

1: The Problem of Emeth – Sunday Freedom

In The Last Battle, Emeth was a soldier from Calormene who worshiped Tash. Emeth thought that Tash was basically like Aslan, so Aslan interpreted Emeth's worship of Tash as actually being worship of him.

The full text of this article in PDF format can be obtained by clicking [here](#). In Chapter XV, a noble pagan named Emeth Hebrew for truth dies and expects to meet the vulture-headed god Tash that he has worshipped all his life. He meets instead Aslan the Christ of Narnia, who tells him that the good that Emeth did for Tash was actually done for Aslan, and that his search for truth has led him to Aslan. Now, if Emeth had politely asked Aslan to direct him to the Tash part of heaven, and if Aslan had sent him on his way to spend eternity with his god, then critics of Lewis would be justified in accusing him of teaching universal salvation. But that is not at all what happens! As Emeth stands before Aslan, he realizes that Tash and Aslan are not two different names for the same God, but that they are complete opposites. Rather than learn that all religions are the same, Emeth learns that Aslan alone is the true end of his pagan longings. For all find what they truly seek. When the true Lord reveals Himself to Emeth, he recognizes Him as the one he has sought all his life. Remember that when Paul preached before the Areopagus in Athens, promising that what they had long worshiped in ignorance he would proclaim to them as known, there were a few who accepted the revelation. Yes, most laughed at Paul and dismissed his seemingly nonsensical suggestion that the body would be resurrected, but there were some who believed, who recognized that this is what they had been seeking all of their lives. Traditional, orthodox Christianity has always held that once we die, all bets are off, and the decision for Christ must be made before we breathe our last breath. The orthodox Lewis, however, seems to say that more chances remain to us. We simply do not understand the difference between time and eternity. Eternity does not mean time going on forever; it means no time at all. God, who dwells in eternity, does not foresee the future; He sees it as we see the present. Searching for Salvation Now, let us extend this insight about time and eternity to the end of our lives. The moment we die, we step into an eternal moment that includes within it all other moments past, present, and future. Might it not be that if I am a person who had no opportunity to accept Christ either out of ignorance or mental illness or a wretched upbringing that made it psychologically impossible for me to trust the promises of the Christian faith, but whose heart has been yearning for and desiring the true God to fill the God-shaped vacuum within me, might not the living Christ reveal Himself to me in the midst of that eternal moment? And if, in that moment, I recognized as Emeth does that Christ is the end of my lifelong search for truth—just as He is the end, not only of the Jewish Law and Prophets, but of all the highest yearnings of the pagans—might Christ not take me to Himself? Lewis is just as tentative in his suggestions about heaven and hell. In *The Great Divorce*, Lewis conjures for us a lovely fantasy, but he makes it clear that it is a fantasy. He is not recounting a vision given him by God nor preaching a new doctrine. He simply wonders what might happen if the souls of the damned were allowed to climb aboard a special bus and ride on it to heaven. What if, when they got to heaven, the souls of the blessed who knew them on earth met with them and tried to convince them, even now, to let go of their sin and their narcissism and embrace the love and grace and mercy of Christ? And the one soul that does, in the timeless eternity of heaven, turn to Christ is the one we least expect. Did not Jesus Himself say that it is the sick who need a doctor and not those who are well? Is that not why the prostitutes and tax collectors who knew their need flocked to Jesus, while the self-righteous Pharisees who thought they were doing quite well rejected Him? He opens the tiniest rift in his heart, and the love of Christ floods in, transforming the man and the evil lizard who whispers lewd things in his ear into a giant blessed spirit and a noble, powerful horse on which the spirit mounts and rides. Is Lewis then saying that Christianity is only about feeling? No, it is not about feeling; it is about yielding: In that moment of death, which is an eternal moment, this poor, twisted, tormented man, like Emeth, yields to both the authority and mercy of Christ. And therein is found the good news and the bad. Heaven and hell, Lewis writes in *The Great Divorce*, work backward. That is the final division, the great divorce. There are people a great many of them who are slowly ceasing to be Christians but who still call themselves by that name: There are other people who are slowly becoming Christians though they do not yet call themselves so. There are

people who do not accept the full Christian doctrine about Christ but who are so strongly attracted to Him that they are His in a much deeper sense than they themselves understand. For example, a Buddhist of good will may be led to concentrate more and more on the Buddhist teaching about mercy and to leave in the background though he might still say he believed the Buddhist teaching on certain other points. This is a bold statement, and with it Lewis pushes the envelope just about as far as it can go. Does he push it too far? I do not think he does. Recognizing the Revelation The Buddhist is not saved by his Buddhism, but his slow, incremental yielding to the Spirit of Christ that reaches out to him through general as opposed to special revelation, prepares his heart for what we might call the Emeth moment: God does not judge us on the basis of our raw material which includes the country where we are born , but on what we do with that raw material. Will we recognize our need and yield to Him, or will we cling on obstinately to our pride, greed, and lust? It is a yielding to the transforming power of Christ. It is the rift in the heart that enables the flood of grace to wash in. Ray Chair in Humanities. Portions of this essay have been adapted from chapters 8&€”10 of Apologetics for the 21st Century Crossway, Christian Research Institute Our Mission: To provide Christians worldwide with carefully researched information and well-reasoned answers that encourage them in their faith and equip them to intelligently represent it to people influenced by ideas and teachings that assault or undermine orthodox, biblical Christianity. Do you like what you are seeing? Your partnership is essential.

2: Beyond Mere Christianity - Christian Research Institute

Aslan isn't saying that Emeth's service to Tash is just as worthy as service to Aslan. Rather, he's saying that what Emeth thought was service to Tash was really service to Aslan. In other words, Emeth was a servant of Aslan's, even though he didn't realize it.

Christianity-is-not-leftwing Self explanatory title. I abhor that nicey nicey, politically correct, pseudo-Christianity which almost always supports leftwing attitudes - which in most cases are profoundly anti-Gospel. This Blog supports persecuted Christians. This Blog exposes cults. This Blog opposes junk science. This is not a forum. It is hardhitting and unashamedly evangelical so if it offends - please do not come to this site! Eventually, all of the characters you would expect end up in heaven: Knowing what we know about his country, that comes as a shock to many Christian readers of Narnia. He says he met Aslan and was amazed at the beauty and majesty of the lion. Even though he spent his life serving Tash, the supposed god of Calormen, Emeth says seeing Aslan, even if it meant his death, was better than being a king on earth. For all find what they truly seek. So what do I do? Lewis is using a fictional world to present pictures and myths that point to real truth. It seems obvious, but it bears stating. Narnia is a different world with a different incarnational appearance. Aslan repeatedly visits Narnia, while Christians are waiting on the second and final appearance of Christ. It was not meant to redeem all of Narnia. No one is ever asked to accept the sacrificial death of Aslan to ensure their salvation. Because of the differences, we should not expect the same rules to apply in both places. Clearly, the literary picture of Aslan is meant to reflect Jesus, but the character Aslan has a different relationship with the fictional world of Narnia than Earth has with Christ. Narnia did not have a Fall. There is no Adam and Eve who disobey and impart sin into their offspring. Sin, as it were, enters Narnia through Jadis, a queen from a completely different world. Clearly, the animals and humans living in Narnia have the ability to choose to follow Aslan, but we should not assume the redemptive history of that fictional world mirrors our own. In a way, however, Emeth is subject to the earthly Fall. But Emeth was born and has lived his entire life in a world without the same type of Fall. He is in a place where God became incarnate as a lion, not a human. It is here where Emeth meets Aslan and realizes his mistake of following Tash. A group of dwarfs refuse to believe they are in a beautiful land and, instead, behave as if they are trapped in a dark dungeon. I would love more of that. If so, how did you think through the issue? Polly was there warning him not to do it. Only the genders are reversed from Eden.

3: List of The Chronicles of Narnia characters - Wikipedia

The image of Aslan as presented to Emeth in Calormen would have been that of a horrible demon, the enemy of the good God Tash and dedicated to the destruction of all that was righteous- naturally he wouldn't have accepted the name of such a creature.

Talking with trees 2. A defence of Lewis 3. Lewis and love his works are likely to have come up against elements in his writings that cause them to cringe or frown; and those who do not love him or his work have found a good many more. A great many charges have been levelled at Lewis over the years, and in particular at his Narnia stories. Recently these have come particularly from outspoken secular humanists like Philip Pullman and Polly Toynbee, and from those on the more liberal wing of Christianity like the Reverend Giles Fraser. However, Lewis has also come under fire from many conservative evangelicals who object to some of his theology and moral teaching as well as the supposedly occult and pagan elements in the Narnia stories. Charges against Lewis and Narnia include proselytising for Christianity; patronizing, preachy moralising; prejudice and bigotry; sexism and chauvinism ; racism and anglocentrism ; colonialism, imperialism and anti-democratic monarchism ; classism ; reactionary ultra-conservatism ; datedness and out-datedness ; heresy and heterodoxy ; immorality and blasphemy ; occultism and paganism see next chapter ; bloodthirsty bellicosity, sado-masochism and approval of violence ; frightening horror inappropriate for children ; sickly-sweet sentimentalism, anti-growing up and anti-sex ; humourlessness ; plagiarism and derivativeness ; inconsistency and incoherency. And while many of them are serious moral issues, several of the lesser charges are merely stylistic and subjective. Among the most serious from a Christian perspective are the issues of occultism and paganism, which together form a topic large enough to merit a section of its own; so I will leave discussion of these to the next chapter. I love the Narnia stories, but I also recognise their imperfections: But few of us can completely transcend or even realise all the blindnesses of our own time. And perhaps in some cases where we are quick to accuse Lewis of prejudice or old-fashioned views, his thinking may one day turn out to have been better or truer than ours all along. Furthermore, I believe that whatever faults we may find in the books or their author do not significantly undermine the abiding quality or value of the stories. Why did one find it so hard to feel as one was told one ought to feel about God or about the sufferings of Christ? One was told one ought to. An obligation to feel can freeze feelings. And reverence itself did harm. But supposing that by casting all these things into an imaginary world, stripping them of their stained-glass and Sunday school associations, one could make them for the first time appear in their real potency? Could one not thus steal past those watchful dragons? I thought one could. But Lewis himself rejected putting morals into stories: If we ask that question we are assuming too superior an attitude. But it is better not to ask the question at all. Let the pictures tell you their own moral. For the moral inherent in them will rise from whatever spiritual roots you have succeeded in striking during the whole course of your life. For the moral you put in is likely to be a platitude, or even a falsehood, skimmed from the surface of your consciousness. I think Lewis abided by these principles pretty consistently; in most cases his moral points are made subtly and form a natural part of the story without impinging on our conscious minds or grating on our ears. Prejudice and bigotry This is obviously a very broad charge " prejudice against what? What I would say here is that every single human has prejudices, conscious or unconscious, admitted or concealed. Lewis is no exception and there are places in his books where he seems to reveal his prejudices quite strongly. Nonetheless I suspect that what Lewis objects to in the Scrubbs is not so much their vegetarianism etc Lewis himself loved animals and was I think opposed to blood sports and vivisection , but their faddishness. Perhaps most noteworthy is that his two greatest personifications of evil are female, and also very beautiful: This has been read by some as a sign that Lewis was frightened of powerful, intelligent and beautiful women. I think this is unlikely. Perhaps Lewis, like so many men Christian and otherwise, simply struggled with sexual temptation. If this all sounds terribly pagan and occult, see the next chapter on Magic and faith in Narnia. In any case, we need to put all this in context. Although most of the rulers of Narnia are men, and Peter is the High King partly because he is the oldest , Susan and Lucy are also great and highly-honoured queens and rulers. More importantly, all of the

books contain both boy and girl protagonists, and in most cases the girls come off at least as well if not better. Everyone must sometimes have wondered why in nearly all tongues certain inanimate objects are masculine and others feminine. Our ancestors did not make mountains masculine because they projected male characteristics onto them. The real process is the reverse. Gender is a reality, and a more fundamental reality than sex. Sex is, in fact, merely the adaptation to organic life of a fundamental polarity which divides all created things. Female sex is simple one of the things that have feminine gender; there are many others, and Masculine and Feminine meet us on planes of reality where male and female would be simply meaningless. To say that each sex has certain unique roles, responsibilities and inclinations seems to me simply biological and psychological common sense, but Lewis is in fact more complex than that: Racism and anglocentrism Racism is a serious charge and probably the hardest to defend Lewis against. Of course there are no truly black people at all, either good or bad, in the Narnia stories which is pretty much par for the course for a British author. I think we probably simply have to accept that all white westerners up to about the ss were, by our standards and to our eyes, racist to some degree. This is not a problem unique to Lewis by any means. Nesbit and even Chesterton contain some shockingly racist ideas and language. Even here though, the picture is not quite so forgive me black-and-white. This of course crucially means that the Calormenes are inherently redeemable. The much lesser charge of anglocentrism does not, I feel, warrant addressing in great detail though my own Englishness may of course blind me to it. Lewis was part Irish, part Welsh, part English and was not particularly widely-travelled. He wrote primarily of the world he knew and of the world he longed for, which inevitably is very British in its form and character down to the specifics of its countryside, flora and fauna, food, language and culture. If Lewis is depicting a primarily English or British Kingdom of heaven, let it inspire others to create authentic versions for their own culture. Classism and snobbery It seems not unlikely to me that Lewis in common with almost all British people was afflicted with some degree of unconscious class prejudice. The good Beavers in *Lion and Trufflehunter* the Badger in *Prince Caspian* along with most of the other animal characters in the series are also simple country folk. The charge of artistic and particularly intellectual snobbery against Lewis may bear a little more weight, though Lewis himself would have rebuffed it. Nonetheless, I think Lewis is aware of his prejudice here and has the patient Magician Coriakin speak kindly of them, though their foolishness and childishness frustrate him enormously; and in some of their comic stupidity Lewis uses them as exaggerated pictures of how anyone can be, himself included. I have a strong feeling also that Lewis deliberately put some of his own characteristics of intellectual arrogance and snobbery into the initially obnoxious Eustace, who even after his redemption can be quite pedantic and unsympathetic, and who in particular is irritated by the Dufflepuds. And there are many other uneducated, non-intellectual characters who Lewis does not mock at all such as the Beavers again, who have no books on their shelves but are full of kindness, hospitality and good sense, or Trufflehunter who is unlearned but has a deep, genuine and simple faith. Bellicosity, bloodthirstiness and violence Lewis has been accused by some of promoting violence and glorifying war. Actually, there is relatively little war and fighting in the Narnia stories overall. In *Lion*, there is only the brief final battle to rout the White Witch, which is dealt with in a few short paragraphs. In *Horse and His Boy*, there is the one brief Battle of Anvard in which Shasta fights and which is not in the least romanticised. Only in *Prince Caspian* is warfare a more constant theme: In Narnia then much as in the Old Testament fighting and war are seen as sometimes necessary but generally undesirable activities, to be pursued only to overthrow evil oppressors or usurpers, or to defend against attack. Of course, as with all things in Narnia, there is also a symbolic and metaphorical dimension to the battles. Another area in which Lewis has sometimes misguidedly to my mind been accused of barbarity is his depiction of the violent execution of Aslan, mirroring of course the crucifixion of Christ. But the cross of Christ is one of the central and necessary facts of the Christian faith, and the cross simply is barbaric, brutal and shocking; it cannot be airbrushed out or made to look pleasant. It is horrible, yes, but only because the reality it mirrors demands it, not for the sake of revelling in horror. This is a harder question to answer; each parent must decide for themselves at what age it is suitable for their own child. My own experience of having had it read to me at the age of about seven was that it I found it powerful, even thrilling, but not brutalising or terrifying. Let there be wicked kings and beheadings, battles and dungeons, giants and dragons, and let villains

be soundly killed at the end of the book. Revenge is specifically taught against in the New Testament: My only defence is that vengeance is simply part of the fabric of the knightly, chivalric medieval world in which Narnia is set, and in which setting it has a slightly different connotation. When a knight has been killed or otherwise dishonoured, the chivalric code requires that his brother knights avenge the deed in order to restore his honour. Too frightening for children As noted above, parts of the Narnia stories can be quite frightening for children – and a former colleague of mine in his thirties, who used to watch zombie films without batting an eyelid, admitted that he was still frightened of the White Witch! Is it ever appropriate to include dark and scary elements in books intended for children? I think it possible that by confining your child to blameless stories of child life in which nothing at all alarming ever happens, you would fail to banish the terrors, and would succeed in banishing all that can ennoble them or make them endurable. For in the fairy tales, side by side with the terrible figures, we find the immemorial comforters and protectors, the radiant ones; and the terrible figures are not merely terrible, but sublime. It would be nice if no little boy in bed, hearing, or thinking he hears, a sound, were ever at all frightened. But if he is going to be frightened, I think it better that he should think of giants and dragons than merely of burglars. And I think St George, or any bright champion in armour, is a better comfort than the idea of the police. Otherwise you are not making their destiny brighter but darker. The more theological objections include his treatment of the Trinity, his view of the atonement, and his allowing of non-Christians into heaven. However, it should also be pointed out that most of the Bible also does not present a developed doctrine of the Trinity, and the Trinity has to be inferred rather than directly read from most of Scripture. The Narnia chronicles are primarily introducing us to Christ; in other more systematic works for example Mere Christianity Lewis does present a much clearer picture of the whole Trinity. And there is at least one place in the Narnia stories where Lewis does hint at the whole Trinity – in this passage from Horse and His Boy where Shasta converses with the invisible Voice who we know to be Aslan: In Lion, Aslan dies for one traitor alone Edmund rather than for all people or indeed the whole cosmos; and his substitutionary self-sacrifice is apparently made not to God but to the devil represented by the White Witch. This reflects a particular historical theology of the atonement that most Christians would not now subscribe to. However, it should be borne in mind that Lewis is not setting out to present a systematic and complete theology of the atonement. The atonement is a mystery, a multi-faceted reality which can only ever be partially depicted in theories and models – of which there are of course many, each with strengths and flaws. But what Lewis does brilliantly is illustrate certain aspects of the atonement, and above all to convey its personal and emotional impact. Emeth is a devoted worshipper of the Calormene god Tash but, when he meets Aslan, he discovers that it was really Aslan whom he has been serving and seeking all along: Nevertheless, it is better to see the Lion and die than to be Tisroc [emperor] of the whole world and live and not to have seen him. But the Glorious One bent down his golden head and said, Son, thou art welcome. He answered, Child, all the service thou hast done to Tash, I account as service done to me! For I and he are of such different kinds that no service which is vile can be done to me, and none which is not vile can be done to him! But I said also for the truth constrained me, Yet I have been seeking Tash all my days.

4: NarniaWeb Community Forums - View topic - An Idea about Emeth--A Biblical Parallel

(Note how Aslan responded to Emeth's question as to whether he and Tash were one and the same after all.) We know that C.S. Lewis believed that faith in Jesus Christ is the only way that anyone can be saved.

Eventually, all of the characters you would expect end up in heaven: Knowing what we know about his country, that comes as a shock to many Christian readers of Narnia. Calormen, in this conclusion to *The Chronicles of Narnia* and in several other stories, is the enemy of Narnia and all things good. And finally in *The Last Battle*, they work with a deceptive ape to capture the Narnia king and enslave the people. He says he met Aslan and was amazed at the beauty and majesty of the lion. Even though he spent his life serving Tash, the supposed god of Calormen, Emeth says seeing Aslan, even if it meant his death, was better than being a king on earth. For all find what they truly seek. So what do I do? Lewis is using a fictional world to present pictures and myths that point to real truth. It seems obvious, but it bears stating. Narnia is a different world with a different incarnational appearance. Aslan repeatedly visits Narnia, while Christians are waiting on the second and final appearance of Christ. Aslan did offer himself as a sacrifice to save Edmund from the White Witch in *The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe*, but that was the extent of the redemption. It was not meant to redeem all of Narnia. No one is ever asked to accept the sacrificial death of Aslan to ensure their salvation. Because of the differences, we should not expect the same rules to apply in both places. Clearly, the literary picture of Aslan is meant to reflect Jesus, but the character Aslan has a different relationship with the fictional world of Narnia than Earth has with Christ. Narnia did not have a Fall. There is no Adam and Eve who disobey and impart sin into their offspring. Sin, as it were, enters Narnia through Jadis, a queen from a completely different world. Clearly, the animals and humans living in Narnia have the ability to choose to follow Aslan, but we should not assume the redemptive history of that fictional world mirrors our own. In a way, however, Emeth is subject to the earthly Fall. But Emeth was born and has lived his entire life in a world without the same type of Fall. He is in a place where God became incarnate as a lion, not a human. It is here where Emeth meets Aslan and realizes his mistake of following Tash. A group of dwarfs refuse to believe they are in a beautiful land and, instead, behave as if they are trapped in a dark dungeon. I would love more of that. If so, how did you think through the issue?

5: Project MUSE - Inclusivism in the Fiction of C. S. Lewis: The Case of Emeth

The Problem of Emeth Posted by Renette on 12 June 3 July Today I decided to write about the most problematic portion of the entire chronicles of Narnia series, at least for me.

This article first appeared in the Christian Research Journal, volume 27, number 4. For further information or to subscribe to the Christian Research Journal go to: Lewis was one of the most influential Christian apologists of the twentieth century, and he remains influential today. Once they came to faith, Lewis believed, they would learn about theological differences between churches and join a Christian fellowship of their choosing. Lewis claimed to have limited his apologetic writings to mere Christianity; however, there were times when he addressed teachings that are not held by all Christians. He believed, for instance, that Scripture is in some sense the word of God, but he questioned its inerrancy. He also believed in the existence of purgatory, though he did not consider it to be a place of punishment. Lewis, rather, believed saved people were purified of their sins in purgatory before entering heaven itself. Another controversial belief he held was that a person could belong to Jesus Christ and be saved without necessarily knowing Him specifically. This is not exactly universalism, but it goes beyond the clear teaching of Scripture. A full consideration of Lewis needs to include his strengths and his weaknesses. A discerning reader can recognize that many of his writings and strategies are helpful and are a valuable contribution to apologetics and theology while also recognizing that some of his teachings go beyond the scope of mere Christianity. Lewis is often called the foremost Christian apologist of the twentieth century. His many writings have introduced countless people to the Christian faith. Popular books, such as *The Screwtape Letters*, have given many people ample material for thought and reflection. Lewis believed that theology should be accessible to any Christian who was willing to read and think. His clear, concise writing addresses significant theological issues and invites the reader to explore a greater depth of faith. Some from outside of Christianity dislike his works because of their biblical message, but critical voices have emerged from within Christianity as well. When a reader encounters a description of Christianity that resonates with his or her own understanding, that reader may conclude that the writer shares his or her theological perspective. Further reading, however, may reveal some surprising contrasts. How should one respond to a writer who shared some remarkable insights but who also presented some questionable teachings? Some readers consider any critical assessment of Lewis to be inappropriate, not wanting a champion of Christian outreach to be disparaged. This concern is legitimate. Concealing or ignoring his shortcomings does no service to Lewis or the truth he defended. Lewis was not an inerrant writer, nor was he the ultimate theological authority. He was a human being who made a significant contribution, but his writings contain some flaws. A legitimate assessment of Lewis must account for both. Through many literary genres types and in a variety of settings, he winsomely presented his faith to a modern audience. Though raised in a Christian home, Lewis abandoned his faith at a young age and became a self-professed atheist. He had many objections to Christianity and did not return to it until these objections were answered satisfactorily. With those answers, he answered the objections of others. His writings, therefore, focus on the most essential teachings of Christianity and on obstacles that unbelievers often face. Some of these obstacles are addressed in his apologetic works: Is there a universal moral law? If so, must there also be a universal moral lawgiver? Is the universe a closed system, or is supernatural intervention possible? Is it logical to consider Jesus to be a good ethical teacher while denying His deity? Can miracles really occur? How can an omnipotent God allow suffering and still be good? Lewis addressed such questions with candor and ease. Part of the reason Lewis was able to do this is because he was a layman. He did not make his living from religious writing but from his secular professorship. Lewis used every avenue available to him to present his faith. His nonfiction books directly address theological issues. Likewise, his fictional works present significant religious themes. His speeches, essays, and letters show that his faith was an essential part of his life. Even his academic works present Christian themes when they are appropriate to the subject at hand. Lewis used his entire life as a platform for sharing his belief in Christ. The Common Hall Much of the success of C. Lewis knew how to precisely delineate a topic and focus his writing. This precise focus is evident throughout his works. In the

preface to *Mere Christianity*, Lewis explicitly noted his purpose: First, he believed that the disputed doctrines required a depth of theological and historical understanding that he did not possess. He humbly considered others better qualified to discuss such topics. Second, Lewis said that this type of writing, while important for those who are already Christians, would not bring unbelievers into the church. His goal was not to persuade those who were debating which denomination to join or which congregation to attend; rather, he wrote for those who did not know Jesus Christ. Third, he noted that many writers already addressed the controversial points, but few focused on the basics. Nonbelievers find that he presents the central beliefs of Christianity clearly. Christians generally find significant agreement with his presentation. Many readers, unfortunately, do not take to heart what Lewis said about the limits of his approach: It is more like a hall out of which doors open into several rooms. If I can bring anyone into that hall I shall have done what I attempted. But it is in the rooms, not in the hall, that there are fires and chairs and meals. The hall is a place to wait in, a place from which to try the various doors, not a place to live in. For that purpose the worst of the rooms whichever that may be is, I think, preferable. Christians should rejoice in this commonality but not overlook the significant challenges that remain. He left that task to others. He did, however, caution Christians to be charitable toward those who dwell in other rooms and those who had not yet found a room of their own. First, who determines what is common to all Christians? No individual Christian can express what is common only in terms of his or her church or his or her own particular beliefs. Some including myself have suggested that the ecumenical creeds comprise a summary of essential Christianity, yet not all Christians formally acknowledge the creeds. We will consider three of them: Lewis wrote about the need to find a proper church, yet some of his readers seem hesitant to do this. In this ecumenical age, many are reluctant to make any commitment to a confession or a congregation. At times, however, Lewis addressed topics that are controversial among Christians. We will now consider three of these forays beyond mere Christianity. He discussed questions such as: Is it true and trustworthy? At first glance, readers may assume that Lewis had a high view of Scripture. He had said that the Gospels were not myths. I have been suspected of being what is called a Fundamentalist. That is because I never regard any narrative as unhistorical simply on the ground that it includes the miraculous. Some people find the miraculous so hard to believe that they cannot imagine any reason for my acceptance of it other than a prior belief that every sentence of the Old Testament has historical or scientific truth. But this I do not hold, any more than St. The idea that the creation account in Genesis was derived from earlier mythical and pagan accounts did not trouble Lewis. It carries the Word of God and we under grace, with attention to tradition and to interpreters wiser than ourselves and with the use of such intelligence and learning as we may have receive that word from it not by using it as an encyclopedia or an encyclical but by steeping ourselves in its tone and temper and so learning its overall message. The very kind of truth we are often demanding was, in my opinion, not even envisaged by the ancients. On this point, Lewis, who was ordinarily objective in his theological understanding, added a layer of subjectivity. If Scripture only in some sense is the word of God, then in some sense it is not. Parts of it are trustworthy; others must be less so. The problem such a view creates is, how is the Christian to decide which part to trust? If all Scripture can be the word of God but not communicate truth, then inspiration is of little practical consequence. One wishes that Lewis had taken more time to examine other apologetic responses to his objections against inerrancy, but the message of his writings remains clear. Lewis did not believe in an inerrant Bible, though he did believe that Scripture was in some sense inspired. Many readers first encounter this teaching in *The Great Divorce* where, in a fictional context, the damned are allowed a brief respite from their suffering to travel to the fringes of heaven. One of the clearest examples is in *Letters to Malcolm*: Souls in purgatory are saved, but they are not yet pure enough to enter heaven. Instead, Lewis viewed it as a purification of the sinner, or a completion of the work of redemption. Whatever suffering it may cost you in your earthly life, whatever inconceivable purification it may cost you after death, whatever it costs Me, I will never rest, nor let you rest, until you are literally perfect “until My Father can say without reservation that He is well pleased with you, as He said He was well pleased with me.

6: C. S. Lewis on Hell - Christian Research Institute

The magical worlds of Narnia: the symbols, myths, and fascinating facts behind The chronicles. [David Colbert] -- Why a wardrobe? --Should Aslan Save Emeth.

Has this ever bugged you? I am a little confused about what Dr. Ransom said about Emeth not going up to the hill. Right after Emeth finishes his story, Puzzle comes up and tells his story. Then the book states: Rather, Emeth is left kind of forlorn, but optimistic, still seeking the Lion who had appeared to him. Back in May this year, inspired by the podcast discussion with Rilian, I wrote a complete column with the most comprehensive treatment of the subject I could think of: It also includes, and expands upon, a lot of the podcast discussion. How could anything be so awesome and yet so popular at the same time? There must be Something Wrong with it. People worry about it: We began with reading excerpts from The Last Battle itself, in which the character Emeth, a young man who had earlier been showed as being fully devoted to the false god "though very real and evil entity" Tash. Nevertheless, it is better to see the Lion and die than to be Tisroc of the world and live and not to have seen him. Then by reasons of my great desire for wisdom and understanding, I overcame my fear and questioned the Glorious One and said, Lord, is it then true, as the Ape said, that thou and Tash are one? The Lion growled so that the earth shook but his wrath was not against me and said, It is false. Not because he and I are one, but because we are opposites, I take to me the services which thou hast done to him. For I and he are of such different kinds that no service which is vile can be done to me, and none which is not vile can be done to him. And if any man do a cruelty in my name, then, though he says the name Aslan, it is Tash whom he serves and by Tash his deed is accepted. Dost thou understand, Child? For all find what they truly seek. And after that, he said not much, but that we should meet again, and I must go further up and further in. Then he turned him about in a storm and flurry of gold and was gone suddenly. For many people "including myself in the past" this jumps out. How could a non-Narnian, a follower of a false religion, find himself in Heaven and accepted by Aslan? It seems readers can have, and have had, three different reactions in response to this: We ought to read the Chronicles with discernment and look past the portions that might be in error. Tumnus to imagined physical features of the Devil. If Lewis meant that, we can politely disagree, and enjoy the rest of the story. Yet I take the third option for the Emeth Element listed above "Lewis was not in error here. Also, we need not count Universalism among those errors" the idea that God will save all people, or most people, regardless of whether they believed in Christ in this world. Before Aslan has ended the first Narnia and forever closed the Stable door on a world that is now dark and cold, a horde of creatures comes running to the door, in a picture of the Judgment Seat of Christ. Two different reactions, fear and love, take place in the good creatures. But others look at him with loathing, then turn aside into darkness. The narrator explains their fate is unknown. Yet one can safely surmise that the evil false god Tash, Rishda, Ginger the cat, Shift the Ape and thousands of other creatures clearly went to Some Other Place. In The Great Divorce, another work of fiction, Lewis may have been less certain about the fate of those who have never heard of Jesus, and so translated his uncertainties into the medium of fiction. But we can see that he did not buy into Universalism. And throughout the story, Lewis, upholds the idea of Hell "though Lewis casts it metaphorically as a completely small, insignificant, dull sort of place that more resembles a ghetto than a burning lake of fire. In his nonfiction works, too, Lewis argues against the idea that all people "or most people, without Christ" will be saved. In our podcast, Rilian related something I had not thought of before: And Aslan works all things for good, similar to Christ Romans 8: He receives glory in all things "even good deeds practiced by pagans because of common grace Matthew 5: His story ends a bit quickly, and like with the agnostic, humanistic Dwarves and the evil Rishda Tarkaan whom Tash himself abducts and then disappears, readers are left to wonder. Blogs, guest authors, novel reviews, and features on hot fiction topics. Dr Elwin Ransom Moderator Emeritus, "

7: Into the Wardrobe – View topic - Hints of a unique Christian perspective in Narnia books

faith in Aslan can be compared to a Christian's faith in Jesus, Emeth's salvation in spite of his erroneous beliefs raises the question of Lewis's views concerning the possibility of salvation in non-Christian.

I had to do this just to keep my faith from dying. When my crisis of faith began in August, it took me a long time to figure out that Narnia theology was responsible for it. When I finally did, I found out I was the only Christian voice saying: Narnia is fraught with problems. Read it to enjoy it, but check the theology. And when it comes to the idea of salvation, checking the theology becomes especially paramount. Art by Jef Murray. Not because he and I are one, but because we are opposites, I take to me the services which thou hast done to him. For I and he are of such different kinds that no service which is vile can be done to me, and none which is not vile can be done to him. And if any man do a cruelty in my name, then, though he says the name Aslan, it is Tash whom he serves and by Tash his deed is accepted. For all find what they truly seek. And Aslan accepts Emeth. Because apparently Emeth was so zealous in his pursuit of Tash that he was really pursuing Aslan. The theological implications on this side of the wardrobe are mixed. There is a path before each person that seems right, but it ends in death. He went so far as to claim that Aslan and Jesus did and said pretty much the same things. In , a concerned mother wrote to C. Was her son loving Aslan more than Jesus? For the things he loves Aslan for doing or saying are simply the things Jesus really did and said. So that when Laurence thinks he is loving Aslan, he is really loving Jesus: First, the Bible is clear that salvation comes from no one, through no one, and by placing faith in no one—except Christ, the one true God. No one comes to the Father except through me. What should we do? Believe in the one He has sent. Back when Israel was a theocracy, God created a religion from scratch. The people were doing all the right things with the wrong heart. Moreover, they were doing heinous wrong, including literal murder and spiritual adultery: Once the home of justice and righteousness, she is now filled with murderers. Your leaders are rebels, the companions of thieves. All of them love bribes and demand payoffs, but they refuse to defend the cause of orphans or fight for the rights of widows. And all their obedience to the laws of the land could not possibly offset their corruption and evil. Instead, those good things had become an abomination. I get no pleasure from the blood of bulls and lambs and goats. When you come to worship Me, who asked you to parade through my courts with all your ceremony? Stop bringing Me your meaningless gifts; the incense of your offerings disgusts Me! As for your celebrations of the new moon and the Sabbath and your special days for fasting—they are all sinful and false. I want no more of your pious meetings. I hate your new moon celebrations and your annual festivals. They are a burden to me. I cannot stand them! When you lift up your hands in prayer, I will not look. Though you offer many prayers, I will not listen, for your hands are covered with the blood of innocent victims. Wash yourselves and be clean! Get your sins out of my sight. Give up your evil ways. Learn to do good. Defend the cause of orphans. Fight for the rights of widows. Though they are red like crimson, I will make them as white as wool. The inner nature of humanity is corrupt beyond understanding and in desperate need of redemption—and no level of piety or zeal can redeem the human soul. Only God can do that. Instead, to quote Mere Christianity: This is an alarming idea, and not just to me. The work of the Holy Spirit is to bring glory to Christ by taking what is his—his teaching, the truth about his death and resurrection—and making it known. The Spirit does not work indiscriminately without the revelation of Christ in view. You have died with Christ, and he has set you free from the spiritual powers of this world. Such rules are mere human teachings about things that deteriorate as we use them. These rules may seem wise because they require strong devotion, pious self-denial, and severe bodily discipline. Without the Holy Spirit, all our efforts to conquer our evil desires are pretty much hopeless. But God made it so that simple faith in Him—not zeal, not piety, not a back-breaking course to gain acceptance in the eyes of anyone or anything—makes us right with Him and ushers Him into our hearts. Now make no mistake: If we believe God is what he really is, then logic dictates that we accept Him as King of our hearts. We also need to believe that He is everything He says He is: Lord, Savior, Creator, King, lover and friend of our hearts. In an age of extreme individualism, obedience to God can seem even more contrary to our nature than it already is. When God is allowed to rule and direct our lives,

genuine faith in Him will lead to the things He wants us to do, the things that He Himself proclaims to be good. God wants the kind faith that leads to the good things He wants us to do; moreover, He wants our good deeds to be propelled by love, faith, and His help. For God is working in you, giving you the desire and the power to do what pleases him. But this sort of theology pops up in an earlier Chronicle”and the implications add to the alarm. And when their eyes meet, Rabadash shows us where is loyalty lies. You are the foul fiend of Narnia. You are the enemy of the gods. I am descended from Tash, the inexorable, the irresistible. The curse of Tash is upon you. Lightning in the shape of scorpions shall be rained on you. The mountains of Narnia shall be ground into dust. Let blood and fire obliterate the world! He openly proclaims it. For another, Aslan ought to throw the book at the guy, since he shows no interest in repentance. Have it your way. About 14 years ago, I went God-Lion on Jadis, the coldest thing on earth. So if you want to try me, bring it on. Instead, Aslan drops this stunner of a statement: But as long as you live, if ever you go more than ten miles away from the great temple in Tashbaan you shall instantly become again as you now are. And from that second change there will be no return. This has massive implications for the system of magic and justice in Narnia. You are welcomed here, Son of Adam. I say, Sir, I have not behaved like a Son of Adam. I was beastly to my brother and sisters. I betrayed them for Turkish Delight. Child, any service that you have done until Jadis, I count as service done unto me. You fell under the magic of Jadis; therefore, it is by her magic that you are redeemed. Take Scrubb in Dawn Treader. He turned into a dragon and had to have the skin ripped clean off him by Aslan himself. I was beastly to my friends. I ran away from them. Child, when you were running away from them, you were running toward me. And you acted under dragonish magic; therefore, it is by dragonish magic that you will be relieved of your dragon skin. But”that would be just plain silly, right?

8: NarniaWeb Community Forums – View topic - Emeth in Aslan's Country

Now if that exchange between Emeth and Aslan were the only scene in Narnia in which Aslan seems to be advocating for a salvation based on sincerity, zeal, and intensity of pursuit, this would be alarming on its own.

I came lately into Narnia with nine and twenty others under the command of Rishda Tarkaan. Now when I first heard that we should march upon Narnia I rejoiced; for I had heard many things of your Land and desired greatly to meet you in battle. But when I found that we were to go in disguised as merchants which is a shameful dress for a warrior and the son of a Tarkaan and to work by lies and trickery, then my joy departed from me. And most of all when I found we must wait upon a Monkey, and when it began to be said that Tash and Aslan were one, then the world became dark in my eyes. For always since I was a boy I have served Tash and my great desire was to know more of him, if it might be, to look upon his face. But the name of Aslan was hateful to me. And the people and the Beasts bowed down and did honour to it. But I thought, the Tarkaan is deceived by the Ape: And then I understood that he did not believe in Tash at all: Nevertheless I hid my anger and held my tongue and waited to see how it would end. But last night, as some of you know, the Monkey brought not forth the yellow thing but said that all who desired to look upon Tashlan – for so they mixed the two words to pretend that they were all one – must pass one by one into the hovel. And I said to myself, Doubtless this is some other deception. But when the Cat had followed in and had come out again in a madness of terror, then I said to myself, Surely the true Tash, whom they called on without knowledge or belief, has now come among us, and will avenge himself. And though my heart was turned into water inside me because of the greatness and terror of Tash, yet my desire was stronger than my fear, and I put force upon my knees to stay them from trembling, and on my teeth that they should not chatter, and resolved to look upon the face of Tash though he should slay me. So I offered myself to go into the hovel; and the Tarkaan, though unwillingly, let me go. But I had no time to marvel at this, for immediately I was forced to fight for my head against one of our own men. As soon as I saw him I understood that the Monkey and the Tarkaan had set him there to slay any who came in if he were not in their secrets: I had the better will to fight him; and having slain the villain, I cast him out behind me through the door. And I said, By the Gods, this is a pleasant place: And I began to journey into the strange country and to seek him. In a narrow place between two rocks there came to meet me a great Lion. He was more terrible than the Flaming Mountain of Lagour, and in beauty he surpassed all that is in the world even as the rose in bloom surpasses the dust of the desert. Then I fell at his feet and thought, Surely this is the hour of death, for the Lion who is worthy of all honour will know that I have served Tash all my days and not him. Nevertheless, it is better to see the Lion and die than to be Tisroc of the world and live and not to have seen him. But the Glorious One bent down his golden head and touched my forehead with his tongue and said, Son, thou art welcome. He answered, Child, all the service thou hast done to Tash, I account as service done to me. Then by reasons of my great desire for wisdom and understanding, I overcame my fear and questioned the Glorious One and said, Lord, is it then true, as the Ape said, that thou and Tash are one? The Lion growled so that the earth shook but his wrath was not against me and said, It is false. Not because he and I are one, but because we are opposites, I take to me the services which thou hast done to him. For I and he are of such different kinds that no service which is vile can be done to me, and none which is not vile can be done to him. And if any man does a cruelty in my name, then, though he says the name Aslan, it is Tash whom he serves and by Tash his deed is accepted. Dost thou understand, Child? I said, Lord, thou knowest how much I understand. But I said also for the truth constrained me, Yet I have been seeking Tash all my days. Beloved, said the Glorious One, unless thy desire had been for me thou wouldst not have sought so long and so truly. For all find what they truly seek. And after that, he said not much, but that we should meet again, and I must go further up and further in. Then he turned him about in a storm and flurry of gold and was gone suddenly. I myself have a couple of questions about it, which I plan to write about one at a time. My first and biggest question is this: Did he mean to say that a person who has not believed in Jesus can enter heaven as long as that person has been sincere in seeking some other god? This directly contradicts what Jesus explicitly stated in John Interestingly, this came to me while I was taking a bath one morning. Emeth has not

SHOULD ASLAN SAVE EMETH? pdf

died yet, meaning he still has a chance to repent. And that was what he did – the moment he saw Aslan, he turned to him and recognized that he is the true God and not Tash.

9: Aslan Quotes (38 quotes)

As Emeth stands before Aslan, he realizes that Tash and Aslan are not two different names for the same God, but that they are complete opposites. Rather than learn that all religions are the same, Emeth learns that Aslan alone is the true end of his pagan longings.

Pluck her an apple from the Tree. Though there are occasions when he plays a more active role, Aslan is more narrator than actor. That is why he always makes his appearance towards the end of each book and is often associated with set-piece scenes in which he is the focal character. He tells individual characters what their story has been and he also fulfils a prophetic function, foretelling what will happen or dispensing judgement: He is, in fact, the great story-teller who, like Prospero, seems like a covert stage-manager. This is entirely appropriate for a series of tales which reveals to us at the very end that life and story are indistinguishable: And for us this is the end of all the stories, and we can most truly say that they all lived happily ever after. But for them it was only the beginning of the real story. All their life in this world and all their adventures in Narnia had only been the cover and the title page: The forms of address Aslan uses also distinguish his style from that of any other character: Most noteworthy of all are the questions Aslan asks. As the omniscient Storyteller, he never asks questions which imply that he does not know the answer. When he questions Jill Pole about Eustace Scrubb at the beginning of *The Silver Chair*, it is clear that although he knows what happened he is drawing Jill into a confession about her own behaviour: Do so no more. I was only pretending. He especially draws on the last two chapters of the Gospel of John which cover the period between the Resurrection and Ascension, when Jesus is presented as God-man, in the same way that Aslan is a lion but also the Lion. The breakfast on the beach at the end of *The Voyage of the "Dawn Treader"* is taken directly from this source. Such indirect echoes of the words of Jesus can be heard in what Aslan says. The examples she gives are of antimetabole--"Do not dare not to dare"--in *The Horse and His Boy* and the memorable use of anaphora, i. I was the cat who comforted you among the houses of the dead. I was the lion who drove the jackals from you while you slept. I was the lion who gave the Horses the new strength of fear for the last mile so that you should reach King Lune in time. And I was the lion you do not remember who pushed the boat in which you lay, a child near death, so that it came to shore where a man sat, wakeful at midnight, to receive you. I give you the woods, the fruits, the rivers. I give you the stars and I give you myself. The Dumb Beasts whom I have not chosen are yours also. Treat them gently and cherish them but do not go back to their ways lest you cease to be Talking Beasts. For out of them you were taken and into them you can return. As Lewis himself wrote, if the speaker does not have the sovereignty and authority he claims, he must be bad or mad. Mere Christianity This is the language of someone who takes it for granted that the kingdom, the power, and the glory are his. The voice in which Aslan speaks is appropriate to the eloquence he utters. It was deeper, wilder, and stronger; a sort of heavy, golden voice" Silver The term is over: The dream is ended: The final paragraph of the novel, which follows these words, functions as a coda; it is full of the conventions which signal the wrapping up of a story. This direct speech is the true climax of the Chronicles. Aslan is given the last word in these quiet but emphatic lines. He is the ultimate arbiter of reality:. The references here to the Shadowlands and to the dream refer back to an earlier explanation by Digory, now the Lord Digory: That had a beginning and an end. It was only a shadow or a copy of the real Narnia, which has always been here and always will be here: The punctuation is careful, with colons and not semi-colons, so that the second half of each sentence is not equivalent to, but is an antithetical confirmation of, the first half. These are to be understood as definitive statements of fact, built around the verb "to be. It takes a reading of all the Narnian stories to hear the eloquent grandeur in the utter truth of "this is the morning. Just before speaking these final words, as "the light ahead was growing stronger," Aslan arrived, "leaping down from cliff to cliff like a living cataract of power and beauty" Last Similarly in John His central problem in building the parable had always been the difficulty of portraying his Lion of Judah, Aslan, in such a way that the Christ figure would speak with the needed authority yet without intimidating the tale back into those stained-glass and Sunday School associations Lewis wished to avoid. The odds against him were long, and he did not really surmount them--or,

rather, he surmounted them and toppled over onto the other side of" good judgement. There are many more, however, when the Lion of Judah simply looks goofy. In *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* when Aslan comes to a private agreement with the White Witch and she asks how she can be sure that the promise he has given her will be kept, the original British version reads: Since all editions have been standardised according to the original British edition. In adjudicating between "Wow! Nevertheless, it is the only instance Goldthwaite gives of Aslan appearing to be "goofy. As has been seen, the style in which Aslan speaks throughout the *Narnia Chronicles* is deliberately crafted. It is straightforward, direct, declarative, and definite. Rhetoric and transparency underpin its credal affirmation; clarity and profundity are combined. In the year after completing the seven *Narnia* novels, Lewis wrote his last work of imaginative fiction, *Till We Have Faces*, which he thought "much my best book," his "favourite of all my books," and "far and away the best I have written" Hooper Doris Myers shows how the narrative voice of the central character, Orual, is purposefully constructed. Orual uses "semiobsolete, dialectal, and marginally standard words"; she uses "functional shift in a way that gives an Elizabethan flavour"; she uses "the schemes of classical rhetoric" Even so, her style "seems sparse and plain overall," and the deliberate use of language is "unnoticed in a first reading" Orual at the end of the story recalls what her tutor used to tell her: It is this art that Lewis enters into when creating an appropriate style for Aslan. He aims to write for Aslan the form of pure speech towards which all communication should aspire. His success in this reveals C. Lewis as a greater stylist in the *Chronicles of Narnia* than he is often given credit for. In this article I have followed the ordering of the books in the Collins edition. This is the American printing to which Goldthwaite refers. Works Cited Goldthwaite, John. *The Natural History of Make-Believe. A Companion and Guide. The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe. A Preface to Paradise Lost. Till We Have Faces.* Kent State UP, Lewis Memorial Lecture in his native city.

Stopping mass killings in Africa Making better business decisions steve williams Corporatism and the myth of consensus Scjp questions Dirac equation book Constantine Samuel Rafinesque Talley and o connor clinical examination 7th edition Jace made a noise under his breath. / Alfred H. Thomas. Different schools New procedures in nuclear medicine The real world an introduction to sociology 5th A case of letter-by-letter reading Linda Garcia Carl Fohr, drawings for Princess Wilhelmina of Hesse Mikhail Dedinkin. Combat applications techniques, principles of destruction Paul Ricour and the Poetic Imperative Nikon d5300 tutorial for beginners An invitation to indian cooking Mrs. Beeton's complete book of fish seafood cookery Pierre herme recipe book Locating a discourse in transition Bourdieu practical reason on the theory of action Hagar H/that Dreaded The case of the venomous voice Mechanical design engineering handbook peter rn childs Nine sense (McGraw-Hill reading) Financial markets and institutions jeff madura 12 Mariners, renegades, and castaways Searching for level VI Allen illustrated guide to saddlery Appendix : the Irish peasants. Ethiopia The Missing Link Madame Teteron and the dragon by Toni Vuurboom The case of Camp Crooked Lake Early modern Europe Figure 3. Wrestling 119 Speak softly love piano sheet The quicker the dead DOS 6.0 Coursebook Leadership and creativity