



mythLORE

A Journal of J.R.R. Tolkien, C.S. Lewis,  
Charles Williams, and Mythopoeic Literature

Volume 29  
Number 3

Article 4

4-15-2011

## A Matter of Time: C.S. Lewis's *Dark Tower* Manuscript and Composition Process

Jonathan B. Himes

*John Brown University, AR*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.swosu.edu/mythlore>

 Part of the [Children's and Young Adult Literature Commons](#)

### Recommended Citation

Himes, Jonathan B. (2011) "A Matter of Time: C.S. Lewis's *Dark Tower* Manuscript and Composition Process," *Mythlore: A Journal of J.R.R. Tolkien, C.S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and Mythopoeic Literature*: Vol. 29 : No. 3 , Article 4.

Available at: <https://dc.swosu.edu/mythlore/vol29/iss3/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Mythopoeic Society at SWOSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mythlore: A Journal of J.R.R. Tolkien, C.S. Lewis, Charles Williams, and Mythopoeic Literature by an authorized editor of SWOSU Digital Commons. An ADA compliant document is available upon request. For more information, please contact [phillip.fitzsimmons@swosu.edu](mailto:phillip.fitzsimmons@swosu.edu).

To join the Mythopoeic Society go to:  
<http://www.mythsoc.org/join.htm>



---

## Mythcon 51: The Mythic, the Fantastic, and the Alien

Albuquerque, New Mexico • Postponed to: July 30 – August 2, 2021



### Abstract

Explores Lewis's writing process in the unfinished *Dark Tower*, leading us through his examination of the manuscript and explaining his conclusions about the order of composition and Lewis's writing methods.

### Additional Keywords

Lewis, C.S.—Technique; Lewis, C.S. “The Dark Tower”—Authorship; Lewis, C.S. “The Dark Tower”—Manuscript



MATTER OF TIME: C.S. LEWIS'S  
*DARK TOWER* MANUSCRIPT  
AND COMPOSITION PROCESS

JONATHAN B. HIDES

IF C.S. LEWIS'S RANSOM (OR COSMIC) TRILOGY IS LESS FAMILIAR to readers of the Narnia Chronicles, then the fragmentary novella published after his death entitled *The Dark Tower* [*DT*] (1977, ed. Walter Hooper) is virtually unheard-of. Many who have actually read this science-fiction piece find it so bizarre and vulgar that they prefer to let it fade from memory, and some have even doubted whether Lewis could have written something so disturbing and out of character with his other works. What begins in the tale as a theoretical debate among scholars on the possibilities of time travel—a scene somewhat reminiscent of the conversations among Inklings-inspired characters in J.R.R. Tolkien's *Notion Club Papers*—quickly degenerates as the gathering of men use a device called the *chronoscope* to observe a series of obscene and inhumane events in another dimension called Othertime. Although the semi-pornographic imagery of the Stingingman has led some readers to suspect *DT* of being a forgery, several document analysts have examined the original draft and determined that the handwriting is indistinguishable from Lewis's.<sup>1</sup> I too have spent several hours with this manuscript in the Bodleian and agree that the script looks consistent throughout; however, I have not compared it with other samples of Lewis's handwriting, nor have I examined samples of Hooper's. I can only say that this document appears to be the work of a single writer.<sup>2</sup> Due to the inference made by John D. Rateliff from a 1944 letter of J.R.R. Tolkien's (*Lost Road* 207, 212), and because of other direct statements about this story by witnesses like Mathew and

---

<sup>1</sup> Kathryn Lindskoog was the most outspoken proponent of the forgery theory. Her writings such as *The C.S. Lewis Hoax*, though raising many important questions about the editing of Lewis's posthumously published works, are weakened by the vehemence with which she increasingly sought to discredit Walter Hooper. As far as editing quality is concerned, I myself count three word mistakes and one punctuation error in the very few quotations of *DT* that Hooper and Green included in their 1974 biography of Lewis, mistakes that still appear in the newly-revised 1994 edition. One wonders what other editorial errors might lie within Hooper's 1977 edition of *DT* itself.

<sup>2</sup> The handwriting does indeed look uniform, the *f*'s in particular being very distinctive—identical in both main text and in super-script corrections.

Fowler, one may conclude that Lewis did work on such a story in stages, and that this manuscript contains it. Its lack of polish and its crudity can be explained as the quality one might expect of a rough draft that the author abandoned as not worthy of publication.

The following is a brief report on my examination of the manuscript. This is not an exhaustive bibliographic description, as time limitations did not permit me to record every correction or textual feature, but rather it is a more detailed account of the predominant trends of Lewis's revision throughout the manuscript than has heretofore been available.<sup>3</sup> I limited myself mostly to substantive changes of wording and skipped over the minor spelling or grammar errors. A complete record of its contents will have to await the publication of a critical edition, should the Lewis estate ever permit the release of one. My purpose for now is to provide correctives to some of Rateliff's statements about *DT*'s dating and composition process by elucidating Lewis's large-scale revisions mostly within the second half of the manuscript.<sup>4</sup>

One of the first significant alterations in *DT* is a detailed phrase on page 4 that was struck out from the Cambridge men's conversation about time travel theory as opposed to the possibility of directly experiencing specific moments in history without having to travel there. Orfieu mentions, as examples, images of Napoleon and Pericles that might occur in one's mind without having read about them in books, yet that conform to other people's imaginings. The strike-through comes further down, below Lewis and Ransom's responses to Orfieu, where in the *DT* manuscript, Orfieu again mentions the commander who led Athens during the Peloponnesian Wars in the 430s BC, a golden age for Greece when the arts flourished. In contrast to a simple memory of one's own, such as Ransom seeing a boy (himself) in an English public school, Orfieu talks about getting "a [mental] picture of a boy in ancient Greece watching Pericles go [...]" The image here of an Athenian youth privileged to observe one of the greatest heroic leaders of all time was the author's attempt to flesh out Orfieu's example of a direct mental experience of the past. But then, perhaps thinking that this follow-up detail to the earlier Pericles reference was becoming a tangent, Lewis strikes out the uncompleted depiction of ancient Greece and goes with the more bland phrase, "something that happened ages before your birth" instead. This rephrasing confirms within the very first chapter that the majority of revisions are not mere interpolations or additions by a later editor, but are variant ideas that the author changed in midsentence while composing. It's worth noticing

---

<sup>3</sup> For the idea of doing research on the revisions and excisions of the *DT* manuscript, I am indebted to Joe R. Christopher's brief but informative report "A Visit to 'The Dark Tower'" (1993), in which he mentions (but is unable at the time to quote or describe) the many crossed-out portions of the manuscript.

<sup>4</sup> See also Rateliff's book review in *Mythlore*, especially p. 188.

that access to other people's memories from the past as an alternative to time travel is also contrasted in this passage with what we usually call "imagination," as Orfiu relates: "and in fact most of us at present have no test by which to distinguish real fragments of the past from mental fictions" (I quote here from the published version, *DT* 21).

As Lewis scholars well know, pictures in the mind and nightmares were two vehicles that conveyed strong story elements to Lewis's imagination as he wrote his works of fiction, and both certainly play a prominent role in *The Dark Tower*. Green and Hooper's biography of Lewis states that *DT* may have had its origins in nightmare: "There is no record of what pictures grew into *Out of the Silent Planet*; but it seems probable that pictures, or even actual nightmares (to which Lewis was prone throughout his life) were very much in evidence when he started to write *The Dark Tower*" (169). After looking at the *DT* manuscript, I discovered more evidence that this could very well be the case. Consider Lewis's words on the verso of page 2 (in a brighter blue ink than the black of page 1) within a kind of "rough draft" of *Surprised By Joy* [*SBJ*], concerning his memories of growing up in Belfast:

Of the time at the old house I remember much in quality [...]. It is easy to see why autobiography abounds in pictures of very happy, and very unhappy, childhoods: according to the mood I could almost classify my own childhood as either. It was intolerable, and delightful. On the one hand fear played a very important part in it. Giant insects peopled my dreams: that is with me the oldest terror. Nightmares of a more spectral kind came later.

Compare the unpublished passage above with the account of Lewis's earliest childhood recollections published in *SBJ* (italics below are mine):

I remember nothing earlier than the terror of certain dreams. [...] [I]t still seems to me odd that petted and guarded childhood should so often have in it a *window opening on what is hardly less than Hell*. My bad dreams were of two kinds, those about specters and those about insects. The second were, beyond comparison, the worse [...]. Their angular limbs, their *jerky* movements, their dry, metallic noises, all suggest either machines that have come to life or *life degenerating into mechanism*. You may add that in the hive and the anthill we see fully realized the two things that some of us most dread for our own species—the dominance of the female and the *dominance of the collective*. (*SBJ* 6-7)

*DT* contains both major elements of these passages—insects and dreams—and uses them as important framing devices to symbolize the theme of mechanistic

dehumanization: the beetles that teem on the walls of the Stingingman's throne room, along with other forms of prolific yet inhuman images like crashing waves and deathly armies on the march that overwhelm the senses with "obscure [...] fertility" (30-31 in Hooper's text); the insect- or machine-like precision of the Stingingman's method of injecting his victims with venom (35); the insect ingredients within the Othertime meal that Scudamour suspects of maintaining the poison in his horn (80); the disturbing dreams that plague the chronoscope observers after witnessing the scenes in Othertime (33); the "dreams" and "waking hallucination[s]" of Othertimers leading to discoveries of more "historical" versions of the "Smokehorse" and other fabulous creatures from Othertime nursery- and folktales (88); and the nightmares that children suffer so that the Othertime experimenters may exploit them to spy on our Earth-time (88-89). One might also refer to these textual details as the kind of Story elements, as Lewis explains in "On Stories," responsible for the peculiar atmosphere of good tales and thus in some ways more important than the mere succession of events in plot—a concept encapsulated in the term coined by Michael Ward as *donegality* (72-76). In this case the atmosphere of Story evoked by such elements would be *horror*; the word itself appears in *DT* at least seven times.<sup>5</sup> And it seems that Lewis drew largely from elements of his own personal nightmares to construct the particular flavor of horrors in Othertime.

Page 8 of the manuscript, which has astronomical diagrams on the back of the sheet, has about two sentences crossed out concerning the observatory's heavy curtains and the sky at night thus viewed in Othertime.<sup>6</sup> Then an interesting cross-out shows Lewis making a significant change in his conception of the duration of a day in the other dimension. Replying to MacPhee, who had asked if days are longer there, Orfieu says in the cross-out that strangely, a day is actually not as long. Lewis replaced this with a brief phrase inserted above the line, that "No—they're the same." And after another sentence explaining the time difference, he crosses out yet another sentence concerning the shorter days in Othertime. This demonstrates that Lewis was making substantial changes in his conception of the alien timescape in the earliest pages of the manuscript. It was

---

<sup>5</sup> On pages 33, 36, 51, 70, 79, 81, and 88 of Hooper's 1977 edited text.

<sup>6</sup> Of the sketches on the verso of page 8: one in the upper right corner has seven dots lined up in a row like a solar system. The largest planet (earth?) is a two-tone figure that has been circled with an arrow pointing diagonally up to the right, as if to indicate that this planet (or a nearby speck—its moon?) would go off course from its orbit. In the middle of this page, right side, is a drawing of the sun and its beams centered on a horizon, with an overhead motion arc sketched between two dots in the sky. At left of the horizon line appears the letter *w* (looks like *h*) and on the right, the capital letter *E*. These diagrams appear on the back of page 8, in which characters view the night sky and talk about it.

not merely a clean copy he was making of an earlier draft, but a work in progress, certainly by the time he reached page 8.

Page 10 reveals serious second thoughts as well, this time in pencil. He writes "How do they know?" next to Scudamour's statement (written in the usual ink) that they rarely can see things "ten miles away from the Dark Tower" while viewing Othertime scenes through the chronoscope. How *would* they know the relative distances between sights that materialize due to the random "interest lines" taken by the device? Lewis realized the problem but didn't resolve it.

Pages 11 and 49 are missing from the manuscript, but while Lewis leaves the loss of page 49 unremarked, his editing pencil makes special notation about the loss of page 11: the inked numeral 10 on the tenth sheet is crossed out and replaced with the numeral 11, using a similar pencil lead to that used on the same page for other notes to self (see above paragraph). At this stage in his editing, Lewis was aware that he had lost (or deliberately removed?) page 11 and numbered this sheet in its place.<sup>7</sup> Such a decision could indicate Lewis's awareness that the fragment contained too much degenerate material for serious *scientifiction*. Whatever was contained on the missing page 11, Lewis did not try to reproduce it or replace it, although he went to great lengths elsewhere to revise portions of his prose.

As for the corrections he did make: at least twenty-five strike-throughs in the manuscript occur in the act of composition, often consisting of a fragmentary idea struck out and then replaced by a better phrase adjacent on the line, showing that the original thought was altered in midstream. Only five of these corrected phrases occur in the first half; three more occur in the middle (pp. 31-42); with the vast majority of seventeen instances occurring in the latter half (pp. 43-54).

In other types of revision, substituted phrases appear above the corrected text and not after it. This superscript method, evidence of later editing and sometimes with upward caret marks to indicate inserted wording, occurs at least forty times. Thirty of these forty editing corrections take place in the second half of the manuscript, on pp. 32-53. In other words, there is considerably more copy-editing in the second half.

Starting in part III, there are paragraphs of considerable size struck out, some that take up the greater part of an entire page: 118 words on p. 23;<sup>8</sup> at least

---

<sup>7</sup> The missing sheet probably contained a scene further demonstrating Cyril Knellie's penchant for debauchery, as indicated by his insistence on leading "Lu-lu" (his nickname for Lewis) to his rooms for some "real" claret right before the missing page and Lewis and Ransom's drunkenness from fatigue and from too much claret right after it. Knellie, a flamboyant devotee of erotic arts (*DT* 28) and Oscar Wilde (52), takes rapturous delight in the horrid torturings viewed with the chronoscope.

<sup>8</sup> Details about this excision are given at length here in the following paragraphs.

200 words on p. 33;<sup>9</sup> 37 words on p. 54;<sup>10</sup> and 148 words on p. 61.<sup>11</sup> There is nothing like this extent of revision in the first two chapters. Yet these excised passages, the most substantial revisions in all of the manuscript, show the writer making multiple attempts to get a similar idea across but in a better or clearer style. That is, all except for the first one on p. 23 which is simply crossed out; within it, there are four minor word changes, but not substantive variants of phrasing or any series of false starts:

So we sat in the window drinking tea and smoking and enjoying the summer morning and keeping half an eye on the screen. I got Scudamour to talk about himself and presently about Marion Ambed (that was the fiancée) and their plans for the future, and his headache became much better. At least, that is how I remember the conversation. MacPhee, with a grin which ~~he~~ suggests he may not be speaking the truth, tells me that Scudamour says <sup>^ it was he ^ who</sup> got me to talk about my books and my war experiences and so from being rather rattled, I ~~came~~ cheered me up. But what followed is perhaps the best comment on that version.

The narrator notes here that Scudamour is stressed out about his relationship with the fiancée and thus shares his anxieties with Lewis. There is a marked tone of intimacy and personal revelation between the two men in this passage. Complicating the inclusion of such self-disclosure is the fact that it is reported by C.S. Lewis-the-narrator, an even more active character role here than in *Perelandra* or in *The Great Divorce*. And he admits in this crossed-out recollection of the tea-time chat with Scudamour that he may be an unreliable narrator. He recalls that they passed the summer morning pleasantly smoking

---

<sup>9</sup> This excision contains mostly Ransom and Lewis's dialogue, with two paragraphs by Ransom explaining that Scudamour had now changed bodies with the Othertime clone with the sting. Of these 200 words crossed out on page 33, he closely paraphrases several sentences, some of them verbatim, on page 36 (58-59, Hooper's edition). Lewis (the author) felt that action was called for instead of dialogue, and so MacPhee, Ransom, and Lewis (the character) give chase to the Stingingman who now inhabits Scudamour's body, but then resume this talk when the trail grows cold.

<sup>10</sup> These crossed-out words include three separate attempts at the same sentence about the aging scientists who witness the evolution of Stingingmen: "seeing the sting lavished by nature," they "grew old in their experiments and saw man after man rise from the dregs of the working caste."

<sup>11</sup> This crossed-out portion deals with two alternate "scientific" attempts to explain that Scudamour had encountered a proper name while reading books in the Dark Tower library, and why it gave him pause. The passage was an attempt at a bit of realism about the disorienting effects of Scudamour's inhabiting an alien (but identical) body in Othertime.



and drinking tea in the window as a diversion from the vigil with the chronoscope—an important detail in that it relieves Scudamour's headache.

When he projects himself into a matrimonial future while chatting with Lewis, Scudamour escapes both his present anxieties and the Othertime horrors involving his double. "At least, that is how I remember the conversation," concludes Lewis-the-narrator. However, he quickly acknowledges in the next sentence that MacPhee remembers differently. The Scotsman in this fragment has been supervising Lewis's chronicles of the chronoscope adventures, almost reading over his shoulder and commenting all along, and in this case he smirks at Lewis mischievously in stating that Scudamour claimed to have got Lewis reminiscing about war experiences and the books he had written—elements of Lewis-the-author's real past—which have the effect of cheering up Lewis-the-character (who is now narrating). Yet the grin on MacPhee's face suggests to the narrator that "he may not be speaking the truth" about how Scudamour remembers the conversation. But as the narrator concludes this crossed-out paragraph, "what followed is perhaps the best comment on that [...]." And what followed is that Scudamour flung himself at the screen just before his fiancée's double could be stung by his own double, exchanging their psyches across timescapes. This unpublished paragraph of *DT* thus offers an interesting metafictional moment in the narrative—a collaboration between Lewis and MacPhee, who vie for the title of Unreliable Narrator.

Through the excision of this crossed-out paragraph, Lewis-the-author ultimately decided here to be just as reticent as he typically is elsewhere about his wartime experiences and his own reputation as a writer. It is well known among biographers that Lewis never kept copies of his own publications on his shelves. Of his various published works, his most personal, *Surprised by Joy*, contains only eight pages (out of 130) about his experience in the trenches of WWI. Lewis made it a habit to keep his private life to himself, including some of the most pivotal influences—from The Great War itself to his compromising and embarrassing domestic situation of living with Mrs. Moore, a married woman. Considering his lifelong habit of reserve, it's interesting that these self-referential remarks made their way at all into the narrative's initial draft, and curious that memories of The Great War, undoubtedly a traumatic experience, had a soothing effect on Lewis-the-character in the midst of so much degeneracy observed with the chronoscope that had rattled him. Though eventually excised, this passage in which the vexed Scudamour confides in Lewis provides one more textual instance of Lewis's scientifictional premise for this story—the psychic vulnerability required for exchanging places with Othertime doubles. It allows us to see more of Lewis's basis for the plot, even though he may have crossed it out for other reasons (MacPhee was already far too intrusive, Lewis himself was

getting too personal, and perhaps the author felt this intimate chat was giving away too much and ruining some of the suspense).

One last interesting detail in this passage: *Marion Ambed* is the original name of Scudamour's fiancée. The first name *Marion* is a medieval French diminutive form of *Marie*, whereas the last name *Ambed* has no entries in dictionaries of names that I consulted. The next time Lewis refers to her, it is by her last name only, but no longer is it *Ambed*. As Hooper explains in his notes, "Before Lewis changed Camilla's surname to 'Bembridge', which first appears on page 44, she was called Camilla 'Ammeret,'" a fact which links these characters to Spenser's Scudamour and Amoret in *The Faerie Queene*, Book III (97). The only occurrence of *Ammeret* occurs in the *DT* manuscript on page 24 about midway down: "In our defence I may plead that Miss Ammeret was expected in a very few days [...]" The first reference to her at all as a character occurs near the beginning of part III (which starts at the top of a fresh sheet of paper), where Scudamour merely mentions that his fiancée is coming for a visit, and it is in this same section of the tale that Lewis tries out the appellations *Marion Ambed* and then *Miss Ammeret*. The evolution of this character's name proceeds to "Camilla!" shouted by Scudamour in part IV (also commencing at the top of a fresh page), right as she enters the Stinging chamber and he dashes into the chronoscope. Not until a page later in part IV of the manuscript does Lewis give the full name "Camilla Bembridge" as related by Orfieu on the resemblance of the female double to the fiancée. The various name connotations suggest that Lewis was modifying her role slightly at different stages of writing.<sup>12</sup>

In all, the nature and extent of revisions reveal that the manuscript is clearly a work in progress and not a clean copy, though the greater number (and the most substantive) of corrections is confined to the second half. We can see the author editing in ink as he goes, rewording and at times revising entire sentences or even paragraphs. Penciled corrections of spelling and wording also appear as

---

<sup>12</sup> Camilla's first two revised names soon after she is introduced as a character in part III indicate her integral role as a chaste helpmeet to Scudamour: both "Marion" (a form of "Marie" or "Mary") and Ammeret (called after the "noble and virtuous" Amoret, according to Hooper, p. 97) have connotations of conjugal purity—i.e., knowing one's spouse in the biblical sense without physically objectifying that person—a Spenserian paradox not to be confused with the term "chaste marriage." Yet the first name Lewis used, "Marion Ambed," also has undertones that belie her consoling function in the excised scene of MS p. 23 where Scudamour tells Lewis about her and their wedding plans: *Marion* has a meaning of "obstinacy" or rebellion in many etymological reference works, and *Ambed*, of unknown derivation, simply resembles "abed" or "in bed." *Ammeret* was perhaps too obviously a clue that she would be in need of rescue, whereas by the time she finally appears in part IV, her role was realized as *Camilla* 'servant' *Bembridge* 'in the bridge,' or a crucial link between the two worlds.

more of a proofreading stage, in some cases calling into question the logistics of his scientification. It's clear that the more theoretical chapters of *DT*—the first and last—are Lewis's most eloquent, the first being especially fluent and most likely composed not long after *Out of the Silent Planet*.

By a strange coincidence, Lewis's tale of time travel was inscribed on sheets of paper whose textual features raise some questions about the author's timeframe of composition. Trusting to Rateliff's reckonings, one would have to believe that Lewis himself did some time traveling, from 1938 to 1946 and back again, in order to have composed it after completing the entire Ransom trilogy.<sup>13</sup> However, Lewis had to have composed the bulk of *DT* between the late 1930s and early 40s, making it the second book he began writing for the series. Not only the bibliographic evidence argues this, but the internal matters of the narrative as well: the year 1938 is mentioned three times (once on p. 19 and twice on p. 59 in Hooper's edited text)—the same year that *Out of the Silent Planet* was published. Furthermore, Ransom is said to have undergone, as a hero or victim, "one of the strangest adventures that had ever befallen a mortal man," and that beyond the theoretical speculations of the other Cambridge men, he alone had "actually experienced, how thin is the crust which protects 'real life' from the fantastic" (*DT* 17, my italics). Notice that Ransom's prior fantastic experience is given in the singular: "the story is told in *another book*" (*ibid*, my italics). If Lewis had been writing *DT* after the other three Ransom books but meant for it to be retro-fitted as the second story (as Rateliff argues), wouldn't we expect the author to express this intention for his audience a bit more clearly, if his readers had already read three published Ransom adventures? These and many other details of characterization and plot similar to those in Lewis's subsequent books indicate clearly that *DT* was begun soon after *Out of the Silent Planet* as its sequel, but that due to its many weaknesses Lewis dropped it in favor of reworking its more promising themes into *That Hideous Strength*, among other writings.<sup>14</sup>

In his critique of my formerly published sequence for Lewis's composition of *DT*, Rateliff misses some key points. He dismisses out of hand the manuscript's complicated history as deduced from the conflicting reports of

---

<sup>13</sup> See Rateliff, "*The Lost Road, The Dark Tower, and The Notion Club Papers.*" The second verso of *DT* contains an early draft of *Surprised by Joy*, bearing the date 1946 given for the year of Lewis's birth in the very first autobiographical sentence, which is crossed out and replaced with 1898. Rateliff considers this "strong circumstantial evidence that he was working on *The Dark Tower* in 1946" (212).

<sup>14</sup> These elements of *DT* that appear in other works by Lewis including *The Screwtape Letters* and *The Great Divorce* are treated at length in my 2008 essay "The Allegory of Lust" (see pp. 57-58, 64, 66, 68-70; notes 12, 13).

Fowler, Mathew, and Hooper.<sup>15</sup> Ignoring the discrepancies about a supposed typescript shown to Alistair Fowler, the only living witness to the pre-publication form of *DT* besides Walter Hooper, Rateliff relegates any rebuttals to a footnote, stating that the “manuscript [...] aside from minor copy-editing corresponds exactly to the published text” (188n). The many passages I have checked against Hooper’s published version do indeed correspond, but there are significant excisions and corrections that go beyond minor copy-editing, as shown above.<sup>16</sup>

Rateliff further claims the manuscript to be “a coherent rough draft *all* set down in a single stage of composition and on the *same batch of fresh paper*” (188n, my italics). The evidence of the text argues otherwise: pages 1-18 are written on a yellowish-light brown paper with blue ruling lines, the first 8 pages of which contain innumerable tiny specks and brown splotches, half of them being “scrap” sheets of notes, math sums, diagrams, and abandoned drafts of other works. Pages 7 and 8 mark the boundary between parts I and II of the story, and the splotches nearly disappear after the first eight pages. Page 19, near the beginning of section III, and the rest of the manuscript are written on a different, whiter type of paper with black ruling lines that is clean and free of any splotches. Granted, paper tends to change color over time and the manuscript could certainly have acquired the splotches long after being in Lewis’s possession.<sup>17</sup> However, the groupings of these different paper types and qualities seem more than coincidental and at least allow for the possibility that Lewis composed this story in stages, setting it aside and taking it back up again (possibly two stages of drafting, in addition to at least two stages of revision, one in ink and one in pencil), before finally leaving it for good.

More importantly, the fact that Lewis (re)used the first eight sheets for other abandoned drafts and other notes would explain the date of 1946 written on the verso of sheet two, even though Lewis probably began writing *DT* in the late 1930s. In other words, the evidence of the text supports a total reversal of Rateliff’s idea: that instead of starting this draft after writing *That Hideous Strength* (as Rateliff believes he did), Lewis took up Ransom’s further adventures in *DT* soon after finishing *Out of the Silent Planet*, worked intermittently on it and eventually abandoned the whole thing, but sometime in 1946 re-used its “scrapped” sheets to try out ideas for *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* and *Surprised By Joy*.

---

<sup>15</sup> My 2008 essay provides details about a *DT* typescript and other discrepancies in Fowler’s various accounts of *DT*’s composition process and dating.

<sup>16</sup> Of the many minor errors corrected throughout the manuscript, Lewis’s most common mistakes occur with being verbs—he has to change *being* to *be* (and vice-versa) or *were* to *are* (at least twice)—and omissions of helping verbs or tenses on verbs.

<sup>17</sup> At the time of my research at the Bodleian, I was unable to determine whether the specks and splotches were made prior to Lewis’s handwriting or vice-versa.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am deeply grateful to John Brown University for the generous Supplemental Travel Grants and for ancillary funding from the Humanities & Social Sciences division that allowed me to do this research in Oxford (May 2009) and present it at the annual CSLIS conference (April 2010) and get useful feedback. I also want to express my gratitude to Laura Schmidt, archivist at Wheaton College's Marion E. Wade Center, for checking my *DT* manuscript findings against the copy held in their collection.

### WORKS CITED

- Christopher, Joe R. "A Visit to 'The Dark Tower.'" *Mythprint*. March 1993: 3-4.
- Green, Roger Lancelyn and Walter Hooper. *C.S. Lewis: A Biography*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974.
- Himes, Jonathan B. "The Allegory of Lust: Textual and Sexual Deviance in *The Dark Tower*." In *Truths Breathed Through Silver: The Inklings' Moral and Mythopoeic Legacy*. Ed. Jonathan B. Himes, with Joe R. Christopher and Salwa Khoddam. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2008. 51-80.
- Lewis, C.S. *The Dark Tower and Other Stories*. Ed. Walter Hooper. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.
- . *The Great Divorce*. New York: Macmillan, 1946.
- . Manuscript of *The Dark Tower*. N.d. MS. Eng. misc. c. 1109=Res. Bodleian Library, Oxford. Excerpts printed with the permission of the CSL Company.
- . "On Stories." In *Of Other Worlds: Essays and Stories*. Ed. Walter Hooper. Harcourt Brace, 1966.
- . *Out of the Silent Planet*. 1938. New York: Macmillan, 1965.
- . *Perelandra*. 1943. New York: Macmillan, 1965.
- . *Surprised by Joy: The Shape of my Early Life*. In *The Inspirational Writings of C.S. Lewis*. New York: Inspirational Press, 1987. 3-130.
- . *That Hideous Strength*. 1946. New York: Collier Books, 1965.
- Lindskoog, Kathryn. *The C.S. Lewis Hoax*. Portland: Multnomah Press, 1988.
- Rateliff, John D. "The Lost Road, The Dark Tower, and The Notion Club Papers: Tolkien and Lewis's Time Travel Triad." In *Tolkien's Legendarium: Essays on The History of Middle-earth*. Ed. Verlyn Flieger and Carl F. Hostetter. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2000.
- . Rev. of *Truths Breathed Through Silver: The Inklings' Moral and Mythopoeic Legacy*, ed. Jonathan B. Himes, with Joe R. Christopher and Salwa Khoddam. *Mythlore* 28.1/2 (#107/108) (2009): 186-91.
- Ward, Michael. *Planet Narnia*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.

### ABOUT THE AUTHOR

**JONATHAN B. HIMES** is Associate Professor of English at John Brown University. His other publications include articles on Lewis and Tolkien and an edited book on the Inklings entitled *Truths Breathed Through Silver* (CSP, 2008), as well as a critical edition of *The Old English Epic of Waldere* (CSP, 2009).



EXPLORE

READ

# PARABOLA

{Where Spiritual Traditions Meet}

Quarterly Magazine  
(128 highly illustrated pages)  
US \$29.95 per year print or digital

1.877.593.2521 [WWW.PARABOLA.ORG](http://WWW.PARABOLA.ORG)