

diplomatic component). Duffin tells us *what* Langstaff recorded in his daybooks (the content), but unfortunately, tells us very little about *how* he used them. Langstaff was operating in the days when the doctor travelled to the patient, and in the days before case files centralized all information about a patient in one location. What this meant was that Langstaff could not consult the medical records at the bedside; he had to remember how he had treated the patient before. And the chronological arrangement of the daybooks meant that information on one patient was scattered throughout the numerous journals. What, then, was the function of these records? Were they an *aide-mémoire*? a financial accounting tool? a method of ensuring legal accountability? How much of Langstaff's time was spent in writing up his visits and when did he do this? If, as Duffin tells us, he frequently made as many as ten house calls per day, did he ever forget to record a visit? Was there a nominal index to the daybooks so that he could, if necessary, quickly consult his notes about former treatments, or did he rely on the account books, with their page-per-person arrangement, for that purpose? What did this cumbersome method of records-keeping mean for Langstaff's medical practice and the progress of medicine in general?

Despite the lack of a diplomatic/functional analysis, Duffin is particularly good at situating Langstaff's records within his life and his medical practice. This is especially important since medical records, or the collection and accumulation of scientific information, are so important for the medical profession. Duffin gives us a sense of the significance of documentation—a commonplace for archivists, but not necessarily for the general public, and often not for academics either. The systematic, self-conscious accumulation of data is something that has continued from the early days of medicine in Ontario, as James Langstaff's rural medical practice shows.

**Carolyn Heald**  
Archives of Ontario

**A Not Unightly Building: University College and Its History.** DOUGLAS RICHARDSON, with J.M.S. CARELESS and G.M. CRAIG. Edited and with an introduction by PETER HEYWORTH. Toronto: Mosaic Press, 1990. 174 p. ISBN 0-88962-449-6.

Whereas archivists occasionally mount exhibitions of materials from their collections and are asked at times to prepare catalogues and write articles about the materials they curate, it is rarer to find opportunities to present and interpret the knowledge they have acquired about materials entrusted to their care in a book-length format. Douglas Richardson, architectural historian and archivist of University College, University of Toronto, had such a chance in the late 1980s when he received an invitation to contribute the major portions of *A Not Unightly Building: University College and Its History*, a beautifully-illustrated book that focuses on the architectural history of the university's premier building, University College. Richardson's objectives were to detail the aesthetic considerations leading to the design and construction of University College and its subsequent restoration. The book, however, also includes a chapter on the history of the University as a state

college by the late historian, Gerald M. Craig, and a chapter that examines the University's role in the social and political life of Victorian Toronto by the historian, J.M.S. Careless.

The origins of the University of Toronto can be traced to the ill-fated attempt by the Rev. John Strachan, Toronto's first Anglican bishop, to found a denominationally-controlled university in Upper Canada in the early decades of the nineteenth century. In 1827, after years of persistent effort, Strachan obtained a charter from King George IV to establish an institution of higher learning in York (as Toronto was then called) for the "youth of all denominations." However, charter provisions linking the new institution, King's College, to the Church of England and Strachan's stated vision that the new university should serve as a "Missionary College" for the Anglican priesthood rankled the non-Anglican electorate of Upper Canada. At stake was the control and dispensation of the great financial resources attached to the charter, a tract of 224,000 acres of land and an annual cash payment of a thousand pounds from the Canada Company for the support of the new institution.

The "University Question" became one of the burning political issues of Upper Canada in the 1830s and 1840s, as Reformers and non-Anglican denominations sought to stave off Tory attempts to establish the institution as conceived by Strachan. The University of King's College managed to open in 1843 (under Strachan's presidency), but political opposition to it remained steadfast. Finally, in 1849, Reformers under Robert Baldwin passed legislation that abolished King's College and replaced it with the secularized University of Toronto, to which were given the assets of Strachan's institution.

Strachan was by no means alone in opposing the secular character of the University of Toronto. Representatives of the country's leading denominations bitterly denounced the concept of a state college and sought to wrest the University's sizeable endowment for their own purposes. Responding to the challenge, legislators in 1853 passed a second *University of Toronto Act* which provided for government control over most of the university's affairs. Legislators dismantled the organizational structure of King's College and authorized the establishment of University College, the new teaching arm of the University. As a final measure, government officials urged University authorities to use the endowment to erect a building for University College, for, in their view, University opponents "couldn't steal bricks and mortar."

With the backing of the new Governor General, Sir Edmund Walker Head, the University pushed forward in 1856 on an ambitious building programme that produced, within the space of under four years, one of the most notable academic buildings in all of North America. It is clear from Richardson's narrative that University officials sought the finest, most up-to-date residential college that could be obtained from the ample, if not inexhaustible, budget. The architects, William Cumberland and William G. Storm, responded with one of their grandest designs, a stone and brick multi-storied, towered structure measuring nearly four hundred feet on the south facade and enclosing a two hundred square foot quadrangle to the north. University College included a museum, library, lecture halls, faculty residences, student quarters, a refectory, laboratories, and public rooms and was

lavishly decorated by expert craftsmen working in stone, wrought iron, glass, wood, and ceramic tile. Set amidst the landscaped grounds of University Park, the complex had a picturesque charm quite unlike anything seen in Toronto before that time.

Prompted by Governor General Head, an art historian of note, Cumberland and Storm designed University College in a quasi-Romanesque style (one of the first such instances of the style's use in North America). However, the architects looked well beyond the Norman forms of the Romanesque and added many architectural details derived from other lands and historical periods, as well as natural sources. As Richardson emphasizes, the architects were attempting to remain true to John Ruskin's dictum that the world needed "no new style of architecture," only a creative reworking of the best of the past. Indeed, the Oxford University Museum, then being built under Ruskin's guidance, served as the principal inspiration for University College.

The building opened to great acclaim in October 1859. Among those who commented on the remarkable qualities of the building was John Langton, the University's Vice-Chancellor, whose wry understatement serves as the book's title. As one of the most impressive buildings in Toronto, University College became a source of civic pride and a focal point of the community. Every Torontonians therefore felt its loss when a fire gutted the interior and destroyed a substantial part of the building on the evening of 14 February, 1890. Rebuilt in two years' time under the architectural direction of David B. Dick, the building reopened with some modifications, including a reappointed interior that was no less ornate than the original. It is this version of University College that exists today.

Produced to coincide with the centenary of the University College's reconstruction and its restoration in 1987-88, *A Not Unsightly Building: University College and Its History* makes use of the scholarship that was gained from two exhibitions of architectural drawings organized by Richardson, an 1984 exhibition entitled *The Glory of Toronto*, and one in 1987 entitled *The Campus in the Nineteenth Century*. Hence, although the essays by Craig and Careless touch upon the broader social and political implications of the University within the context of nineteenth-century Canadian life, the heart of the book is a meticulous recounting by Richardson of the various attempts to bring the University to architectural fruition. Considering the complexity of the story and the wealth of drawings that exits for the several schemes advanced for the University, Richardson does an admirable job of leading the reader through the planning and design process that lead to the physical development of King's College, University College, and other early University of Toronto buildings important in the history of the campus. His analysis of the documentation is cogent, insightful, and scholarly. He addresses the aesthetic merits for each scheme, identifies the buildings and plans that served as probable architectural models for them, and provides an idea of their significance, usually within the context of Canadian architectural history. He also offers a concise reading of the internal political debate within the University that shaped the outcome of each scheme.

As would be expected of a handsome and scholarly work that emphasizes the architecture of University College, the book is profusely illustrated with reproduc-

tions of architectural drawings, renderings, historical photographs, portraits, and beautiful contemporary shots of the College in its restored state. These are numbered for ease of reference within the narrative. The text is attractively laid out, well-indexed, and well-referenced. The work on a whole is highly recommended for anyone interested in University College, Canadian architecture, and nineteenth-century campus planning.

The book has its faults, however. Given the degree to which religious rivalry affected the early history of the University and influenced public discussion regarding higher education in Upper Canada in the first half of the nineteenth century, a few pages devoted to the history of denominational colleges should have been included. A chronology of the University and a bibliographic essay of the primary sources used in the authors' research would have been helpful as well. However, better editing would have eliminated the book's most glaring flaws: a propensity among the authors to rehash information that has already been covered in the text and the appearance of many confusing and misleading caption statements. In the latter case, the collection from which the illustration was drawn is routinely presented in capitalized letters and given precedent over all subject information—an annoying practice that works against the effectiveness of each caption. At times, the captions do little to broaden the readers' understanding of images, or worse, provide inaccurate information. In the worst instance of this, the caption identifying a full-page photograph (on page 48) prefacing the critical chapter in the book, "Toronto University and University College: The Grand Design," discusses the issue of "gigantic trees" in the surrounding woods, despite the fact that the photograph fails to show a single large tree. The caption is all the more puzzling for the reason that Richardson states that the photograph was taken during the building's construction in the 1850s (when, according to Richardson's own narrative, the photograph must have been taken after the fire of 1890). This unfortunate error should have been caught before the book went to press.

Archivists will find *A Not Unightly Building: University College and Its History* a useful model for the day when fate calls and enables them to bring out a book of their own on materials they have come to appreciate intimately in the course of their duties. Certainly, it also stands as a sensible (and marketable) approach to the publication of institutional history, especially for those institutions that boast notable collections of cultural properties. In its greater context, the work serves to satisfy Eric Arthur's hope, expressed thirty years ago in his classic work, *Toronto: No Mean City*, that the story of the building of University College would someday be fully told.

**Mark A. Coir**

Archives and Cultural Properties, Cranbrook Educational Community

**George Grant: A biography.** WILLIAM CHRISTIAN. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 472 p. ISBN 0-8020-5922-8. \$39.95.

George Parkin Grant was the descendent of a line of formidable Canadians. One grandfather, George Munro Grant, the beloved Principal Grant of Queen's University, turned that small Presbyterian college into the national institution it is