admirably in mapping out a field of study which will undoubtedly occupy many other scholars in years to come.

E. LEE, *University of Calgary*

Lawrence Stone, editor. *The University in Society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974. Pp. ix, 642 (in two vols.). \$22.

So much writing in the history of education has been deplorable enough to make many educational historians despair. The self-congratulatory chronicle that purports to be the history of an educational institution, the Whiggish educational histories, and those writings which treat of education without showing its relation to society are all indications that educational history as an academic discipline is still only adolescent.

In increasing quantity mature scholarly work that avoids these puerile diversions in educational history is being produced and coming into print. The collection of essays which make up the volumes under review, and which are the polished outcome of a research seminar held at the Shelby Cullom Davis Center for Historical Studies at Princeton University from 1969 to 1971, endeavours by judicious inquiry into primary sources to fill in a few of the many lacunae in our knowledge of the relationship between university and society. In the first volume, *Oxford and Cambridge from the 14th to the Early 19th Century*, the essays of most interest to readers of *Renaissance and Reformation* will be Guy Fitch Lytle's "Patronage Patterns and Oxford Colleges c.1300-c.1500," James McConica's "Scholars and Commoners in Renaissance Oxford," and Victor Morgan's "Cambridge University and 'The Country' 1560-1640." In the second volume, *Europe, Scotland, and the United States from the 16th to the 20th Century*, there is Richard L. Kagan's "Universities in Castile 1500-1810," though an earlier draft of this appeared in *Past and Present* in 1970.

Crucial in understanding the relationship between university and society is the reply to the question, "what happens to students after they graduate?" In one sense this can be answered readily enough, if the data survives and one has the time and the patience. Even at this level of who-got-which-jobs, G. F. Lytle's study of the change in patronage patterns is immensely interesting. The table and graph of Ecclesiastical Livings Presented to University Graduates (pp. 124-125) carry enormous implications for the relationship between Oxford and English society in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Yet it is the analysis of the response at Oxford to the crisis of patronage that is most valuable, for it does much to increase our understanding of the position and function of the college and that peculiarly English relationship of college and university.

The complexities of the change from a largely clerical student body to a largely lay student body at Oxford in the sixteenth century are examined in James McConica's essay, by an analysis of the social composition of the four sixteenth-century foundations and a comparison with the social composition of a sample of colleges and halls of mediaeval foundation in the same era. Although much of the work has to be limited to post-c.1575 because of the quality of the data yielded by the Matriculation Registers, the result is illuminating for the whole century. Apart from fascinating asides such as "[confirmation of] our general impression that Sir Thomas White's foundation [of St. John's College] reached the urban

middle classes quite successfully" (p. 167), or the possibility that the "influx of gentleman-commoners may indeed have worked to the disadvantage of the poor" (p. 176), the evidence shows how Tudor gentry came to use the university for a wide variety of purposes, and how in return the university acquired "a vast national constituency."

The ties between the university and its constituency in "the country" are brought under scrutiny in Victor Morgan's essay, which contains a plethora of material illustrating the strength and variety of the connections between Cambridge University and the area it served in the period 1560-1640. So convincing is the cumulative effect that a re-assessment of the relationship between university and society will have to be made, and it is difficult to disagree with the plea made in the conclusion that we need to change our way of working, namely "to give 'Society' a local habitation and a name."

The standard of production of the whole work is first-class, marred only by the sloppy maps (strangely, historians still do not seek sufficient aid from geographers). Combined with the flawless scholarship, this excellence makes the work a joy to read and to possess. Yet the final effect—and this is a criticism of the state of educational history and not the volumes under review—is the feeling that so much remains to be done.

ALAN W. JONES, *Bishop's University*

Paul Oscar Kristeller. *Medieval Aspects of Renaissance Learning: Three Essays*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1974. Pp. xii, 175.

These three essays by one of the most eminent of contemporary intellectual historians of the Renaissance constitute volume one of a new series entitled "Duke Monographs in Medieval and Renaissance Studies." The editor, Edward P. Mahoney, has chosen well. All three essays are typical of Kristeller's careful analysis, balanced judgments, and lucidity and succinctness of presentation, though all three are acknowledged as introductory surveys of their respective topics. Again, though each was originally prepared for a quite different audience and over a ten-year span (1960-1970), they do manifest a considerable unity, well captured by the title. In the typical Kristeller-Ferguson fashion, the collection seeks to illustrate further that the Renaissance is best understood as a singular combination of continuity and uniqueness. The revisions and additions made by Kristeller for this particular publication contribute to its remarkable degree of cohesion, yet without provoking the sense that it is contrived or artificial.

One does wonder, however, to whom this volume is addressed. All three essays were previously published and available to scholars. That one was in French and another in German would hardly be a serious impediment. On the other hand, they are rather too specialized to appeal to most students; even the numerous seed ideas specifically mentioned for further research are mostly of such a nature as to require a response by scholars in the field.

The first essay centres on the relationship of the scholar of the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance to his public. Kristeller's contention is that the varying literary genres of the age, humanist, scholastic, Latin and vernacular, are best understood "in terms of different reading publics," rather than by overly rigorous contrasts in thought and expression. This