

11-1999

# C.S. Lewis's Ontological View of the Demonic: Satan as an Explanatory Postulate

John David Geib  
Malone College

Follow this and additional works at: [https://pillars.taylor.edu/inklings\\_forever](https://pillars.taylor.edu/inklings_forever)

 Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#), [History Commons](#), [Philosophy Commons](#), and the [Religion Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Geib, John David (1999) "C.S. Lewis's Ontological View of the Demonic: Satan as an Explanatory Postulate," *Inklings Forever*: Vol. 2 , Article 24.  
Available at: [https://pillars.taylor.edu/inklings\\_forever/vol2/iss1/24](https://pillars.taylor.edu/inklings_forever/vol2/iss1/24)

This Essay is brought to you for free and open access by the Center for the Study of C.S. Lewis & Friends at Pillars at Taylor University. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Inklings Forever* by an authorized editor of Pillars at Taylor University. For more information, please contact [pillars@taylor.edu](mailto:pillars@taylor.edu).

# **INKLINGS FOREVER, Volume II**

A Collection of Essays Presented at the Second  
FRANCES WHITE COLLOQUIUM on C.S. LEWIS & FRIENDS

Taylor University 1999

Upland, Indiana

---

## **C.S. Lewis's Ontological View of the Demonic: Satan as an Explanatory Postulate**

John David Geib

## C.S. Lewis's Ontological View of the Demonic: Satan as an Explanatory Postulate

by John David Geib

C.S. Lewis's Space Trilogy<sup>1</sup> both summarized the historic Christian view on the demonic and anticipated the renewal of interest shown in spiritual warfare in the last fifteen years.<sup>2</sup> Lewis's theses were that axiological realities such as evil and good exist in the human domain as derivations from the spiritual, angelic, and demonic domains. Lewis's trilogy replicated the historic Christian

view of angelic and demonic beings as veridical, sentient and volitional creatures of God who have great influence on the human race. The origin of evil was angelic rebellion against God that occurred before God created humanity. Lewis viewed evil as a choice to cling to the "wrong good" (volitional autonomy rather than obedience to God (Lewis 1965b, 69). This was reminiscent of the narration of how evil originated among humans in the Bible (Genesis 3) and Augustine's privation of evil theory.<sup>3</sup>

Lewis's trilogy illustrated how the cosmic and eternal consequences of angelic evil have been translated into the lives of other created beings. Evil has been manifested in the experience of spiritual warfare between the forces of good (God) and Evil (Satan), and

---

<sup>1</sup>C.S. Lewis, *Out of the Silent Planet* (New York: MacMillan, 1965a); *Perelandra* (New York: MacMillan, 1965b); *That Hideous Strength* (New York: MacMillan, 1965c).

<sup>2</sup>A spate of literature was published in this period that formed the foundation of the modern spiritual warfare movement (Baker 1990; Cowie and Martin 1990; Greenway 1990; Fragomeni 1991; Kraft 1989, 1992; McAlpine 1991; Wagner and Pennoyer 1990). Some made a case, supported with anecdotal histories, for strategic spiritual warfare against demonic powers (Arnold 1992; Hawthorne 1991; Otis 1991; Wagner 1991; Warner 1991; White 1991). By 1994-95, strategic spiritual warfare had become an international phenomenon sufficiently practiced that a cohort of authors raised concerns and solutions regarding its epistemological and methodological foundations (Archer 1994; Arnold 1997; Bolt 1994; Corwin 1995; Priest, Campbell and Mullen, 1994; Kirkwood 1994; Wakely 1995, Wink 1992).

---

<sup>3</sup>P. Edwards, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, vol. 3 (New York: MacMillan, 1967), s. v. "Evil, the problem of," by John Hick. Hick pursued Augustine's "evil as privation" theory, rooted in the biblical fall of Satan, for its effect on Aquinas, Luther, Calvin and modern theologians. The consensual thesis of these theologians was that evil was a turning away from God (the highest good) to lower goods created by God. The lower goods then become idols that replace God.

## C.S. Lewis's Ontological View of the Demonic: • John David Geib

the effects of this warfare were described as eternal and cosmic in nature (1965a, 153).

Another historic antecedent of Lewis's presentation of good and evil was discovered in the biblical and medieval notions of the great chain of being (see Table 1, p. 17). God was viewed as the ultimate Personality and Creator of all other personalities in the chain of being. God was the ultimate source of good, and sentient personalities were seen as the agents for all that is axiological in nature. It was deemed evil to choose any other created being or value before God, and only personalities with volitional and rational capacities can make such a choice. This was the ultimate sin of Satan, who has embarked on a strategic campaign to corrupt and ruin lesser personalities by tempting them willfully to share in Satan's rebellion against God. All choices made by sentient personalities thus "... lead sooner or later either to the Beatific or Miserific vision" (1965b, 111).

### The Nature of Angelic Beings: Thinking Minerals and Macrobes

Lewis reiterated the historic Christian understanding of the nature of angels (called "Oyarsa" or "Eldils" in his trilogy) as a basis for understanding that they are personal beings: "Oyarsa does not die," "... does not breed ..." [and] "... is hard to see and the light goes through it" (1965a, 93).<sup>4</sup> Lewis named God "Maleldil" in the novels, and angels and humans "... are both copies of Maleldil" (1965a, 120). Despite this similarity of angels and humans, they were identified as different species of beings:

Their physical organism, if organism it can be called, is quite unlike either the human or Martian. They do not eat, breed, breathe, or suffer natural death, and to that extent they resemble thinking minerals more than they resemble anything we should recognize as an animal (1965b, 9).

Lewis thus described angelic nature as a synthesis of natural and supernatural domains:

These things were not animals—to that extent one had to classify them with the second group; but they had some kind of material vehicle whose presence could (in principle) be scientifically verified. To that extent they belonged to the first group. The distinction between natural and supernatural, in fact, broke down; and when it had done so, one realized how great a comfort it had been (1965b, 11).

Lewis employed MacPhee to typify the logical empiricist who doubts the veridical existence of such notions as angels and demons. MacPhee thus explained as a theoretical construct the historic, Christian notion of angels and demons as follows:

These creatures are not planetary creatures at all. Supposing them to exist, you are to conceive them floating about the depth of space, though they may alight on a planet here and there, like a bird alighting on a tree, you understand. There's some of them, he says, more or less permanently attached to particular

---

<sup>4</sup>Hebrews 1, especially 1:7 and 1:14

## C.S. Lewis's Ontological View of the Demonic: • John David Geib

planets, but they're not native there. They're just a clean different kind of thing (1965c, 191).

Modern scientists who abandoned biblical notions of God and the supernatural but who contacted evil angels were portrayed by Lewis as identifying the nature and hierarchical place of such beings from their world view perspective by the term "Macrobes":

I did not say microbes. I said macrobes. The formation of the word explains itself. Below the level of animal life, we have known that there are microscopic organisms. Their actual results on human life, in respect to health and disease, have of course made up a large part of human history: the secret cause was not known till we invented the microscope. I have now to inform you that there are similar organisms above the level of animal life. When I say "above," I am not speaking biologically. The structure of the Microbe, so far as we know it, is of extreme simplicity. When I say that it is above the animal level, I mean that it is more permanent, disposes of more energy, and has greater intelligence (1965c, 256).

Thus, the more scientifically acceptable terms "macrobes" and "thinking minerals" enabled Lewis to contextualize the historic Christian notion of angels as spiritual personalities for twentieth century readers.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup>See P. T. O'Brian, "Principalities and Powers: Opponents of the Church," *Evangelical Review of Theology* 15 (1992): 353-384. O'Brian traced the

interpretations of principalities from the scant references to them in the 19<sup>th</sup> century due to rationalist rejection of the supernatural through the existential de-mythologizing of Bultman's *Theology of the New Testament*: (London: SCM, 1952; O'Brian, 357-358). Cullman's *The State in the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1957) viewed the Powers as a double reference to both human and demonic entities (361). Rupp explained this terminology as simply economic, social and political forces in *Principalities and Powers: Studies in the Christian Conflict in History* (London: Epworth, 1952; O'Brian, 363). Berkof in *Christ and the Powers* (Scottsdale, Pa: ET, 1962) posited the Powers to be primarily the human, religious and ethical traditions that have become exalted over God (364). Wilder's *Kerygma, Eschatology and Social Ethics* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966) concluded the powers to be the false authorities of this world opposing God. Caird's *Paul's Letters from Prison* (Oxford: University, 1976) added ontological spiritual entities as a fourth view to his earlier threefold interpretation of the Powers as pagan religion and state, a legalistic view of the Law and the bondage of the creation to corruption (366). Mouw's *Politics and the Christian Drama* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976) acknowledged that the Powers have more than one meaning in the New Testament but was hesitant to reject what appears to be Paul's ontological view of the Powers (368-369). Carr (369-370) in his *Angels and Principalities* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981) attempted to advance the thesis that Paul's use of this terminology was entirely about Angelic beings and not demonic entities at all. As O'Brian and Wink (1984) have shown, Carr could only defend his thesis by an unsubstantiated excision of Ephesians 6:12 from the letter (372). O'Brian closed his survey with salient New Testament passages that he thought best understood, whether one chooses to embrace their intended meaning or not, as defining the Powers as personal, ontological spiritual entities opposed to God and the human race (376-383). That these passages were clearly intended to convey such a meaning became evident from the clear admissions and consciously embraced program of the de-mythologizers (378). Thus, O'Brian concluded his article with a trenchant analysis of the ultimate role of world view and resultant hermeneutical approach in one's ultimate interpretation of the terms Principalities and Powers (374-376). People have either chosen to believe the plain language and texts of the Bible on demonic entities or they have consciously

## C.S. Lewis's Ontological View of the Demonic: • John David Geib

### The Origin of Cosmic Evil

Lewis's cosmology borrowed from the historic Christian notion that angels are participants with God in governing the great chain of being within the created order. The central character of Lewis's trilogy, Ransom, was kidnapped by an evil scientist and taken to Mars. Ransom eventually met the angel who governed Mars, who explained to Ransom the vast hierarchical chain of being that begins with God and extends downward to encompass all of the creation: "Beast must be ruled by Hnau [sentient creatures who bear God's image], and Hnau by Eldila [angelic beings who bear God's image] and Eldila by Maleldil" [God] (1965a, 102).<sup>6</sup> Ransom was amazed at this picture of reality, for as a modern thinker he operated on the assumption that Earth was not influenced by things such as angels. Later, Ransom studied an obelisk that contained pictures of how angelic entities governed the cosmos. Ransom was shocked when he found Earth on the obelisk:

The ball was there, but where the flame-like figure should have been, a deep depression of irregular shape had been cut out as if to erase it. Once, then—but his speculations faltered and became silent before a series of unknowns (1965a, 111).

The Oyarsa of Mars provided an answer to Ransom for why Earth had no legitimate Oyarsa, which answer was Lewis's recapitulation of the orthodox Christian explanation of the ultimate source of cosmic

evil being found in an angel who rebelled against God:

He became bent. That was before there was any life on your world. Those were the bent years of which we still speak in the heavens, when he was not yet bound to Thulcandra [Earth] but free like us. We did not leave him at large for long. There was a great war, and we drove him back out of the Heavens and bound him in the air of his own world as Maleldil taught us. There doubtless he lies to this hour, and we know no more of that planet; it is silent. We think that Maleldil would not give it up utterly to the bent one, and there are stories among us that He has taken strange counsel and dared terrible things, wrestling with the bent one in Thulcandra. But of this we know less than you; it is a thing we desire to look into (1965a, 121).

In the preceding passage, Lewis cogently placed into a cosmic context the biblical story of the fall of Satan and angelic interest in Christ's redemptive incarnation.<sup>7</sup> By telling this story from a cosmic rather than an earthly perspective, Lewis reiterated the historic Christian view that the source of evil is not merely human, but also encompasses the angelic domain. In Lewis's imaginary recasting of the Eve story (*Perelandra*), Ransom explained the precise nature of angelic evil to the first female of Venus to whom Ransom was sent to help her resist the evil one's temptations:<sup>8</sup>

---

chosen to re-interpret them according to their world view preferences.

<sup>6</sup>Hebrews 2:9; Genesis 1:26-28.

---

<sup>7</sup>1 Peter 1:10-12.

<sup>8</sup>2 Corinthians 11:3; 1 Timothy 2:14.

## C.S. Lewis's Ontological View of the Demonic: • John David Geib

[Ransom] You spoke yesterday of clinging to the old good instead of taking the good that came. There was an *eldil* who clung longer—who has been clinging since before the worlds were made. [Woman] But the good would cease to be good at all if he did that. [Ransom] Yes, it has ceased, and still he clings (1965b, 83).

Lewis thus retold the Genesis 3 narrative to gain a hearing among moderns for the view that the ultimate source of evil is found in a personality of cosmic proportion who has misused God-given abilities of reason and choice.<sup>9</sup> When Ransom eventually met the Devil incarnate in another human, he discovered the results of the misuse of reason and choice:

What was before him appeared no longer a creature of corrupted will. It was corruption itself to which will was attached only as an instrument. Ages ago it had been a person; but the ruins of personality now survived in it only as weapons at the disposal of a furious self-exiled negation (1965b, 156).

In historic Christian orthodoxy, evil (and good) have been presented as extensions of personality and thus reflected choices that either appropriately or inappropriately corresponded to the values inherent in God and the great hierarchical chain of being created by God. The origin of evil must have originated then in the first personality who chose self-will rather than God's will.

<sup>9</sup>John 8:44.

### Clinging to the Wrong Good: The Essence of Evil

As a Christian who stood inside historic Christianity, Lewis found the source of evil in the volitional domain. "Either something or nothing must depend on individual choices. And if something, who could set bounds to it?" (1965b, 140).<sup>10</sup> Sentient personalities make all choices within some axiological hierarchy. Thus, the essence of evil was the "bending" of some legitimate good from its God-defined hierarchical context by the misuse of God-given rationality. Lewis portrayed an angel explaining the nature of this "bentness"<sup>11</sup> to the scientist Watson, who was in process of being corrupted by evil spirits:

I see now how the lord of the silent world has bent you. There are laws that all *hnau* know, of pity and straight dealing and shame and the like, and one of these is the love of mankind. He has taught you to break all of them except this one [preservation of the human species] which is not one of the greatest laws; this one he has bent till it becomes folly and has set it up, thus bent, to be a little blind *Oyarsa* in your brain, and now you can do nothing but obey it, though if we ask you why it is a law you give no other reason for it than for all the other and greater laws which it drives you to disobey. Do you know why he has done this? (1965a, 139).

<sup>10</sup>Romans 5:12-21; Romans 1:18-32.

<sup>11</sup>Daniel 10; Revelation 17.

## C.S. Lewis's Ontological View of the Demonic: • John David Geib

This explanation was an imaginary restatement of Augustine's theory of evil as the privation of evil (Hick 1967). After Weston became a devotee of bentness, he (or Satan through him) explained the seductive power of the apparent freedom of moral autonomy:

Their minds run ahead of what Maleldil has told them. They do not need for Him to tell them what is good, but know it for themselves as He does. They are, as it were, little Maleldils (1965b, 106).

Thus, Lewis echoed the historic Christian combination of will, reason and a hierarchy of values found in and created by God as the ingredients for both good and evil. The essence of evil was deemed a misuse of will and reason that wrenches a lower good from the context of the God-ordained hierarchy of goods and exalts that lower good over higher goods. Ultimate evil was posited as the exaltation of self-will above the will and Person of God, which exaltation historic Christianity and Lewis discovered to be found in the angel known in the Bible as Satan.<sup>12</sup>

The effect of this cosmic evil was one main theme, if not the main theme, of Lewis's space trilogy. Cosmic evil caused a division among biological creatures who bear the incorporeal image of God: "This man—he is a friend of that eldil of whom I told you—one of those who cling to the wrong good" (1965b, 84). In the conclusion of the trilogy (*That Hideous Strength*), Lewis had a college professor ruminates on the pervasive influence of evil (and good) among human societies:

If you dip into any college, or school, or parish, or family—anything you like—at a given point in its history you always find that there was a time before that point when there was more elbow room and contrasts weren't quite so sharp; and that there's going to be a time after that point when there is even less room for indecision and choices are even more momentous. Good is always getting better and bad is always getting worse (1965c, 283).<sup>13</sup>

Some individuals have followed the logic of self-will to its ultimate conclusion and Lewis portrayed this course also as a matter of choice. Lewis pictured the scientist Weston as inviting into his personality what he erroneously believed to be the "impersonal force" that animated the universe:

There is no possible distinction in concrete thought between me and the universe. In so far as I am the conductor of the central forward pressure of the universe, I am it. Do you see, you timid, scruple-mongering fool? I am the universe. I, Weston, am your God and your Devil. I call that force into me completely (1965b, 96).

How can one determine (given such possessions really happen) who or what was the source of evil in cases such as Weston's? Lewis rejected the view of "the devil made me do it" by his portrayal of the denouement of one who embraced demonic ethics:

<sup>12</sup>1 Timothy 3:6.

<sup>13</sup>1 Tim. 4:1-3; 2 Tim. 3:1-9.



## C.S. Lewis's Ontological View of the Demonic: • John David Geib

He [Ransom] did not know whether in the last few hours the spirit which had spoken to him was indeed Weston's or whether he had been the victim of a ruse. Indeed, it made little difference. There was, no doubt, a confusion of persons in damnation; what Pantheists falsely hoped of heaven bad men really received in hell. They were melted down into their master, as a lead soldier slips down and loses his shape in the ladle held over the gas ring. The question whether Satan, or one whom Satan has digested, is acting on any given occasion, has in the long run no clear significance (1965b, 173).

This depiction has received some claimed corroborating support by the extensive case histories provided by those who have alleged to have worked with those possessed by evil spirits.<sup>14</sup>

Lewis addressed the objections of modern evolutionary theorists who have rejected such notions as supernatural, demonic personalities and the demonization of humans who have obeyed demonic teachings.

He saw clearly that the motives on which most men act, and which they dignify by the names of patriotism, or duty to humanity, were mere products of the animal organism. But he did not see what was to be substituted for these irrational motives. On what ground hence forward were actions to be justified or condemned? If one insists on putting the question in those terms, said Frost, I think Waddington has given the best answer. Existence is its own justification. The tendency to developmental change is justified by the fact that it is a general characteristic of biological entities. The present establishment of contact between the highest biological entities and the macrobes [evil spirits] is justified by the fact that it is occurring, and it ought to be increased because an increase is taking place (1965c, 295).

Some modern authors who have agreed with Lewis's imaginary professor have extensively argued for contact with "spiritual beings or forces."<sup>15</sup> Wilson (1971) termed the ability to contact spiritual forces and

---

<sup>14</sup>C. F. Dickason, *Demon Possession and the Christian: A New Perspective* (Westchester, Ill: Crossway, 1990). Dickason provided a thorough exposition of the biblical teaching on demons, demonization and the impact of spiritual warfare on humans. After a careful study of biblical evidence cited for and against demonization, Dickason concluded this issue could only be resolved in conjunction with evidence generated via case histories of counselors in clinical practice. With both biblical and clinical evidence derived from four hundred case histories in hand, Dickason argued that individuals can in fact become demonized.

---

<sup>15</sup>See C. Wilson, *The Occult: A History* (New York: Random, 1971). Wilson argued that humanity possesses latent powers of transrational perception and power, which he labeled "Faculty X." Wilson opined that Faculty X has been suppressed by the limitations of scientism and has led to the impoverishment of humanity in general and the sensationalizing of those who have exhibited Faculty X. This thesis was illustrated with a survey of magic and occultism as a historical reality via occultic adepts. Wilson concluded with a plea for humanity to cooperate with the "elan vital" in its evolutionary ascent by opening themselves to a synthesis of reason and the transrational Faculty X.

## C.S. Lewis's Ontological View of the Demonic: • John David Geib

experience occult phenomenon "Faculty X." Wilson agreed with Lewis's Professor Frost when he divorced Faculty X from objective values and he posited that contact with spiritual forces was evidence of the evolutionary pattern of the cosmos. Thus, Wilson exhorted that we should cultivate contact with spiritual forces simply because some humans reported such contact to have been part of their experience. Wilson's thesis and supporting evidence corroborated Lewis's imaginary projection of the terminus of such a theory:

[Weston] The world leaps forward through great men and greatness always transcends mere moralism. When the leap has been made our 'diabolism' as you call it becomes the moralism of the next stage; but while we are making it, we are called criminals, heretics, blasphemers . . .  
[Ransom] How far does it go? Would you still obey the life force if you found it prompting you to kill me? [Weston] Yes. (1965b, 95).

Contrary to Wilson, Lewis viewed the transcending of "mere moralism" in favor of amoral contact with "forces" as the step preceding demonic possession, which results in the ultimate experience of spiritual warfare. The recasting of ancient Christian doctrines about angelic nature and angelic rebellion as the source of evil allowed Lewis to retell the ancient Christian perspective of a great cosmic war of eternal proportions fought between God and Satan. Lewis drew extensively on biblical themes to describe the nature of this spiritual warfare.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>16</sup>1 Peter 1:10-12; Ephesians 2:1-3; 6:10-20.

The angel who befriended Ransom echoed 1 Peter 1:10-12 when he said, "I wish to hear of Thulcandra [Earth] and of Maleldil's strange wars there with the bent one; for that, as I have said, is a thing we desire to look into" (1965a, 122). This angel was depicted later as inferring that Earth was the scene of some form of spiritual conflict, reminiscent of Ephesians 2:1-3:

From what you have told me, I begin to see there are Eldila [angels] who go into your air, into the very stronghold<sup>17</sup> of the bent one; your world is not so fast shut as was thought in these parts of heaven (1965a, 142).

Ransom's subsequent encounter of spiritual warfare with Satan illuminated him to discern the evil strategies of Satan in terms similar to Ephesians 6:10-20: "The black Archon—our own bent Oyarsa—is mediating some sort of attack on Perelandra [Venus]" (1965b, 23). Lewis proffered that this type of spiritual discernment was possible for those whose minds have become attuned to the nature of spiritual reality.<sup>18</sup>

There is an environment of minds as well as of space. The universe is one—a spider's web wherein each mind lives along every line, a vast whispering gallery where (save for the direct action of Maleldil) though

<sup>17</sup>2 Corinthians 10:3-5. This notion of strongholds was extensively researched and explicated by George Otis Jr. in *The Twilight Labyrinth: Why Does Spiritual Darkness Linger Where It Does?* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997).

<sup>18</sup>2 Kings 6:15-17; 1 Corinthians 10:12; 1 John 4:1-5, among others.

## C.S. Lewis's Ontological View of the Demonic: • John David Geib

no news travels unchanged yet no secret can be rigorously kept. In the mind of the fallen Archon [Satan] under whom our planet groans, the memory of deep heaven and the gods [angels] with whom he once consorted is still alive (Lewis 1965b, 201).

Ransom eventually presented a portrait of spiritual warfare that occurs on earth to others because Ransom's world view had become congruent with the biblical world view:

We had eldila of our own he [Ransom] said, Tellurian eldils, but they were of a different kind and mostly hostile to man. That, in fact, was why our own world was cut off from communication with the other planets. He described us as being in a state of siege, as being, in fact, an enemy occupied territory, held down by eldils [demons] who were at war both with us and with the eldils [angels] of "deep heaven," or "space."<sup>19</sup> Like the bacteria on the microscopic level, so these co-inhabiting pests on the macroscopic permeate our whole life invisibly and are the real explanation of that fatal bent which is the main lesson of history (1965c, 192).

This "main lesson of history" was Lewis's retelling of Ephesians 2:1-3 and 6:10-20, and the empiricist MacPhee was used to explain "objectively" the conspiratorial ramifications of such a world view:

---

<sup>19</sup>Revelation 12:7-9.

Our own crew, the terrestrial eldils, are at the back of the whole conspiracy. You are to imagine us, Mrs. Studdock, living on a world where the criminal classes of the eldils have established their headquarters (Lewis 1965c, 192).

Lewis attempted to forecast how some modern evolutionary thinkers who no longer believe in a personal God or personal spirit beings would interpret contact with such beings, should it occur, from the naturalistic world view perspective. Professor Frost represented the naturalist, used by Lewis to explain to another modernist the causative (yet amoral) effects of contact with the "Macrobes":

Their effect on human history has been far greater than that of the microbes, though, of course, equally unrecognized. In light of what we now know, all history will have to be rewritten. The real causes of all the principal events are quite unknown to historians; that, indeed, is why history has not yet succeeded in becoming a science (1965c, 257).

Frost's viewpoints have been difficult to refute, as displayed by scholars who have studied demonology.<sup>20</sup> Scott and Oesterreich

---

<sup>20</sup>See T. K. Oesterreich, *Possession and Exorcism* (New York: Causeway, 1974) for an exhaustive study of possession and exorcism. Part I dealt with foundational concepts of possession such as its signs, subjective effects and modern responses to this reported phenomenon. Part II was a massive tour de force of reported case histories of possessions and exorcisms from various world view perspectives. It is ironic that Oesterreich concluded that the manifestation of

## C.S. Lewis's Ontological View of the Demonic: • John David Geib

could not deny the historical evidence of humans who have claimed to have had contact with "spiritual forces." However, both concluded that such contact ceased via the influence of education, scientific methodology or has been ultimately reinterpreted as the hysteria of nonscientific world view thinking. Lewis had his Professor Frost turn Scott's and Oesterreich's view of spiritualism on its head. He deployed Frost to predict that it will be in fact those of the educated classes who have rejected the God of the Bible and objective good and evil who will be the most susceptible to the seductive notion of amoral contact with "spiritual forces" as an outworking of the evolutionary process. Lewis left the refutation of this false equation of "spirituality" and contact with spiritual forces to his hero Ransom, who represented the historic Christian view of the true motive for contact with God:

[Weston] Didn't we agree that God is a spirit. Don't you worship Him because He is pure spirit? [Ransom]

---

possession occurs only among the least educated and cultured of peoples while he himself was persecuted by the nascent Nazi movement. That persecution seemed to illustrate Lewis's thesis that it is precisely the educated who are most susceptible in the modern era to demonic doctrines. See also Sir W. B. Scott, *Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft* (New York: Fowle, 1900) for a learned review of demonology and witchcraft from the origin of history until 1900. Scott's thesis was as follows, corroborated by what he cited as both veridical and hysterical case histories: "... the nature of demonology, which, as gathered from the sacred volumes, every Christian believer is bound to receive as a thing declared and proved to be true" (84). However, in typical Deist fashion, Scott concluded that very little if any supernatural phenomenon has occurred after Constantine's reign: "It is alike inconsistent . . . that fiends should be permitted to work marvels that are no longer exhibited on the part of humans" (72).

Good heavens, no! We worship Him because He is wise and good. There's nothing specially fine about simply being a spirit. The devil is a spirit (1965b, 93).

Lewis expressed the logical conclusion of angelic rebellion against God with its effects of ethical evil among humanity in martial terms, derived directly from the Bible. God is at "war" with the "bent one," who holds Earth as his "stronghold." Earth is under "siege" and viewed as "enemy-occupied territory," the "theater of angelic war," "headquarters" of the "criminal classes" of angels who have launched a "conspiracy" to bend humanity and human history to their evil intentions. Lewis provided a gloss on Ephesians 6:10-20 that explained the social implications of this view:

When the Bible used that very expression about fighting with principalities and powers and depraved hypersomatic beings at great heights (our translation is very misleading at that point, by the way) it meant that quite ordinary people were to do the fighting (1965b, 24).

Lewis's rehearsal of the Christian view of spiritual warfare encompassed the continuum from "ordinary people" involved in this war to its eternal implications: "The dangers to be feared are not planetary but cosmic, or at least solar, and they are not temporal but eternal" (1965a, 153). Mark Studdock, the atheistic sociologist who had rejected Christianity for quasi-scientific spiritualism, realized after he encountered the "spirits" behind this martial conspiracy that theories about good and evil divorced from a consideration of their ultimate personal sources were mere corollaries of

## C.S. Lewis's Ontological View of the Demonic: • John David Geib

cosmic spiritual warfare between God and Satan:

These creatures of which Frost had spoken—and he did not doubt that they were now locally present with him in the cell—breathed death on the human race and on all joy. Not despite this but because of this the terrible gravitation sucked and tugged and fascinated him towards them. Gradually he realized that he had sustained some sort of attack, and that he had put up no resistance at all; and with that realization a quite new kind of dread entered his mind. Though he was theoretically a materialist, he had all of his life believed quite inconsistently, and even carelessly, in the freedom of his own will . . . It had never occurred to him that his mind could be changed for him, all in an instant of time, changed beyond recognition (1965c, 269).

Studdock's terrible experience represented Lewis's ultimate recapitulation of historic Christian teaching about ethics and values; they are expressions of the ultimate Person in the Cosmos (God). Whenever ethics has been divorced from a theistic context, ethics has become the grist for the "bent theories" of fallen angels, who consequently taught humans to "cling to the wrong good" in their attempts to corrupt humanity. Lewis found humans to express ethics, but he did not view humans as the only or even the highest sources of ethics and values. This perspective was highly reminiscent of Romans 1:18-32.

### The Cross and Crossroads

Lewis used the characters of Mark and Jane Studdock to display two central views inherent in historic Christian teaching about good and evil. Goodness was ultimately found in a personal God and can be experienced by humans who come into willing contact with God. Evil was ultimately found in angelic rebellion and experienced by humans who willingly or by deception come under their control.<sup>21</sup> Jane Studdock was Lewis's prime example of one who came to realize that all rightful ethical demands find their origin in God.

She had come into a world, or into a Person, or into the presence of a Person. Something expectant, patient, inexorable, met her with no veil or protection between. This demand which now pressed upon her was not, even by analogy, like any other demand. It was the origin of all right demands and contained them. In its light, you could understand them; but from them you could know nothing of it (1965c, 318).

Lewis had Jane discover through her experience with God that a personal God is the source of all good. Her husband Mark came to the same conclusion regarding objective values, but only by extensive exposure to demonic beings who, in an allusion to 1 Timothy 4:1-3, attempted to teach him the doctrine of ethical relativism:

And day by day, as the process went on, the idea of the straight and the

---

<sup>21</sup>1 John 3:4-16.

### C.S. Lewis's Ontological View of the Demonic: • John David Geib

normal which had occurred to him during his first visit to this room, grew stronger and more solid in his mind till it became a kind of mountain (1965c, 310).

Though not yet a Christian at this point in the story, Mark finally realized both the personal and ethical implications of Jesus's death on the cross when his demonically controlled superior Frost insisted that Mark desecrate a wooden crucifix:

And that, as he suddenly saw, explained why this image, though not itself an image of the straight or normal, was yet in opposition to crooked Belbury. It was a picture of what happened when the straight met the crooked, a picture of what the crooked did to the straight—what it would do to him if he remained straight. It was, in a more emphatic sense than he had yet understood, a cross (1965c, 336).

Lewis summarized the historic Christian view of the crucifixion of Jesus as the ultimate crossroad<sup>22</sup> of the spiritual war between an all good, personal God and a "bent" personal angel, Satan. The spiritual war between these two personalities was displayed by Lewis as the ultimate spiritual "map" upon which all world view theories appear as roads. Though there are many roads, all of them lead finally to only two destinations:

As there is one Face above all worlds merely to see which is irrevocable joy, so at the bottom of

the worlds that face is waiting whose sight alone is the misery from which none who beholds it can recover. And though there seemed to be, and indeed there were, a thousand roads by which a man could walk through the world, there was not a single one which did not lead sooner or later either to the Beatific or the Miserific vision (1965b, 111).

---

<sup>22</sup>John 12:23-33; 16:11; Colossians 2:15; 1 John 3:8.

**C.S. Lewis's Ontological View of the Demonic: • John David Geib**

Table 1.—The Great Chain of Being<sup>23</sup>

<p align="center"><b>The Eternal Domain of The Supernatural: The Triune God of The Bible</b>  <i>God</i> was viewed as the Eternal Creator (Revelation 4).</p> <p align="center"><i>Christ</i> was viewed as currently seated and co-reigning with God in the heavenly realms, far above all rule and authority, power and dominion, with all things placed under Christ's rule (Ephesians 1:20-23).</p>
<p align="center"><b>The Created Domain of the Supernatural</b>  <i>Angelic Spirit Beings</i><sup>24</sup></p> <p align="center">Innumerable angelic beings were believed to exist who served God and human beings (Revelation 5:11-12, Hebrews 1).</p> <p align="center">The designation Archangel (ἀρχαγγέλου) used at 1 Thessalonians 4:16 implied that these angelic beings were organized in some manner under the Sovereign Reign of God.</p> <p align="center"><i>Demonic Spirit Beings</i></p> <p align="center">These included Satan, The Ruler (ἄρχοντα) of the Kingdom of the Air (Ephesians 2:1-3, 6:12), which consisted of the Rulers (ἀρχάς), Authorities (ἐξουσίας), Cosmic Powers of this Darkness (κοσμοκράτορας του σκότους τούτου) and Evil Spirits (πνευματικά της πονηρίας).</p>
<p align="center"><b>The Created Domain of The Natural (Genesis 1; John 1:1-4; Revelation 4).</b>  <i>Christian humans</i> were viewed as under the reign of God &amp; Christ (Ephesians 2:1-6; Colossians 1:13, 1:21-22).</p> <p align="center"><i>Other humans</i> were deemed under the reign of Satan (Ephesians 2:1-3; Colossians 1:13; 2 Corinthians 4:4; 1 John 5:19; Revelation 12:9).</p> <p align="center"><i>The Animal Kingdom</i> (Psalm 8).  <i>The Plant Kingdom.</i>  <i>The Insect Kingdom Down to Single Cell Amoebas.</i>  <i>The Inanimate Domain.</i></p>

<sup>23</sup>P. P. Wiener, ed. in chief, *Dictionary of the History of Ideas: Studies of Selected Pivotal Ideas*, Vol. I (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973), s. v. "Chain of Being," by L. Formigari: 325-335.

<sup>24</sup>See C. F. Dickason, *Angels: Elect and Evil* (Chicago: Moody, 1975) for a biblical and comprehensive discussion of spirit beings.

C.S. Lewis's Ontological View of the Demonic: • John David Geib

Works Cited

- Archer, J., compiler. 1994. *The Devil, Demons and Spiritual Warfare: A Panel of Experts Answer 10 Often-Asked Questions about the Church's Battle against the Forces of Darkness.* *Charisma* 19(7): 52-57.
- Arnold, C. 1992a. *Ephesians: Power and Magic. The Concept of Power in Light of its Historical Setting.* Grand Rapids: Baker.
- . 1997. *3 Crucial Questions about Spiritual Warfare.* Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Baker, K. 1990. Power Encounter and Church Planting. *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 26(JI): 306-312.
- Bolt, J. 1994. Satan is Alive and Well in Contemporary Imagination: A Bibliographic Essay with Notes on 'Hell' and 'Spiritual Warfare.' *Calvin Theological Journal* 29: 497-506.
- Corwin, G. 1995. This Present Nervousness. *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* (April): 148-149.
- Cowie, L. E. and L. Martin. 1990. *Reaching Your City for God.* Kailua-Kona, Hawaii: University of the Nations.
- Dickason, C. F. 1975. *Angels: Elect and Evil.* Chicago: Moody.
- . 1990. *Demon Possession and the Christian: A New Perspective.* Westchester, Ill: Crossway.
- Edwards, P., ed. in chief. 1967. *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, vol. 3. New York: MacMillan. S. v. "Evil, the problem of," by J. Hick.
- Fragomeni, R. N. 1991. "Wrestling with Angels: Satan and the Struggle with Evil." *New Theology Review* 4 (3): 28-38.
- Greenway, R. S. 1990. New Wineskins for World Evangelization. *Urban Missions* 8(S): 55-59.
- Hawthorne, S. and G. Kendrick. 1991. *Prayerwalking.* Orlando, FL: Creation House.
- Kirkwood, D. S. 1994. *Modern Myths about Satan and Spiritual Warfare.* Ethnos.
- Kraft, C. 1989. *Christianity with Power: Your World View and your Experience of the Supernatural.* Ann Arbor, MI: Servant.
- . 1992. *Defeating Dark Angels: Breaking Demonic Oppression in the Believer's Life.* Ann Arbor, MI: Servant.
- Lewis, C.S. 1965a. *Out of the Silent Planet.* New York: MacMillan.
- . 1965b. *Perelandra.* New York: New York: MacMillan.
- . 1965c. *That Hideous Strength.* New York: MacMillan.
- McAlpine, T. H. 1991. *Facing the Powers: What are the Options?* Monrovia, CA: MARC.



C.S. Lewis's Ontological View of the Demonic: • John David Geib

- O'Brian, P. T. 1992. Principalities and Powers: Opponents of the Church. *Evangelical Review of Theology* 15: 353-384.
- Oesterreich, T. K. 1974. *Possession, Demoniacal and Other: Among Primitive Races, in Antiquity, the Middle Ages and Modern Times*. N.Y.: Causeway.
- Otis, G. Jr. 1991. *The Last of the Giants*. Tarrytown, NJ: Chosen.
- . 1997. *The Twilight Labyrinth: Why Does Spiritual Darkness Linger Where It Does?* Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Perry, M. 1990. Taking Satan Seriously. *Expository Times* 101(4): 105-112.
- Priest, R. J., T. Campbell and B. A. Mullen. 1994. *Missiologial Syncretism: The New Animistic Paradigm*. Paper presented at the 1994 annual meeting of the Evangelical Missiologial Society.
- Scott, Sir W. B. 1900. *Letters on Demonology and Witchcraft*. New York: Fowle.
- Wagner, C. P. and F. D. Pennoyer. 1990. *Wrestling with Dark Angels*. Regal: Ventura, CA.
- Wagner, C. P. Ed. 1991. *Engaging the Enemy: How to Fight and Defeat Territorial Spirits*. Ventura, CA: Regal.
- Wakely, M. 1995. A Critical Look at a New 'Key' to Evangelization. *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 31: 152-162.
- Warner, T. 1991. *Spiritual Warfare: Victory over the Powers of this Dark World*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway.
- Wiener, P. P., ed. 1973. *Dictionary of the History of Ideas: Studies of Selected Pivotal Ideas*, Vol. 1. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. S. v. "Chain of Being," by L. Formigari.
- White, T. 1991. *The Believer's Guide to Spiritual Warfare*. Ann Arbor, MI: Servant.
- Wilson, C. 1971. *The Occult: A History*. New York: Random.
- Wink, W. 1984. *Naming the Powers: The Language of Power in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- . 1987. *Unmasking the Powers: The Invisible Powers that Determine Human Existence*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- . 1992. *Engaging the Powers: Discernment and Resistance in a World of Domination*. Minneapolis: Fortress.