

**AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY  
TO C.S. LEWIS:  
*TILL WE HAVE FACES:*  
*a myth retold***



**compiled by Ian C. Storey (Emeritus Professor, Trent University)**

**Note to readers: I have brought the secondary material on Lewis’s novel up to 2020 and have decided to close off my contributions at this point – due to a combination of retirement, difficulties in consulting books and journals because of the lockdown, and the need to winnow down my own research activities. Anyone who wishes to take this project on past 2020 is welcome to do so, but please acknowledge what I have contributed.**

As a full bibliography on C.S. Lewis would be immense, only studies that dealt with *TWHF* to a reasonable degree were included. I have endeavoured to provide annotations to the various entries wherever possible, to do more than just list secondary works on this strange and powerful (and very atypical) novel by CSL. This proved to be feasible except for the dissertations (section VI) and certain articles (section XI), where the journals were not held in the local university libraries. Those that I could not actually consult are marked “[\*]”.

- [I. Publication & editions](#)
- [II. Reviews](#)
- [III. C.S. Lewis on \*TWHF\*](#)
- [IV. Commentary](#)
- [V. Bibliographical Studies of CSL](#)
- [VI. Dissertations](#)
- [VII. Full-length studies of \*TWHF\*](#)
- [VIII. \*TWHF\* in the CSL-Biographies](#)
- [IX. \*TWHF\* in the full-length studies of C.S. Lewis](#)
- [X. \*TWHF\* in collections of essays on CSL](#)
- [XI. Articles](#)

## I. Publication & editions:

I have used the resources of World Catalogue ([www.worldcat.org](http://www.worldcat.org)) here. The various publishers listed below have brought out quite a number of reprints and new imprints, also large-print editions and e-books.

- 1956 edition published by Geoffrey Bles, London
- 1957 American h/c publication by Harcourt, Brace, New York
- 1966 edition published by Time, New York (Time Reader Series), with a new introduction by T.S. Matthews
- 1966 edition published by W. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan
- 1978 edition published by HarperCollins, London
- 1978 p/b edition published by Fount Paperbacks, London
- 1980 p/b edition published by Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, with drawings by Fritz Eicherberg (Harvest/HBJ book)
- 1984, edition published by Mariner Books, New York
- 1998, edition published by HarperCollins, London, to mark the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the birth of CSL.
- 1998, large-print edition, published by G.K. Hall, Thorndyke ME.

## II. Reviews:

Reviews are cited from *Book Review Digest*, *Book Review Index*, and J. R. Christopher and J. K. Ostling (edd.), *C. S. Lewis: An Annotated Checklist of Writings About Him and His Works*. Those marked [+] are excerpted in the entries in *Book Review Digest* vol. 53.

- William Blissett, *Canadian Forum* 36 (January 1957) 238-9  
[Compares Lewis's retelling to that of Robert Graves. Blissett finds the second book unmythical and the first book to be the more successful: "it is a most remarkable combination of swift narrative and the self-revelation (partly deliberate, partly involuntary) of a complex mind and character which, though fully individual, is also fully representative of a phase in religious history"]

- Richard Mayne, *New Statesman & Nation* 52 (1956) 351 [+]  
[“Frankly, I found it hard to stomach, with its ‘city of Glome’, its ‘house of Ungit’, its king ‘Trom’, and its nurse ‘Batta’. But many people, I’m sure, will greatly enjoy so bizarre an excursion beyond the frontiers of Professor Lewis’s dreams” - quoted from *BRD* 53 p. 550]
- Ben Ray Redman, *Saturday Review* 40 (12 January 1957) 15 [+]  
[Mr. Lewis has transformed the Apuleius tale into a religious allegory: “In Mr. Lewis’s sensitive hands the ancient myth retains its fascination, while being endowed with new meanings, new depths, new terrors”]
- Charles J. Rolo, *Atlantic* 199 (February 1957) 84-5 [+]  
[Views this tale as difficult and obscure with a single reading, but praises its narrative level. “What is remarkable about the novel is that a string of complex psychological dramas - about the nature of love and hate, and other fundamental aspects of the human condition - are played out quite unobtrusively within a swiftly moving tale of barbarism”].

### Other Reviews:

- *America* 96 (2 February 1957) 507, 508
- *Arizona Quarterly* 14 (Spring 1958) 81-4
- *Asbury Seminarian* 20 (June 1966) 93-4
- *Blackfriars* 38 (December 1957) 536
- *Booklist* 53 (1 February 1957) 278
- *Bookmark* 16 (February 1957) 109
- *Book World* 10 (19 Oct. 1980) 12
- *Catholic World* 184 (March 1957) 472 [+]
- *Chicago Review* 2 (Summer 1957) 92-4
- *Chicago Sunday Tribune* (20 January 1957) 2 [+]
- *Choice* 24 (Dec. 1986) 597
- *Christian Century* 74 (20 March 1957) 362
- *Christian Science Monitor* (10 January 1957) 7 [+]
- *Commonweal* 65 (8 February 1957) 494 [+]
- *Emergency Librarian* 9 (Jan. 1982) 15
- *English Journal* 77 (Dec. 1988) 72
- *Eternity* 8 (April 1957) 24
- *Human Events* 40 (7 June 1980) 12
- *Kirkus* 24 (1 November 1956) 820 [+]
- *Library Journal* 82 (1 January 1957) 77 [+]
- *Magazine of Fantasy and Science Fiction* 12 (June 1957) 10
- *Magazine of Fantasy and Science Fiction* 14 (March 1958) 110
- *Manchester Guardian* (11 September 1956) 4 [+]
- *New Republic* 136 (21 January 1957) 19 [+]
- *New York Herald Tribune Book Review* (20 January 1957) 3 [+]
- *New York Times Book Review* (13 January 1957) 5 [+]
- *New York Times Book Review* (15 June 1980) 31
- *New Yorker* 32 (9 February 1957) 124
- *Renascence* 10 (Winter 1957) 103-104
- *San Francisco Chronicle* (10 March 1957) 22
- *Tablet* 208 (6 October 1956) 278
- *Time* 69 (28 January 1957) 108

- *Times Literary Supplement* (21 September 1956) 551
- *Time and Tide* 37 (13 October 1956) 1227-1228
- *Wisconsin Library Bulletin* 53 (May 1957) 401

[excerpts from the reviews by T.H. White (*Time & Tide*), G. Meath (*Blackfriars*), Chad Walsh (*The New York Herald Tribune Book Review*), C.J. Rolo (*Atlantic Monthly*), Riley Hughes (*Catholic World*), and Ben Ray Redman (*The Saturday Review*) are provided at Hooper, *Companion* (see IX) 262-3]

[Return to beginning](#)

### III. C.S. Lewis on *TWHF*:

- Note by CSL as an introduction to the British editions -- a 3-page summary of the story as told by Apuleius plus his own comments on his version:  
The central alteration in my own version consists in making Psyche's palace invisible to normal, mortal eyes - if 'making' is not the wrong word for something which forced itself upon me, almost at my first reading of the story, as the way the thing must have been. This change of course brings with it a more ambivalent motive and a different character for my heroine and finally modifies the whole quality of the tale. I felt quite free to go behind Apuleius, whom I suppose to have been its transmitter, not its inventor...but in relation to my work he is a 'source', not an 'influence' nor a 'model'.
- Further note in the introduction to the British editions: ("on another occasion")  
This re-interpretation of an old story has lived in the author's mind, thickening and hardening with the years, ever since he was an undergraduate. That way, he could be said to have worked at it most of his life. Recently, what seemed to be the right form presented itself and themes suddenly interlocked: the straight tale of barbarism, the mind of an ugly woman, dark idolatry and pale enlightenment at war with each other and with vision, and the havoc which a vocation, or even a faith, works on human life.
- Entry in CSL's diary for 23 November 1922:  
...After lunch I went out for a walk up Shotover, thinking how to make a masque or play of Psyche and Caspian.  
[cited in W. Hooper (ed.), *All My Road Before Me: The Diary of C.S. Lewis 1922-27*, (London: HarperCollins, 1991) 142]
- Entry in CSL's diary for 9 September 1923:  
My head was very full of my old idea of a poem on my own version of the Cupid and Psyche story in which Psyche's sister would not be jealous, but unable to see anything but moors when Psyche showed her the Palace. I have tried it twice before, once in couplet and once in ballad form.  
[Two fragments of the couplets were recorded in the Lewis Papers vol. viii, pp. 163-4, and are now published in Don W. King (ed.), *The Collected Papers of C.S. Lewis: a critical edition* (Kent OH: Kent State Press, 2015) 131-3.]
- Entry by Warren Lewis in the *Lewis Papers*, vol. viii 163-4:  
It will perhaps be remembered that in this year [1923] Clive describes himself as being very full of the idea of re-writing the story of Cupid and Psyche. To

what extent this scheme was brought is not known, but I have found the following draft in one of his note books ... This note book contains six or seven other drafts of the first thirty odd lines of the poem.

[This is quoted by Don W. King – see previous entry.]

- Letter to Sister Penelope, 25 March 1943 (*Collected Letters II*, 563-5)  
On the imaginative level I think the deepest truths enter the mind better as arbitrary marvels than as universal theorems. Cinderella had to be back at midnight --- Psyche must not see Cupid's face – Adam and Eve must not eat the fruit: how much better these statements are than any philosophical generalities about obedience.
  - Letter to Alastair Fowler, 25 March 1943 (*Collected Letters II*, 611)  
I've read little of anything being v[ery] occupied with my Cupid & Psyche story.
  - Letters to Katherine Ferrer, 2 April 1955 (*Collected Letters III*, 589-90)  
I've given up the Phoenix story for the present. An old, 25 year old idea having just started into imperative life! My version of Cupid, Psyche. Apuleius got it all wrong. The older sister (I reduce her to one) couldn't see Psyche's palace when she visited her. Hence her dreadful problem: "is P mad or am I blind?" As you see, tho' I didn't start from that, it is the story of every nice affectionate agnostic whose dearest one suddenly "gets religion", or every lukewarm Christian whose dearest gets a vocation. Never, I think, treated sympathetically by a Christian writer before. I do it all thru the mouth of the elder sister. In a word, I'm much with book.
- 9 July 1955 (*Collected Letters III*, 630-1)  
About Psyche herself your *diagnosis* is wrong, but that only shows I have failed to get across what I intended. Pin-up girl, nothing! The attempt was precisely to show the biddable ideal daughter, Maia's little pet (the ideal object for a devouring maternal love, the live doll), turning into the, sometimes terrifying, sometimes maternal, goddess. I'll try to mend it, but not, I think, in the directions you suggest. I think she must have the same deep voice as Orual: for 'you also are Psyche'. The whole thing is very tricky, though. The numinous breaking through the childish mustn't be made just like the mature breaking through the juvenile; the traits of eternal *youth* have to come in.
- Letter to Christian Hardie, 31 July 1955 (*Collected Letters III*, 633)  
The idea of re-writing the old myth, with the palace invisible, has been in my mind ever since I was an undergraduate and it always involved writing through the mouth of the elder sister. I tried it in all sorts of verse-forms in the days when I still supposed myself to be a poet. So, though the version you have read was very quickly written, you might say I've been at work on Orual for 35 years. Of course in my pre-Christian days she was to be in the right and the gods in the wrong.

- Letters to Jocelyn Gibb (CSL's publisher):
  - 16 February 1956 (*Collected Letters* III, 707): [Gibb had written rejecting Lewis' preferred title, *Bareface*, on the grounds that readers would mistake it for a Western] I don't see why people ... would be deterred from buying it if they *did* think it a Western ..... Actually, I think the title cryptic enough to be intriguing.
  - 21 February 1956 (*Collected Letters* III, 710-11): Defending the original title, "Bareface", he pleads that everyone that he has consulted prefers it.
  - 29 February 1956 (*Collected Letters* III, 715a): One other possible title has occurred to me: *Till We Have Faces*. (My heroine says in one passage, 'How can the gods meet us face to face till we have faces?').
  - 22-23 March 1956 (*Collected Letters* III, 722-3)  
[Two letters with some purely technical matters about type-face and presentation.]
  - 11 April 1956 (*Collected Letters* III, 735-7): [Somewhat testily, he rejected two wrapper designs, insisting on the representation of the goddess Ungit by a band of red rock inscribed with the wrinkles of a hideously aged female face, and of Aphrodite's statue by a figure like the early Greek original in being stiff rather than provocative.]
  - 20 April 1956 (*Collected Letters* III, 735-7)  
Yes, this is much better but I agree that Ungit does not stand out enough. I don't want her to be white, though. W[oul]d it increase costs to give her a *lurid red* outline with perhaps a lop-sided patch of red on her top and dribbles of blood running down from it? But if that is too expensive – *either a*. White outline, but no white surface *or b*. Simply soft-pedal (even, if necessary, delete) the mountain background and make the lines – by whatever means – *bolder*. I still have no objection to *Bareface*. But McCallum liked (you don't) *Till We Have Faces*. Settle it between you. All I insist is that the book must have the same title in England & America.
  - 23 April 1956 (*Collected Letters* III, 741-2)  
Yes. Certainly *A Myth Re-told* as the sub-title, whatever title you fix on.
  - 27 April 1956 (*Collected Letters* III, 745)  
McCallum wanted an appenditicial note on the original story. As I have no English address for him I am sending it to you. Will you kindly convey it to him? And if you w[oul]d like it to go in the English ed[ition] too (a point on which I have no views either way) of course take a copy and use it. Either for the American ed[ition] or for yours it must come at the end, not (like a preface) at the beginning.
  - 2 May 1956 (*Collected Letters* III, 747) □  
I leave it entirely to your judgement where the quotation 'Love is too young' sh[oul]d come, provided (A point that has only just occurred to

me) it comes as far as possible from the dedication. Otherwise, though the lady [Joy Davidman] would not, the public might think they had some embarrassing relation to each other.

- 19 June 1956 (*Collected Letters* III, 763)  
[Acknowledging receipt of the proofs.]
  - 25 June 1956 (*Collected Letters* III, 764-5)  
[Fine points arising from reading the proofs.]
  - 29 June 1956 (*Collected Letters* III, 767)  
Some 'late corrections just sent in by my Irish reader'[Arthur Greeves].
  - 20 October 1956 (*Collected Letters* III, 799)  
Thanks for cheque. Glad to hear *TWHF* sells: we don't get much help from the reviewers.
  - 30 November 1956 (*Collected Letters* III, 813)  
The reviews en masse were much less depressing than the chance selection I had seen.
  - 5 May 1958 (*Collected Letters* III, 941)  
Thanks for the cheque (1499-0-4). Gosh! What a flop *Till We Have Faces* has been!
- Letter to Mary Willis Shelburne, 3 April 1956 (*Collected Letters* III, 716)  
My new book went to press last week. It is the story of Cupid & Psyche told by one of the sisters – so that I believe I've done what no mere male author has done before, talked thro' the mouth of, & lived in the mind of, an ugly woman for a whole book. All female readers so far have approved the feminine psychology of it: i.e., no masculine note intrudes.
  - Letter to Arthur Greeves, 13 May 1956 (*Collected Letters* III, 716)  
You always say (truly enough) that I'm a bad proof-reader. I may be getting proofs of my new Cupid & Psyche story in June. If there's time to send you one copy wd. you care to do me a kindness by going through it? Don't, if it is in the least a bother. You'd have about 10 days probably to do it in and the book is a little longer than *S. by J.*
  - Letters to John H. McCallum
    - o 19 May 1956 (*Collected Letters* III, 753)  
No, no. *Love is too young* w[oul]d not have done at all. People w[oul]d have expected a v[ery] different book for such a title.
    - o 13 July 1956 (*Collected Letters* III, 770)  
[Corrections to the American edition.]
    - o 11 August 1956 (*Collected Letters* III, 779)  
I don't mind about *interpretation* or *re-interpretation*, but the latter w[oul]d be slightly better. A good many people between me and Apuleius have told the story and I have very drastically altered the accepted motivation. But I don't insist.

- Letter to Roger Lancelyn Green (*Collected Letters III*, 790)
 

I am so pleased with what you say about *Till We Have Faces* – no reviews yet that show much understanding.
- Letter to Kathleen Raine, 5 October 1956 (*Collected Letters III*, 794-5)
 

What a nice letter, and how well you understand what I was up to. I think what makes Orual different from the ‘warrior maiden’ Archetype is that she is *ugly*, represents virginity not [in] its highest poetic state but as mere misfortune and, of course, masculine activities as the *pis aller*, the thing she is driven into because nothing else is left her. (A bit of ambivalence too. Bardia’s attempt to treat her as a man is agony, yet also to be as much of a man as possible and share his masculine activities is the only thing that links her with him at all and, in that way, precious to her). Even so, she does feel on killing her first man that she has somehow been debauched.
- Letter to John Gilfedder, 18 November 1956 (*Collected Letters III*, 808)
 

It is always nice to get a letter from you and it is always nice to get a letter in praise of one’s last book. The combination is irresistible, especially since that book has had a worse reception from the English reviewers than any I ever wrote.
- Letter to Mary van Deusen, 18 November 1956 (*Collected Letters III*, 809)
 

It was nice of you to write about *Till we Have Faces* (I originally called it *Bareface*, but the publishers vetoed that because they said people would think it was a Western!), and a most needed encouragement to me, for it has had a more hostile reception from the critics than any book I ever wrote. Not that the critics really matter much. The real question is how the book goes 10 or 15 years after publication.
- Letter to I.O. Evans, 27 November 1956 (*Collected Letters III*, 812)
 

Your cheering letter about Orual came very *à propos*, for that book has had a worse reception from the critics than any I ever wrote. I am delighted that you, at any rate, like it.
- Letter to Mrs D. Jessup, 29 January 1957 (*Collected Letters III*, 829)
 

If there is more pity and depth in my last book than in its predecessors, perhaps my own recent life has something to do with it. I am glad you liked it. It has had a less favourable reception not only from critics but from friends than any I ever wrote.
- Letter to Professor Clyde Kilby, 10 February 1957 (*Collected Letters III*, 830-1)
 

An author doesn’t necessarily understand the meaning of his own story better than anyone else, so I give you my account of *TWHF* simply for what it’s worth. The “levels” I am conscious of are these: Lewis then gives four levels which have become starting-points for many critics: (i) “a guess of what it might have been like in a little barbarous state on the borders of the Hellenistic world of Greek culture”, (2) “Psyche is an instance of the *anima*



*naturaliter Christiana*” (3) “Orual is ... an instance, a ‘case’ of human affection in its natural condition”, and (4) the reaction of a family or a community to one of its members “finding religion”.

- Letter to Mrs D. Jessup, 19 February 1957 (*Collected Letters* III, 835):  
The cold reception of the book, far from being the last straw, is hardly even a straw. You need waste no sympathy from me on that score.
- Letter to Deborah Fraser, 28 February 1957 (*Collected Letters* III, 836):  
Thank your father very much for his nice article. Tell him I am extra-specially glad he likes *Till We Have Faces*, because it is so far the most unpopular of my books.
- Letter to Anne and Martin Kilmer, 7 August 1957 (*Collected Letters* III, 973-4)  
I am so glad you both like *Till We Have Faces*. I think it my best book but not many people agree ... I think, Anne, the 3 sisters are not v[ery] like goddesses. They’re just human souls. Psyche has a vocation and becomes a saint. Orual lives the practical life and is, after many sins, saved. As for Redival - well, we’ll all hope the best for everyone.
- Letters to Herbert Palmer:  
17 November 1957 (*Collected Letters* III, 897-8)  
I am cheered by your appreciation of *Till We Have Faces*, and needed some cheering: for to judge by reviews, it is my biggest failure yet.  
  
15 March 1958 (*Collected Letters* III, 924)  
The proper title for my book was *Bareface*, but the publishers wouldn’t have that because they said people w[oul]d think it promised a book about Red Indians.
- Letter to Joan Lancaster, 20 April 1959 (*Collected Letters* III, 1039-40)  
I am so glad you liked *Till We Have Faces*, because so few people do. It is my biggest ‘flop’ for years, and so of course, I think it is my best book.
- Letter to Father Peter Milward SJ, 24 September 1959 (*Collected Letters* III, 1090)  
The main themes are (1) Natural affection, if left to mere nature, easily becomes a special kind of hatred, (2) God is, to our natural affections, the ultimate object of jealousy.
- Letter to Audrey Sutherland, 28 April 1960 (*Collected Letters* III, 1147-8)  
What pleased me enormously in your letter was the bit about *Till We Have Faces*, for that book, which I consider far and away the best I have written, has been my one big failure both with the critics and with the public.

- Letter to Anne Scott, 26 August 1960 (*Collected Letters* III, 1181)
 

You gave me much pleasure by what you said about *Till We Have Faces*, for that book, which I consider far and away the best I have written, has been my one big failure both with the critics and with the public.
- Letter to Meredith Lee, 6 December 1960 (*Collected Letters* III, 1213-14)
 

3. Which of my books do I think most “representational”? Do you mean (a.) Most representative, most typical, most characteristic? or (b.) Most full of “representations”. i.e., images. But whichever you mean, surely this is a question not for me but for my readers to decide. Or do you mean simply which do I like best? Now the answer would be *Till We Have Faces* or *Perelandra*.
- Letter to Clive Kilby, 20 November 1962 (*Collected Letters* III, 1382)
 

And the Fox expresses *neither* Anthroposophy *nor* my views, but Stoicism.
- Letter to Patricia Mackey, 26 March 1963 (*Collected Letters* III, 1419)
 

Your letter was cheering, for *Till We Have Faces* has attracted less attention than any book I ever wrote. The names are just “made up”. I expect some Jungianisms do come in but the main conscious prosework is Christian, not Jungian. Divine Love gradually conquers, first a Pagan (and almost savage) soul’s misconception of the Divine (as Ungit), then shallow “enlightenment” (the Fox), and most of all, her *jealousy* of the real God, whom she hates till near the end because she wants Psyche to be entirely hers.
- Letter to Dorothea Conybeare:
 

How can they (i.e., the gods) meet us face to face till we have faces? The idea was that a human being must become real before it can expect to receive any message from the superhuman; that is, it must be speaking with its own voice (not one of its borrowed voices), expressing its actual desires (not what it imagines that it desires), being for good or ill itself, not any mask, veil, or *persona*. [cited at Constance Babington Smith, *Letters to a Sister from Rose Macaulay* (1964) 261; also at Hooper, *Companion* (see IX) 252]
- Recollection by Charles Wrong of a meeting with CSL, 8 August 1959:
 

We discussed a number of topics, which follow here in no special order. On his novel, *Till We Have Faces*, which I had recently read: “A complete flop”, he said, “the worst flop I’ve ever had. I must admit it’s my favorite of all my books, but I suppose that’s because it’s the last” ... I mentioned that, as an admirer of the books of the late Monsignor R.A. Knox, I had been disappointed in his monumental *Enthusiasm*, an account of the different heresies through eighteen centuries or so. “It’s extraordinary”, said Lewis, what a bad book it is. I suppose an author’s favorite often is; like *Till We Have Faces*” [C. Wrong, “A Chance Meeting”, in Como (see IX) 109, 113]

[Return to beginning](#)

## IV. Commentary:

N.C. Starr, *C. S. Lewis's "Till We Have Faces". Introduction and Commentary*, (New York: Seabury Press, 1968).

[“radical departure from his others in subject matter, form, and style” (4); “an extraordinarily subtle tale of a person’s lifelong attempt to achieve release from the burden of sin” (10-11); discusses prominent themes of love and how their meanings relate to Lewis’s *Four Loves*; discusses *TWHF* as Christian allegory; Orual’s death as a spiritual transformation (17); Psyche as parallel to Christ (18-19); “the most concentrated and the most powerful expression of Lewis’s religious belief to be found in any of his novels” (21).]

## V. Bibliographical Studies of CSL:

(i) Joe R. Christopher, and Joan K. Ostling, *C. S. Lewis: An Annotated Checklist of Writings About Him and His Works*, (Kent OH: Kent State University Press, 1974) 117-19, 290-95.

[useful annotated bibliography of studies about Lewis and his works; secondary sources on *TWHF* (17-9); reviews (290-5); time-frame is c.1919 to 1972]

(ii) Z. Karimpour, “A Descriptive Bibliography of C.S. Lewis’s Fiction: 1938-1981” (PhD thesis: Oklahoma State University, 1985) [\*]

(iii) Susan Lowenberg, *C.S. Lewis: a reference guide 1972-1988*, (New York: Hall, 1993) [continues the survey of CSL from where Christopher & Ostling leave off; entries are listed alphabetically by year, but *TWHF* entries are indexed on p. 302]

[Return to beginning](#)

## VI. Dissertations:

As there have been over a hundred dissertations on CSL since 1972, only those which bear directly on *TWHF* have been included. In most cases, I was not able to see the thesis and have relied on the summaries in *DA* and in the *DAI* CD-Rom data-base.

- J.Q. Becker, “Patterns of Guilt and Grace in the development and function of character in C.S. Lewis’ Romances”, (PhD thesis: University of Washington, 1981)
- R. S. St John Clucas, “Myth and Fantasy in Faith and Mission”, (MTh thesis: University of South Africa, 1983)
- M.E. Donaldson, “Narratives of Transformation: C.S. Lewis’s *Till We Have Faces* and Paul Ricoeur’s *Theory of Metaphor*”, (PhD thesis: Emory University, 1984), summarised in *DA* 45:8 (1985) 2522-3A.
- J.D. Haigh, “The Fiction of C.S. Lewis”, (PhD dissertation: Leeds, 1962)

- J.A. Hajjar, “Spiritual Quest in French and English Post-War Novels”, (PhD thesis: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1982)
- D.A. Hart, “C.S. Lewis’s Defense of Poesie”, (PhD thesis: University of Wisconsin, 1959), summarised in *DA* 20 p. 3293A
- M.B. Hook, “Christian Meaning in the Novels of C.S. Lewis”, (M.A. thesis: Southern Methodist University, 1959)
- R.M. Kawano, “Reason and Imagination: the shape of C.S. Lewis”, (PhD thesis: University of Utah, 1974), summarised in *DA* 35:11, p. 7310A
- J.D. Loney, “Reality, Truth, and Perspective in the Fiction of C.S. Lewis”, (PhD thesis: McMaster University, 1983)
- P.A. McKenzie, “The Last Battle: violence and theology in the novels of C.S. Lewis”, (PhD thesis: University of Florida, 1979), summarised in *DA* 36:2 p. 907A
- L.O. McMillan, “C.S. Lewis as Spiritual Autobiographer: A Study in the Sacramental Imagination”, (PhD thesis: University of Notre Dame, 1986), summarised in *DA* 47:3 (1986) p. 913-4A.
- L.S. Melanson, “The Hero’s Quest for Identity in Fantasy Literature: a Jungian analysis”, (PhD thesis: University of Massachusetts, 1994)
- J.W. Neuleib, “The Concept of Evil in the Fiction of C.S. Lewis”, (PhD thesis: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1974), summarised in *DA* 35:7, p. 4539A
- R.F. Orme-Johnson, “Psyche’s Descent into the Underworld: the transcending pattern in myth and literature”, (PhD thesis: University of Maryland at College Park, 1984)
- A.F. Reddy, “The Else Unspeakable: an introduction to the fiction of C.S. Lewis”, (PhD thesis: University of Massachusetts, 1972), summarised in *DA* 33:6 p. 2949A
- L.D. Rossi, “The Politics of Fantasy: C.S. Lewis and J.R.R. Tolkien”, (PhD thesis: Cornell University, 1972), summarised in *DA* 33:9 p. 5195A
- P.G. Saunders, “The Idea of Love in the Writings of C.S. Lewis”, (PhD thesis: Ball State University, 1987)
- J. Smallwood, “Out from Exile: C.S. Lewis and the Journey to Joy. A Comparative Study of *Surprised by Joy* and *Till We Have Faces*”, (M.A. thesis: Bowling Green State University, 1999).
- G. Urang, “The Shadows of Heaven: the uses of fantasy in the fiction of C.S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and J.R.R. Tolkien”, (PhD thesis: University of Chicago, 1970)
- D.A. Wood, “The Pattern in the Myth: Archetypal Elements in C.S. Lewis’s *Till We Have Faces*”, (PhD thesis: University of Tulsa, 1976), summarised at *DA* 37 (1976) 1575A
- M.E. Wright, “The Cosmic Kingdom of Myth: a study in the myth-philosophy of Charles Williams, C.S. Lewis, and J.R.R. Tolkien”, (PhD thesis: University of Illinois, 1959) esp. pp. 55f., 86f., 114, 138-48, 152-7, 164-70, 185f.  
[M.E. Wright’s untimely death in 1959 robbed CSL-studies of a very able critic - her analyses of CSL and myth are always pointed and acute, although *TWHF* receives less attention than the Ransom-trilogy]

- R. Wright, “Biblical Allusions in C.S. Lewis’ *Till We Have Faces*”, (MA thesis: Florida Atlantic University, 1982)

## VII. Full-length studies of *TWHF*:

- M.E. Donaldson, *Holy Places are Dark Places: C.S. Lewis and Paul Ricoeur on Narrative Transformation* (Lanham MD: University Press of America, 1988). [one of two major full-length studies on *TWHF*; her approach is “narratives of transformation” with emphasis on the metaphors “you are also Psyche” and ““holy places are dark places””; excellent summary of previous critical views, plus observation that most take CSL as the book’s subtext and few approach the work as work of literature or try to understand the technique involved; an important study].
- Doris T. Myers, *Bareface: A Guide to C.S. Lewis’s Last Novel* (Columbia MO: U Missouri Press, 2004). [studies *TWHF* as “a realistic modern novel”, much in the style of William James; lays emphasis on the techniques of modern psychology and narratology, on the role of Plato and Carl Jung in understanding the story; *TWHF* is “the story of the soul’s journey to love and to God the source of love – a journey that, as the spiritual guides of every tradition agree, can be accomplished only through self-knowledge” (137)]
- P.J. Schakel, *Reason and Imagination in C.S. Lewis: A Study of Till We Have Faces* (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1984). [provides tremendous help in understanding Lewis’s ‘difficult’ and best achievement in fiction which, as many critics have noted, requires more than one reading; the first half of the text leads the reader step by step through the story discussing plot, themes, characters, structure, symbols, allusions; the second part of the book places *TWHF* in context by examining it through the corpus of Lewis’s works; “it will yield, therefore, adult-level understandings of Lewis, of life, and of oneself” (8); reveals the full value of myth in conveying eternal and universal truths to the receptive heart and mind” (57); “It is the most universal of Lewis’s works; at the same time it is the most closely personal of Lewis’s works.” (162); studies the change that came over Lewis’ writings in the 1950s -- reason will lead to truth, but imagination to reality].

[Return to beginning](#)

## VIII. *TWHF* in the CSL-Biographies:

- R.L. Green & W. Hooper, *C.S. Lewis: A Biography* (London: Collins, 1974) 11, 171, 261-7. [the first of the Lewis-biographies; they discuss C. S. Lewis’s earlier Cupid & Psyche project + fragment and the contribution of Joy Davidman; analysis of various levels of the story, including text of C. S. Lewis’s letter to Kilby on *TWHF*; relate to *The Four Loves*].

- William Griffin, *Clive Staples Lewis: A Dramatic Life* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986) 365, 376-7, 383-4, 407, 444.  
[Lewis discusses with Joy Davidman his ideas for writing “Bareface” (365); discusses with R. Green the point of view of *TWHF* (376); letter to Kilby and discussion of Orual (384); “it’s my favorite of all my books” (407); asks Kay Farrer to critique manuscript (444)].
- Alan Jacobs, *The Narnian: the life and imagination of C.S. Lewis* (New York: HarperCollins 2005) 238-47, 261-2.  
[approaches the creation of Narnia by examining Lewis’s creation of Orual and Glome; Orual’s complaint against the gods is a “raw assertion and reassertion of pure want”; refers to Lewis’s “expository demon” in his works; fairy-tale or romance as a fully adult art-form; explores the “fiendishness that conversion can produce in the families of new Christians”; Psyche ~ Lewis, Orual ~ Minto].
- G. Sayer, *Jack: C. S. Lewis and His Times* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988) 220, 234-6 [n.b. index is incorrect.]  
[role of Joy Davidman in creation of novel as “editor” or “collaborator”; about Love and redemption; “we all have something of Orual in us”.]
- A.N. Wilson, *C. S. Lewis: A Biography* (London: Collins, 1990) 252, 261.  
[very little about the novel itself; relates to ‘autobiography’, *Surprised by Joy*; discusses Joy Davidman’s influence on the work.]

[Return to beginning](#)

## IX. *TWHF* in the full-length studies of C. S. Lewis:

I have included those full-length studies of CSL where there is a reasonable amount of discussion on *TWHF*.

- L. Adey, *C.S. Lewis: writer, dreamer & mentor* (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans 1998) 151-64.  
[discusses the novel as “psychologized myth”; Orual’s “inward growth constitutes the novel’s plot”; discusses why the work is little known and not popular; CSL is “grafting Christian upon pagan mythology”; Lewis is at his best when the universal takes precedence over the particular and personal].
- C.S. Carnell, *Bright Shadow of Reality: C.S. Lewis and the feeling intellect* (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1974) 110-15.  
[good & evil merge in each of the characters; even Psyche “must suffer and cause suffering”; uses Jungian analysis - Fox seen as Jungian dream analyst; “Orual moves steadily through individuation (the Jungian goal of consciousness) through suffering and increased understanding”].

- H. Carpenter, *The Inklings* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1978) 244-5. [brief discussion of the novel; “possibly Lewis’ best book”; discusses Joy Davidman, but more concerned with Orual as expression of C.S. Lewis himself].
- Joe R. Christopher, *C.S. Lewis* (Boston: Twayne, 1987) 5, 7, 9, 13, 14, 30, 42, 50, 84, 89, 120-25, 126, 127, 128, 130. [compares Joy Davidman to heroine (7); “fits what Frye calls a romance-confession” (8-9); “Davidman is, to some degree, responsible for the book”; “it is his best fiction...because *TWHF* also contains in Orual his best, most complex, characterization” (120); discusses original title ‘Bareface’ (121); changes to Apuleius myth (122); Christian symbolism (123); parallels to Dante’s *Divine Comedy* (124-5); depiction of pagan kingdom “is well sustained as myth” (130)].
- J.T. Como, *C.S. Lewis at the Breakfast Table and other Reminiscences* (New York: Macmillan, 1979) xxxiii, 24, 109. [Como: personality and what it might become (xxxiii); A. B. Griffiths: myth-making versus philosopher (24); C. Wrong: C.S. Lewis - “A complete flop, the worst flop I’ve ever had. I must admit it’s my favourite of all my books” (109)].
- J. Como, *Branches to Heaven: The Geniuses of C.S. Lewis* (Dallas: Spence Publishing, 1998) 11-12, 181-5. [“his one real novel, *Till We Have Faces*, is a masterpiece, and typically unnoticed post-Jamesian psychological study ... about a person in despair, not knowing it, but on the brink, and finally being brought over, ‘kicking and screaming’.”]
- R.B. Cunningham, *C.S. Lewis: Defender of the Faith* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967) 143-51. [levels of myth in CSL; realism v. myth, appeal to imagination; Man and his relationship to the Transcendent].
- C. Duriez, *Tolkien and C.S. Lewis: the gift of friendship* (Mahwah NJ: Hidden Spring, 2003) 163-5, 184-5. [explores the influence of Tolkien on *TWHF*; compares Lewis and Tolkien in their creation of imaginary worlds and in their use of the divine – *TWHF* employs symbolism rather than allegory].
- K. Filmer, *The Fiction of C.S. Lewis: “Mask and Mirror”* (New York: St Martin’s Press, 1993), 7. “Masking the Misogynist in Narnia and Glome” 104-20 (esp. 111-120) [little evidence that CSL had changed his attitudes about women; CSL not JD behind Orual; confronts his *anima*-figure in this creation; women are either goddesses or devils; affection gone bad is put in the form of a woman; Orual’s ‘mask’ is in fact a ‘mirror’ to Lewis himself].
- E. Fuller, *Books with Men Behind Them* (New York: Ransom House, 1959), “The Christian Spaceman: C.S. Lewis”, 143-68 (esp. 165-8).
- Evan K. Gibson, *C.S. Lewis, Spinner of Tales: A Guide to His Fiction* (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1980) 221-55. [discusses four themes: barbarism; the mind of an ugly woman; the three-way

conflict between idolatry, enlightenment, and vision; the “havoc which a vocation or even a faith, works on human life”; explains “a myth retold”; describes plot and structure; discusses the doctrine of co-inherence; Lewis uses the old Greek myth to convey Christian truth; “Psyche seems to be the platonic ideal of what a person should be”].

- D.E. Glover, *C.S. Lewis: The Art of Enchantment* (Athens OH: Ohio University Press, 1981) 15, 36, 39, 40, 61, 64, 68, 105, 123, 127, 164, 187-99, 205-8. [cites letters that date its composition and link Orual with Joy Gresham (39); compares *TWHF* with *Screwtape Letters* (127); “Apuleius got it all wrong. The older sister...couldn’t see Psyche’s palace” (187); “the high level of achievement which has ironically been undervalued by his most dedicated admirers” (189); discusses general meaning; various techniques; various levels as a series of quests toward “Joy” (190-9); “We critics point to Lewis’s mastery of fiction...and lay before those who have not yet met Lewis his final artistic achievement” (208)].
- M.P. Hannay, *C.S. Lewis* (New York: Ungar, 1981) 113-28, 229, 241, 245, 249, 262, 265, 267. [discusses plot concentrating on the character of Orual (113-28); Lewis in the character of Orual; “Orual is by far the most fully developed character that Lewis created” (125); discusses imagination and reason, symbols of Orual’s vision (127) ; “*TWHF* is both a profound psychological study and a significant myth” (128) ; “a haunting combination of historical imagination, mythic symbols, and psychological probing” (262)].
- D.A. Hart, *Through the Open Door: A New Look at C.S. Lewis* (University AL: University of Alabama Press, 1984) 8-9, 38-39, 84-7, 142. [Lewis’s idea of the function of myth and the doctrine of mythopoeia (8-9); discusses the oppositions between the cultures of the Greek world and the world of Glome (38-9); discusses the Fox’s role as teacher and his link with Socrates (84-7); “In the relationship between Orual and her teacher, Lewis revealed the aims of liberal education” (87); “Security, Lewis suggested in *TWHF*, is an illusion” (142)].
- D. Holbrook, *The Skeleton in the Wardrobe: C.S. Lewis’ Fantasies, a Phenomenological study* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1991) 251-67. [part of his generally unsympathetic view of CSL; inner story of his psychic life with roots in the death of his mother; struggle with his own misogyny].
- L. Paul Holmer, *C.S. Lewis: The Shape of His Faith and Thought* (London: Sheldon Press, 1977) 18, 39-41, 44. [“a taxing book to read” (39); “major themes of Aristotle and Plato and Western moral pedagogy and even Christianity” (39); explains title *Till We Have Faces* (40)].
- Walter Hooper, *C.S. Lewis. A Companion and Guide* (London: Harper Collins, 1996) 243-63. [Hooper provides a **background** (re-interpretation, summary of Apuleius’ story,



Lewis' earlier attempts, how he came to write *TWHF*), an **analysis** of what Lewis attempted (central alteration, the Christian perspective, natural love, the character of Psyche, the title, pagan and Greek religion), a **summary** of the story, and a selection of **reviews**.]

- Thomas Howard, *The Achievement of C.S. Lewis* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1980) 207-59.  
[analysis of various themes of the novel concentrating on Orual's journey to "joy"; Lewis has given the Cupid and Psyche tale "as rich and complex a rendering as the story has ever had" (207); "Orual's growth towards Charity" (232); discusses what C.S. Lewis did to Apuleius's tale (233)].
- Clyde S. Kilby, *The Christian World of C.S. Lewis* (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1964) 37, 51-64, 74, 182, 198, 200.  
[provides brief synopsis of the novel and discusses three themes 1: "a rationalistic versus a Christian interpretation"; 2: "Orual's case against the gods and the gods' case against Orual"; 3: "the significance of the great myths of mankind"].
- Clyde S. Kilby, *Images of Salvation in the Fiction of C.S. Lewis* (Wheaton IL: Harold Shaw, 1978), chap. VII. "Getting a Face Two Other Ways: *Till We Have Faces*", 125-40.  
[plot summary; address to rationalism and scientism; blindness, willingness to be honest with the truth].
- G. Knight, *The Magical World of the Inklings* (Longmead: Element, 1990) 102-8.  
[psychological transformation; need for "Clear" and "Thick" religions; cites CSL "Religion without Dogma"].
- W.A. Kort, *C.S. Lewis Then and Now* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) 59-65.  
[discussion of Lewis's use of 'house' and 'home'—Orual cannot see the house of Psyche; "what they desire is to be invited in"]
- G. Krantz, *C.S. Lewis: Studien zu Leben und Werk* (Bonn: Grundmann, 1973) 82-102.
- P. Kreeft, *C.S. Lewis: a critical essay* (Front Royal VA: Christendom College Press, 1988) 53-4.
- Kathryn Lindskoog, *C.S. Lewis, Mere Christian* (Downers Grove IL: InterVarsity Press, 1981) 20, 31, 62-4, 82-3, 141, 143, 149-150, 162.  
[mentions dedication to Joy Davidman (20); "Sacrifice is at the heart of Lewis's strange pagan novel *TWHF*" (31); "a novel full of suffering which ends in redemption"; "It was judged by Owen Barfield and John Lawlor to be Lewis's finest work" (162)].

- H. M. Luke, *The Way of Woman, Ancient and Modern* (Three Rivers MI: Apple Farm Paper, 1974) II 19-88.  
[women out of touch with archetypal self; animus > feminine self; Orual is viewed from the point of view of these terms].
- C. Manlove, *C.S. Lewis: His Literary Achievement* (London: MacMillan, 1987) 198-213.  
[themes of identity and personality, relationships between gods and men; freedom of CSL's characters].
- G. Meilander, *The Taste For the Other: The Social and Ethical Thought of C.S. Lewis* (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1978) 6, 165, 174-5, 228 n.60, 239-40  
[discusses Lewis as mythmaker and theologian putting "words" into the mouth of Orual (6); discusses Orual's "natural affection becoming demonic" (165); "Lewis' most haunting presentation of the theme of nature wounded by grace must certainly be *TWHF*" (174); discusses title (175); differences of philosophy from religion in Glome].
- C. Moorman, *Arthurian Triptych: Mythic Materials in Charles Williams, C.S. Lewis, and T. S. Eliot* (Berkeley /Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1960) 104-7.  
[conflict of scientific rationalism and faith as dominant themes in *TWHF*; the second part of the novel "presents in fictional terms the theme of Lewis' autobiography, *Surprised by Joy*"].
- Brian Murphy, *C.S. Lewis* (Mercer Island WA: Starmont House, 1983) 10, 13, 23, 24, 72, 73, 78-81, 85.  
[date of publication (10); "his least read work, *TWHF*, is a very complex and dense re-telling of the Psyche and Eros myth" (13); discusses the strangeness of *TWHF* from Lewis's other works (72); "his creation of a rational Greek in a primitive, superstitious land is among his finest achievements" (79); discusses the "powerful" second part of the novel - "that we must follow the god within us" (80-1)].
- Doris T. Myers, *C.S. Lewis in Context*, (Kent OH: Kent State University Press, 1994) 190-213.  
[compares and discusses historical accuracy in the myth; thread throughout - "myth becomes fact" - relates it to "euhemerism" (190); the second part of the novel Lewis demonstrates the Psyche myth as "a foreshadowing of the Christian Gospel" (193); interprets the geography and sets the time taking into account ancient works available to Lewis (194-5); Orual's language, speech and classical rhetoric of her style are especially effective in helping to establish the story as history (199-200)].

- Leanne Payne, *Real Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Works of C. S. Lewis* (Westchester IL.: Cornerstone Books, 1979) 53-62.  
[discusses Orual as the “fallen-self” comparing her to the fallen Adam and Eve and the need for “fallen” man to work towards being “sovereignly resurrected” in order to be “God conscious” and not “self-conscious”; “Lewis’s great mythic work *TWHF* dramatically illustrates, the fallen self cannot know itself” (53); “Orual is really Lewis” (57); “in the form of epic myth, Lewis was expressing...man will find his true self only in communion and union with Christ” (62).]
- J. Prothero & D.T. Williams, *Gaining a Face: the Romanticism of C.S. Lewis* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2013) 63-7.  
[A study of Lewis’ reaction to and use of ‘romanticism’, particularly Wordsworth and Coleridge, concentrating on three themes: the beautiful, utopianism, and the childlike; *TWHF* provides the title of the work; examines the concepts of dark/light, how beauty reflects the progress of Ungit’s ‘conversion’, and how Orual becomes Psyche at the end, that is assuming divine beauty.]
- R.L. Purtill, *The Lord of the Elves and Eldils: fantasy and philosophy in C.S. Lewis and J.R.R. Tolkien* (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1974) 148-9.  
[complex attempt to deal with religious issues expressed in fictional form; relates to *Problem of Pain*]
- R.J. Reilly, *Romantic Religion: A Study of Barfield, Lewis, Williams and Tolkien* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1971) 116-29.  
[in the book Lewis is trying to recreate “the ancient consciousness which saw a part of reality in terms of myth” (118); it is not allegory, not symbolism, but myth “which must be grasped with the imagination, not with the intellect” (125); “Lewis’s version comes first and is a source for Apuleius’s version”; *TWHF* “is the preamble to Lewis’s mythopoeic Christianity” (129); suggests that this myth is a symbolic representation that prefigures the great “Incarnation” of Christ.]
- L.D. Rossi, *The Politics of Fantasy: C.S. Lewis and J.R.R. Tolkien* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1984) “The Later Fantasies”, pp. 78-87.  
[psychological approach; belief v. rationalism; Lewis’ own life beneath the work; “politics yields to ethics”].
- P.J. Schakel, *Imagination and the Arts in C.S. Lewis: journeying to Narnia and Other Worlds* (Columbia MO: University of Missouri Press, 2002) 27-8, 99, 115-16, 144-5, 151-2.  
[on books, music, dancing, architecture in *TWHF*].
- B. Sibley, *C.S. Lewis through the Shadowlands* (Grand Rapids MI: Revell, 1994) 22-3.  
[discusses the book as the product of his relationship with Joy Davidman and sees JD as essential in Orual].

- R.H. Smith, *Patches of Godlight: The Pattern of Thought of C.S. Lewis* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1981) 11, 53, 74, 114, 127, 138, 163, 177, 231, 249 n. 49.  
[“Orual is one of Lewis’s most difficult characters” (74); discusses the contrasts of rationalism (Fox) and the supernatural (Ungit) (138); discusses Orual’s journey to grace; “*TWHF* is far subtler, more probing and less self-confident than {sic} most of his other fiction” (231); refers to the religion of Ungit as a dark, primitive religion (249)].
- Gunnar Urang, *Shadows of Heaven: Religion and Fantasy in the Writing of C.S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and J. R. R. Tolkien* (Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1971) 40-50, 154.  
[discusses themes of conflicts between myth, ritual, religious belief versus enlightened rationality (46); compares similarities of theme to *Surprised by Joy* (47); notes flaws in structure in second part of novel (48); looks for “poet in poem” (49); “in the “vision-ritual” at the end - one feels the pressure of traditional supernaturalism...so as to exalt the divine holiness and power” (154)].
- Chad Walsh, *The Literary Legacy of C.S. Lewis* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979) 12-14, 43, 159-78, 232, 248, 250  
[theme of human beings taking on one another’s burdens (13); “reviewers seemed more bewildered than impressed” (159); “an allegory of the quest of the soul to achieve intellectual love”; the central psychological theme: “quest for self-knowledge” (160); “experience of death and rebirth” (177-8); “closer in insight to Dostoevsky than to the ancient myth of Cupid and Psyche” (250)].

[Return to beginning](#)

## X. *TWHF* in collections of essays on CSL:

- C. Duriez & D. Porter, *The Inklings Handbook* (London: Chalice Press, 2001)  
“*Till We Have Faces*”, 209-10.  
[Psyche is a “Christ-likeness”; identification of the sisters represents the union of reason and imagination, and “the marriage of myth and fact in the Gospels”].
- B.L. Edwards (ed.), *C.S. Lewis: Life, Works, and Legacy*, vol. 2: *Fantast, Mythmaker, & Poet* (Westport CT: Praeger, 2007).
  - K. Rowe, “*Till We Have Faces: A Study of the Soul and the Self*”, 135-56  
[Rowe examines what Lewis meant by “myth” and how myth is employed in Lewis’s rewriting of the myth told by Apuleius: need-love as opposed to gift-love, self-knowledge, renunciation, transformation, and the need for humans to rely on the gods].
- B.L. Edwards (ed.), *The Taste of the Pineapple: Essays on C.S. Lewis as Reader, Critic, and Imaginative Writer* (Bowling Green: Bowling Green State University Popular Press, 1988).

- K. Filmer, “The Polemic Image: The Role of Metaphor and Symbol in the Fiction of C.S. Lewis”, 161 [compares development of theme in *TWHF* and *The Great Divorce*].
- Paul Leopold, “Fighting ‘Verbicide’ and Sounding Old-Fashioned: Some Notes on Lewis’s Use of Words”, 117. [discusses effects of using “ugly” as applied to Orual].
- P.S. Fiddes (ed.), *A Christian for all Christians* (London: Hodddard and Stoughton, 1990).
  - P.S. Fiddes, “C.S. Lewis the myth-maker”, 149-55 [Myth has become Fact and yet remains Myth.]
- J. Gibb (ed.), *Light on C.S. Lewis* (London: Bles, 1965).
  - S. Gibbons, “Imaginative Writing”, 94-8 [a “severe” work, a “painful book”; “haunted” by allegory].
- Charles A. Huttar (ed.), *Imagination and the Spirit: Essays in Literature and the Christian Faith presented to Clyde S. Kilby*, (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1971)
  - D.K. Kuhn, “The Joy of the Absolute: A Comparative Study of the Romantic Visions of William Wordsworth and C.S. Lewis”, 192, 201 [“ontological meaning of life” in *Perelandra* and *TWHF* (192); discusses Orual’s “surrender to Love himself” and her transformation (201)].
  - M.E. Wright, “The Vision of Cosmic Order in the Oxford Mythmakers”, 272-3 [discusses gods in *TWHF*; “acts of exchange and substitution are intricately worked out”].
- J. Lawlor (ed.), *Patterns of Love and Courtesy: Essays in Memory of C.S. Lewis* (Evanston IL: Northwestern University Press, 1966).
  - John Lawlor, “On Romanticism in the ‘Confessio Amantis’”, 139-40 [“his highest achievement in narrative”; “an instance of the quality of ‘myth’ which Lewis himself defined better than anyone”; discusses myth as “when a new Fall of the divine creation appears imminent; and which achieves near-perfect expression in *TWHF*”].
- R. MacSwain & Michael Ward (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to C.S. Lewis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
  - P.J. Schakel, “*Till We Have Faces*”, 281-93. [Schakel summarises Lewis’s various attempts at this story, gives a plot summary, and discusses the themes of myth, sacrifice, and knowledge of the divine].
- T.L. Martin (ed.), *Reading the Classics with C.S. Lewis* (Grand Rapids MI: Baker, 2000) 65-7, 207, 285-96
  - P. Andrew Montgomery, “Classical Literature”, 52-71 [discusses Lewis’s classical education, its contribution to his academic methodology, and the use of classical themes in his fiction. The myth behind *TWHF* resonates with the

- deepest truths about humanity].
- K. Filmer-Davies, “Fantasy”, 285-96. [examines Lewis’s use of the “baptized imagination” in his fantasy novels. On one level the novel shows how the human imagination and spirit may be “born again”].
  - D. Mills (ed.), *The Pilgrim’s Guide: C.S. Lewis and the art of witness* (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1998).
    - C. Duriez, “The Romantic Writer: C.S. Lewis’s Theology of Fantasy”, 107-9. [in a section entitled “paganism and grace”].
  - P.J. Schakel (ed.), *The Longing for a Form: Essays on the fiction of C.S. Lewis* (Kent OH: Kent State University Press, 1977).
    - Joe R. Christopher, “Archetypal Patterns in *Till We Have Faces*”, 193-212□ [discusses symbolism of Christ for Christian and non-Christian readers (196-7); “conflict between Orual and Psyche in the valley of the god may be considered archetypally as another Paradise Lost” (198); the meanings behind the queen’s veil (200); compares Orual to Job (201); C. Williams “Doctrine of Exchange” (206-10); Dantean imagery as Christian archetypes (210-2)].
    - Clyde S. Kilby, “*Till We Have Faces: An Interpretation*”, 171-81 [“reprinted by permission from *Orcrist*, No. 6 (Winter 1971-72)”] [discusses themes with a Christian perspective; “a story of true love and false love” (171); “Orual was a replica of pagan and Christian alike” (175); discusses Lewis’s belief concerning the meaning of myth (179-80); discusses influence of Charles Williams teachings of co-inherence and substitution (180).]
    - Janice Witherspoon Neuleib, “The Creative Act: Lewis on God and Art”, 41, 47 [“In this tale Lewis is able to emphasize the importance of the creative nature of the Divine”].
    - S.J. Van Der Weele, “From Mt. Olympus to Glome: C.S. Lewis’s Dislocation of Apuleius’s “Cupid and Psyche” in *Till We Have Faces*”, 182-92. [compares and contrasts with the Apuleius tale; discusses the four main alterations to the Cupid and Psyche myth of Apuleius: (1) The historical reconstruction of life in the city-state of Glome; (2) The story told from the point of view of Orual; (3) Orual’s glimpse of the castle and subsequent enlightenment; (4) The exhibition of the anatomy of love; “a truly great work - authentic, wise, and penetrating”; “relates the novel to Lewis’s many treatments of the subject of love”]
    - E.G. Zogby SJ, “Triadic Patterns in Lewis’s Life and Thought”, 21, 22, 25, 28, 30, 33-36 [compares *TWHF* to *Surprised By Joy*; tension between masculine and feminine (25); “It is not a book which an atheist could have written” (28); “portrays the last chapter of pagan myth before the Incarnation” (34); discusses reason and imagination in *Till We Have Faces* (34-6)]

- P.J. Schakel & C.A. Huttar (edd.), *Word and Story in C.S. Lewis* (Columbia MO: University of Missouri Press, 1991).
  - Mara Donaldson, “Orual’s Story and the art of retelling: a study of *Till We Have Faces*”, 157-70 [questions of narrative technique; the three stories in the text (Orual, Psyche, Arnom); interaction of *Logos* and *Poiema*].
  - C. Manlove, “‘Caught up into the Larger Pattern’: Images and Narrative Structures in C.S. Lewis’ fiction”, 256-76 [*TWHF* mentioned incidentally in discussion; difference from earlier fiction].
  - S. Medcalf, “Language and Self-consciousness: the Making and Breaking of C.S. Lewis’ Personae”, 109-44 (esp. 129-35) [on CSL’s change of style c.1955].
- J.D. Schultz & J.G. West Jr, *The C.S. Lewis Readers’ Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1998).
  - C.A. Huttar, *Till We Have Faces*, 403-6 [an encyclopedia entry + brief bibliography].
- A. Slack (ed.), *Doors in the Air: C.S. Lewis and the Imaginative World* (Vitoria, Spain 2010).
  - J. Hathaway, “Holy Places are Dark Places: Finding God in *Till We Have Faces*”, 133-65.  
[Hathaway begins my identifying *TWHF* as “typology” rather than “allegory” and by exploring the antithesis between “clear” and “thick” religions, between the rationalism of the Fox and Orual and the experiential nature of the cult. He also examines the trials that Psyche undergoes and how they fit into the human discovery of God].
- M. Travers, *C.S. Lewis: Views from Wake Forest* (Wayne PA, 2008).
  - Kip Redick, “Wilderness, Arcadia and Longing: Mythic Landscapes and the Experience of Reality”, 137-57. [examines the significances of vivid landscapes in Narnia, Perelandra and Malacandra, and Glome. In *TWHF* the mountain landscape fills “the reader’s imagination with intense experience of the sublime”].
  - Ian C. Storey, “The Classical Sub-text to *Till We Have Faces*”, 237-53.  
[argues that Lewis’s use of classical exempla and allusions form a significant sub-text to the novel, especially the myths about Love. Discusses also the contents of the royal library at Glome].
  - Stephen Yandell, “Medieval Models of Loss in *Till We Have Faces*”, 255-74 [while the book is set in the classical world, “the heart of the work is distinctly medieval”. Examines its relationship to Dante’s Beatrice, *The Book of Margery Kempe*, and the *Pearl*].
- Raymond P. Tripp Jr. (ed.), *Man’s “Natural Powers”: Essays for and about C.S. Lewis*, (Church Stretton: The Society for New Language Study, 1975).
  - Dean Loganbill, “Myth, Reality, and *Till We Have Faces*”, 55-8.
- R. Wagner, *C.S. Lewis and Narnia for Dummies* (Indianapolis IN: Wiley Press, 2005).

- I.C. Storey, “Facing off with an ancient myth: *Till We Have Faces*”, 237-44 [presented in the familiar low-pitched format of this series, this chapter examines Lewis’s inspiration by a classical myth, the destructive side of love, and uncovering the truth in myths].

[Return to beginning](#)

## XI. Articles:

Three journals in particular may be cited as containing material on CSL on an ongoing basis:

1. (1) *The New York C.S. Lewis Society Bulletin* [= *CSLBull*]
2. (2) *Mythlore*, devoted to the works of Lewis, Tolkien, and Williams; published by the Mythopoeic Society of Los Angeles
3. (3) *VII: an Anglo-American Literary Review*, published at Wheaton College, Illinois, and devoted to the works of George Macdonald, G.K. Chesterton, C.S. Lewis, J.R.R. Tolkien, Charles Williams, Dorothy L. Sayers, and Owen Barfield. [= *Seven (VII)*]

Summaries of articles marked by “[\*L]” are taken from the bibliographical survey by Lowenberg (see [V]).

- M.J. Anastasi, “King of Glome: *Pater Rex*”, *The Lamp-Post of the Southern California C.S. Lewis Society* 19.1 (1995) 13-19.  
[examines the figure of father + king; shows how Orual develops into such a figure of power; discusses relationship between Orual and her father (brings in Jung’s Electra-complex); wonders about events in CSL’s own life].
- C.A. Arnell, “On Beauty, Justice and the Sublime in C.S. Lewis’s *Till We Have Faces*”, *Christianity and Literature* 52 (2002) 23-34.  
[starts from Scarry’s 1998 defense of the pursuit of beauty and its relation to ‘justice’ in the world; discusses how Orual relates to the beauty in others that she lacks and how she acts ‘justly’ in her life; at the end beauty enables a sublime experience and she (and we) see how beauty lies at the heart of the world.]
- B.E. Atkinson, “From Facelessness to Divine Identity”, *The Lamp-Post of the Southern California C.S. Lewis Society* 15.1 (1991) 21-30.  
[mixes a Jungian analysis of Orual with Christian psychology; Fox = “head” (faith in nature), while Ungit = “guts” (fear and mystery); study in a change in human nature; Orual’s “finale was self-revelatory, a psycho-therapeutic talking cure”].
- S.A. Bartlett, “Humanistic Psychology in C.S. Lewis’s *Till We Have Faces*: A Feminist Critique”, *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 22.2 (1989) 185-98.  
[sees problems in the religious sub-text and the psychology of the characters; Orual’s self-realization; her “despised self” and her possible self; feminist critique]



of the ending. N.B. This issue of *SLI* (22.2) was devoted wholly to CSL].

- A. Bergvall, “A Myth Retold: C.S. Lewis’ *Till We Have Faces*”, *Mythlore* 11.1 (1984) 5-12.  
[Lewis makes an actual event out of the myth; discusses CSL on Myth in *Expt. Crit.* and “Is Theology Poetry?”; already in Glome myth--> allegory; “rare literary feat of making an ancient myth come alive and speak to modern man”].
- K. Brew, “Facing the Truth on the Road to Salvation: An Analysis of *That Hideous Strength* and *Till We Have Faces*”, *The Lamp-Post of the Southern California C.S. Lewis Society* 22.1 (1998) 10-12.  
[brief examination of masks in *THS* and *TWHF* – Orual disguises herself out of self-pity and then must unmask herself to prevent herself from being lost permanently – “we must reveal ourselves to God before he can reveal Himself to us”]
- C.A. Brown, “Who is Ungit?”, *CSLBull* 13:6 (1982) 1-5.  
[discusses the appeal and lack of appeal to critics; Orual is like Hamlet who does evil things on the road to (self-)knowledge; real Ungit is the demon within Orual, who is virtuous and sensitive, but cannot see her own blindness and possessiveness].
- E. Chapman, “Images of the Numinous in T.H. White and C.S. Lewis”, *Mythlore* 4.4 (1977) 1-10.  
[discerns three scenes of the numinous in *TWHF* - (1) vision of Psyche’s palace in the early morning, (2) Orual’s dream of Ungit, (3) her dream of Psyche’s ordeal. “*TWHF* a more complex version of *Dymer*”].
- J.M. Chard, “Some Elements of Myth and Mysticism in C.S. Lewis’s Novel *Till We Have Faces*”, *Mythlore* 5.2 (1978) 15-18.  
[“face” = total integrated personality; discusses the significance of names and symbols; certain themes elaborated: death/re-birth, fertility/sterility, alchemical images].
- V.V. Chennell, “*Till We Have Faces*”, *English Journal*, 65:1 (1976) 67-8.  
[use as teaching myth; “relevance of mythology today”].
- R. Chervin, “Paganism and Christianity: A Commentary on C.S. Lewis’ Novel *Till We Have Faces*”, *Faith and Reason* 14 (1988) 243-53. [\*L]  
[dialectic: “between primitive religion (the pagan ‘thesis’), Greek philosophy (the pagan intellectual ‘antithesis’), and Christianity (the transformed ‘synthesis’) ... It is Psyche who begins to understand that “the dark primitive rites of sacrifice might be combined with the philosophical idea of goodness”].
- J. Christopher, “The Labors of Psyche: A Sorting of Events”, *CSLBull* 7:1 (November 1975) 1-3.

- [begins with reviews favourable and unfavourable; deals with reader's expectations by pointing out similar themes in *Miracles*, *GD*, *4L*; not a Christian retelling, but how God reveals himself to a pre-Christian audience].
- J. Como, "Till We Have Faces: A Preface to Comprehension", *CSLBull* 7:2 (December 1975) 1-3.  
[not Lewis's usual sort of fiction; de-mythologizing].
  - J. Como, "Disobedience and Self-Discovery: A Search for Meaning in *TWHF*". *CSLBull* (Oct.-Dec. 1999)
  - D.D. Elgin, "True and False Myth in C.S. Lewis's *Till We Have Faces*", *South Central Bulletin* 41:4 (1981) 98-101. [\*L]  
["Lewis portrays Orual, Fox, and Bardia as attractively rational and Ungit as repulsively mystical. When the characters reveal, in the stunning conclusion, that Ungit's way represents true myth and Orual's false, Lewis establishes the nature and demands of the Christian God"].
  - K. Filmer, "The Masks of Lilith: A Comparison of C.S. Lewis's Reading of George MacDonald's *Lilith* and *Till We Have Faces*", *CSLBull* 19:3 (1988) 1-5. [\*L]  
["Lewis saw the main lesson of *Lilith* as the need to die to self to be truly oneself and illustrated this in *TWHF*. The character of Ungit, like Lilith, is the 'somehow spoiled' female image of Nature"]
  - K. Filmer, "Neither Here nor There: The Spirit of Place in George MacDonald's *Lilith* and Lewis' *Till We Have Faces*", *Mythlore* 16.1 (1989) 9-12.  
[discusses the setting (place) of *Lilith* and Glome; both belong to "other world", full of riddles and paradoxes; both are places of Death; discusses Lilith as Ungit]
  - D.H. Fitzgerald, "Themes of Joy and Substitution in the Works of C.S. Lewis and Charles Williams", *CSLBull* 12:3 (1981) 1-9.  
[in CW's *Descent into Hell* there are two dramas of ascent and descent, in one a character takes on another's fear; discusses CSL on this 'doctrine' of CW; *TWHF* is more complicated as both sisters take on burdens for each other].
  - John Gough, "Rivalry, Rejection, and Recovery: variations of the Cinderella story", *Children's Literature in Education* 21 (1990) 99-107.  
[studies various versions of the Cinderella-story, especially in children's and young persons' literature; mentions *TWHF* on 104-5].
  - N. G. Gussman, "*TWHF*: a key-word concordance", *CSLBull* 23.10/11 (1992) 11-16 and 23.12/24.1 (1992) 11-16.
  - H.C. Hangar, "The Excellent Absurdity: Substitution and Co-inherence in C.S. Lewis and Charles Williams", *Mythlore* 9.4 (1983) 14-18  
[discusses "co-inherence" in *THS* and "substitution" in *TWHF*; Orual has her identity in/through others; Psyche is scapegoat and bride; ugliness of Orual = her possessiveness; "through painful substitution a life (or death) of co-inherent

- nature has come true for Orual”].
- M. Hannay, “C.S. Lewis’s Theory of Mythology”, *Mythlore* 1 (1969) [\*]  
[discusses justice v. mercy, CW’s ‘doctrine’ of substitution, and Orual as Ungit; “only an ugly woman with a bitter heart”; Psyche as “Christ-figure” who brings beauty and healing”; “Orual is Everyman seen through God’s eyes”].
  - M. Hannay, “ ‘Surprised by Joy’: C.S. Lewis’s Changing Attitudes Toward Women”, *Mythlore* 4.1 (1976) 15-20.  
[discusses how much Lewis has changed; enters into a woman’s personality; “Orual was wise, valiant and merciful”].
  - R. Holyer, “The Epistemology of C.S. Lewis’s *Till We Have Faces*” *Anglican Theological Review* 70 (1988) 233-55.  
[weaves together many epistemological themes; two questions lurk beneath the text, (1) how do we know the existence and nature of God, (2) are gods good or evil? Fear and Joy as avenues to belief; CSL’s use of metaphysics in the novel].
  - G. Hood, “Husbands and gods as Shadowbrutes: Beauty and the Beast from Apuleius to C.S. Lewis”, *Mythlore* 15.2 (1988) 33-43.  
[examines Love (*amor*) in Apuleius and then other tales in world literature for the same theme; usually the male is a “beast” and the woman redeems him through love; but CSL uses a different tension; discusses the scene between the Priest and the Fox].
  - G. Hood, “Heroic Orual and the tasks of Psyche”, *Mythlore* 27.3-4 (2009) 43-82.  
[discusses the theme of transformation, in this case that of Orual (neither physically nor spiritually beautiful) into Psyche. Examines the moral behaviour of both Orual and Psyche, and compares the tasks as related by Apuleius and CSL].
  - A. Howard, “*Till We Have Faces* and its Mythological and Literary Precursors”, *Mythlore* 4.3 (1977) 30-2.  
[two types of jealousy in Apuleius and *TWHF*, jealousy OF and jealousy FOR; in Apuleius it is the former, in CSL mostly (but not totally) the latter; in Apuleius the story is the maturation of Psyche, here it is the journey of a soul].
  - M. Hunt, “Pagan and Christian Faces in C.S. Lewis’s *Till We Have Faces*”, in *The Divine Face in Four Writers* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), chap. 6  
[A kind of transparency or revelatory potential is attributed to texts that allow readers to discern in human encounters the forgiving and caring face of a gracious God.]
  - C. Keefe, “Mystic Experience in *Till We Have Faces*”, *CSLBull* 7:1 (November 1975) 4-7.  
[uses the four mystic states as defined by William James and shows how they operate for both Psyche and Orual in *TWHF*: ineffability, noetic quality, transiency, passivity; stops short of attributing this consciously to CSL].

- Clyde S. Kilby, “Tolkien, Lewis, and Williams”, in *Mythicon I Proceedings*, ed. Glen Goodknight, (Los Angeles: Mythopoeic Society, 1971) 3-4.  
[“*TWHF*, which Lewis and many others regard as his best book, is essentially mythic in quality”].
- K. Koch, “*Till We Have Faces*”, *Chronicle of the Portland C.S. Lewis Society* 13:3 (1984) 2-7. [\*L]  
[“In the novel, Lewis changes the plot of the Cupid and Psyche myth and adapts it for the doctrine of transference where Orual sees herself united with everyone. The novel demonstrates Lewis’s changing attitude toward women].
- G. Kranz, “Amor und Psyche: Metamorphose eines Mythos bei C.S. Lewis”, *Arcadia: Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft* 4 (1969) 285-99. [\*]
- D. Landrum, “Three Bridge-Builders: Priest-Craft in *Till We Have Faces*”, *Mythlore* 22.4 (2000) 59-67.  
[examines the priests in *TWHF* – the old priest is ‘holy’, courageous and loyal to Ungit – unimpressed by logic – at the same time can be ruthless – Arnorn is rational, pragmatic, and ‘modern’ – tension between ritualism and rationalism—the third priest is that of Istra who can be ‘childish’ and naïve, but is devoted to the “sacred story”]
- K. Lindskoog, “C. S. Lewis: Reactions from Women”, *Mythlore* 3 (1976) 18-20.  
[details of the publication of the novel; relation to Joy Davidman]
- K. Lindskoog, “Getting it Together: C.S. Lewis and the two Hemispheres of Knowing”, *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 3:4 (1975) 290-3; also printed at *Mythlore* 6.1 (1979) 43-5.  
[polarity between reason and imagination]
- K. Lindskoog, “Ungit and Orual: Facts, Mysteries, and Epiphanies”, *CSLBull* 31.8-8 (2000) 1-6.  
[Explains “Ungit” as coming from Latin *unguo* “anoint”), Orual from *oruxis* (“digging”); Ungit is an example of the earth-womb archetype, cites Lewis’s poem “Break, Sun, my Crusted Earth” and the ending of *The Great Divorce* – both describe “an encounter with divinity himself”.]
- P.W. Macky, “Appeasing the Gods in C.S. Lewis’s *Till We Have Faces*”, *Seven: An Anglo-American Literary Review* 7 (1986) 77-89.  
[looks at the part of the story where Psyche’s sacrifice appeases the god’s wrath; uses parallels from Greek myth (Iphigeneia) and the Bible to elucidate; finds two versions of the sacrifice (by the Priest and by the Fox after enlightenment, the latter’s is more correct; Psyche’s self-sacrifice “becomes the means by which the god’s good will to the people achieves fruition”].
- Susan McCaslin, “A Critical Study of C.S. Lewis’ *Till We Have Faces*”, *Cruix* 15:3 (1979) 3-8. [\*L]  
[“The lives of Orual and Psyche can be seen in terms of spiritual rebirth

analogous to the Christian experience ... In this the novel is particularly Christian because it concerns the regeneration of both body and soul at a spiritual level of consciousness”].

- T.S. Miller, “The Pearl Maiden’s Psyche: the Middle English Pearl and the allegorical-visionary impulse in *Till We Have Faces*”, *Mythlore* 30.1-2 (2011) 43-76. [although CSL denied that *TWHF* was an “allegory”, Miller employs a close-text reading of the mediaeval poem, *The Pearl*, to find allegorical elements from that poem in Lewis’s novel: river, seeing, jealousy, dreams].
- D.T. Myers, “Browsing the Glome Library”, *Seven (VII)* 19 (2002) 63-76. [an earlier version of a chapter in her book on *TWHF* (see VII)– examines the ramifications of the Fox’s choice of reading: love, conversion, and *Sehnsucht* – Myers identifies “Virtue ... toil and travail” with a poem by Simonides; it is much more likely to be Aristotle – the choice of books in the library has three functions: foreshadow Part II, reveal Orual’s character, reinforce love, virtue and *Sehnsucht*]
- Setsuko Nakao, “A Reading of *Till We Have Faces*”, *Sophia English Studies* 2 (1977) 53-67. [\*]
- N. Nehemias, “Religion, Love and Life in *TWHF*”, *CSLBull* 34, July-Aug. 2003.
- J.W. Neuleib, “The Empty Face of Evil”, *Christianity Today* 19 (1975) 14-16. [“puts God in the dock; central problem of novel = central problem of life, are the gods fantasy or reality”; “Orual cannot find mercy in the faces of her gods”; “worst kind of evil is the wrong kind of love”; “look inward through the dark glass and see our real faces beyond”].
- W.D. Norwood Jr., “C.S. Lewis’ Portrait of Aphrodite”, *Southern Quarterly* 8 (1970) 237-72. [lengthy summary of plot; deals with analysis of Hart, Fuller, Kilby, Moorman, Reilly; Ungit is one face of God as Love; Ungit too has various faces; CSL and Naturalism and Supernaturalism; three principles of Christian doctrine are important here: death/rebirth cycle, co-inherence, substitution].
- S. Okiyama, “*Till We Have Faces*: a book review”, *Lamp-post of the Southern California C.S. Lewis Society* 15.1 (1991) 15-20. [the central moment of the novel occurs when Orual must face herself as Ungit; applies Jungian process of individuation; discusses the motif of sacrifice in the story; “reason and empirical methodology is not enough”].
- N.L. Patterson, “The Host of Heaven: Astrological and Other Images of Divinity in the Fantasies of C.S. Lewis”, *Mythlore* 7.4 (1981) 18-20. [discusses the imagery of the West Wind (spirit) and Cupid/Eros as son of Love]
- N. Patterson, “The Holy House of Ungit”, *Mythlore* 21.4 (1997) 4-15. [explores the role of Ungit in the novel – the original statue is stone, dark, and “sits” – relates Ungit to various aspects Aphrodite in her various incarnations –

the house of Ungit has deep connections with the earth and the underground – Orual claims that “I am Ungit” but is told “you also are Psyche”, her final self-realisation]

- L. Pieper, “Historical Imagination in *TWHF*”, *CSLBull* 35, Sept.-Oct. 2004
- G. Reader, “I am Orual”, *Pilgrimage: Journal of the Toronto C.S. Lewis Society*, 14.2 (2007) 4-10.  
[personal reflections on the novel, with special attention to the themes of personalities, masks, and mirrors – “eventually the masks and veils so overwhelm the truth of who we really are that to speak of being loved or known, or hated and unknown, comes to have no meaning whatsoever”].
- A. F. Reddy SJ, “*Till We Have Faces: ‘An Epistle to the Greeks’*”, *Mosaic* 13 (1980) 153-64.  
[a first-rate study of religion v. rationalism in *TWHF*; Greeks attempted to explain everything away with words (Fox), hence Orual’s testament is sent to the Greeks at the end; “people do not want art but life” (157); CSL demonstrates the validity of myth; CSL is telling the myth that would be re-told by Apuleius; cites *God in the Dock*].
- Laura A. Ruskin, “Three Good Mothers: Galadriel, Psyche, and Sybil Coningsby”, *Mythicon I Proceedings*, ed. Glen Goodknight, (Los Angeles: Mythopoeic Society, 1971) 12-14.  
[in Jung’s “collective unconscious” Psyche is “World Soul” or “Anima Mundi”]
- M. Sammons, “Christian Doctrines ‘Transposed’ in C.S. Lewis’s *Till We Have Faces*”, *Mythlore* 7.1 (1980) 31-5.  
[Christian doctrines as used imaginatively in the format of the novel: Fall of Man (Psyche is what could have been), its results (veil symbol), redemption (image of sacrifice), relationship with Christ (bridal metaphor), and potential (“you also shall be Psyche”)].
- M. Sammons, “The God Within: Reason and Its Riddle in C.S. Lewis’s *Till We Have Faces*”, *Christian Scholar’s Review* 6 (1976) 127-39. [\*L]  
[“The novel depicts three different worldviews: sacrificial primitive religion and superstition, Greek rationalism, and faith in an unseen god. Orual and her rationalist viewpoint are the center of the story; the central image is the veil, which is both intellectual and spiritual”].
- P.J. Schakel, “A Retelling Within a Myth Retold: The Priest of Essur and Lewisian Mythopoeics”, *Mythlore* 9:4 (1983) 10-12.  
[why “retell” the myth? CSL found no awe or wonder or anything “numinous” in Apuleius; discusses Lewis’ early attempts; what was missing was “sacrifice”; story is a divine hint in pre-Xian times; brings “past natural or pagan truth to its completion”].

- P.J. Schakel, “Seeing and Knowing: The Epistemology of C.S. Lewis’s *Till We Have Faces*”, *Seven (VII)* 4 (1983) 84-97.  
[discusses Stoic views of seeing and knowing; Lewis on reason and faith, imagination, and meaning; myth as avenue to truth].
- A. Searle, “Narrative, Metaphor, and Myth, in C.S. Lewis’s Testimonial Novel *Till We Have Faces*”, in F.C. Fagundes & I.M.F. Blayer (eds.), *Oral and Written Narratives and Cultural Identity* (Bern/Pieterlin: Peter Lang, 2007).
- Chad Shrock, “A Myth of Hubris in *Till We Have Faces*”, *Seven (VII)* 26 (2009) 13-32.  
[Orual sees herself as a “tragic heroine”; reads the novel as a Greek tragedy turning on “hubris” of main character; Orual must learn the true conception of the divine; four-fold process: gods give pain, then grace, her cynical misinterpretation, re-affirmation of her belief that the gods are cruel].
- S.R. Shumway, “‘Shifting Change’: Liminality and Gender in *Till We Have Faces*”, *Seven (VII)* 30 (2013) 93-104.  
[Shumway begins with the figure of Tarin, who appears at two key points in the novel, and from his castration moves on to the theme of gender identity and the confusion of male and female roles. Orual tries to define her identity in terms of gender, only to find out that identity is not gender-based].
- John T. Stahl, “The Nature and Function of Myth in the Christian Thought of C.S. Lewis”, *CSLBull* 7 (January 1976) 3-8. [\*L]  
[“His most superb myth is *TWHF*, whose central theme is that ‘what we are is what we become by what we do day in and day out’”].
- Rob Starr, “*Till We Have Faces*”, *Chronicle of the Portland C.S. Lewis Society* 4:1 (Jan./Feb. 1975) 2-5.  
[two threads: “Orual’s outward righteousness and passion for truth and her subtle inward sins].
- J.J. Steigenga, “Through a Veil of Tears: Reflections on C.S. Lewis’s *Till We Have Faces*”, *Lamp-Post of the Southern California C.S. Lewis Society* 7:2 (August 1983) 13-15, 25.  
[CSL writing from a “distinctly Christian world and life view”; uses vantage point of developmental psychology + a Christian theological system; the novel works because we feel Orual’s situation in our own lives].
- W. Stephenson & M. Stephenson, “Structure and Audience: C.S. Lewis’s *Till We Have Faces*”, *The Lamp-Post of the Southern California C.S. Lewis Society* 21.1 (1997) 4-10.  
[examines *TWHF* in the context of post-modernism – “unambiguous rendering of the truth” – the aim is truth not art – in Part II Orual (and the reader) is forced to examine own egotism – opposes Holbrook’s and Manlove’s reading of ambiguity in the novel – suggests that Orual ~ Or-you-all” – not an ambiguous but a positive ending]

- I.C. Storey, “Between Myth and Reality: C.S. Lewis’ *Till We Have Faces* as Historical Fiction”, in J.P. Bews *et al.* (eds.), *Celebratio: Thirtieth Anniversary Essays at Trent University* (Peterborough ON: Trent University 1998) 154-64. [examines the extent to which *TWHF* falls into the recognised genre of historical fiction, observing that we are never told where Glome is, when the story takes place, and that few historical personages and events are referred to in the novel].
- I.C. Storey, “Classical Allusions in C.S. Lewis’s *Till We Have Faces*”, *The Chronicle of the Oxford C.S. Lewis Society* 4.2 (2007) 5-20. [a shorter and earlier version of the paper published in Travers’s collection of essays – see X above].
- Dale Sullivan, “Stoic Rationality and Divine Madness in *Till We Have Faces*”, *Seven (VII)* 26 (2009) 40-52. [*TWHF* is a critique of Stoic philosophy; reason and self-control may provide some sort of comfort, but ultimate wholeness and healing come from divine madness].
- J.H. Timmerman, “The Epistemology of C.S. Lewis: Reason and Belief in *Till We Have Faces*”, *Religion in Life* 46 (1977) 497-508. [“tale of a pursuit of a vision”; three areas of approach - literary, philosophical & theological; epistemological - what is fantasy for Orual is reality for Psyche; finds Platonic themes in *TWHF*; reason not the sole way to truth; Ungit “is a figure or type of religious longing of all mankind”].
- E. Tixier, “‘On the Stairs of the Great Gate’: C.S. Lewis’s Imagination and the Quest for Faith in *Till We Have Faces*”, *Seven (VII)* 33 (2016) 23-40. [the theme of “seeing and not-seeing” in Lewis’s fiction, especially as applied to Orual and her versions of true reality; brings in parallels with Robin’s experiences in Lewis’s short-story Light.
- B.M. Travis, “The Imbedded Bible in *Till We Have Faces*”, *Lamp-Post of the Southern California C.S. Lewis Society* 6:3 (1982) 11-14. [Lewis uses obvious scriptural significance (Bride, Holy Tree), but in other cases imbedded quotations and situational references give a flavour of the King James Bible and add a taste of authenticity; CSL did not over-use the technique].
- J.C. Ulreich, “Prophets, Priests, and Poets: Towards a definition of Religious fiction”, *Cithara* 22.2 (1983) 3-31.
- E.K. Wagner, “Divine surgeons at work: the presence and purpose of the dream vision in *Till We Have Faces*”, *Mythlore* 32.2 (2014) 15-32. [studies the role of the dream in *TWHF* – the dream-vision in ancient texts (Macrobius) and mediaeval (*somnium*), and elsewhere in Lewis (*GD*) – examines the exchange between Orual and Psyche (“were you awake?”) – dream-visions in Part II allow Orual to reconcile her rational self with faith – notice that Orual sends her memoir to the rationally based Greeks]
- T.R. Watson, “Enlarging Augustinian Systems: C.S. Lewis’ *The Great Divorce* and *Till We Have Faces*”, *Renascence* 46.3 (1994) 163-75. [begins with a summary of Augustine’s *City of God* and the concept of true love (*agape*); moves to a preliminary discussion of *The Great Divorce*; studies *TWHF*



from an Augustinian basis; only in communion with God do we achieve true being; Orual does not lose her love for Psyche, but it is purified and now centered in its true source.]

- G.L. Williams, “*Till We Have Faces: A Journey of Recovery*”, *The Lamp-Post of the Southern California C.S. Lewis Society* 18.4 (1994) 5-15.  
[explores the novel from the viewpoint of the dysfunctional family; Orual’s book can be seen as her attempt to work out her experiences; explores ‘rules’ of silence, denial, isolation; does this work for CSL?].
- M. Wilmot, “A Brief Analysis of C.S. Lewis’ *Till We Have Faces*”, *The Lamp-Post of the Southern California C.S. Lewis Society* 15.3 (1991) 3-12.  
[health and beauty (Psyche) v. sin and pathology (Orual); discusses the picture of need-love and the illusion that Orual has created and maintained; “our own injustice that makes us withdraw from God so self-righteously”; CSL as therapist or spiritual director].
- R.C. Wood, “The Baptized Imagination: C.S. Lewis’s Fictional Apologetics”, *Christian Century* August 30 (1995) 812-19.  
[studies *TWHF* as a work of imagination which ties together all the themes central to Lewis’s life and beliefs; novel is about man’s hunger for the holy and its expression through Joy; asks the question whether loving God means abandoning other loves; Orual learns how to surrender to the gods and turns from bitterness to gladness’]
- (no author), discussion of *TWHF*, *CSLBull* 1.6 (March 1970)
- (no author), “*Till We Have Faces*: report of the 73rd meeting”, *CSLBull* 7.1 (1975) 10-11.  
[a report of the meeting including a paper by J. Como and discussion by the members; topics raised were woman as *persona*, obsession with ugliness, the contrast and transition between the two parts, plot development, ‘doctrines’ of substitution and membership].
- (no author), “Orual’s complaint against the gods”, *CSLBull* 8.10 (1977) 8-16.  
[being a transcription of an impressive and imaginative production at the first CSL Weekend on 12-14.viii.77; after Orual’s accusation and her departure, another accusation is imagined in a formal court setting with prosecution, defense, and judges on the bench - “be it resolved that the gods ARE capricious, frivolous, cruel, and arbitrary, as charged in Orual’s complaint”].
- (no author), “Report of the 209th meeting, 13 March 1987”, *CSLBull* 18.5 (1987) 4-6.  
[an oral presentation by J. Como was followed by discussion; topics raised were four reasons why people dislike *TWHF* (obscurity, “not Lewis”, too dark, characters not believable)].
- (no author), “Report of the meeting of September 12, 1997”, *CSLBull* 28.9-10 (1997) 14.  
[a discussion of *TWHF*, led by J. Como; “triumph of *modern* fiction”; “by surprising, it disappoints”; panelists recorded reactions to teaching *TWHF* in

schools; floor discussion involved: unfamiliarity with classical references, obedience as the essence of Joy, “depiction of words as the mighty manifestation of the greedy Self”.]

- (no author), “Flannery O’Connor on *TWHF*”, *CSLBull* Jan.-Feb. 2022.

Revised 12 June 2023