

floor to the senior common room, is based on the principles of competition.

Therefore, though it is by no means invariably the best solution, there is usually much to be gained by bringing up the mongol child in his own family and community. *Bernard* will be of the greatest interest and value to parents of mongols, or indeed any mentally handicapped children, who have made this decision, especially if they belong to the same social group as the authors. Parents less well-off, less confident and less competent, might find it somewhat intimidating, as Olive Stevenson warns in her very sensible Foreword. But *Bernard* will also be of great usefulness to doctors, social workers and others whose interest in mongols is professional rather than personal. It contains a superbly lucid explanation (to which my opening paragraph is indebted) of the genetic basis of the condition, is well illustrated with photographs of Bernard at various stages of his development, and has an excellent bibliography, except for the omission of the invaluable *Improving Babies with Down's Syndrome* by Rex Brinkworth and Joseph Collins (published by the Northern Ireland Region of the National Society for Mentally Handicapped Children; first published in 1969 as *Improving Mongol Babies*).

Bernard consists mainly of a straightforward account of his development, the problems he presented, and the degree of success achieved in coping with them. In many ways the Wilkses had a particularly hard task: Bernard's IQ is pretty low, even for a mongol, and he seems to have manifested a tendency to throw tantrums

to a rather unusual degree, for an unusually prolonged period. Also much more is known now, than when Bernard was born, about the care and training appropriate to mongol children—in particular the vital importance of programmed stimulation in the first year or two (which is why it is very wrong of medical people not to diagnose the condition and inform the parents as soon as possible). Mr and Mrs Wilks had lots of friendly assistance and well-intentioned advice, but not, it seems, much expert counselling. They had to make up their own rules as they went along.

It might be felt that their rules were sometimes a little severe—that more emphasis on reward and less on punishment in training, for instance, might have been not necessarily more productive but less wearing on the parents. The great merit of this book, however, is that it describes, but does not prescribe. Each reader can draw his own conclusions from the account, and none, surely, will fail to profit from it. As for the authors, they may feel a justifiable pride in the achievement Bernard, at seventeen, represents: someone severely and unmistakably handicapped, but reasonably happy and contented; a valued member of his family, especially as a companion to his invalid grandmother; able to help in simple tasks around the house, to do meaningful paid work in a sheltered workshop, and to assist (with only occasional deviations from the rubric) in the celebration of the liturgy at Blackfriars, Oxford.

DAVID LODGE

C. S. LEWIS. A Biography by Roger Lancelyn Green and Walter Hooper. *Collins*, London, 1974. 308 pp. £3.50.

C. S. Lewis has been fortunate in his two biographers; Walter Hooper was a son to him at the end and Roger Lancelyn Green inspired the 'Narnia' cycle and was responsible for his final idyll, the journey to Greece. They aimed at providing 'a framework of straightforward fact not advancing psychological theories or passing philosophical judgements'. The life story has been told quietly—but it is the quiet digestion of massive documentation. Still, perhaps because of the interests of both authors, it is primarily the life of C. S. Lewis the writer: each of his books is analysed with sensitive perception. But his influence on his contemporaries was at least as much as orator as writer. This will be forgotten increasingly and there is already some evidence of a strange popular image of him. One is cited on p. 140 of this book: 'Lewis was popularly supposed to regard both lectures and tutorials as a complete waste of his valuable time and to hold undergraduates in the uttermost contempt'. No travesty could be farther

from the truth. His milling audiences would never have enjoyed his lectures so much if he had not been so obviously enjoying them himself. He took a vivid, perhaps rather sporting, interest in the numbers who came to him and was depressed when he failed to repeat his Oxford triumphs at Cambridge. At times he lectured from skeleton notes, at times from a written text, on occasion he improvised; it was hard to tell which method he was following. But always he forged a personal link with those who heard him.

I can write with some authority on C. S. Lewis as a lecturer; for nine years my lectures for the English Faculty were co-ordinated with his and when he went to Cambridge he arranged that I should take on his course 'Prolegomena to Medieval Literature'. I have no qualification to write on him as a tutor but when I remember the vehemence of his belief in education as opposed to training, I find it impossible to conceive that he judged his tutorials to be a complete waste of

his time. The suggestion that he had a contempt for undergraduates will seem patently absurd to any who remember the 'Socratic'.

It seems likely that we are at the birth of equally bizarre popular images of Charles Wil-

liams and of J. R. R. Tolkien. The only antidote is a biography like this one: planned clearly written lucidly, the result of deep research and of deep affection.

GERVASE MATHEW, O.P.

PURITANISM IN AMERICA: NEW CULTURE IN A NEW WORLD, by Larzar Ziff. *The Viking Press*, New York and *Oxford University Press*, London, 1973. 338 pp. £3.25.

If puritanism and its influence are still subjects of controversy among English historians, Americans are in no doubt of its importance in England as well as New England. Larzar Ziff, who attempts in *Puritanism in America* a synthesis of previous scholarship of New England puritanism, sees puritanism as a 'new culture' which 'emerged as a way of dealing with the threatening conditions of masterlessness and landlessness in sixteenth century England'. In New England this culture reached its fullest self-expression while pragmatically adapting to new conditions. By the end of the seventeenth century, following the failure to obtain the restoration of the old charter in 1689, the self-conscious culture lapsed into a provincialism similar to contemporary English non-conformity until the old tradition was revived and reinterpreted, in different respects, by Jonathan Edwards and Benjamin Franklin.

Dr. Ziff is at his best when dealing with the formal aspects of the cultural tradition. He emphasizes the dominance of the word, whether preached or printed, in the new culture from the earliest period of the English Reformation. The formidable intellectuality of high puritanism was transported to New England and embodied in Harvard College, which played a central role in the self-consciousness of the colony. The tradition was vigorously defended against the attacks of the sectaries during the middle years of the seventeenth century; but declined before the new 'sensibility' at the end of the century. Harvard College became another gentleman's academy and the last great exponent of the tradition, Cotton Mather, appeared as a survivor from another age. Preaching, too, declined from an intricate logical exercise to an expression of sentiment and sensibility. There is a good discussion of the influence of Dr Benjamin Coleman, who first introduced the new tone and style of contemporary non-conformity to New England at the turn of the century.

Dr. Ziff also succeeds in relating the development of the formal culture to the social and political development of the New England colonies in such areas as relations with the Indians, the growth of maritime commerce and the Salem witchtrials. But his definition of puritanism provokes scepticism. He argues that puritanism in England was dominated by the

'sect-ideal' before 1640 and shows no awareness of the distinction between puritans, separatists and sectaries. He considers the system of civil and ecclesiastical government created in Massachusetts Bay in the 1630s to have been a pragmatic response to novel conditions. In doing so, however, he ignores the complicated history of the emergence of congregationalism among English divines in the Netherlands from 1610 to 1640. The New England preachers learned their congregationalism either in the Netherlands, as did Thomas Hooker, Hugh Petre and John Davenport, or in the case of John Cotton at a second hand in England. Nor was New England the decisive influence on English congregationalism. None of the Five Dissenting Brethren had been in New England; all had been in the Netherlands.

These weaknesses in Dr Ziff's analysis of the origins of New England congregationalism detract from his account of the religious history of the colony. As congregationalism was a not entirely successful attempt to find a middle way between presbyterianism and sectarianism, internal tendencies toward both 'extremes' remained, which the leaders of New England were never able to control completely, despite their major efforts in the Antinomian controversy of the 1530s and the Cambridge Synod of the 1640s. The prehistory of congregationalism also explains the relationship between Massachusetts Bay and the Plymouth Colony, which was not solely a response to American conditions, as Dr Ziff suggests. Nor was the political system of New England necessarily a novel development. While he may have been able to put it into practice first, John Winthrop's vision of a political world controlled by the propertied elect was little removed from that held by his fellow squires Oliver Cromwell and Henry Ireton. The true radicalism of New England did not emerge until after 1660, when it became the last stronghold of the Good Old Cause.

Despite these reservations, Dr Ziff's book has much to recommend it. It is unfortunate, therefore, that it should be replete with elementary errors: Heinrich Bullinger's christian name is given as 'Johann', 'comptroller of the King's house' is used for comptroller of the household, the Family of Love is said to have practised free love, there are references