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Further Responses to Lewis’s ‘Lost Aeneid’

Richard James
For almost fifty years, since his death in 1963, C.S. Lewis, Lazarus-like, has continued through his literary executors to come forth from his literary grave, providing an almost unending, vast landscape of multimedia productions from multi-volume collections of personal letters and anthologies of poems and essays to four major Hollywood film productions; from miscellaneous small action figures and early reader literacy booklets connected to the Narnian movies to highly technical on-stage renditions of the demonic Screwtape and the verbally combative, but highly successful off-Broadway drama, *Freud's Last Session*.

But beyond all of these highly visible projects, this paper will provide some reflections on what is yet another more recent and more substantial Lazarus-like Lewis project: *C.S. Lewis's Lost Aeneid* (ed. A.T. Reyes, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011). For here in this book is a translation both immensely personal to Lewis and also potentially a significant scholarly contribution to the instruction and understanding of one of the world’s great epics. This presentation shall provide insights gathered from a study of Lewis's own annotations in his personal library copy of *The Works of Virgil*, and make a brief review of the many published responses to the recently published Lewis’s translation, and in closing will note several places where Virgil is mentioned in the Lewis corpus – pointing to possible further study.

Let me begin with a disclaimer similar to one that C.S. Lewis shared about not being a student of Hebrew at the beginning of his book, *Reflections on the Psalms* (1958): 1-2. When it comes to classical Latin poetry, I am an amateur. I am neither a classicist nor a literary critic. I am a history major with a course of study in European and American history that then went on to seminary to be trained for the ministry in a mainline Protestant Church. So, even while I have over the last 40 years read much by and about C.S. Lewis and written other papers on his life and work, on the subject of Lewis translating Virgil’s *Aeneid* from Latin into English, I am an amateur sharing my research with other amateurs, but with the hope that possibly some professionals in this field may also benefit from it, especially as it relates to the annotations in his personal copy of the *Aeneid*.

Well, as a student of history and a reader of all things Lewis, I love to do research and a few years back, while working on a Lewis project at the Wade Center at Wheaton College, I asked about a book that I thought was available at the Wade Center as part of their collection of Lewis’s personal library that had his annotations in it. It could have been Augustine’s *Confessions* or Otto’s *The Idea of the Holy* or maybe Law’s *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*, but I’m not sure which one. Anyway, I discovered that the
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book I wanted was not at Wheaton, but somewhere else.

To my surprise I learned that the book I was looking for was in the Wilson Special Collections Library at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill. Walter Hooper, a 1953 alumnus of UNC, had donated a collection of books from C.S. Lewis's personal library to the Rare Book Collection there. Plus, there is also a collection in this library of letters he himself had received from Lewis, his brother, some of the Inklings and others associated with Lewis from the period of 1940 through 1980. So, when I eventually did attend a C.S. Lewis conference in that area in 2007, I made time before the conference to visit Chapel Hill for a few days to do some research in their Rare Book Collection.

Yes, I found the book I had first been looking for at Wheaton and took notes and made some digital copies for further archival research. But one serendipity of my finding that book was also discovering that the Wilson Library also owned Lewis's personal copy of The Works of Virgil (ed. F.A. Hirtzel, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1900). Since from my previous research I knew that in 1962 Lewis had listed Virgil's Aeneid on his top ten most influential booklist [The Christian Century (June 6, 1962)] and that I would probably not be back that way any time soon, I requested this book. I quickly made some archival photos of a few pages for future reference for when I returned home and went on to complete my planned research. Just this brief glance showed me that Lewis had made not only the typical marginal annotations and underlinings found in most annotated books, he had also drawn his own maps on the front and back end pages to follow Aeneas's travels and given his own summary arguments at the beginning of each book. Plus, on the last page of the text he recorded the dates when he had read the Aeneid.

I completed my original project and presented it at the 2010 C.S. Lewis and Friends Conference at Taylor University as “Guidelines for Spiritual Reading from C.S. Lewis” and over the next year began to investigate in more depth some of the specific suggestions Lewis had made. In the midst of this further research announcements appeared in the early spring of 2011 about an upcoming publication of Lewis's translation of the Aeneid, edited by A.T. Reyes and published by Yale University Press. I looked forward to receiving my own copy and enjoyed reading it when it arrived some time in May.

But along with this joy I also had some concerns that arose as well and, being the amateur that I am in Latin poetry and its criticism, I did not quite know how to share my concerns or what to do with them. For while the introduction by A.T. Reyes was superb in so many ways - especially in its overview of the significant place that Virgil had in Lewis's life and works, there also seemed to be some additional items which could have been part of his analysis, but were missing. One major hint came from a statement made late in the introduction. The editor wrote, “It is likely that Lewis used the Latin of F.A. Hirtzel’s Oxford edition” (30), noting that edition had been Lewis's source text for a quotation in a 1953 letter from Lewis to his publisher Geoffrey Bles (C.S. Lewis Collected Letters: Volume III, ed. Walter Hooper. London: HarperCollins, 2006: 307-08). I knew from my own research that there was more than a “likely” probability; it was indeed a fact that the Hirtzel edition of 1900 was the personal copy of the text that he read repeatedly over a period of at least 41 years.

Now, before I get into my unpublished Lewis material, I just wanted to let you know that I was given permission by the Lewis Literary Estate to use copies of the materials I researched in Chapel Hill for this presentation and for
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their publication in Inklings Forever. I may own my notes, but the book they came from is owned by UNC and the Lewis Estate owns the annotations that he made in those books and they are unpublished and still under copyright, and I don’t have the legal authority to give others the permission to use this material. I have shared with you a copy of my transcriptions, but any further use must be approved by the Lewis Literary Estate.

Turning the reader’s attention to this personal library copy of The Works of Virgil as it is titled in English on its spine, one also sees the year, 1920, engraved on that spine. For a book its age that had been annotated and read several times, it still seemed to be in good condition. Opening the front cover reveals on the front endpaper Lewis’s map of the voyages of Aeneas and his visit to the world below in Books I-VI. The front free end page next to this map also has his signature, “C.S. Lewis”, on it. Turning to the back end page a second map is drawn to show the places where Aeneas and his Trojans fought in Italy in Books VII-XII.

But, of all the non-text annotations Lewis made in this book, the most significant is a written list of the dates of when he had read it through to the end. Surprised by Joy (1955), his autobiography, mentions his early reading of Virgil while at Cherbourg School (Ch IV, par 9) and at Malvern College (Ch VII, par 7), and while he was studying with Kirkpatrick, a 1915 letter to his father requests that he purchase a copy of Aeneid VII & VIII for him (CSL Ltrs I:112). But these were all partial readings.

His completion list is on the last page of text just under lines 948-52 of Book XII. There he writes that he had first read this edition of the Aeneid through during his first year back at Oxford, finishing it on September 20, 1919 when he was almost 21. He had written to Arthur Greeves on February 16, 1919 telling him that during this first period of study that he would have to read all of Virgil’s works (CSL Ltrs I:434). Lewis then records his re-readings on March 6, 1932; January 29, 1936; August 1942; December 26, 1946; February 22, 1951; July 1952; September 1956; September 1958; and September 1960.

Early in his introduction, the Lost Aeneid editor lists only four places where Lewis in his letters had mentioned a full re-reading of the Aeneid (6) and two of these were for the same reading (see CSL Ltrs I: 490 & CSL Ltrs II: 61, 750, 754). A comparison chart though between these four and the ten listed in Lewis’s personal copy adds up to a total known reading of 11 times. Plus, even more noteworthy, this comparison chart demonstrates that Jack had read the Aeneid in Latin at least 9 times in the 28 years, starting in 1932, just shortly after he became a Christian in September, 1931.

Continuing into the actual text in Lewis’s personal copy of the Aeneid, the reader will notice as stated earlier three types of annotations. There is first a short and simple statement written at the beginning of each book which summarized for him the argument of that book. This was the custom of some authors to give a synopsis of the chapter or book to assist the reader. Sometimes this was done in the table of contents, but many times it is found at the beginning of each individual book section. For instance Milton did this with Paradise Lost, Dryden with his translation of the Aeneid, and Dante with The Divine Comedy.

Lewis’s second type of annotation is the underlining of Latin words within the text with either an alternative Latin synonym or an English word written in the margin next to that line. Over the twelve individual books Lewis has underlined 90 Latin words or phrases, averaging 7.5 underlinings per book; though one actually has none underlined (Book II). At least seven books have 6 underlined words. Books I, III, and V have only 1 underlined Latin word in them. All of the others have at least 3 words
underlined, with the most words underlined in Book VII. In it he underlined 24 words.

A third type of annotation that Lewis uses somewhat more sparingly with a total of ten is the annotated footnote. No book has more than three: these being Books IV and VI. Books I, II, V, X, XI and XII have none while Books III, VII, VIII and IX have one. The footnotes vary in length with one having six individual lines (Book VI), but another in the same book has only two words. One of his footnotes is in Greek (Book IV), another refers the reader back to Virgil’s Eclogues (Book III) and in one Lewis quotes Cicero (Book IX).

In the following transcriptions I have left the British use of –our and the hyphens Lewis used at the end of a line to split a word, all underlinings, all misspellings and any other errors intact as written. The first lines of the arguments in Books II and IV were very difficult to transcribe since the top of the page in both books had been trimmed after these arguments had been written. I have used question marks (?) in Book IV where this top line was partially illegible. In Book X the * symbol means that this line was overwritten. Where several underlinings were in one book (i.e. Book VII), I have listed them across the page separated by a semi-colon instead of listing each one on an individual line. As stated above all of the following extracts by C.S. Lewis © copyright CS Lewis Pte Ltd.

Book I: The Argument - “Flying from Troy and cast upon the shores of Libya by a storm which Juno stirred up, Aeneas is honorably received by the queen of the land: but Venus, fearing some treason, inspires her with a love for him.”

I. 698: sponda – toro

Book II: The Argument – Aeneas, in an episode, is interrogated about how Troy was taken by the stratagem of the Wooden Horse: wherein his own deeds and suffering and the last labor of the city are narrated and how, mortality lifted from his eyes, he saw what dreadful faces and adverse powers were set against Priam.

Book III: The Argument – Troy fallen, Aeneas takes ship thence and would rest in many lands but always is driven out by ill omens. His meeting with Andromache and what state he found her in. The Harpies and Polypheme: which told, Aeneas ends his story.

III. 92: cortina – tripodic caldron

III. 428: Delphinum caudas utero commissa luporum. ¹

Book IV: The Argument – The queen, now more with the love of Aeneas, detains him at Carthage: where he was even now about to make his city when Jove command-ed him to follow his fates, which, though loth, he obeyed. The poet relates the words and passions of the queen until her miserable death.

IV. 6: lustrabat – traverse; IV. 54: impenso – prodigal; IV. 121: indagine – tracking
IV. 121: dum trepidant alae ¹ saltusque indagine cingunt,
¹ The mounted huntsmen on the wings of the party or beaten or feathers used for scaring the game?
IV. 126: propriamque – permanent; IV. 131: plagae – snares
IV. 178-179: illam Terra parens ira inritata deorum ¹
¹ oia parothen choomene Dii Enceladoque ² sororem exremam, ut perhibent, Coeo Tikten (sc. gaia). Apols. Rh. II. 40.
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2 C. a Titan, and E. a giant; this confusion is common.
IV. 605: foros – lanes

Book V: The Argument – driven by contrary winds Aeneas takes refuge in Trinacria and holds games to the memory of his father, wherein a race of ships and of runners, a fight with the fists and shooting with bows are all illustrated. Thereafter with the burning of the ships by the women, at Juno’s instance, the Book closes.

V. 682: stuppa – flax

Book VI: The Argument: - Consultation had with the prophetess, Aeneas, by the golden bough, is suffered to descend into Avernus: its fashion and habitants described the river Lethe and what souls resort thither are to him illustrated by Anchises who further shews him certain of his descendents then waiting to be born.

VI. 586 - dum 1 flammam Iovis et sonitus imitatur Olympi.
1 There is an attractive theory that his punishment consists in endlessly repeating his sin. But it may mean that the S. can [have] him blasted in flagrante, at the moment of the sin.
VI. 895-898:
altera candenti perfecta 1 nitens elephanto sed falsa ad caelum mittunt insomnia Manes his ibi tum natum Anchises unaque Sibyllam prosequitur dictis portaque emittit eburna 2
1 Perhaps = perfecte
2 a. Because he is not an umbra. ∴ not a vera umbra (v. 898)
b. Because he is not an insomnium ∴ not a true somnium.
c. Because all dreams before midnight are fakes: ∴ only the ivory gate is open before midnight as it is then that A. emerges.
d. Because V. does not claim that his account of Hades is true
e. Because this world is only a dream and A. himself became [mad?] on re-entering it.

Book VII: The Argument: - Aeneas in Hesperia the Trojans seek peace of Latinus, which had been perfected but that Juno raised up a fiend to enter into Amata and especially into Turnus, which being done, the accident of Silvia’s stag straightway gave the occasion of war.

1 Boot of raw hide.
VII. 730: aclydes – javelins; VII. 732: caetra – target; VII. 805: colo calathisve – distaff basket

Book VIII: The Argument: - Aeneas admonished by the god Tiber in a dream, journeys up the river to Evandrus the Arcadian king, seeking alliance: which granted, follows the king’s story of Cacus and Vulcan’s forging of armour.
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1 Long, heavy gallic javelins VIII. 664: pilentis – chariots; VIII. 685: ope barbarica – Ennius; VIII. 696: sistro – timbrel

Book IX: The Argument: - Turnus, having understood by a vision the departure of Aeneas, falls upon the camp, but, being beaten off at the first assault, surrounds it with his battalions: this whom Nisus and Euryalus, wishing to bring tidings to Aeneas, make way, but are after slain. On the next day the Trojans are hard pressed by Turnus.

IX. 21: palantisque polo stellas 1 sequor omina tanta,

1 This was apparently a recognized portent. (Caelum discessisse visum esset atque in eo animadversi globi. Cic. De Div. 1.43)


Book X: The Argument: - After a great consult in Heaven the war takes its course: wherein Aeneas, now returned by sea, performs excellent deeds, but Pallas *************** is slain by Turnus: whom Juno converys privily by ship to his father. Then follow the deaths of Lausus and Mesentius.


Book XI: The Argument: - a truce was made for burying of the dead And Aeneas sent back the body of Pallas to the Arcadian king: meanwhile, Diomede having rejected his elders, Latinus calls a counsel of his peers, wherein, many diversely persuading, Turnus and Drances were proceeding to anger when news of Aeneas already at the gates broke off their consultation. Then follow the excellent deeds and death of Camilla.


Book XII: The Argument: Warning given to Latinus and the Trojans, Turnus comes forth to a monomachie with Aeneas: but when they were about to meet, a treason was wrought by the device of Juno, whence the battle is reviewed: wherein after great slaughter Aeneas over reaches Turnus by the gates and slays him. There the poem concludes.
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Having presented Lewis's personal annotations and hoping that they may some day be used in a future textual apparatus of his partial translation of the Aeneid, it seemed appropriate to consider some personal comments by the editor, A.T. Reyes, on his role in the publishing of this first edition and some of his thoughts on Lewis and his work. What follows is an adaptation and abridgement of five questions to and responses from Reyes when he was interviewed by Jason Fisher for Mythprint (May 2011: 4-5), shortly after C.S. Lewis's Lost Aeneid was published. Hopefully my own editing allows the spirit of what was asked and their answers to clarify some important factors in related to the Lost Aeneid.I have put my version of Fisher's questions in italics. Some of this writer's suggestions and comments follow some answers in brackets.

1. How did he first come to be connected with the Lewis corpus? “I had previously helped Walter to identity some of the quotations in C.S. Lewis’s letters.” [see prefaces to CSL Ltrs I: xi, II: xvii, & III: xvii]

2. Is it possible to determine anything of Lewis’s process of translation from the manuscript? “Because the manuscript is probably a fair copy, it is difficult to deduce anything about Lewis’s method of translation....He probably translated those sections which interested him in particular.” [meaning primarily, but not only, Aeneid I, II and VI]

3. Did Lewis include commentary on lines or passages? “There is no accompanying commentary” [But see the dozens of annotations and underlinings taken from his personal copy at the Wilson Library at UNC on which he based his translation]

4. What do you think Lewis found so compelling about the Aeneid? 1) “the tragedy of the Aeneid, with its stark examination of war and its costliness” [see CSL Ltrs II: 750]; 2)“Lewis also identified with Aeneas... an autobiographical fragment of his poetry makes the explicit comparison between himself and Aeneas” [see CSL Ltrs II: 77-78]; 3)“His translation of the Aeneid is an attempt to bring translation of this work back within a Medieval tradition” [see Lewis’s comments on “the real affinity between the ancient and medieval world” in OHEL III: 84ff]

5. What new appreciation can readers of both Lewis and the Aeneid find in C.S. Lewis's 'Lost Aeneid'? “C.S. Lewis's text reads very well as English poetry, but remains exact in its translation of the Latin. The attempt to set the Aeneid squarely within a medieval tradition, using Alexandrine couplets, renders this translation unique.”

On the YaleBooks Blog (March 4, 2011), just before the book was published, Reyes also shared about an interesting discovery he made as he began working on editing Lewis’s translation,

“Over the next 2 years, I read all of Lewis's published work, as well as all of his papers stored in Oxford University’s Bodleian Library. Eventually, I realized that when, in his academic writing, Lewis quoted from the Aeneid in English, he often used metrical lines, each of twelve syllables. Since his translation also used twelve-syllable lines, it was easy to conclude that, when quoting from Virgil, Lewis was quoting himself. He had translated Virgil’s lines into verse, intending these to fit into a larger whole.” (YaleBooks
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Blog (March 4, 2011), “Discovering C.S. Lewis’s Lost Aeneid”

Next, our presentation considers a compilation of remarks from some of the many published responses to Reyes, his introduction and the Lewis translation he edited. These selected comments come from a diverse group of reviewers: several like Bratman, Como, Downing, Fisher, Guite, Svendsen, Vaus and West have either written books and essays on Lewis or have close connections to groups or periodicals that discuss his writings and ideas. Others like Carter, Pesta, Sharp, and Wilson have no previous Lewis connection and are published in secular print publications, while there are also Catholic, Evangelical Protestant and Mainstream Protestant religious publications who have reviewed Lewis’s translation. Ruden, who did her review in Books & Culture is herself a recent and highly acclaimed translator of all twelve books of the Aeneid and brings a definite scholarly vantage, as does Mackenzie in the University of Glasgow periodical, Translation and Literature. The selected reviews show both positive and negative responses; plus, one even questions the provenance of the manuscript. But overall there is general appreciation for the work that Reyes did and for Lewis’s translation. The compilation is in the alphabetical order of the names of the reviewers.

1. Publisher’s Weekly (May 2011): “the narrative is seamlessly bolstered by editor Reyes....Reyes underscores Lewis’s veneration for Virgil’s Aeneid”.

2. Brad Birzer in The American Conservative (July 21, 2011): “Reyes’s book is deep rather than broad...a fine job explaining the text...provides an index of every reference to the Aeneid throughout Lewis’s corpus...Lost Aeneid forces one to reevaluate the role of Virgil’s poetic and intellectual pull not only on Lewis but by extension on 20th century Christian humanism...I will never be able to look at Lewis in the same way again. From the earliest part of his intellectual awakening to his very deathbed, Lewis was enrapt by the Aeneid.”

3. David Bratman in Mythprint (January 2012): “What interests me is its provenance and the peculiar mysteries that hang around it...I do not recall that Hooper had ever mentioned it in any of his works on Lewis... If the bonfire story is true, then what’s ‘lost’ got to do with it?...It’s not a lost Aeneid but a hidden Aeneid....Why did Lewis make a fair copy of a work in such an incomplete state?”

4. James Como in The New Criterion (September 2011): “Reyes’ introduction lays out what there is of Lewis’s engagement with the Aeneid and with Virgil (vocations and their price looming large), his religious importance to Lewis, and Lewis on translation...the actual book affords us a glimpse of how one rich, enormously sympathetic, and religion-charged literary imagination engaged another, religion-charged, though greater, literary imagination; that, and it recovers for us a well-spring of Lewis’ imagination and spirit.”

5. David Downing in C.S. Lewis Blog (April 27, 2011): “C.S. Lewis’s Lost Aeneid introduces a side of Lewis that many readers don’t know – the sophisticated classicist and talented translator...Reyes offers a thorough and masterly introduction, explaining Lewis’s lifelong fascination with the Aeneid... [and] shows that the Aeneid was never very far from Lewis’s mind...This newly-released translation certainly seems to show its influence on his own imagination. One could even argue that Lewis’s attempts to render that difficult Latin rhythm (dactylic hexameter) into English helped him forge the melodic prose
that is such a hallmark of all the Chronicles [of Narnia]."

6. Anthony Esolen in University Bookman (Fall 2011): “What Lewis does for us.... is to show us something of the beauty and the complexity of Virgil’s poem...[he] entered deeply into the poetic ambience of the Aeneid, its mysterious literary mood, and... he did his best to reveal the very strangeness of Virgil in an English meter, alexandrine couplets, that is itself strange and haunting. For that we should be grateful.”

7. Jason Fisher in Mythprint (May 2011): “In this nimble rendition of parts of Virgil’s Aeneid, C.S. Lewis has managed to achieve both fidelity and beauty to a remarkable degree....[In the preface Ross points out that] Lewis ‘is less bound to reproduce every Latin word, but he hits off what is striking and important...In every respect, we are much closer to Virgil.’ (xxiii)...Reyes’s 30-page introduction stands as a terrific preparatory essay on the Aeneid, on Lewis on Virgil, and on Lewis on translation... Above all, this [translation] is just great reading...The translation is full of wonderful words and clever turns of phrase, so many of them uniquely Lewisian. There is abundant raw material in this new book for anyone interested in the art and science of translation.... I hope Lewis’s Lost Aeneid will inspire other translators to look backward, recalling their subjects’ original audiences and not to mollycoddle their present ones quite so much.”

8. Malcom Guite Blog (April 16, 2011): “Worth the wait...Reyes has done a splendid job of editing it all...and providing an excellent introduction.... But the heart of the book is in Lewis's own long, loping, rangey verse translation, full of felicities and an unashamedly, beautiful, romantic and adventurous ‘take’ on its original...It is clearly designed to be read aloud...For Lewis Virgil was a poet who could both celebrate the beauty and majesty of life in this world and at the same time keep the soul attuned to longing, kindle its desire, for the ‘ever-receding shore’, for the land we long for.”

9. Juliette Harrison on Pop Classics” (April 22, 2011): “the poem read beautifully, but probably should not be used by undergraduates studying Virgil in translation, as it is not quite literal enough...Luckily, the surviving material includes some of the most interesting sections from Book 6...Unluckily, the translation of Book 2 runs out just as it gets to the really exciting bit....Reyes has made one decision I did not agree with....He has used the most recent edition of the Latin, not the older edition Lewis used....It would seem to make more sense to me to use the edition Lewis translated from, so his translation can be directly compared with the source material...Lewis’s own love for Virgil comes through clearly, and every line aims to be, basically, as beautiful as possible.”

10. Donald Mackenzie in Translation and Literature 21 (2012):”[The title, C.S. Lewis’s Lost Aeneid, is] ‘a tad hyperbolical’...No reader of this translation will reckon Lewis has [found] a style wholly counter to his age which is also apt for the rendering of Virgil....Lewis is a notable master of pastiche. His translation does better when he moves over from mere archaism into pastiche and echo....At sundry points I found myself reminded of Keats in the plainer narrative moments of Endymion....the recurrent felicities where Lewis arrives at a fuller match for his original – sometimes direct equivalent, sometimes through the small deft relocation, or at a transfused neutral
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original line….Given Lewis’s emphasis on the importance of story it is unsurprising that some of those felicities come in the local detail of ongoing narrative….Whatever the validity of Lewis’s polemical placing of Virgil in relation to the medieval, the Renaissance, and the modern world, [his translation] can signal larger, graver issues of translation, of the community of reading, of continuity and the breaking of continuity.”

11. Michael O’Sullivan in The Tablet (May 21, 2011): “Lewis’s translation of Virgil’s great epic, the Aeneid, is beautifully produced and thoughtfully edited: it constitutes a welcome addition to his existing oeuvre….There is force, beauty and simplicity in his rendering of the opening lines from Book I….The scholarship is meticulous but accessible. Devotees should waste no time in getting hold of it…the perfect introduction to this aspect of his genius.”

12. Duke Pesta in Choice: Current Reviews for Academic Libraries (September 2011): “In this elegant work… Reyes argues that the Aeneid is the link that unites Lewis’s life as Christian apologist and his career as professor of English literature….Providing the Latin text alongside Lewis’s translation, and copious notes, commentary, and explanation, this volume offers unique insights on Virgil, the Aeneid, the epic tradition, the mind and work habits of Lewis, and the relationship between translation and art.”

13. Sarah Ruden in Books & Culture (May/June 2011): “It is exciting that C.S. Lewis’ Aeneid translation fragments are now available…But in Lewis’s case [unlike Virgil’s], the intervention [of friends to save the manuscript] is not as easy to praise… This book shows the translation as fascinating evidence of his formation, imagination, and critical drive….In this edition, the aesthetic judgments offered, though deeply learned, are highly partisan and remind me more of Lewis at his narrowest… I have to conclude that, granted the fragments needed to be published, they lose out through Reyes, Hooper, and the preface-writer D.O Ross’ sometimes wildly uncritical presentation, which throws suspicion even on Lewis’ most accomplished lines…The worst effect of surrounding this undirected, unrehearsed performance of Lewis with flattery is the way the flattery works against his dearest purposes, the religious ones… As a translator, he mistook his personal tastes and professional critical position for the timeless essence of a literary masterpiece, which comes from God rather than from any worldly circumstance.”

14. Richard West in Mythlore (Fall/Winter 2011): “It is not only a translation but a study of Lewis’s use and understanding of the Aeneid…. Lewis approached his translation similarly to the method he praises in the 15th-century Scots translation by Gavin Douglas: not to render every word literally, but to capture the overall meaning and spirit. This is evident from the beginning, where the famous “Arma virumque” is given as “of arms and the exile” rather than the literal “Of arms and the man,” the better to indicate the plight of Aeneas (or Eneas, as Lewis spells the name throughout)…. [Lewis] ‘attempts to clean Virgil’s canvas of the surface grime of classicism… while it restores the archaism and poetic diction of our pre-industrial literary inheritance’ (xix)…The rhyming alexandrines immediately give us the sense of a classical poem…an invaluable ‘introduction’… [is] very knowledgeable about Lewis’s work as well as Virgil’s…. [Of his] argument that ‘Virgil,
in fact, is the link that unites Lewis's life as a Christian apologist and his career as a professor of English literature’ – I think he is right.”

15. Emily Wilson in The New Republic (July 28, 2011): “The main value of C.S. Lewis's ‘lost’ version of the Aeneid is that Lewis's Virgil is a bracing corrective to Eliot's Virgil....Lewis reads the Aeneid through the medieval tradition....Douglas was able to bring out the ‘sensuous vitality’ of Virgil...Lewis's nostalgia for an imaginary medieval past...can easily come across as wrongheaded and anti-intellectual...I have serious reservations about Lewis's way with Virgil. Still, I find it impossible not to be cheered and inspired by his impassioned love of reading...His defense of story and his suspicion of style...he is so conscious of the need to share his own deep pleasure in literary experience....Yet the literary experience offered by C.S. Lewis's Lost Aeneid is dubious and mixed...[Reyes' introduction] oddly includes no discussion of how Lewis's version compares with modern translations....It would be more accurate to say that the interest of this book lies in tracing how similar the Virgilian Lewis is to the various Lewises we already know....Lewis's bits of translation of the Aeneid are bad and good in very much the same ways as his Narnia books....Lewis is better on landscape than people. The storms of Book One are good...So Lewis's translation is, finally, worth reading.

16. Robert Woods in The Musings of a Christian Humanist Blog (May 14, 2011): “Much of its philosophy of translation ...[is] ‘to be true to the meaning of a great work, we should be true to its language’ (28)... The reader also finds an important description of the terms humanist and humanism (23)...Lewis proposed that the ‘great theme of the Aeneid is, at a more general level, in exploration of human transitions...’ (12)...Lewis's work is an enriching experience.”

17. Carol Zaleski in The Christian Century (June 14, 2011): “Long before Lewis became a Christian, the Aeneid acted upon him almost as a Christian epic; long after he became a Christian, the Aeneid remained central to his understanding of vocation... The poetic diction takes some getting used to...He attempts... a medievalist's touch, bringing to his translation a blend of the ceremonial and the sensuous...The result should be seen as an experiment...Its chief value is in what it tells us about Lewis as a Christian reader of the pagan past...Lewis's unfinished Aeneid, however it may fare with critics, establishes beyond doubt his vocation as a translator to the modern world of its own forgotten traditions.”

One notes in closing that after someone has enjoyed the reading of the Lewis translation of the Aeneid, discovered further understanding in his personal annotations in the Hirtzel edition (which should be considered in any future publication), and uncovered more appreciation of his translation through the comments of both the editor and the many reviewers, the student of Lewis has just touched the tip of the iceberg as regards the influence of Virgil upon the works of C.S. Lewis. Overall Reyes, in his editing, his introduction and his discovery of additional references, has done a good job and has much to be thanked for, but further work is still to be done to add to his beginning.

For example, if one could go through all of the published fiction and non-fiction books, poems, essays, diaries and letters by Lewis and merely placed a bookmark at the pages where Virgil or his works are mentioned and then put them in a
timeline of Lewis’s life and also in the context of the Lewis reading chart given at the end of his personal copy, there is no telling what fresh interpretations and insights might be discovered about the Lewis corpus and Virgil’s influence upon it. In the nearly fifty Lewis books and anthologies of essays and poems in this presenter’s library, at least thirty-seven of them make at least one explicit reference to Virgil or themes found in him. Most of these same books have abundantly more than one reference to him. Merely looking in the indexes of four Lewis books – English Literature in the 16th Century and C.S. Lewis Collected Letters, Volumes I, II, & III – the count of pages on which Virgil and his works are mentioned in the text is over 100. In addition much of his fiction is also impacted by Virgil, as are many less popular and less studied books like The Personal Heresy (1939), Studies in Words (1967) and his essay, “Williams and the Arthuriad” in Arthurian Torso (1974). Plus, often there are many other overlooked, unindexed, and untranslated lines and phrases of Virgil which are found throughout the books in the Lewis opus.

All of these connections between Lewis and Virgil and the publishing of a more inclusive textual apparatus, point to possible further study for anyone seeking an important Lewis-related project. Plus, in the end, the study of both Virgil and Lewis might provide unsought for personal benefits like a better knowledge of Latin poetry and a better understanding of the ancient world and its relationship and importance to our own times.
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