

to the demands of the job market and to provide that information to the student. In addition, the Faculty must provide a series of programmes for "recyclage" (pp. 89-90). One could add that the same considerations might be made for other Faculties (and other universities) and as studies become available on graduates of other faculties, manpower planning could be more effective. Equally it is incumbent on students to realize that the university training cannot be substitutes for practical experience and to be more realistic about the nature of the job market.

Robert J. MacDonald  
The University of Calgary

James Axtell. *The School Upon a Hill: Education and Society in Colonial New England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974. Pp. 298. \$15.00.

Back in 1968, James Axtell gave us *The Educational Writings of John Locke* (Cambridge University Press), establishing himself as a refined scholar bursting with enthusiasm for his subject. Now we can accept with gratitude Professor Axtell's *The School Upon a Hill*, a book evincing no intervening loss of zest for the historian's task. To his credit, moreover, Dr. Axtell attempts here a more hazardous venture, fraught with such pitfalls as beset the daring. Little wonder, then, that his new volume invites comments of two quite different sorts.

In my judgment, the most satisfying way to read *The School Upon a Hill* is to receive it as the richly-embroidered work of a master stylist. If you do this, you learn of a child's spiritual preparation, of New England customs regarding birth, feeding, dressing, weaning, of the importance of one's calling in life, of tension between the vagaries of wilderness existence and the 17th century "great chain" cosmology, of "suffocating paternalism" in colonial colleges, and of the Indian as neighbour, warrior, and example. This is what the book deals with and what makes it a generous source of contemporary advice on education. My only quarrel with it in this light is a certain Menckenesque flippancy that prompts the author to toss off such lines as "trust your souls to the ship of state and don't rock the boat," or "just as familiarity may breed contempt, it may also simply breed."

Your perusal of his Foreword and Afterword will confirm, though, that Dr. Axtell scarcely offers *The School Upon a Hill* as a mere source book. Indeed, by means of those prefatory caveats whereby educational historians traditionally declare their hands as revisionists, he alerts you to what he believes is new and fresh in his approach. First, he will strive for a "waist-high" view of colonial education, a youngster's notion of what it was like to grow up in colonial New England. Secondly, he will emphasize the deliberate in education, for, "otherwise we will spend our time and energy floundering around in total history and tilting at metaphysical windmills." In either case, I find the book's content less persuasive than its intent.

To be fair, the writer of *The School Upon a Hill* concedes the need for imagination and empathy in order to counterbalance those normative adult sources from which he attempts to draw a child's vision of approaching adulthood. Just the same, longish quotations from Cotton Mather and others about how children ought to be raised, extended passages on law, and detailed particulars concerning Indian warfare overly detract, I think, from an effort to depict New England education as a colonial boy or girl might have envisioned it. Oddly enough, James Axtell's best chapter, "The Collegiate Way," provides not a waist-high perspective but an ingenious, face-to-face rendition of how adult students probably felt when they were "treated like irresponsible children . . ."

As for deliberateness, I find it difficult to reconcile Professor Axtell's definition à la Bailyn or Cremin of what education might consist of with the attention he affords cold meetinghouses, children out of wedlock, sexual customs, childbearing, wetnursing, orphan status, Indian agriculture, ideals in names, the imperatives of biology, and a diversified

economy that dissipates leisure. Surely these were very general (albeit interesting) matters, subconscious rather than deliberate in the minds of New England children and their adult mentors. Added to such generalizations as the proposal that "there was something heady in the air of New England that emboldened young people to seek their liberty . . .," these relatively incidental concerns compel me to urge caution as you consider Dr. Axtell's theory of deliberateness and the data he presents to support it.

Isn't it strange, though, that stripped of certain self-conscious nods to historiography with a capital H, books like *The School Upon a Hill* inform, stimulate, please. Unlike his 17th century namesake, Daniel, James Axtell must not for his pains be "drawne . . . hanged . . . his intrealls burnt . . . quartred . . . boyled . . . and his head sett up . . ." On the contrary, he should be read. For when a scholar writes this well, one is inclined to cry "the hell with revisionism!"

John Calam  
The University of British Columbia

Terry Nichols Clark, *Prophets and Patrons: The French University and the Emergence of the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973. Pp. x, 282. \$12.00.

To the uninitiated the mysteries of the French education system are legion. It seems quite appropriate, therefore, for chapter one of this interesting study which combines the approaches of both intellectual history and the sociology of knowledge to present an extensive summary of the formal structure of the French system of higher education. We are introduced to some of the major facts of 19th and early - to mid - 20th century French academic life: centralization; the primacy of Paris in the *université* system, which included the *lycees*, the *Grand Ecolés* as well as the Sorbonne and provincial institutions; professorial chairs; the *baccalauréat*, *licence*, *agrégation* and the *doctorat d'état*; the *Ecole Normale Supérieure*; the *Ecole Pratique des Haut Etudes*; the *Collège de France*; and the *Institut de France*. Through an analysis of these formal structures, the author traces the path that one who aspired to a Sorbonne professorship might normally have followed: *Lycée* and *baccalauréat* examination to the *Ecole Normale Supérieure*, where one studied for the *licence* and *agrégation*, examinations which provided the qualifications to teach in a *lycée* and perhaps a university faculty while working on the *doctorat d'état*, the degree which was normally a requirement for a faculty professorship. In addition to this formal progression through the educational hierarchy there were, of course, many less tangible factors and influences which could affect one's career. The argument of this book is to suggest and document the interaction between the formal and informal structure of career patterns in the French system of higher education and their relationship to the career patterns of the social science disciplines, especially sociology, as they sought to establish themselves among the traditional disciplines and fields of study in faculties and for examination purposes in the last one hundred years or so in France.

The central theme concerns the individual and collective personality and power respectively of the "patron" and the "cluster." As Clark puts it, "The cluster was an association of perhaps a dozen persons who shared a minimal core of beliefs about their work and who were prepared to collaborate to advance research and instruction in a given area. They also generally hoped thereby to advance their careers" (p. 67). He goes on to note that "the cluster was generally organized around one or two incumbents of central chairs — at the Sorbonne or, less often, the *Collège de France* — who shall be referred to as the patron(s)" (pp. 67-68). One might somewhat jokingly suggest that what we are looking at is an academic mafia, in which allegiance and loyalty to the patron ensured the possibility of favoured treatment within the limits of individual background and attainments, when preferred academic positions fell open. One cannot escape the impression, and one is not intended to, that the academic career of any individual was very largely the artifact of sponsorship and negotiation. Scholarly creativity was more a necessary than sufficient condition for success and not always even that.