

left little latitude for the Grand Prince. His main role in the system described by Kollmann appears to be the mediation of conflicts amongst the boyars who seem to be the real powers behind the throne.

In her attempt to show continuity through the reign of Ivan the Terrible, the author greatly downplays the very significant changes which took place in the reign of Ivan III (1462-1505). The compilation of a new law code, the reforms of local administration, the growth of a new gentry class, the restructuring and expansion of the army, the initial stage of peasant enserfment, and sharp conflicts involving the church are only some of the developments pointing to Ivan's reign as a real watershed. Chapter Four, which is designed to demonstrate how the system actually functioned, becomes overly mechanistic. By reducing all politics to boyar struggles and by judging the relative power of boyars by such signs as where their signatures appear in wedding lists, Kollmann has created a medieval version of Kremlinology. The author's contention that political power was confined to the boyar elite and the Grand Prince also seems extreme especially when we consider the church. As A.E. Presniakov long ago suggested, one of the major reasons why Muscovite Grand Princes encountered problems during the second half of the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries is that they lost the full support of the Metropolitan. Finally, Kollmann states (181) that the goal of the Muscovite political system was territorial expansion and defense against external threats. Unfortunately, the prior 180 pages give no indication of how the political system worked to accomplish these goals. In sum, then, the Muscovite political system was much more than the kinship relations of the boyar elite. We must not equate one important part of this system with the entire system.

In conclusion, *Kinship and Politics* is highly recommended for its erudite and penetrating reexamination of the Muscovite political system. The traditional approaches to this system must now be reviewed and even discarded in the light of Kollmann's study. At the same time, Kollmann may well wish to expand the scope of her analysis in future studies and even reconsider or moderate some of the views presented here.

Thomas S. Noonan  
University of Minnesota

\* \* \*

A.B. McKillop — *Contours of Canadian Thought*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987. Pp. xii, 163.

Students of Canadian history will welcome Brian McKillop's "collection of explorations" (xi), which supplements and expands his important *A Disciplined Intelligence: Critical Inquiry and Canadian Thought in the Victorian Era* (Montreal, 1979). *Contours* in part continues the earlier work's examination of Canadian intellectuals' response to scientific doubt in the later nineteenth century, but it probes other avenues as well. McKillop advocates drawing the links between the individuals he studies and the socio-economic context in which they pondered, just as he argues for looking for the ties between the interior life of the mind and the external evolution of society. This broadening out seems appropriate at this stage of the development of intellectual history in English Canada.

McKillop's eight essays fall readily into three categories. Two chapters are concerned with the subdiscipline of intellectual history and what it has to offer to Canadian history at large. Two others are focused on the locus of most intellectuals' work, the university. The second half of the collection zeroes in on individuals and small groups of intellectuals. Chapters on Daniel Wilson, on W.D. LeSueur and on John Watson and "The Idealist Legacy" amplify themes that were introduced in *A Disciplined Intelligence*. The fourth of the specific studies, an examination of a group of English-Canadian intellectuals (especially ones who wrote for *The Canadian Forum*) in the 1920s rounds out the volume. Throughout McKillop demonstrates his accustomed careful analysis, deep reading and thoughtful conclusions.

The messages that *Contours* delivers are both comforting and challenging. The opening chapters that deal with intellectual history are a persuasive plea for taking seriously the study of ideas and opinions in Canada. McKillop distinguishes between intellectual history, which is an outward-facing examination of the relationships between the people who deal with ideas and their social and political environments, and the history of ideas, which he regards as largely an inward-looking analysis that is concerned with logical coherence and consistency. Given McKillop's preoccupation with the exterior world of ideas and their advocates, it is not surprising that he finds nothing incongruous in examining Canadian intellectuals. "Colonial minds must be studied not primarily as colonial, but as minds," (5) he sensibly insists. If the most important thing about minds is their relationship to the outer world, it hardly matters if they are colonial or derivative. McKillop, prodded as all Canadian historians are by the rapid advances of social history, argues forcefully that intellectual historians should pay attention to the intersection of ideas and the forces of social change. In particular he suggests they address themselves to Marx's unresolved problem of the relationship of the economic base and the intellectual superstructures of human communities. He conspicuously refrains from referring to "false consciousness" when discussing ideas.

If McKillop's recent research agenda has been somewhat less ambitious than the one he advocates in *Contours*, it has nonetheless been a rewarding one. The two essays on Ontario academe — "Science, Humanism, and the Ontario University" and "The Research Ideal and the University of Toronto" — both demonstrate effectively that it is pointless to divorce ideas and their champions from the social and political worlds in which they worked. In the latter chapter the connections between the struggle to turn Toronto into a research institution and other forces are clearly delineated. The campaign for the introduction of the Germanic Ph.D. and for sufficient funding to make research possible was linked to inter-generational rivalry within the professoriate and to a nasty quarrel between Canadian nativists and British-born academic administrators.

The four specific chapters reiterate McKillop's earlier argument that tradition and a God-centered view of the universe held on longer in English Canada than we had previously thought. Even in the chapter on the *Forum* group in the 1920s he finds, not an attempt to protect orthodoxy and the dead hand of a glorified race, but a desire to preserve the best of British-Canadian traditions and the familiar bases of social authority. The *Forum's* ambivalence "was part of a continuing tradition of responsible and intelligent commentary in Canadian periodicals" (127) as well as throughout the intellectual community. Toronto's self-consciously critical spirits of the 1920s were part of a tradition that included such distinctive types as Daniel Wilson, W.D. LeSueur and John Watson.

Those interested in Canadian intellectual history can only hope that other practitioners will pursue the paths that McKillop has explored in this collection. He has made an effective argument for concentrating on the outward-looking style of intellectual history, roughed out an ambitious agenda for those who would follow his lead and provided admirable case studies for anyone who is serious about the work. Now that we have had two decades of first-class intellectual history of individuals and specific topics, we are ready for a push to synthesize and draw the linkages between and among the various efforts. We need, for example, an analysis that will tie *A Disciplined Intelligence* and Ramsay Cook's *The Regenerators* (Toronto, 1985) together. McKillop hints at this when he urges consideration of the long tradition that he calls the "moral imperative" (97) and Northrop Frye labelled the "ethic of concern" in English-Canadian thought. We also could do with some study of the parallels between English- and French-Canadian intellectuals. The angst of the *Forum* group at the crassness and vulgarity of American popular culture in the 1920s reminds one of Henri Bourassa and *Action Française*. Are there other similarities, perhaps on the political left, as Michael Oliver and Joseph Levitt have argued?

A great deal, obviously, remains to be done. We should all hope that the practitioners of the mildly unfashionable genre of intellectual history will push on along paths that McKillop has so ably explored in *Contours of Canadian Thought*.

J.R. Miller  
University of Saskatchewan