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C.S. Lewis’s relationship with the Roman Catholic Church is one that has prompted comment and speculation. His conversion – or return – to Christianity is frequently attributed to the influence of his friend and colleague J.R.R Tolkien; this conversion experience prompts the question why, having been convinced of the truth of Christianity in part by the Roman Catholic Tolkien, Lewis instead entered and remained within the Church of England and became, along with Dorothy L. Sayers, perhaps the most famous (and successful) apologist for Anglicanism in the 20th century. Despite his prominent position within the Anglican communion – on one level, essentially a rejection of the Roman Catholic Church – Lewis remains popular with Traditionalist-leaning Roman Catholics, some of whom view Lewis as a sort of Anglo-Catholic or crypto-Catholic, or at the very least, a fellow-traveller; these suggestions continue a narrative of secret or partial Catholicism which dogged Lewis during his life-time.1 This desire to bring Lewis as close to Rome as possible can be seen in works by marginal Catholic figures like Joseph Pearce and Fr Dwight Longenecker. When interviewed about his book *C. S. Lewis & the Catholic Church*,Pearce stated ‘there are grounds for considering [Lewis] a quasi or crypto-Catholic.’2 In his book Pearce brings Lewis as close to Rome as possible, using Lewis’s apparent belief in the Real Presence, auricular confession, and purgatory to demonstrate his closeness to the Roman Catholic Church; Lewis’s own words are used to support the view of him as crypto-Catholic. However, that co-opting of Lewis can only be taken so far, and requires the transformation of Lewis into an irenical figure seeking common ground in his religious writings, and avoiding controversial topics. This is sometimes at variance with Lewis’s own stated positions.

Despite the ecumenical approach in his apologetic writing, it is possible to discern in Lewis a continuing recourse not simply to definitively Protestant thought, but to ideas and expressions which are distinctly anti-Roman Catholic. Reading Lewis as a ‘Protestant’ or anti-Catholic author positions him in a long chronology of Anglophone anti-Catholic writers including Milton, Bunyan and, crucially, Spenser. This Protestant-centric analysis demonstrates Lewis’s recourse to a shared language of anti-Catholicism and his use of a Protestant poetics which can be dated to the first generation of Reform. It is a mode of writing which can be attributed both to Lewis’s reading but also to his background and it should cause a pause before Lewis and his work are neatly described as ‘Christian’ in the broadest possible sense. This is not to suggest that Lewis was personally anti-Catholic -  his friendships with Roman Catholics including J.R.R Tolkien and Dom Bede Griffiths negates this, despite some clear concern on Lewis's part with some of the more contentious areas of Roman Catholic belief.  However, there is within Lewis’s work – even only as a rhetorical device – a deep-seated seam of anti-Roman Catholic imagery and language which allows him to be re-contextualised as a ‘Reformed’ or Protestant author rather than simply a ‘Christian’ writer avoiding all offence and doctrinal difference.

**Personal anti-Romanism**

Pearce’s claim that Lewis ‘seemed to believe in the Real Presence (though not apparently in transubstantiation)’,3 should have prompted Pearce’s interviewer to question how Lewis could be viewed as a crypto-Catholic while rejecting a fundamental belief of the Roman Catholic Church. Pearce’s other claims about Lewis’s Catholic leanings based on Lewis’s position regarding confession and his belief in Purgatory should also be challenged. Pearce’s suggestion that Lewis making a regular auricular confession was ‘an extremely eccentric practice for an Anglican’4 is wrong. To ascribe a belief in confession as a sign of Romish inclinations is to misunderstand the place of confession within Anglicanism. It may not be a sacrament, it may not be prerequisite for reception of communion, but it is a possibility within the Anglican Church and as such, Lewis’s confession is simply a manifestation of Anglican piety.5 Lewis’s personal acceptance of Purgatory also demonstrates his difficult relationship with Roman Catholicism: in professing a belief in the idea of Purgatory, Lewis also criticised the Roman Catholic Church for promulgating the belief in Purgatory without sufficient Biblical authority.6

In his book Pearce makes clear Lewis’s difficulties with a number of key Roman Catholic beliefs and dogmas, including Marian adoration. This rejection on the part of Lewis of Marianology should challenge the idea of Lewis as crypto or potential Catholic, particularly by those Traditional Catholics who move the Virgin Mary towards the position of co-Redemptrix. Lewis’s critical suggestion that Roman Catholics ‘worship’ the Virgin Mary7 evokes a very old Protestant criticism of Roman Catholicism but also indicates a misunderstanding regarding the theological difference between *latria* (worship given to God alone), *dulia* (honour given to the saints) and *hyperdulia* (honour given to the Virgin Mary). Lewis, like earlier Protestant authors, confuses – deliberately or otherwise – *hyperdulia* for *latria.* This misunderstanding positions Lewis in a long history of anti-Catholic thought.

This historical anti-Catholicism is also discernible in some of Lewis’s linguistic choices. As Christopher Derrick argues in *C. S Lewis and the Church of Rome*,when Lewis was faced with the perennial problem of Reformation ‘terminology’ in *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century excluding drama* (1944), his choice of the word ‘Papist’ to describe Roman Catholics and Roman Catholic belief was not the neutral term Lewis suggested. Lewis’s assertion that ‘Papists … is not now used dyslogistically except in Ulster’8 is wrong and he surely knew that. This was not mere disingenuousness. ‘Papist’, as Lewis knew, was a charged term.9 The key is Lewis’s reference to ‘Ulster’ as it explains in part – as Pearce argues – why Lewis did not enter the Roman Catholic Church and why he retained a limited hostility towards elements of Romanism.10 As Lewis’s wife Joy Gresham explained when asked about the rumour that Lewis had converted to Roman Catholicism:

He’s a tough Ulsterman, after all, half Scot and half Welsh, with the sort of views you expect of an Orangeman – though in his case they’re half humorous.11

The ‘sort of views you’d expect of an Orangeman’, including the rejection of explicitly Roman Catholic beliefs, were instilled in Lewis as a child. His grandfather was ‘an evangelical churchman who never tired of deprecating the Church of Rome from his pulpit’. As Lewis stated when recalling his introduction to Tolkien, ‘At my first coming into this world I had been (implicitly) warned never to trust a Papist’.12 Northern Ireland, along with parts of Scotland and Liverpool, were (and in some sense are) sites of a continuing tradition of anti-Catholicism, providing a language and a mindset indebted to the Reformation period.13 This unending religious conflict, the suspicion of all things Romish, remains visible in Lewis’s attitude towards major points of departure between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism but also in ancillary issues which had long since passed into normality in the rest of the United Kingdom. One such site of contention was the convent.

When asked to address some Anglican nuns, Lewis in accepting the invitation also included the comment ‘the Protestant in me had just a little suspicion of an oubliette or a chained skeleton … the doors do open outwards as well, I trust’.14 This is the same Lewis, according to Christopher Derrick, who referred to ‘whips, brick walls, and disciplinary officials to typify things characteristic of Catholicism’.15 In Lewis’s joke about the skeleton chained to the wall and the door that only opens one way we find an echo of the long cultural history of negative Protestant constructions of Roman Catholic religious houses visible in texts ranging from John Bales’s *Acts of English Votaries* (1544), John Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments* (1563, 1570, 1580, 1583),16Thomas Robinson’s *An Anatomy of the English Nunnery at Lisbon* (1622), Matthew Lewis’s *The Monk* (1796), Charles Maturin’s *Melmoth the Wanderer* (1820), and *The Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk* (1836).17 The latter, like Robinson’s early 17th-century ‘exposure’ of a Portuguese convent, purports to be an insider’s account of the horrors of an enclosed Romish institution, with details of the mental, physical and sexual abuses committed against the inmates. Although Lewis almost certainly did not know *Maria Monk* directly,18 it is an example of the type of sensationalist text about alleged Roman Catholic wrong-doing – particularly sexually malfeasance – which were a common feature of Ulster anti-Catholic culture. That Lewis was aware of the corrupt religious house genre is suggested from his focus on confinement or imprisonment in relation to the convent.

So much Protestantism from the 16th and 17th centuries onwards was anti-Catholic, rather than positively Protestant. This was known to Lewis through first-hand experiences gleaned from growing up in Loyalist Ulster, but also through his reading of 16th- and 17th-century texts. In Bunyan, in Milton and crucially – for *The Chronicles of Narnia* – in Spenser we find authors making recourse to the standard language and imagery of anti-Catholicism which developed during the first half of the 16th century, which continued to determine the method of writing about the Church of Rome throughout the 17th century, and which remained part of British Protestantism throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. Lewis, the Ulster Protestant whose academic work included a then ground-breaking study on Spenser, was thus exposed to the historic and current iterations of British anti-Catholic rhetoric; little wonder then that at points in *The Chronicles of Narnia* – Lewis’s own version of *The Faerie Queen*19–we find the type of anti-Catholic discourse central to Spenser’s epic poem.  What follows, dictated by the constraints of the word limit, is a very focused reading on one particular figure in *The Chronicles of Narnia* in order to demonstrate Lewis's engagement with, and use of, the language of anti-Roman Catholicism

**Anti-Popery and *The Chronicles of Narnia***

Lewis identifies the centrality of anti-Popery in Spenser’s *Faerie Queen* in *The Allegory of Love*.20In Spenser’s poem one of the key sites of anti-Catholicism is the figure of Duessa, the whorish witch who deceives Red Cross Knight in Book One, whose exposed body is revealed to be a monstrous human/animal hybrid,21 and who is finally executed in Book Five by the titular Faerie Queen. Duessa is a complicated allegorical figure formulated from a collection of standard anti-Catholic tropes and who represents Mary Queen of Scots, Mary Tudor, and the Church of Rome as figured in the Whore of Babylon. It is this latter figure – absolutely crucial in Protestant anti-Catholic discourse as an allegorical representation of the Roman Catholic Church – that we find represented in *The Chronicles of Narnia* in the figure of the White Witch. Occupying the same narrative space in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* (1950) and *The Magician’s Nephew* (1955)as Duessa in *The Faerie Queen,* Jadis the White Witch is similarly constructed through verbal echoes of the Whore of Babylon and through the replication of behaviour associated with the Biblical Whore. She is both Lewis’s Duessa – a feminised threat to a quasi-masculine order luring men to spiritual destruction – and Lewis’s Whore of Babylon. This connection is overlooked by critics – Elizabeth Baird Hardy for example in *Milton, Spenser and the Chronicles of Narnia* fails to extend her reading of Jadis to include the Whore of Babylon despite discussing the relationship between Jadis and Duessa.22 Yet the behavioural and linguistic links are there, whether by accident or design. Lewis, as a result of his background and his academic work, was particularly well-placed to appreciate the Whore’s role in Protestant anti-Catholic discourse and consequently her function in Spenser’s Protestant epic.

The Whore’s brief appearance in chapters 17 and 18 of the Book of Revelation belie the cultural dominance of the figure in Protestant polemic and exegetical thought. The Whore, along with Anti-Christ, became the standard means of condemning the Roman Catholic Church, and provided the Biblical justification for Reform of Christianity and the destruction of Romanism. The Whore represents Rome and the entire Roman Catholic system of belief. The scarlet-clad Whore ‘with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication’ and who has made ‘the inhabitants of the earth … drunk with the wine of her fornication’23 is a tempting and sexually alluring figure. It is from this sexually corruptive figure that first- and second-generation Reformers developed the representation of Rome’s doctrinal corruption through images of sexual corruption. This is the intellectual root of the Protestant convent/religious house genre. The Whore with her ‘golden cup … of abominations and filthiness of fornication’24 is inextricably linked with ideas of sex, deceit and corruption. She is a mysterious, foreign figure (‘upon her forehead was a name written, Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth’),25 one who brings destruction. This conjunction of sex, temptation and doctrinal corruption is part of the standard triumvir of accusations laid against Papistry: in Protestant discourse the Roman Catholic is treasonous, violent and corrupt. This became the standard means of delineating Roman Catholicism in Anglophone Protestant discourse and remained active in Northern Ireland political discourse until well into the 20th century.26

Two of these accusations are fulfilled by Lewis’s Whore. The account of the destruction of Charn in *The Magician’s Nephew* reveals Jadis to be at the epicentre of violence in this text. The fact that the destruction of Charn was the final action in a conflict between rival sisters – one of whom cares nothing about inflicting death and destruction on her subjects – may suggest to a Protestant readership the relationship between Mary I and Elizabeth I; in any event, the well-established connection between Roman Catholicism and violence – found in texts including *Acts and Monuments,* and existing in a long Ulster Protestant cultural memory that sees the Irish rebellions of 1641 and 1798, the Battle of the Boyne in 1690 and the Easter Uprising of 1916 all connected in a chronology of Irish Catholic threats to Ulster Protestantism – is evoked here once Jadis’s other connections with the Whore of Babylon are recognised.

The White Witch/Jadis is a corrupting figure in both *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* and *The Magician’s Nephew.* This corruption is heightened in *The Magician’s Nephew* through the encoded sexuality around the figure of Jadis.In both *The Magician’s Nephew* and *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*,the White Witch/Jadis attempts to corrupt through acts of temptation located around acts of ingestion. In this, Lewis the careful close reader makes use of the two recurrent words in the description of the Whore in Revelation 17 and 18 – fornication and her cup.

If we consider the first appearance of the White Witch in *The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe*, the famous section in which Edmund is tempted with Turkish Delight after having been intoxicated with a drink of unknown concoction, it is possible to discern reference to two distinct moments in the Bible in which ingestion proves lethal to mankind. Edmund – a future King – is tempted with food and drink. The Turkish Delight suggests the temptation in the Garden of Eden, with the White Witch simultaneously fulfilling the role of Satan tempting a feminised Edmund, and Eve tempting Adam, or in this instance, a Son of Adam. Edmund’s reaction to the Turkish Delight, eating it hungrily and greedily, forgetting his manners, also suggests Lewis’s reading of the corresponding section of *Paradise Lost*. In Milton’s poem one of the first signs of Eve’s corruption is the manner in which she eats. Her disordered, greedy ingestion of the apple is contrasted with the mannered style of eating in Book Five:

She turns, on hospitable thoughts intent

What choice to choose for delicacy best,

What order, so contrived as not to mix

Tastes, not well joined, inelegant, but bring

Taste after taste with kindliest charge.27

Greedily she engorged without restraint,

And knew not eating death: satiate at length,

And heightened as with wine, jocund and boon,

Thus to herself she pleasingly began.28

We find the same with Edmund eating the Turkish Delight. He loses control and gives way to uncontrolled appetite:

At first Edmund tried to remember that it is rude to speak with one’s mouth full but soon he forgot about this and thought only to shovel down as much Turkish Delight as he could, and the more he ate the more he wanted to eat.29

This idea of losing control when giving way to Romish corruption takes its poetic cue from Milton but it takes its Biblical cue from both Genesis and the depiction of the people of the Earth made drunk by the wine from the Whore’s corrupting cup. The connection between the White Witch’s corruptive influence and the Whore is made explicit when Edmund drinks from the Witch’s cup:

there stood a jewelled cup full of something that steamed … Edmund felt much better as he began to sip the hot drink. It was something he had never tasted before, very sweet and foamy and creamy, and it warmed him right down to his toes.30

The jewelled cup is a reference to the Whore’s golden cup but also to the gold, precious stones and pearls which she wears. The mysterious nature of the drink may be an oblique reference to the word ‘mystery’ written on the Whore’s forehead; in any event, the cup and the effect it has on Edmund are enough to establish the connection between the White Witch and her actions and the Whore. Both these acts of ingestion are part of the novel’s discourse about food; this often centres upon Edmund’s appetite. Edmund is associated with food and hunger at various points in the novel. Lewis is explicit that the Turkish Delight has corrupted Edmund’s tastes: ‘There’s nothing that spoils the taste of good ordinary food half so much as the memory of bad magical food’.31 Eating the Turkish Delight changes Edmund – Mr Beaver identifies Edmund as ‘Treacherous’ and knows by looking at his eyes that ‘he has been with the Witch and eaten her food’.32 The Turkish Delight and the contents of the cup are a source of false nourishment.33 When Edmund joins his siblings in the battle against the White Witch, one of the first events is a meal.34 This reorientation away from the White Witch and her Turkish Delight towards genuine nourishment allows Edmund to ingest Lucy’s life-giving cordial, an obvious anti-type of the White Witch’s cup.35

While sexual attraction is absent from the White Witch in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, there is pseudo-sexual desire located in the figure of Jadis in *The Magician’s Nephew*. This connects Jadis to a matrix of earlier Protestant texts in which aberrant sexuality or uncontrolled sexual desire is inextricably linked with Roman Catholicism. The spiritual Whoredom offered by the Whore of Babylon is figured as literal whorish behaviour. While there is nothing this explicit in *The Magician’s Nephew,* the physical attractiveness attributed to Jadis, and the consequent temptation offered by her beauty, provides an encoded sexuality in the text. At her first appearance she is described as possessing a ‘look of such fierceness and pride it took your breath away’. But the succeeding sentence is clear: ‘Yet she was beautiful too’.36 Later in the novel Uncle Andrew still refers to Jadis as ‘a damn fine woman’ despite her ‘devilish temper’.37 Again, in the sexless world of Narnia, the reference to Jadis’s physical attraction encoded within ‘damn fine’ locates sexual desire in the figure of Jadis. Her association with the Whore of Babylon is continued with her description as ‘a mysterious lady, a foreign royalty’.38 Again, we recall the word ‘Mystery’ written on the Whore’s forehead. The mysterious and dangerously bewitching nature of Jadis connects her linguistically and behaviourally to the Whore of Revelation. Even Jadis’s foreignness may have a connection to long-standing Protestant discourse, and to thematic ideas about ‘otherness’ in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe.*

Rachel Towns argues the Turkish Delight represents a foreign invasiveness, having a corrupting influence on the English Edmund.39 As the Turkish Delight is the gift of the White Witch, she thus becomes foreign herself. In English Protestant polemic, the Whore as Rome is foreign because Rome, obviously, is a foreign entity but also because the Roman Catholic Church is viewed as an invasive and corrupting force. This is particularly the case for those Protestants who argued that Christianity already existed in Britain *before* the Augustinian mission, with the Papal mission suppressing the ‘true’ Christian Church until the Reformation. By describing Jadis as both mysterious and foreign, Lewis refers to the Whore of Babylon (Mystery) and to Protestant nationalistic criticism of the entity allegorised by the Whore, a criticism still alive and well in Loyalist Ulster when Lewis was a child.

The foreign nature of Jadis is also apparent in the opposition established between Jadis and her two antitypes – Polly and Digory’s mother. Jadis is the antithesis of the English girl and English mother. We can see in the final confrontation between Digory and Jadis how, despite her absence, Polly is used as an obvious counter to Jadis, while it is the reference to Digory’s mother – and the remembrance it sparks in the boy – which leads to the witch’s defeat.40 And again, as with the later/earlier Turkish Delight scene with Edmund in *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, and with the references to Jadis being ‘fine’, we find a further coded reference to implied sexuality and seduction. Jadis is described as ‘speaking more sweetly than you would have thought anyone with so fierce a face could speak’.41 Coupled with the presence of the apple in this sequence,42 we have a section in the text which is clearly re-staging the temptation of Adam in the Garden of Eden, but in this instance, the Eve-like figure fails to seduce the Adam substitute. However, the combination of coded sexuality, and the attempt to corrupt through the ingestion of food means that at this point, Jadis is still acting as a figure for the Whore of Babylon.

The focus on Lewis as irenic Christian apologist is understandable and the broad Christian reading placed on *The Chronicles of Narnia* is largely accurate but it is a great mistake to exclude Lewis’s Protestant background when considering his writing career; his use of contentious Biblical exegesis in the construction of his characters is a product of both that religio-political background and his studies of Spenser. To talk about the type of hard anti-Catholicism found in Spenser in relation to a major 20th-century literary figure may meet resistance but to ignore it is to miss major influences on Lewis and his fiction and prevents Lewis being positioned in a long and notable chronology of British Protestant writers alive to the language of anti-Catholicism but able to elevate it into art.

Paul Quinn
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