1 A century ago, Freud's analysis of dream-interpretation
included the notion of Fromethean (special-heroic-powers) imagination compensationally at work in the sleep-life of very ordinary, unremarkable people. Jas. Thurber translated the idea into humorous fiction, \& Walter Mitty was born.
2 Walter Mitty was fictional, but J.K.Rowling is a living woman who when a single mother on welfare--how ordinary can you get?--daydreamed up a Promethean boy (Jung would say a strong animus compensating for a weak anima) \& named him "Harry Potter," probably without thinking that the Bible's first occupational image of God is as a Potter.
3 The greater the power "on high" (the technology-wielding authorities--political, financial, military: not God), the less powerful "the people" feel, $\varepsilon$ their children the least powerful. Harry's creator, for pathos effect, made him the least powerful of the least, an abused orphan. Take him as Jung's puer aeternus or, better, as Paul's Christ in "the form of a slave" (Phil.2.7: self-humiliated from [6] "the form of God," then publicly humiliated by [8] "death on a cross"; but [9] "God highly exalted him").
4 Harry a Christ figure? The HP books are not specifically Christian, but the author is of a culture in which the incarnation/crucifixion/resurrection parabola-story continues as (in Michael Polanyi's phrase) tacit knowledge. In the 1st four books (three to come), as in the Jesus story, Harry (1) is--though unconsciously--a powerful wizard before he becomes (2) an abused orphan; (3) suffers malevolent action by "the evil one" (the last words of the Lord's Prayer--in Mt., before the doxology; in some manuscripts of L.--the devil, Satan, is represented in the HP books as Voldemort); but (4) is the only wizard V. cannot destroy (as Jesus' resurrection frustrates the powers, \& the power, bent on doing away with him) ; $\varepsilon$ (5) uses his magic to bless other people.

Put this down, please, as $a+$ for the Potter books. The millions of children reading Harry are experiencing the archetype whose fulfilment is the Jesus story. Pray that for many of them, Harry will be protevangelical (preparation for receiving the gospel)... (l don't know of anybody else who's remarked the Christ/Harry parallel.)
5 Yes, millions. In all l've read $\&$ heard of Harry, the biggest + has been that (to the delight of parents, teachers, \& all who've worried that electronics would make the hand-held book obsolete), he (i.e., Ms.Rowling) has gotten millions of children ( $\varepsilon$ millions of non-children!) to READ. An easy read, too. Opening at random, I counted on 1 p 8 less-than-7-word sentences. Eminent critic Harold Bloom, however, harrumphed that this non-literature is (a most inelegant word!) "goo." But the author is good at connectives: opening at random, I found no "run-on 'and'" on either p. In popular Hellenistic writing, which includes most of the NT (L.-Ac. \& Heb. being the main exceptions), "and" is a common connective--partly from the writing being "koiné" (Gk. for "common") house- - -street speech, partly because the Hebrew underlying much of NT thinking has one connective ("vav" or "waw") serving literally dozens of meanings, though usu. trd. just "and." But in contrast to Hebrew, Greek has dozens of precise connectives: no "talmud" (with extensive arguments on the meaning of "vav"-"waw" in particular contexts) could have been written in Greek. (Hebrew is superior to Greek for suggestion; Greek to Hebrew for specification. As a lover of both, I hope I may be pardoned for imagining that God chose, for the Bible, these two language-mentalities to converse with each other. Through the Bible's actual word-sounds comes (Polanyi again) a tacit knowing unavailable in translation.)
6 Enlightenment rationalism, now rapidly falling out of fashion, snorts at miracle (on which eminent religion journalist Ken Woodward recently had a book published) $\varepsilon$ magic. But the nonrational is too prominent in human living-knowing-thinking-loving to be suppressed; it forever irrupts through the crust of "what every reasonable person believes." Superbly, Alex.Pope, in his "Essay on Man," says we are a "chaos of thought and passion....Sole judge of trust, in endless error hurled; / The glory, jest and riddle of the world." And in his "Although as from a Prison," Rilke cries "the world yet holds a wonder, and how great!"

Danger: The Christian Story is miracle (God's action), not magic (human manipul-
ation). Bible-ignorant readers of Potter may come more open to Merlin than to Jesus. 7 No universal experience, no universal appeal. Harry, the bookworld's spectacular Everyboy-Everychild, has universal appeal (in, the last I heard, 76 languages). The universal experience? Being, like J.R.R.Tolkien's hobbit Frodo, an endangered innocent. We all remember troubles we had to face through no fault of our own, \& we hold our breath for fear of what horror Frodo or Harry will have to face next. Life is not fair, but we root for it to be! And we Christians, in our liturgy, continually experience the greatest justice (resurrection) emerging out of the greatest unfairness to the Innocent (crucifixion). Stories echoing the Great Story always will sell. And, in the end, the witch will not eat Hansel \& Gretel....

8 .....which brings us to the most serious criticism of Rowling's series, viz., that like current Satanism it puts a good face on what the Bible consistently puts a bad face on, viz., witchcraft. The covens love Harry! The revisioning, in this morality tale in which good/evil are conventional, angelizes the users $\varepsilon$ teachers of magic, which is an alternative to biblical religion, which is monotheistic (in contrast to the polytheism implicit in magic, as the manipulation of "energies" [a favorite New Age term]): a re-reading of my personal index to the 1 st Harry book (HARRY POTTER AND THE SOCERER'S STONE, Scholastic/98) turns up no relief from atheism, no word or phrase that might suggest God. If forgetting God is (as the Bible says) the primal sin, Harry's godlessness helps his readers have no thought of, or forget, God: Rowling is the distracting snake (Gn.3.1, "more crafty"), evil while promoting (in the form of conventional morality) good (whereas in the Bible--the Law, the Prophets, \& the NT--magic is associated with immorality, moral corruption). Ethical evil Harry is not, theological evil Harry is. But for a God-unaware secular culture, the category of theological evil does not exist: therefore, Harry is good without being also (with another meaning of "good") evil.... But isn't Headmaster Dumbledore, ever protecting Harry, a God-figure? No, he's not awe-inspiring, as the numinous evil Satan-figure ("He-Who-Must-Not-Be-Named," Voldemort, the Dark Lord) is. Adding to Rowling's revival of superstitions, ghosts wander in $\varepsilon$ out of her episodes. And terror: "something strange and horrible" had happened in the old house, we are told in her 4th volume's 2nd $\pi$.
9 Before long, somebody will get a PhD for comparing/contrasting, in the late West, anti/christian fantasy. Narnia (C.S.Lewis) \& Middle Earth (J.R.R.Tolkien) are very different places from Hogwarts (Harry's school for magic). We already have Michael W. O'Brien's A LANDSCAPE WITH DRAGON: THE BATTLE FOR YOUR CHILD'S MIND (Ignatius Press), \& Alison Lentini's perceptive article "Harry Potter: Occult Cosmology and the Corrupted Imagination" (18-29, SCP JOURNAL vol.23.4-24.1.2000). CHRISTIANITY TODAY (117-19, 9.4.00) printed a surprisingly favorable review, "Virtue on a Broomstick," overimpressed that "Harry is good," but admits the danger of domesticating magic, desensitizing readers to witchcraft, \& dealing with life-issues without reference to God or even moral authority. I add that teaching children to be fascinated with the supernatural nudges them toward becoming "spiritual," nonreligious adults. (Noting that vol. 4 had a 1 st printing of 5.3 million copies, NEWSWEEK put Harry on its 7.17.00 cover, \& quotes Harry's inventor: "Death and bereavement and what death means is one of the central themes in all seven books." The article is not at all critical of "Harry" or "the Potter Effect," though it says "the books have been banned in schools in Kansas and Colorado.")
$10 \quad$ I'm waiting to see if Rowling explicitly denies the reality of witchcraft, as did "The Wizard of Oz" in revealing, at the end, that the wizard was a fraud.
11 "Harry" does not use the afterlife for reinforcement of morality now: "Death is but the next great adventure" (SORCERER'S STONE.297). But Rowling contradicts this in having the immorality-giving Stone destroyed (SS.297; cp.Gn.3.22: can't eat "from the tree of life" \& "live forever").
11 "Harry" offers a diet competitive with Bible fantasy-food. How teach children to live the Great Story, letting it live in them (as the Lord's Prayer teaches)? "All stories are not created equal." The Incarnation, said Chesterton, satisfies "the mythological search for romance by being a story and the philosophical search for truth by being a true story" (EVERLASTING MAN, 310).

