), it is preposterous.”<sup>14</sup> Subsequently, in 1933, Lewis wrote to Owen Barfield<sup>15</sup> that a recent article by Barfield on Coleridge was “exciting” but hard to understand, though he now understood why Coleridge frequently appeared incoherent.<sup>16</sup> Barfield had written that Coleridge’s “extraordinarily unifying mind was too painfully aware that you cannot really say one thing correctly without saying everything....His incoherence of expression arose from the coherence of what he wanted to express. It was a sort of intellectual stammer.”<sup>17</sup> (Since we all fumble with big ideas that seem to escape the bounds of our

---

12 Entry for 18 January 1927 in C. S. Lewis, *All My Road Before Me. The Diary of C. S. Lewis 1922-1927*, edited by Walter Hooper, Foreword by Owen Barfield (London: HarperCollins Fount, 1991), pp. 431-432. Similar musings can be found in Lewis’s *Surprised by Joy. The Shape of My Early Life* (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1955). References below are to the 1956 Harcourt, Brace edition.

13 Entry for 19 January 1927 in Lewis, *Diary*, 1991, p. 432.

14 C. S. Lewis to Warren Lewis, [18 April 1927], in C. S. Lewis, *The Collected Letters of C. S. Lewis, Vol. I: Family Letters, 1905-1931*, edited by Walter Hooper (London: HarperCollins, 2000), pp. 685-686.

15 C. S. Lewis to Owen Barfield, 28 March 1933, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2004, Vol. II, pp. 104-107.

16 Owen Barfield, “The Philosophy of Samuel Taylor Coleridge,” first published in 1932 and reprinted in 1944 in Barfield’s *Romanticism Comes of Age*, new augmented edition (Middletown CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1967), pp. 144-163.

17 Barfield, *Romanticism Comes of Age*, 1967, p. 146. For more on Lewis and Barfield and imagination, see Stephen Thorson, *Joy and Poetic Imagination. Understanding C. S. Lewis’s “Great War” with Owen Barfield and its Significance for Lewis’s Conversion and Writings* (Hamden CT: Winged Lion Press, 2015). The interest in Coleridge was keen enough in Lewis’s circles that Dom Bede Griffiths proposed to Lewis sometime around 1930 that they subsidize an edition of Coleridge by Owen Barfield. See Walter Hooper’s note in

words and, perhaps, our minds, we can all empathize with Coleridge here.)

Lewis's views on imagination were eventually boiled down in a 1956 letter: "The true exercise of imagination, in my view, is (a) To help us to understand other people (b) To respond to, and some of us, to produce, art."<sup>18</sup> It seems clear that Lewis was intimately familiar with Coleridge, Coleridge's theories, and his view of esemplastic imagination.<sup>19</sup>

In addition to sense A of Esemplastic (as secondary imagination), there are two more senses. In the 20th century, esemplastic also come to be defined as the "forming or moulding into one in the manner of an artist"<sup>20</sup> or, as *The Oxford Dictionary* has it, "of the process of molding into a unity; unifying."<sup>21</sup> Sense B is, then, is the idea of a unifying process or unity in similarity, which many see as the principal basis for friendship. There is also an additional sense C, in which the unifying process brings together opposites. This is another paradox: esemplastic friendship leads to unity in diversity itself.<sup>22</sup>

How do these three senses of esemplastic apply to C. S. Lewis and Charles

---

the "Supplement," in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2002, Vol. II: Note 114, p. 1518; this project did not materialize. Barfield went on to publish an entire book on Coleridge: *What Coleridge Thought* (Middletown CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1971), with two chapters on "Imagination and Fancy," including a discussion of primary and secondary imagination.

18 C. S. Lewis to Keith Masson, 3 June 1956, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2004, Vol. II, p. 759. He goes on to recognize that imagination can also be put to bad uses. Compare Lewis's comment that "Friendship (as the ancients saw) can be a school of virtue; but also (as they did not see) a school of vice....It makes good men better and bad men worse." Lewis, *Four Loves*, 1963, p. 75.

19 On fantasy and imagination, see also C. S. Lewis, *The Discarded Image. An Introduction to Medieval and Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), pp. 162 ff. On Lewis and Coleridge, see Peter J. Schakel, *Reason and Imagination in C. S. Lewis. A Study of Till We Have Faces* (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1984), p. 183; David Jasper, "The Pilgrim's Regress and Surprised by Joy," in Robert MacSwain and Michael Ward, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to C. S. Lewis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 232-233; and J. T. Sellars, *Reasoning beyond Reason. Imagination as a Theological Source in the Work of C. S. Lewis* (Eugene OR: Pickwick Publications, 2011), pp. 48 ff, 194-195.

20 P. L. Carver, "The Evolution of the Term 'Esemplastic'," *Modern Humanities Research Association*, Vol. 24 (1929), p. 330.

21 *Oxford Universal Dictionary on Historical Principles*, third edition with addenda revised and edited by C. T. Onions (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955) p. 633. The OUD makes a connection between Schelling's term *Ineinsbildung*, literally "forming into one," which is rejected by Carver, "Esemplastic," 1929, pp. 329-331.

22 For a thorough discussion of the issue of similarities and differences in the Inklings, see Glyer, *The Company They Keep*, 2007, Ch. 1-2.

Williams? It seems clear that Lewis and Williams had nothing in common if not their shared devotion to the *esemplastic* in sense A (i.e. secondary imagination) and to deep, understanding friendships with others, both similar and dissimilar, that is the *esemplastic* in senses B and C. This dated from their first direct contact, a 1936 letter from Lewis to Williams in which Lewis wrote:

“A book sometimes crosses ones path which is so like the sound of ones native language in a strange country....I have just read your *Place of the Lion* and it is to me one of the major literary events of my life—comparable to my first discovery of George Macdonald, G. K. Chesterton, or Wm. Morris. There are layers and layers—first the pleasure any good fantasy gives me: then, what is rarely (tho’ not so very rarely) combined with this, the pleasure of a real philosophical and theological stimulus: thirdly, characters: fourthly, what I neither expected nor desired, substantial edification.”

Lewis was led to invite Williams to be his guest at Magdalen and join him in “talk...till the small hours” with an “informal club called the Inklings: the qualifications (as they have informally evolved) are a tendency to write, and Christianity.”<sup>23</sup> This rapidly evolved into a memorable friendship which ended only with Williams’ premature death in 1945.

Lewis and his friends were agreed on the Coleridgean *esemplastic* power of secondary imagination. An illustrative example can be found in a 1955 letter from Lewis to another close friend of Charles Williams, Dorothy L. Sayers. Lewis writes of their shared interest in

“the plastic, inventive, or constructive power, *homo faber*. This wants to make things out of any plastic material, whether within the mind or without; stone, metals, clay, wood, cloth, memory, & imagination. It will take from imagination any of the material I’ve enumerated. In my own stories it usually takes chiefly 2e: pictures, arising I don’t know how, are

---

<sup>23</sup> C. S. Lewis to Charles Williams, 11 March 1936, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2004, Vol. II, pp. 183-184. For a further elucidation of what Lewis saw in Williams’ fiction, see C. S. Lewis, “The Novels of Charles Williams,” in C. S. Lewis, *On Stories and Other Essays on Literature*, edited by Walter Hooper (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982), pp. 21-27, where Lewis also outlines his idea of “supposals.” This is the script of a lecture read by Lewis on the BBC, 11 February 1949, which is also available on CD.

got hold of by invention which wants to connect them & build a thing."<sup>24</sup>

Lewis's friendship with Charles Williams had a similar source. For example, Lewis was careful to point out to Williams in 1942 "that, far from loving your work because you are my friend, I first sought your friendship because I loved your books."<sup>25</sup> A few years after Williams' death he wrote to I. O. Evans that Williams had the gift of writing books in which "the doctrine is as good on its own merits as the art."<sup>26</sup> And in the preface to *Essays Presented to Charles Williams*, Lewis wrote wistfully that Williams' "face—angel's or monkey's—comes back to me most often seen through clouds of tobacco smoke and above a pint mug, distorted into helpless laughter at some innocently broad buffoonery or eagerly stretched forward in the cut and parry or prolonged, fierce, masculine argument and 'the rigour of the game'."<sup>27</sup>

An esemplastic friendship embodied not only shared artistic vision, but shared agreements as such. Deep friendship was of immense—probably essential—importance to C. S. Lewis. The "friendship as sharing" motif appears repeatedly in Lewis' correspondence. In a letter to Arthur Greeves in 1916, Lewis continues a discussion with Greeves on the difference between books and music in their shared aesthetic. Lewis argues that the difference "is just the same difference between friendship and love. The one is a calm and easy going satisfaction, the other is a sort of madness."<sup>28</sup> In

---

24 C. S. Lewis to Dorothy L. Sayers, 14 December 1955, in C. S. Lewis, *The Collected Letters of C. S. Lewis, Vol. III: Books, Broadcasts, and the War, 1931-1949*, edited by Walter Hooper (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002), pp. 683-684.

25 C. S. Lewis, "Dedication. To Charles Williams," 1942, in C. S. Lewis, *A Preface to Paradise Lost* (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), p. v.

26 C. S. Lewis to I. O. Evans, 28 February 1949, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2004, Vol. II, pp. 918-919.

27 Lewis, *Essays Presented to Charles Williams*, 1966, p. x.

28 C. S. Lewis to Arthur Greeves, 14 March 1916, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2000, Vol. I, pp. 685-686. The contrast between friendship and love was frequently mentioned in Lewis's correspondence with Greeves, and need not detain us here. Suffice it to note that this was a 17 year-old Lewis discussing the difference between love and friendship, though, by most accounts, at this stage in life he had had little experience with either.

a July 1930 letter to Greeves,<sup>29</sup> Lewis affirmed the importance of shared agreements for their friendship: “our common ground represents what is really (I think) the deepest stratum in my life, the thing in me that, if there should be another personal life, is most likely to survive the dissolution of my brain. Certainly, when I come to die I am more likely to remember certain things that you and I have explored or suffered or enjoyed together than anything else.”

In a 1930 letter to Arthur Greeves, Lewis wrote about a new friend, H. V. Dyson: “he is a man who really loves truth: a philosopher and a religious man: who makes his critical and literary activities depend on the former—none of your damned dilettante.”<sup>30</sup> Dyson also had an “honestly merry laugh,” Lewis noted, and asked “Have you observed that it is the most serious conversations which produce in their course the best laughter? How we roared and fooled at times in the silence of the night—but always in a few minutes buckled to again with renewed seriousness.”<sup>31</sup>

Lewis further illustrated the bond between himself and Greeves in a 1933 letter: “our correspondence was really like two explorers signalling to one another in a new country...we still thought that we were the only two people in the world who were interested in the right kind of things in the right kind of way.”<sup>32</sup>

In a subsequent 1935 letter to Greeves, Lewis wrote “friendship is the greatest of

---

29 C. S. Lewis to Arthur Greeves, 29 July 1930, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2000, Vol. I, p. 916. It might be noted that in Lewis’ early correspondence, the overwhelming number of references to friendship come in his letters to Greeves. Out of sixteen letters in which it is mentioned, fourteen were to Greeves and one each to his father and to Owen Barfield. In his letters between 1931 and 1949, there are ten references, two of which are to Greeves. In the letters between 1950 and 1957, there are twenty references, none in letters to Greeves.

30 C. S. Lewis to Arthur Greeves, 29 July 1930, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2000, Vol. I, pp. 917-918.

31 C. S. Lewis to Arthur Greeves, 29 July 1930, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2000, Vol. I, p. 918. Lewis came to regard Dyson as a friend “of the 2nd class—i.e. not in the same rank as yourself or Barfield, but on a level with Tolkien or Macfarlane.” Lewis to Greeves, 22 September 1931, p. 969. Dyson played a key role in Lewis’s conversion to Christianity: see Lewis to Greeves, 1 October 1931: “I have just passed on from believing in God to definitely believing in Christ—in Christianity...My long night talk with Dyson and Tolkien had a good deal to do with it.” p. 974; and Lewis to Greeves, 18 October 1931, pp. 976-977, all in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2000, Vol. I.

32 C. S. Lewis to Arthur Greeves, 25 March 1933, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2004, Vol. II, p. 101.

worldly goods. Certainly to me it is the chief happiness of life. If I had to give a piece of advice to a young man about a place to live, I think I shd. say, 'sacrifice everything to live where you can be near your friends.'"<sup>33</sup> And in a 1941 letter, he asked Dom Bede Griffiths, not at all rhetorically, "Is any pleasure on earth as great as a circle of Christian friends by a good fire?"<sup>34</sup>

Of course, *Surprised by Joy's* well-known 1955 account of Lewis' first meeting with Arthur Greeves is the *locus classicus* on Lewis's ideas about friendship and shared ideas:

"I found Arthur sitting up in bed. On the table beside him lay a copy of *Myths of the Norsemen*. 'Do you like that?' said I. 'Do you like that?' said he. Next moment the book was in our hands, our heads were bent close together, we were pointing, quoting, talking—soon almost shouting—discovering in a torrent of questions that we like not only the same thing, but the same parts of it, and in the same way....Many thousands of people have had this experience of finding the first friend, and it is none the less a wonder....Nothing, I suspect is more astonishing in any man's life than the discovery that there do exist people very, very like himself."<sup>35</sup>

Later, in *Surprised by Joy*, Lewis reiterated his description of the First Friend as "the *alter ego*, the man who first reveals to you that you are not alone in the world by turning out (beyond hope) to share all your most secret delights. There is nothing to be overcome in making him your friend; he and you join like raindrops on a window."<sup>36</sup>

This was the kind of friendship that C. S. Lewis had with Charles Williams. It was a friendship to which Lewis owed a good deal of the inspiration behind his career in the late 1930s and 1940s, including his *A Preface to Paradise Lost* (1942) and *That Hideous Strength* (1946).<sup>37</sup> By 1939, Lewis was writing, only semi-jocularly, to Williams

<sup>33</sup> C. S. Lewis to Arthur Greeves, 29 December 1935, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2004, Vol. II, p. 174.

<sup>34</sup> C. S. Lewis to Dom Bede Griffiths, 21 December 1941, Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2007, Vol. II, p. 501.

<sup>35</sup> Lewis, *Surprised by Joy*, 1956, pp. 130-131.

<sup>36</sup> Lewis, *Surprised by Joy*, 1956, p. 131.

<sup>37</sup> Grevel Lindop notes that Williams's "feelings about Lewis's enthusiasm for his ideas were mixed. After listening to a reading of *That Hideous Strength* at the Inklings, he told Anne Renwick: 'Lewis is becoming a mere disciple; he is now collecting the doctrine of exchange in the last chapter of the new novel. "That," he says, "is all yours"—I do not deny it, but no-one else will think so; I shall be thought his follower everywhere.'" Charles Williams to Anne Renwick, 13 May 1942, quoted in Grevel Lindop, *Charles*

that “I begin to suspect that we are living in the ‘age of Williams,’ and our friendship with you will be our only passport to fame.<sup>38</sup> And, in 1942, in the dedication to his *A Preface to Paradise Lost*, Lewis thanked Williams for liberating him by showing that “the door of the prison was really unlocked all the time; but it was only you who thought of trying the handle. Now we can all come out.”<sup>39</sup>

In return, Williams benefitted from the generous support that his Inkling friends gave him—including getting for him an influential lecture series at the University on Milton and an honorary Oxford MA.<sup>40</sup> Williams, for all his adoring following and popularity, was a somewhat solitary person. But with Lewis he felt at ease, writing in 1945 to his wife: “somehow, except at home...and perhaps at Magdalen [i.e. with Lewis] or with [T. S.] Eliot...I am always aware of a gulf. My voice—or my style—goes across it, but my heart doesn’t.”<sup>41</sup>

Sense C of esemplastic friendship, unity in diversity, was another aspect that Lewis strongly agreed with. In April of 1920, Lewis wrote to Arthur Greeves, who was considering coming to live in Oxford: “You would find an enormous choice of congenial friends, and you can have no idea how the constant friction with other and different minds improves one.”<sup>42</sup> This was also true of Lewis’s friendship with Dom Bede Griffiths. In a 1934 letter to Griffiths, he wrote: “There was nothing to apologize for. My friendship with you began in disagreement and matured in argument, and is

---

*Williams. The Third Inkling* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 360.

38 C. S. Lewis to Charles Williams, 7 June 1938, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2004, Vol. II, p. 228.

39 Lewis, “To Charles Williams,” in Lewis, *Paradise Lost*, 1962, p. vi. The primary reference here was to Williams’ 1940 preface to an edition of Milton’s poetical works and its influence on Lewis’s revolutionary views of Milton.

40 Lewis’s lack of snobbery showed in his unconcern for Williams’ lack of formal academic credentials: “...the vulgarest of my pupils asked me, with an air, if Williams had a degree. The whelp!” C. S. Lewis to Warnie Lewis, 28 January 1940, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2004, Vol. II, p. 335.

41 Charles Williams to his wife, 17 February 1945, in Charles Williams, *To Michal from Serge. Letters from Charles Williams to His Wife, Florence, 1939-1945*, edited by Roma A. King, Jr. (Kent OH: Kent State University Press, 2002), p. 249.

42 C. S. Lewis to Arthur Greeves, 11 April 1920, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2000, Vol. I, p. 481.

beyond the reach of any dangers of that kind. If I object at all to what you said, I object not as a friend or as a guest, but as a logician."<sup>43</sup>

A final Lewisian example of friendship in diversity from his correspondence was Lewis's relationship with Father Don Giovanni Calabria: "It is a wonderful thing and a strengthening of faith that two souls differing from each other in place, nationality, language, obedience and age should have been thus led into a delightful friendship; so far does the order of spiritual beings transcend the material order."<sup>44</sup>

Diversity in friendship was also stressed in a classic passage in *Surprised by Joy*. Lewis introduced Owen Barfield as the second type of Friend, an extreme example of variety or diversity:

"...the Second Friend is the man who disagrees with you about everything. He is not so much the alter ego as the antiself. Of course he shares your interests; otherwise he would not become your friend at all. But he has approached them all at a different angle. He has read all the right books but has got the wrong thing out of every one. It is as if he spoke your language but mispronounced it. How can he be so nearly right and yet, invariably, just not right?... And then you go at it, hammer and tongs, far into the night, night after night, or walking through fine country that neither gives a glance to, each learning the weight of the other's punches and often more like mutually respectful enemies than friends. Actually (though it never seems so at the time) you modify one another's thought; out of this perpetual dogfight a community of mind and a deep affection emerge."<sup>45</sup>

Even Lewis's primary academic friend, J. R. R. Tolkien, despite their intellectual agreements and interests, was also quite different from Lewis. As Lewis wrote in *Surprised by Joy*, friendship with Tolkien "marked the breakdown of two old prejudices.

---

43 C. S. Lewis to Dom Bede Griffiths, 26 December 1934, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2004, Vol. II, p. 150. The same was true of Lewis's friendship with another of the Inklings, Dr. R. E. Havard, who wrote "Our differences laid the foundation of a friendship that lasted...until his death nearly thirty years later." Robert E. Havard, "Philia: Jack at Ease," in James Como, ed., *Remembering C. S. Lewis. Recollections of Those Who Knew Him*, third edition (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005), p. 350. Glycer comments: "The point is clear—Havard does not say similarities formed a foundation that allowed friendship to thrive in spite of their differences. He says the differences themselves were the foundation." Glycer, *The Company They Keep*, 2007, p. 33.

44 C. S. Lewis to Don Giovanni Calabria, 17 March 1953, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2007, Vol. III, p. 306.

45 Lewis, *Surprised by Joy*, 1956, pp. 199-200.

At my first coming into the world I had been (implicitly) warned never to trust a Papist, and at my first coming [in 1925] into the English Faculty (explicitly) never to trust a philologist. Tolkien was both."<sup>46</sup> (Tolkien for his part, as a Catholic, doubtless looked somewhat askance at Lewis, the Anglican Northern Irishman.)

C. S. Lewis and Charles Williams were opposites who through their friendship and shared imagination were moulded into an esemplastic unity. In a letter to Williams in 1936, Lewis noted that Williams' kind of romanticism was not his "kind at all....Put briefly, there is a romanticism which finds its revelation in love, which is yours, and another which finds it in mythology (and nature mythically apprehended), which is mine."<sup>47</sup> In the same letter, Lewis stressed their unity in disunity, asserting that though he was "a man who is native in a quite distinct, though neighbouring, province of the Romantic country," he "willingly believes well of all her provinces, for love of the country himself, though he dare not affirm except about his own."<sup>48</sup>

Lewis differed from Williams in other significant ways, but this did not affect their friendship. For example, he wrote in 1944 to Griffiths "You're right about C. W. He [Williams] has an undisciplined mind," which Lewis definitely did not, and as a writer Williams "sometimes admits into his theology ideas whose proper place is in his romances," which usually bothered Lewis. But, "What keeps him right is his *love* of which (and I now known him long) he radiates more than any man I know."<sup>49</sup> A few

---

46 Lewis, *Surprised by Joy*, 1956, p. 216. On p. 190, Lewis remarks that "It would almost seem that Providence...quite overrules our previous tastes when it decides to bring two minds together."

47 C. S. Lewis to Charles Williams, 23 March 1936, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2004, Vol. II, pp. 185-186.

48 C. S. Lewis to Charles Williams, 23 March 1936, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2004, Vol. II, p. 185. On romanticism, Coleridge, Williams, and more, see Corbin Scott Carnell, *Bright Shadow of Reality: C. S. Lewis and the Feeling Intellect* (Grand Rapids MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1974); and Wayne Martindale, "Romantics," in Thomas L. Martin, ed., *Reading the Classics with C. S. Lewis* (Grand Rapids MI: Baker Academic, 2000), pp. 203-226, especially pp. 212-213.

49 C. S. Lewis to Dom Bede Griffiths, 25 May 1944, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2004, Vol. II, p. 618. Earlier, he had written to Griffiths, 21 December 1941, that Williams "Both in public and in private he is of nearly all the men I have met the one whose address most overflows with *love*. It is simply irresistible." Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2004, Vol. II, p. 501.

years later, on another count, Lewis the master of clarity wrote to Barfield: “Don’t imagine that I didn’t pitch into C. W. for his obscurity for all I was worth.”<sup>50</sup>

Lewis also made the same point, as we have already seen, in his preface to the 1947 Williams festschrift where he stressed that the Inklings were by no means “of one trade.” He noted that the collaborators with the volume included “one professional author, two dons, a solicitor, a friar, and a retire army officer.” Indeed, “the variety displayed by this little group is far too small to represent the width of Charles Williams friendships.”<sup>51</sup> Here, again, Williams demonstrated an esemplastic influence.

Finally, it does not seem to be too much of a stretch to argue that the esemplastic concepts discussed so far have a good deal in common with one of Charles Williams’ pet ideas, “The Way of Exchange,” that is, coinherence, substitution, and exchange.<sup>52</sup> Williams defined coinherence as follows: “A certain brother said: ‘It is right for a man to take up the burden for them who are near to him, whatever it may be, and, so to speak, put his own soul in the place of that of his neighbour...’”<sup>53</sup> His idea of coinherence was an inherently esemplastic concept, arguing for a commitment to friends that went far beyond a superficial interest in their well-being.

Lewis came to share this view. In 1948, he wrote of coinherence: “We can and should ‘bear one another’s burdens’ in a sense much more nearly literal than is usually dreamed of....one can offer to take another’s shame or anxiety or grief and the burden will actually be transferred. This Williams most seriously maintained, and I have

---

50 C. S. Lewis to Owen Barfield, 22 December 1947, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2004, Vol. II, p. 817.

51 Lewis, *Essays Presented to Charles Williams*, 1966, p. v.

52 See Charles Williams, “The Practice of Substituted Love,” in his *He Came Down From Heaven* (London: William Heinemann, 1938), pp. 114-133; and Alice Mary Hadfield, *Charles Williams. An Exploration of His Life and Work* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983) on Williams’ ideas. For a succinct definition of these concepts, see C. S. Lewis, “Williams and the Arthuriad,” 1948, in Charles Williams and C. S. Lewis, *Taliessen Through Logres, The Region of the Summer Stars, and Arthurian Torso*, introduction by Mary McDermott Schideler (Grand Rapids MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1974), p. 307.

53 Charles Williams, *The Descent of the Dove: A Short History of the Holy Spirit in the Church* (Grand Rapids MI: William B. Eerdmans, n.d.), 1939, p. 55. See also the Postscript, pp. 234-236; and Williams’ novel, *Descent into Hell* (1937).

reason to believe that he spoke from experimental knowledge."<sup>54</sup> And in 1949, Lewis wrote to Greeves: "it does me good to hear what I believe repeated in your voice—it being a rule of the universe that others can do for us what we cannot do for ourselves and one can paddle every canoe except ones own."<sup>55</sup> Finally, in 1957, Lewis believed he had had a "substitution" experience with Joy Davidman.<sup>56</sup>

This thematically unifying aspect of coinherence was summarized by Helen Tyrrell Wheeler, a student of Lewis's during World War II, who wrote the following:

"Much...was owed to a special tang in the air of Oxford at that time and which was specially linked to with the figures of CSL and his entirely enchanting friend, Charles Williams, poet, novelist and critic who had moved to Oxford at the beginning of the war...Was it Williams who revived the Coleridgean word coinherence?<sup>57</sup> Certainly it seemed to be the banner word of the time, and it was to have revealed the coinherence of the most disparate texts, times, dilemmas, and ideas that people crowded out the lectures of both Williams and Lewis....at few times can there have been such splendidly exciting lectures....coinherence was Charles Williams's label for the quality which they believed in. What it meant to my generation of English Language and Literature undergraduates was that what happened in the great books was of equal significance to what happened in life, indeed that they were the same..."<sup>58</sup>

Indeed, C. S. Lewis, Charles Williams, J. R. R. Tolkien, and the rest of the Inklings were living, breathing examples of commitment to the essential unity of texts, ideas, the great books, and life; what we might today call a commitment to a Liberal Arts education and the integration not only of faith and learning, but of faith, learning, imagination, and all aspects of life. In other words, what Lewis called for in *The Abolition of Man*, getting "the trees of knowledge and of life growing together."<sup>59</sup>

---

54 Lewis, "Williams and the Arthuriad," in Williams and Lewis, *Taliessen*, 1974, p. 307. See Hooper, *Guide*, 1996, pp. 85-86.

55 C. S. Lewis to Arthur Greeves, 2 July 1949, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2004, Vol. II, p. 953.

56 See Hooper, *Guide*, 1996, pp. 85-86; and C. S. Lewis to Sheldon Vanauken, 27 November 1957, Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2007, Vol. III, pp. 901-902.

57 While the word "coinhere" appears (once in Ch. IX) in Coleridge's *Biographia Literaria*, the word "coinherence" does not. This bears further investigation.

58 Helen Tyrrell Wheeler, "Wartime Tutor," in David Graham, ed., *We Remember C. S. Lewis. Essays and Memories* (Nashville TN: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 2001), pp. 49-52.

59 C. S. Lewis, *The Abolition of Man* (London: Oxford University Press, 1943), Ch. 1.

### III. *The Four Loves on Friendship (Philia)*

It is no surprise, then, that when we turn to *The Four Loves*, we find that the importance of shared agreements in friendship (*Philia*) is a powerful emphasis in Lewis's systematic thinking. This is not to be confused with

"companionship—or clubbability," which is "only the matrix of friendship.... Friendship arises out of mere companionship when two or more of the companions discover that they have in common some insight or interest or even taste which the others do not share and which, till that moment, each believed to be his own unique treasure (or burden). The typical expression of opening Friendship would be something like, 'What? You too? I thought I was the only one.'"<sup>60</sup>

This, Lewis wrote, is the "common quest or vision which unites Friends..."<sup>61</sup>

Secondly, Lewis argued in *The Four Loves* that diversity does not affect *Philia* since friendship "is uninquisitive. You become a man's Friend<sup>62</sup> without knowing or caring whether he is married or single or how he earns his living. What have all these 'unconcerning things, matters of fact' to do with the real question, *Do you see the same truth?*"<sup>63</sup> Put another way, "Do you care about the same truth?' The man who agrees with us that some question, little regarded by others, is of great importance, can be our Friend. He need not agree with us about the answer."<sup>64</sup>

In *The Four Loves*, Lewis also wrote that

"In each of my friends there is something that only some other friends can fully bring out. By myself I am not large enough to call the whole man into activity; I want other lights than my own to show all his facets. Now that Charles is dead, I shall never again see Ronald's reaction to a specifically Caroline joke. Far from having more of Ronald, having him 'to myself' now that Charles is away, I have less of Ronald. Hence true

---

60 Lewis, *Four Loves*, 1963, pp. 61-62.

61 Lewis, *Four Loves*, 1963, p. 67. Compare C. S. Lewis to Charles Moorman, 15 May 1959, Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2007, Vol. III, p. 1049: "To be sure, we all had a common point of view, but we had it before we met. It was the cause rather than the result of our friendship."

62 Lewis thinks that friendships are usually man and man, woman and woman, but that this isn't inherent in friendship. The reason is that men and women usually don't have "the companionship in common activities which is the matrix of Friendship." However, Lewis also believed that this could be changed. Lewis, *Four Loves*, 1963, p. 68.

63 Lewis, *Four Loves*, 1963, p. 66.

64 Lewis, *Four Loves*, 1963, p. 62.

Friendship is the least jealous of loves. Two friends delight to be joined by a third, and three by a fourth....They can then say, as the blessed souls say in Dante, 'Here comes one who will augment our loves.' For in this love, 'to divide is not to take away.'"<sup>65</sup>

Compare this to what Lewis wrote in 1961 in *An Experiment in Criticism*:

"...we seek an enlargement of our being. We want to be more than ourselves. Each of us by nature sees the whole world from one point of view with a perspective and a selectiveness peculiar to himself....To acquiesce in this particularity...would be lunacy....The primary impulse of each is to maintain and aggrandize himself. The secondary impulse is to go out of the self....In love, in virtue, in the pursuit of knowledge, and in the reception of the arts, we are doing this....in worship, in love, in moral action, and in knowing, I transcend myself; and am never more myself than when I do."<sup>66</sup>

Interestingly, in *The Four Loves*, Lewis does not see coinherence as a distinctive aspect of *Philia*: "A Friend will, to be sure,...lend or give when we are in need, nurse us in sickness, stand up for us among our enemies, do what he can for our widows and orphans. But such good offices are not the stuff of Friendship....For Friendship is utterly free from Affection's need to be needed."<sup>67</sup>

Friendship loomed large among the Four Loves. Lewis wrote that friendship is "the happiest and most fully human of all loves: the crown of life and the school of virtue....Life—natural life—has not better gift to give. Who could have deserved it?"<sup>68</sup> On the other hand, "Friendship is unnecessary, like philosophy, like art....It has no

---

65 Lewis, *Four Loves*, 1963, pp. 58-59. "Charles" is, of course, Charles Williams; "Ronald" was what J. R. R. Tolkien was called by his friends. It is not clear that Tolkien agreed with this; he wrote in 1965 that "I was and remain wholly unsympathetic to Williams' mind....we had nothing to say to one another at deeper (or higher) levels" and argued that Williams' influence on Lewis owed mainly to the fact that "Lewis was a very impressionable man, and this was abetted by his great generosity and capacity for friendship." J. R. R. Tolkien to Dick Plotz, 12 September 1965, in J. R. R. Tolkien, *The Letters of J. R. R. Tolkien*, selected and edited by Humphrey Carpenter with the assistance of Christopher Tolkien (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1981), pp. 361-361. Cp. Carpenter, *Inklings*, 1979, pp. 120-126; and Zaleski and Zaleski, *The Fellowship*, 2015, pp. 268-269, on Tolkien's reservations about Williams. On the other hand, Grevel Lindop, *Williams*, 2015, pp. 309-301, 410-411, points out that the evidence for Tolkien's negativity concerning Williams dates from later in life, and notes that in 1942, Tolkien even wrote a lengthy and fond poem about Williams (p. 362).

66 C. S. Lewis, *An Experiment in Criticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), pp. 137-141.

67 Lewis, *Four Loves*, 1963, pp. 65-66.

68 Lewis, *Four Loves*, 1963, pp. 55, 68.

survival value; rather it is one of those things which give value to survival."<sup>69</sup>

Finally, Lewis believed that friendship, at least for the Christian, was a divine gift, not a matter of chance or a source of pride:

"A secret Master of Ceremonies has been at work. Christ, who said to the disciples 'Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you,' can truly say to every group of Christian friends 'You have not chosen one another but I have chosen you for one another'....Friendship is not a reward for our discrimination and good taste in finding one another out. It is the instrument by which God reveals to each the beauties of all the others..."<sup>70</sup>

#### IV. Conclusions

So what did C. S. Lewis mean when he described Charles Williams as an esemplastic force in his life and work and that of the Inklings? The Inklings Project had as its unifying objective, in the words of Malcolm Guite: "to heal the widening split between outer and inner, rational and imaginative, microcosm and macrocosm. They aimed to do so by using the power of poetic language, in verse and prose...to heighten and deepen our awareness by re-enchanting the disenchanting, by re-mythologizing a demythologized world."<sup>71</sup> And they did this because of the entirely voluntary community of friends in which they functioned.

To this end, as Diane Pavlik Glycer has effectively argued, the Inklings evolved into "an ongoing, interdependent creative community," an idea which

"has a strong foundation in the Christian faith, a vital link that the Inklings had in common...Each author's work is embedded in the work of others, and each author's life is intertwined with the lives of others....Like filaments joined together in a web, writers work as members of larger communities. As they work, they influence and are influenced by the company they keep."<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> Lewis, *Four Loves*, 1963, p. 67.

<sup>70</sup> Lewis, *Four Loves*, 1963, p. 83. Compare C. S. Lewis to Genia Goetz, 20 June 1952, Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2007, Vol. III, p. 204: "the Holy Spirit...speaks through Scriptures, the Church, Christian friends, books..."

<sup>71</sup> Malcolm Guite, "Poet," in MacSwain and Ward, *Cambridge Companion*, 2010, p. 306.

<sup>72</sup> Glycer, *The Company They Keep*, 2007, pp. 224-226. Lewis was acutely aware of the potential for a positive community of this sort to evolve into a coterie or an inner ring. See C. S. Lewis, "The Inner Ring," in

Lewis saw Charles Williams as an esemplastic force in his Oxford circle of friends because he shared their belief in the power of secondary imagination, *real* imagination. Secondly, Williams was a unifying force in the development of the Inklings from 1939 to 1945, a key period in the lives and work of Lewis and Tolkien. Thirdly, Williams seems to have won at least some of the Inklings over to the “Way of Exchange,” of coinherence, certainly in the case of Lewis. And, lastly, Williams played a role in promoting among undergraduates at Oxford a unified view of the past, of texts, and of ideas, something that Lewis and friends had long had as their intellectual and pedagogical mission.

A week after Charles Williams’ death on May 15, Lewis wrote to Williams’ widow, Florence (Michal) Williams:

“My friendship is not ended. His death has had the very unexpected effect of making death itself look quite different. I believe in the next life ten times more strongly than I did. At moments it seems almost tangible. Mr. Dyson, on the day of the funeral, summed up what many of us felt, ‘It is not blasphemous,’ he said ‘to believe that what was true of Our Lord is, in its less degree, true of all who are in Him. They go away in order to be with us in a new way, even closer than before.’ A month ago I wd. have called this silly sentiment. Now I know better. He seems, in some indefinable way, to be all around us now. I do not doubt he is doing and will do for us all sorts of things he could not have done while in the body.”<sup>73</sup>

In a subsequent letter, on May 28, 1945, Lewis wrote to Sister Penelope about

“the death of my dearest friend, Charles Williams....it has been, and is, a great loss. But not at all a dejecting one. It has greatly increased my faith. Death has done nothing to my idea of him, but he has done—oh, I can’t say what—to my idea of death. It has made the next world much more real and palpable. We all feel the same. How one lives and learns.”<sup>74</sup>

And in August 1945, Lewis published a poem, later collected under the title, “To

---

C. S. Lewis, *Transposition and other Addresses* (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1949), pp. 55-64; Lewis, *Surprised by Joy*, 1956, *passim*, and Lewis, *Four Loves*, 1963, pp. 73 ff.

73 C. S. Lewis to Florence (Michal) Williams, 22 May 1945, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2004, Vol. II, pp. 653-654.

74 C. S. Lewis to Sister Penelope, 28 May 1945, in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2004, Vol. II, p. 656.

Charles Williams.”

Your Death blows a strange bugle call, friend, and all is hard  
To see plainly or record truly. The new light imposes change,  
Re-adjusts all a life-landscape as it thrusts down its probe from the sky,  
To create shadows, to reveal waters, to erect hills and deepen glens.  
The slant alters. I can't see the old contours. It's a larger world  
Than I once thought it. I wince, caught in the bleak air that blows on the ridge.  
Is it the first sting of the great winter, the world-waning? Or the cold of spring?  
A hard question and worth talking a whole night on. But with whom?  
Of whom now can I ask guidance? With what friend concerning your death  
Is it worth while to exchange thoughts unless—oh unless it were you?<sup>75</sup>

Bibliographical Note:

A paper presented at the 10<sup>th</sup> Francis White Ewbank Colloquium on C. S. Lewis and Friends, Taylor Univeristy, Upland IN, June 3, 2016, and published as "C. S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and Esemplastic Friendship," *Inklings Forever*, Vol. 10 (2017), pp 454-477.

---

<sup>75</sup> See Walter Hooper's note in Lewis, *Collected Letters*, 2004, Vol. II, Note 69, p. 665. The text here is taken from C. S. Lewis, *The Collected Poems of C. S. Lewis*, edited by Walter Hooper (London: Fount Paperbacks/HarperCollins, 1994), p. 119. Lewis also published "Charles Walter Stansby Williams (1886-1945): an obituary," *The Oxford Magazine*, Vol. 63 (23 March 1945), p. 265, reprinted in C. S. Lewis, *Image and Imagination. Essays and Reviews*, edited by Walter Hooper (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 147-148.