THE PALGRAVE MACMILLAN
Animal Ethics Series

ANIMALS IN THE WRITINGS OF C. S. LEWIS

Michael J. Gilmour

The Palgrave Macmillan Animal Ethics Series

Aims of the Series

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in the ethics of our treatment of animals. Philosophers have led the way, and now a range of other scholars have followed from historians to social scientists. From being a marginal issue, animals have become an emerging issue in ethics and in multidisciplinary inquiry. This series will explore the challenges that Animal Ethics poses, both conceptually and practically, to traditional understandings of human-animal relations. Specifically, the Series will:

- provide a range of key introductory and advanced texts that map out ethical positions on animals;
- publish pioneering work written by new, as well as accomplished, scholars;
- produce texts from a variety of disciplines that are multidisciplinary in character or have multidisciplinary relevance.

More information about this series at
http://www.springer.com/series/14421

Michael J. Gilmour

Animals in the Writings of C. S. Lewis

palgrave
macmillan

Michael J. Gilmour
Providence University College
Otterburne, MB, Canada

The Palgrave Macmillan Animal Ethics Series
ISBN 978-1-137-55297-6 ISBN 978-1-137-55298-3 (eBook)
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-55298-3

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017948712

Cover credit: J Marshall—Tribaleye Images/Alamy Stock Photo

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Macmillan Publishers Ltd
The registered company address is: The Campus, 4 Crinan Street, London, N1 9XW, United Kingdom

To mom,
with love

Series Editors' Preface

This is a new book series for a new field of inquiry: Animal Ethics.

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in the ethics of our treatment of animals. Philosophers have led the way, and now a range of other scholars have followed from historians to social scientists. From being a marginal issue, animals have become an emerging issue in ethics and in multidisciplinary inquiry.

In addition, a rethink of the status of animals has been fuelled by a range of scientific investigations which have revealed the complexity of animal sentiency, cognition and awareness. The ethical implications of this new knowledge have yet to be properly evaluated, but it is becoming clear that the old view that animals are mere things, tools, machines or commodities cannot be sustained ethically.

But it is not only philosophy and science that are putting animals on the agenda. Increasingly, in Europe and the USA, animals are becoming a political issue as political parties vie for the "green" and "animal" vote. In turn, political scientists are beginning to look again at the history of political thought in relation to animals, and historians are beginning to revisit the political history of animal protection.

As animals grow as an issue of importance, so there have been more collaborative academic ventures leading to conference volumes, special journal issues, indeed new academic animal journals as well. Moreover, we have witnessed the growth of academic courses, as well as university posts, in Animal Ethics, Animal Welfare, Animal Rights, Animal Law, Animals and Philosophy, Human-Animal Studies, Critical Animal Studies, Animals and Society, Animals in Literature, Animals and Religion—tangible signs that a new academic discipline is emerging.

"Animal Ethics" is the new term for the academic exploration of the moral status of the non-human—an exploration that explicitly involves a focus on what we owe animals morally, and which also helps us to understand the influences—social, legal, cultural, religious and political—that legitimate animal abuse. This series explores the challenges that Animal Ethics poses, both conceptually and practically, to traditional understandings of human-animal relations.

The series is needed for three reasons: (i) to provide the texts that will service the new university courses on animals; (ii) to support the increasing number of students studying and academics researching in animal related fields and (iii) because there is currently no book series that is a focus for multidisciplinary research in the field.

Specifically, the series will

- provide a range of key introductory and advanced texts that map out ethical positions on animals;
- publish pioneering work written by new, as well as accomplished, scholars; and
- produce texts from a variety of disciplines that are multidisciplinary in character or have multidisciplinary relevance.

The new Palgrave Macmillan Series on Animal Ethics is the result of a unique partnership between Palgrave Macmillan and the Ferrater Mora Oxford Centre for Animal Ethics. The series is an integral part of the mission of the Centre to put animals on the intellectual agenda by facilitating academic research and publication. The series is also a natural complement to one of the Centre's other major projects, the *Journal of Animal Ethics*. The Centre is an independent "think tank" for

the advancement of progressive thought about animals and is the first Centre of its kind in the world. It aims to demonstrate rigorous intellectual enquiry and the highest standards of scholarship. It strives to be a world-class centre of academic excellence in its field.

We invite academics to visit the Centre's website www.oxfordanimalethics.com and to contact us with new book proposals for the series.

Andrew Linzey and Priscilla N. Cohn
General Editors

Preface

On the opening page of the 2015 novel *Fifteen Dogs* by André Alexis, we find the gods Apollo and Hermes sitting in a Toronto tavern. As is often the case with barroom conversations, theirs takes a philosophical turn. Apollo insists humans are no better or worse than other creatures, and even if they think themselves superior, they are not. Hermes wonders what might happen if animals had human intelligence. And then it gets interesting as Apollo wagers a year's servitude that misery is the likely outcome. The gods make it happen, giving human intelligence and language to fifteen dogs in a nearby veterinary clinic, and for the rest of the novel, we follow them through the highs and lows, blessings and curses of their newly-gifted existence. It's a bit like Jonathan Swift's horses in the Land of the Houyhnhnms. *Fifteen Dogs* also holds up an unlikely mirror to readers, forcing them to critique their own "pack" behaviour. In that sense, it's about us, not dogs. But it's more than that. To look at the world through non-human eyes is oddly disorienting. We cheer for the dogs (the good ones, at least) and are saddened by their hurts and deaths. The fantasy awakens emotion, if even for a moment. Maybe we hear the neighbour's dog barking as we read. Maybe the boundaries between fiction and nonfiction blur a little. Animals, real

animals, feel pain too. Animals, real animals, experience fear, joy, love and sadness. Animals are social beings.

I fancy the dog-loving C. S. Lewis would have enjoyed this novel. Not only did he tell his own story of fifteen talking dogs (see Chapter 11 of *The Last Battle*) but he was also a classicist so quite at home with stories about the mischievous gods of antiquity. He was a poet too so would have enjoyed following the dogs' progress as they discover language and its figurative capacities. (The canine poet Prince would surely be his favourite!) Lewis is best known for his own humanlike animals, of course, and his fascination with this literary device started early. He not only enjoyed reading "the anthropomorphized beasts of nursery literature" when a child, as he puts it in his memoir, but also wrote his own stories, complete with drawings. A collection of juvenilia is now in print.

What started when a young boy continued into early adulthood. When he was only twenty years old on 20 March, 1919, he published his first book. *Spirits in Bondage: A Cycle of Lyrics* failed to establish the young writer as a major poet but in hindsight, it is a harbinger of a prolific output and a fascinating glimpse into his intellectual formation a full decade before his conversion to Christianity. Already at this stage of his career, on the first page of the first poem, in the first part of this three-part collection, we find Lewis still contemplating nature, and not only that, but contemplating it in theological terms. "Satan Speaks" (the first of two poems so titled) includes a series of first person singular self-descriptors by the dark narrator. Satan identifies himself with many things, including death, lust, war and

> … the spider making her net,
> I am the beast with jaws blood-wet.

Predation is a subject Lewis thought about often. Twenty years later in *The Problem of Pain* (1940) he returns to it, still associating violence in nature with spiritual darkness. The only difference was that he now believed in the existence of those devilish powers.

As a child, as a young adult nonbeliever and as a middle-aged Christian, C. S. Lewis marvelled at the teeming life filling our world, and that is the topic of this book. He loved animals. He loved to write

about animals. And unlike many of his contemporaries, he insisted they are worthy subjects for study within Christian theological and ethical discourses.

Relatively few theologians and communities of faith take animals seriously as a matter of religious concern. My aim is to introduce the already-familiar C. S. Lewis as an animal thinker who invites a specifically Christian response to animals. It is a study of Lewis's writing but the motive behind it relates more to that last point. If animals are not a high priority for Christians, there is strategic value in recovering the insights of respected luminaries from the church's history who articulate an animal-friendly interpretation of the faith. From Jesus's remark about sparrows (Matthew 10:29) through to Pope Francis's encyclical *Laudato Si': On Care for Our Common Home* (2015), there are many resources within the tradition urging consideration of animals. C. S. Lewis is one of them.

Judging by his books, letters, poems, diary and the anecdotes of friends, animals occupied his thoughts and inspired his art. No wonder. They seemed to follow him everywhere he went. Pets indoors and wildlife on the property of his Headington Quarry home provided entertainments and distractions. It was no different in his professional life. There were mice—which he refused to trap, he is careful to point out—in his Magdalen College rooms in New Building, and whenever he looked out the windows of those rooms, he likely saw the herd of deer that roamed the grounds. (The cover photo of this book shows one of their descendants. That's New Building in the background.) For more than twenty years he listened to the "click click" of their antlers, as he puts it on more than one occasion.

We read his books for all kinds of reasons. His poetry is often beautiful, his scholarship insightful, his theologizing and apologetics accessible and thought provoking, his novels entertaining. But his writings also urge us to think about animals. Like the Alexis novel, his stories disorient at times. Under Lewis's spell, we become a wee bit less self-absorbed and more attentive to the non-human other.

He is also, I realize, a polarizing figure. Those who know the books seem to love or loathe them. There seems to be no middle ground and those who comment on them often "take sides." Hagiographers and iconoclasts. I try to avoid these extremes. I admire and enjoy reading

Lewis—that much will be obvious—but this does not mean I agree with everything he writes. But this is the case with many authors, perhaps especially those removed from us in time. I cringe at the anti-Semitism in *The Merchant of Venice* and *Oliver Twist* but still read Shakespeare and Dickens. Censorship is too blunt a tool when it comes to literature. Appreciation does not preclude criticism. I mention this because I do not always distinguish my opinions from Lewis's in what follows. I try to follow rabbit trails of the *leporidae* variety in this book, leaving most others to the side for another occasion.

A few words of thanks are in order. Andrew Linzey, as is often the case in theological animal studies, pointed the way with an important paper on Lewis and animals delivered to the C. S. Lewis Society at Oxford University and later published in the *Anglican Theological Review*. I am grateful he gave me the opportunity to tackle this subject for the Palgrave Macmillan Animal Ethics Series even though he had designs on doing it himself. A word of thanks is also due to my niece Kate Henderson, a voracious reader who kindly helped track the animals of Narnia. Kyla, as always, was a partner in the adventure. Aravis to my Shasta, Jill to my Eustace. And I happily dedicate this book to my mother, Gayle Gilmour. A lifelong reader who passed along that most rewarding of gifts—the habit of escaping into good books.

Otterburne, MB, Canada Michael J. Gilmour

Contents

1

Introduction: The Genesis Palimpsest

And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven. And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind: and God saw that it was good…. And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so. And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that it was good.

—Genesis 1:20–21, 24–25[1]

In Kenneth Grahame's *The Wind in the Willows* (1908) we read of a gaoler whose daughter enjoys animals. She is a kind-hearted girl who pities the miserable Toad, and she says to her father, "'I can't bear to see that poor beast so unhappy, and getting so thin! You let me have the managing of him. You know how fond of animals I am. I'll make him eat from my hand, and sit up, and do all sorts of things.'"[2]

C. S. Lewis was ten years old when Kenneth Grahame published his story about Toad Hall, Mole, Badger, and their many friends. We

M.J. Gilmour, *Animals in the Writings of C. S. Lewis*, The Palgrave Macmillan Animal Ethics Series, DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-55298-3_1

do not know when he first read *The Wind in the Willows* but clearly it was a favourite. Older brother Warnie knew it too as their correspondence many years later indicates. "I suppose I'm not allowed to write to you about the weather in England," the adult Lewis wrote to his soldier brother in February 18, 1940. Nothing "beyond saying that I endorse Mr. Badger's view and am more thoroughly sick of all weather and all news every day."[3] Badger insists the only way to find peace and tranquillity is to live underground: "'No builders, no tradesmen, no remarks passed on you by fellows looking over your wall, and, above all, no *weather*.'" Mr. Badger belabours the point: "'I *hate* a draught myself,'" so "'underground … that's my idea of *home*!'"[4] Enough said. Both brothers knew the story so a mere allusion is a fitting grumble about English winter.

The story of the gaoler's daughter and Toad Hall presents us with twin themes familiar to Lewis from an early age, and formative to his own imaginative writings. Animals are part of his stories, yes, but so too are human interactions with them. There is something of the gaoler's daughter in Elwin Ransom or the narrator of his early poem "The Ass," characters concerned for the wellbeing of animals and troubled by the avoidable harms they endure at the hands of the careless and cruel.

Reading Lewis with attention to his views on animals takes us into the whole of his collected works though with an emphasis on his creative and religious writing. It is lamentable he left no systematic summary of his ideas on the topic. Instead, what he we have is a habit of the mind. Animals are part of this world so naturally fitting subjects for his art (which reflects the artist's environment) and his theology (which is the study of Creator and creation). This book focuses on this habitual inclusion of the nonhuman in his artistic and theological writing. There is risk involved. If C. S. Lewis left no full statement on the subject, there is a temptation to read too much into his work, or to place emphases where they do not belong. Lewis comments on this interpretive pitfall as it pertains to readings of John Milton's *Paradise Lost*. Studies of that poem tend to be combative, he observes: "Our whole study of the poem [becomes] a battle between us and the author in which we are trying to twist his work into a shape he never gave it, to make him use the loud pedal where he really used the soft, to force

into false prominence what he took in his stride, and to slur over what he actually threw into bold relief."[5] I suspect I overuse the loud pedal at times but take the lesson from this remark seriously: Proceed with caution.

Animals and Christian Theology?

This is an especially pressing caution for those whose research is agenda-driven, which I confess is the case here. Though I am interested in literary criticism and theology, this is primarily a study of animal ethics. As mentioned in the Preface, Christianity is typically silent on the place of animals and indifferent toward their treatment, but within this tradition there are remarkable exceptions. Christians as diverse as St. Francis of Assisi, Anne Brontë, and Albert Schweitzer—random examples who conveniently represent the church, the arts, and the academy, which is to say the contexts where we most often meet C. S. Lewis—question this *status quo*. These three have very little in common save an insistence that religious concern ought not be species specific. All life matters because God is the author of all life. Writers who remind us of this are often prophets in their hometown, ignored as often as not. Though regularly forced to wipe the dust off their feet, this is not evidence their message is unimportant.

As Lynn White, Jr. argues in an oft-cited essay,[6] Christianity is not friendly toward the environment or its animals, and indeed is frequently hostile for all manner of reasons. A half century later, a burgeoning bibliography in eco-theology and theologically grounded animal ethics attests to the emergence of serious conversations about these matters though it is fair to say neither are yet priorities for much of the Christian world.

There are many reasons for Christianity's general indifference to animals. For one thing, the status of animals in the Bible is ambiguous: God cares for fallen sparrows (Matthew 10:29) but accepts blood sacrifice; God rescues some animals in the flood but wipes out the rest (Genesis 6–9); Jesus insists his followers help a fallen ox (Luke 14:5) but allows thousands of pigs to drown in the sea (Mark 5:11–13).

For another, there are many examples of influential thinkers throughout the church's history who either relegate animals to the margins or exclude them from moral consideration altogether.[7] But the matter is not so simple as all that. Many others find the Bible saying just the opposite. They insist animals matter. How humanity treats them matters too.

To suggest otherwise is to make the same mistake as Job, chastised by God for his self-centredness. The divine speech that closes the book includes this rather humbling rhetorical question:

> Who hath divided a watercourse for the overflowing of waters, or a way for the lightning of thunder; To cause it to rain on the earth, where no man is; on the wilderness, wherein there is no man; To satisfy the desolate and waste ground; and to cause the bud of the tender herb to spring forth? (Job 38:25–27).

It is not all about Job. It is not even all about humanity—*to cause it to rain on the earth, where no man is; on the wilderness, wherein there is no man*. God's concern extends to all the earth, and all the life it sustains.

To suggest animals do not matter is also to make the same mistake as the prophet Jonah. Here too God rattles self-centredness, both the self-centredness of the man himself lamenting the loss of a shade-giving plant (Jonah 4:6–8), and the man as a representative Israelite bemoaning the mercy God extends to gentiles. The rebuke closing that biblical book insists the Creator's interest reaches beyond the individual, the nation, and even beyond *the species*: "should not I spare Nineveh, that great [gentile] city, wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; *and also much cattle*?" (Jonah 4:11; italics added).

C. S. Lewis's writings function in a similar way. Like Job and Jonah, readers of Lewis occasionally find themselves (gently?) chastened in conscience regarding that tendency to drift toward self-absorption. We see this in a short essay first published in 1943 in which he reminds readers they are a small part of something much, much larger. God did not make the spiral nebulae solely or chiefly so I might experience awe and bewilderment, he writes. And then, like the humbled Job, he adds:

> I have not the faintest idea why He made them; on the whole, I think it would be rather surprising if I had. As far as I understand the matter, Christianity is not wedded to an anthropocentric view of the universe as a whole.[8]

He then observes a dilemma facing readers of the Bible. The "folk-tale" form of Genesis potentially leads to the "impression" that humanity *is* the centre of creation but as seen, Job functions as an important correction and caution against this: "There are few places in literature where we are more sternly warned against making man the measure of all things than in the Book of Job."[9] This theme emerges in his fiction too. While on the planet Perelandra (Venus), Elwin Ransom wonders if that world is really and fully the possession of its rightful rulers. His musings perhaps owe something to the book of Job as well. "How could it be made for them [the Adam- and Eve-like King and Queen of the planet]," he wonders, "when most of it, in fact, was uninhabitable by them? Was not the very idea naïve and anthropomorphic in the highest degree?"[10]

Animals in Lewis Scholarship

Unlike many other topics, the study of Lewis's views on animals is not well-travelled road,[11] but there are some exceptions. Animals are everywhere in Lewis's writing, and by all accounts they loomed large in his personal life as well—one recent biography describes his household as an "eccentric Noah's ark"[12]—so it is no surprise the literature about the author and his work often mentions his interest in animals. Most often, those considering animals in Lewis's writing focus on their various literary functions. Doris T. Myers, for one, writes of Lewis's use of animals and mythological beings and what she calls their hieroglyphic properties. She notes a resemblance in this regard between his stories and George Orwell's *Animal Farm* (1945), a book Lewis admired. Commenting on *The Last Battle*, she discusses how attributes and personalities commonly associated with various species suit characters' behaviours in the story: a stupid donkey; spirited and noble horses;

loyal and excited dogs; an aloof cat; mice, rabbits, and squirrels that are gentle but helpless, and so on.[13]

Some approach animals in Lewis with attention to ethics,[14] and others still, with attention to animal ethics as a corollary of the religious life. Both categories are relatively rare.[15] Important also is the growing attention given to Lewis's views about nature more broadly. Matthew Dickerson and David O'Hara find in Lewis "a vision of the world brimming with life and goodness, full of purpose, rich with value, every part enmeshed in deep and ethical relations with every other part. His is a world of spirit—spirit dwelling in the trees, rivers, and stones, hovering over the deep and upon the mountains."[16]

Some of the biographies also supply important contexts for appreciating Lewis's writing about animals. Alister McGrath is helpful for treating his theological and literary projects within the trajectory of Lewis's development as a thinker and writer.[17] Commenting on the pervasive presence of animals in the Chronicles of Narnia, McGrath argues this is no mere reversion to a childhood play world as some suggest.[18] Instead, the Narnia adventures contest contemporary thought and behaviour, such as the "widespread acceptance of the practice of vivisection in laboratory experiments." To reduce the Narnia stories to childish fantasies overlooks his more serious intentions:

> It is easy to depict the Narnia novels as an infantile attempt to pretend that animals speak and experience emotion. Yet Lewis's narrative mounts a deceptively subtle critique of certain Darwinian ways of understanding the place of humanity within the natural order, and offers a corrective. Lewis's portrayal of animal characters in Narnia is partly a protest against shallow assertions of humanity's right to do what it pleases with nature.[19]

This makes more sense than theories proposing the Narnia books were simple escapism or a frivolous lark. Lewis's writings regularly challenge contemporary ideas in a variety of genres, so it is reasonable to expect the Chronicles and other fiction to do the same. Furthermore, Lewis never really left his love of fantasy behind, as the escapist hypothesis suggests. Narnia is not a return to childhood imagination because he

never really left it, as he insists in his poem "Impenitence" (discussed in Chap. 3).

Strategies for Reading Lewis on Animals

Lewis is usually candid about his deficiencies when writing about religious matters. We see this in *Mere Christianity* where he admits leaving certain topics to the side because the subject at hand "involve[s] points of high Theology or even of ecclesiastical history, which ought never to be treated except by real experts. I should have been out of my depth in such waters: more in need of help myself than able to help others."[20] *The Problem of Pain* includes a similar caveat. Here he self-identifies as a non-specialist, freely admitting "any real theologian" reading these pages "will very easily see that they are the work of a layman and an amateur."[21] "This is not a work of scholarship," he tells us in the first sentence of *Reflections on the Psalms*, his only book focused entirely on the Bible. "I write for the unlearned about things in which I am unlearned myself."[22] When addressing a room full of priests in training at Westcott House in Cambridge in 1959, he introduced his talk announcing himself as a sheep telling shepherds what only a sheep can tell: "And now I start my bleating."[23] If anything, this characteristic humility is even more emphatic when he speculates about animals: "I am now going to suggest—though with great readiness to be set right by real theologians—that there may be …."[24]

Though not a formally trained theologian or biblical scholar, Root, Linzey, McGrath, and others maintain he makes useful, even if imperfect contributions to Christian conversations about animals. I begin with that collective insight and examine what it means to say Lewis thinks Christianly about the nonhuman. The result is admittedly quirky. Because he did not confine his ideas to any one style of writing, and because it was not a concern addressed during any one period of his career, and because—with St. Francis, Brontë, and Schweitzer—he had interests in the church, the arts, and the academy, I tend to wander through the Lewis canon rather than follow a rigidly fixed route. I pursue themes wherever they appear rather than limit myself to one

book or genre or time of writing. Even so, it is not an entirely haphazard approach. A few reading strategies guide the process.

To begin with, I take from McGrath the assumption that Lewis's animal writing is not disconnected from biographical considerations and his historical moment, and from Linzey and Root that his writings across a range of genres are theologically consequential, even if not uniformly successful. With them all, I take for granted his art bleeds into philosophy and worldview. Consider Lewis's poem "The Late Passenger." On one level, it is an artistic consideration of the unicorn of medieval bestiaries but it is also much more than that.[25] This story about Noah's sons refusing to save the unicorn from the approaching flood is also a picture of humanity's rejection of Christ ("He came unto his own, and his own received him not" [John 1:11]) and, at least indirectly, humanity's inhospitality toward the nonhuman. The other animals are on board and the door closed but Japhet espies one more approaching, alone. It knocks but Ham does not answer, leaving it to swim or drown because, he insists, the ark is overcrowded already. Not only that but to add one more passenger is to add more work for them. Their only concern is for themselves. This great discourtesy angers Noah who sees the insulted creature turning away and taking flight. Noah then wonders to what "stable" and "manger" it might go. Because of his sons' churlishness, the ark sails without the noble unicorn. Lewis's hostile ark becomes a story of animal exclusion.[26]

Furthermore, his private (but now published) journal of the 1920s and his voluminous correspondence supply numerous examples of Lewis's fascination with animals and his distress at the suffering they endure. To read the 'private' alongside the 'public' Lewis is crucial as we consider this topic. He translates a deeply felt affection for the nonhuman into poetry, and anger at the infliction of pain into moral arguments. The story of Noah's sons closing the door on the unicorn is good art, and an even better plea for compassion.

There are two principal theoretical considerations shaping the analyses that follow, even if not always explicitly stated. The first is attention to the idea of a palimpsest as used by some literary critics. A literal palimpsest is a repurposed writing surface with traces of effaced text remaining. Think of the faint pencil lines left behind on

paper after using an eraser. The term appears most often in the study of ancient manuscripts and refers to papyrus or vellum scraped for reuse. Occasionally traces of the original writing show through any new words placed over top. Some theorists find in this a useful metaphor. In their well-known study of nineteenth-century women writers, Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar describe palimpsestuous works as those "whose surface designs conceal or obscure deeper, less accessible (and less socially acceptable) levels of meaning." Writers such as Jane Austen, Mary Shelley, Emily Brontë, and Emily Dickinson, they argue, achieve "true female literary authority by simultaneously conforming to and subverting patriarchal literary standards."[27] Post-colonial theorists also use the term to capture dynamics involved in the rewriting of maps and histories.[28]

For others, the image illustrates the co-presence of texts, which includes literary influences whether deliberate or otherwise.[29] This is the way I use the term here. I look particularly at ways the mythic content of Genesis 1–11 is subtly present in various works by Lewis. Linda Hutcheon describes palimpsestuous writings as those haunted by precursors. "If we know that prior text," she writes, "we always feel its presence shadowing the one we are experiencing directly." We "experience adaptations (*as adaptations*) as palimpsests through our memory of other works that resonate through repetition with variation."[30] Lewis counts on readers' awareness of the haunting presence of Genesis. For those who know its stories, his tendency to accentuate animals is conspicuous. For those who consider the Genesis precursor religiously authoritative, these (often) new emphases on animals are both compelling and motivating.

Some of Lewis's own stories illustrate the kind of textual haunting Hutcheon describes. While on the planet Mars or Malacandra, the hero of Lewis's space trilogy encounters a creature called a *sorn* that reminds him of Homer's Cyclops. It's a story beneath a story. When on Venus or Perelandra, the carnival of exotic, unearthly delights of smell, taste, and sight, and an encounter with a benign dragon, bring to his mind the garden of the Hesperides.[31] In more despairing moments, he fears living within "a terrible myth," like that of Circe or Alcina.[32] Later, when back on Earth, Ransom likens his life to the king in *Curdie*, evoking one of