draftsmen (nos. 305–42), depicting over twenty designs for country houses, indicate that he had more commissions of this type than previously thought.

For minor projects, such introductions are not provided in the catalog. But for every drawing there is detailed data, including a new cataloging number that supersedes the old All Souls system. (A concordance at the end of the volume correlates the AS volume numbers, the new catalog numbers, and the Wren Society plates, making it easy to cross reference all three systems.) Most significantly, every drawing, whether alone or part of a small group, is given a deliberately brief but extremely useful commentary addressing a variety of possible issues: the subject depicted, the context for the project, the chronological development of the design, major published sources, and related drawings at other locations. By citing all of the primary and major secondary sources for each building, Geraghty has created an excellent starting point for the researcher.

Furthermore, Geraghty’s commentary format invites new insights on the designs depicted in the drawings. Not intended to be definitive, it leaves the way open for scholars to add their own nuggets. For example, to Geraghty’s note that the project for replanning the city of London (nos. 395–96) can be linked to Vitruvius’s treatise and to Palladio’s reconstructions of ancient buildings, this reviewer can add that the two drawings were generated using Richard Newcourt’s 1658 map of London as a base or template. The accessibility of the All Souls drawings provided by this volume is sure to stimulate more such discoveries about familiar as well as lesser known projects by Wren.

The clarity and usefulness of the catalog, particularly in establishing new chronologies and attributions for the drawings, would not have been possible without Geraghty’s expertise in the analysis and characterization of drawing styles. The introductory essay, “The Drawings: Technique and Purpose,” traces the history of the drawings that emerged from Wren’s office. Reflecting the older Italian concept of disegno, Wren understood design and drawing to be the same thing.

As a result he drew throughout his entire active career, making small freehand sketches in pencil or ink, large and precise presentation drawings, as well as large-scale construction drawings. At the same time, due to the demands of his prolific practice, he employed a succession of draftsmen from the 1670s on—Edward Woodrooffe, John Oliver, Thomas Laine, Robert Hooke, Nicholas Hawksmoor, and William Dickinson—whose varying roles in the design process has been long debated. By identifying different hands, Geraghty concludes that the primary role of these draftsmen was to make copies, to complete Wren’s drawings, and to make presentation drawings—Wren always retained his role as designer. The only possible exception is Hawksmoor, who transformed Wren’s practice from the late 1680s, as seen in the potent and expressive qualities of over 120 drawings at All Souls. Taking the form of highly-developed pen-cil preparatory drawings, inked presentation drawings, and the wash perspective sketches, these sheets indicate a sympathy with his employer’s intentions, if not a direct role in the design. Collectively the numerous drawings at All Souls reveal Wren’s control of his designs; viewing sheet after sheet, we can also conclude that it was the drawings that made this control possible. Different kinds of drawings communicated his ideas at various stages of the design and construction process, but they also could be rendered to heighten the aesthetic qualities of a project. All of these drawing types and their visual possibilities ensured that Wren’s intentions were clearly expressed and that he maintained design control in the course of actual building.

The only criticism of the book that could be voiced relates to the scale at which the drawings are reproduced, which seems to have been determined more by the exigencies of page layout than respect for the relative sizes of the drawings themselves. Original drawings made at the same scale, but on paper of different dimensions, are at times reduced in the catalog to the same height or width and consequently appear at different scales. For example, the plan and elevation of the pre-fire design for St. Paul’s are reproduced at the same scale, but the section is not (nos. 45–47), while in the case of the Warrant design, its west and south elevations and its longitudinal section each end up at a different scale (nos. 73–75). This limits the reader’s ability to correlate design elements from one drawing to another.

Nevertheless, the book provides a rich venue for first encounters with the drawings at All Souls. Ultimately, however, these sheets must be studied first hand to be truly understood and appreciated. In a time when architecture students design buildings by tapping a mouse to create a three-dimensional model on a computer screen, and see little or no value in either drawing by hand or in making plans, sections, and elevations, Geraghty’s book reminds us of the power of the architectural drawing. With pencil and paper, a deft hand, and an imaginative mind, Wren was able to design complex buildings and clearly represent them by means of this relatively simple but richly informative and highly personalized medium.

LYDIA M. SOO
University of Michigan

Notes

Barbara Miller Lane, editor
Housing and Dwelling: Perspectives on Modern Domestic Architecture
New York: Routledge, 2007, 467 pp., 85 b/w illus. $54.95 (cloth), ISBN 041534655x, $54.95 (paper), ISBN 0415346568

When she compiled Housing and Dwelling: Perspectives on Modern Domestic Architecture, Barbara Miller Lane had several goals in mind: to remedy the dearth of thoughtful teaching texts for the history of housing, to present differing perspectives from...
within and without the architectural discipline on housing and dwelling in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and to contribute to the growing body of scholarship that challenges the attention architectural historians have traditionally lavished on great buildings. Lane clearly chose the terms housing and dwelling for her title because of their philosophical and theoretical connotations. “Housing” suggests the anonymous, commercial ventures controlled by contractors and investors, municipalities and cooperatives, rather than architects. This is not to say that architects have not been engaged in designing housing for the masses, and Lane includes several selections on this work. But although numerous architects have proposed both utopian and practical housing schemes, other non-aesthetic interests have dominated the field.

“Dwelling” evokes the philosophical discussions largely generated by Heidegger’s well-known essay “Building, Dwelling, Thinking.” He famously defines dwelling as “the basic character of being,” thus tying habitation and building to the fundamentals of human existence. Heidegger also held up the vernacular German Black Forest farmhouse as an ideal traditional dwelling, although he dismissed a romantic return to such architecture in the twentieth century. In this spirit, the volume focuses on the everyday because it is inextricably bound to all of us. As Lane writes, most people confront the problems of space, domesticity, and habitation in the realm of the quotidian rather than the rarified realm of great architecture.

At issue in any volume on housing and dwelling is how we live; who determines this; how models for domestic living shift and change over time; and the differences between urban, suburban, and rural modes of living. Lane confronts these questions by dividing the volume into two parts, each of which has several subsections and chapters. Part one deals with questions of interpretation, authority, and meaning; part two treats nineteenth- and twentieth-century housing and dwelling types in a series of subcategories.

Lane is sensitive to the immensity of her task and the impossibility of assembling a collection that will satisfy every reader. Housing and Dwelling is an interdisciplinary effort that includes excerpts from essays by architectural historians, urbanists, philosophers, sociologists, anthropologists, fiction writers, and more. Each section has a brief introduction, but the individual text selections do not. These excerpts are organized not so much in a straightforward dialectical manner, but so as to engage multiple points of view associated with each theme. This organizational strategy sets up some very interesting questions. In order to establish the multidisciplinary approach, for example, Lane begins by asking the reader to consider, “Who interprets?” The five essays she includes present very different perspectives: that of an historian, an architect, a cultural anthropologist, an archaeologist, and a user/author. Rather than argue for each perspective, or explicate it as other editors have done in recent anthologies, Lane lets the writers speak for themselves. The first excerpt in the book is Nikolaus Pevsner’s classic comparison of the bicycle shed to Lincoln Cathedral. Pevsner evinces a traditional understanding of both architecture and the historian’s role vis-à-vis the discipline. By placing this piece first, Lane accomplishes two feats: she introduces the reader to her subject and establishes the attitude against which her collection stands as a foil.

Part one, section three typifies Lane’s method. Here she presents several differing views on the meaning of home, house, and dwelling. Alongside Heidegger’s well-known essay are architectural historian Reyner Banham’s ruminations on technology and modern living in “A Home Is Not a House,” which presents the opposing view. Lane juxtaposes Banham with the anthropologist Mary Douglas, who explicates the tyranny of the idea of “home,” in her view, a stifling milieu filled with senseless restrictions. A beautiful piece of memoir writing by bell hooks, penname of the feminist activist and writer Gloria Jean Watkins, rounds out this section. Hooks explains how home can be a refuge, directly countering Douglas’s more negative assessment. In this way, the four contributions invite the reader to take the idea of home and turn it over again and again to interrogate it from many different positions.

Lane includes subjects that are often marginalized or ignored, including a section on living downtown that examines typical and atypical urban housing solutions in the nineteenth century, from YMCAs and boarding houses to Viennese apartments. For architects, the short piece on Viennese apartments is particularly fascinating, since it describes the Austrians’ apparent lack of interest in practical planning at a time when functional design was in vogue in most of Europe. In a section on participatory planning and design, the authors consider such twentieth-century topics as squatter and self-help housing.

The essays range from treatments of Victorian domesticity to discussions of the rural ideal, as embodied in three different types: the farmhouse, suburban tract house, and rural retreat.

Lane’s organizational method is particularly valuable for students of architectural design who tend to be underexposed to relevant ideas outside the discipline. The list of contributors is impressive, although it would have been helpful if Routledge had included a roster with short biographies, since the typical architecture audience will not be familiar with many of them. The list includes only a handful of names from the architectural canon—including Walter Gropius, Le Corbusier, and Alison and Peter Smithson—and well-known architectural historians Susan Henderson, Elizabeth Collins-Cromley, and Georges Teyssot. Other distinguished contributions come from Sharon Marcus, Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia University and a specialist in urban studies and queer theory; British author Anthony Burgess, perhaps best known for A Clockwork Orange; J. S. Fuerst, Professor of Social Policy at Loyola; Paul Groth, Professor of Architecture and Geography at University of California, Berkeley; and Suzanne M. Spencer-Wood, professor, anthropologist, and director of Women’s Studies at Oakland University.

Lane concludes the collection with a selection of speculative pieces on contemporary and future housing models, followed by the section “Where Is Home?” The speculative pieces constitute, perhaps, the one weak link in the volume.
The focus on prefabricated and mobile homes ignores cyber-architecture and its potential, along with the exploding green movement, where much cutting-edge research and construction are now taking place. Although cohousing still exists, its latest incarnation is so-called eco-housing. As opposed to other sections, where the contributors present many often conflicting points of view, the last chapter tackles similar ideas from different perspectives. The German notion of Heimat—“home,” “homeland,” or “home country”—where one has an eternal sense of belonging, is set against a contemporary society of ever more mobile, rootless nomads displaced by war, religious and ethnic discrimination, and poverty. Here, with the exception of filmmaker Edgar Reitz, the writers agree: home and homeland are largely emotional constructs that owe their power to a sense of community, history, and collective memory. Reitz’s film Heimat does not refute the possibility of belonging but suggests the impossibility of recapturing a traditional sense of homeland in the face of twentieth-century disasters. Over the course of the film, the central character, Paul, discovers that he cannot recreate his sense of belonging to his German hometown because he no longer belongs there and because the town and its residents do not share a history with him.

Unfortunately, the book ends without a summation by the editor. Such an essay would help direct student discussions of this excellent, thought-provoking collection. The last chapter offers a subtle and clever twist on themes addressed in part one. If the introductory pieces attempt to offer definitions for home, the concluding section suggests that home may no longer exist, or that modern life may necessitate new notions of home and, by extension, housing and dwelling.

DEBORAH ASCHER BARNSTONE
Washington State University and Technical University, Delft

Andrew Leach, Antony Moulis, and Nicole Sully, eds. Shifting Views: Selected Essays on the Architectural History of Australia and New Zealand
St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 2008, 256 pages, no illus., AUS$59.95 (paper), ISBN 9780702223680

Occasions such as birthdays and anniversaries commonly provoke reflection—joyous, unsettling, or sometimes both. This was certainly the case in 2008 for the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand (SAHANZ), it being twenty-five years since the society’s first meeting at the University of Adelaide in August 1984. Shifting Views was produced to mark this milestone and more particularly to trace the shifting state of inquiry into the region’s architectural history across the quarter-century of SAHANZ activity. The book is both a celebration of SAHANZ’s longevity as well as a broader critical reflection on the contested nature of architectural history-making in Australia and New Zealand.

From over a thousand papers delivered at the society’s conferences, editors Andrew Leach, Antony Moulis, and Nicole Sully have selected a collection of sixteen essays by SAHANZ members. Not simply a miscellaneous reader in the region’s architectural history, the book is also a careful, timely exploration of issues around architectural historiography, as described on its back cover: “[The book] shows us how architectural history has been made and revised, giving us a glimpse of the means by which the past becomes our history.” The contributions span twenty years and provide valuable insight into the diversity of subjects addressed at the conferences. At the same time, they elucidate recurring tensions around local structures and modes of historical inquiry.

Indeed, the selection of essays itself bears the traces of these tensions. The introduction to the volume discusses ongoing debates within the society over the place of documentary versus critical historians (sometimes framed as “historians” versus “theorists”), but the editors have firmly favored essays that display a criticality, although sometimes a subtle one. In this they move decisively to establish SAHANZ’s position as the preeminent forum for sustained analysis of architectural history in Australia and New Zealand. They are particularly sympathetic to a characteristic that Judith Brine (in the first essay of the volume) defined as “aggressive egalitarianism,” positing this as a component of the selected essays that drives them to “expose the scaffolding that holds up the histories of Australian and New Zealand architecture” (xiii). Leach, Moulis, and Sully emphasize their appreciation of this quality when they state: “Shifting Views pays tribute to those architectural historians on both sides of the Tasman Sea who undermined the privileged figures of whom Brine writes by producing, from the 1980s, a new, critical forum for architectural historians” (xii). This well-considered selection of essays presents a self-conscious reflection on what it means to write architectural history in this part of the world.

The papers in Shifting Views deal with a wide range of subject matter related to the architectural history of the region—from Polynesian influences in New Zealand architecture to the reception of postmodern architecture in Australia. However, these diverse investigations also address a more focused range of issues pertaining to the construction of architectural history itself. Various questions are raised about the responsibility of historians for the way that architects instrumentally work, about the complex cultural interplay active when writing history within colonized nations, and about the validity of established historiographical categories.

A provocative call for categorical revision is found in Stanislaus Fung’s paper “The ‘Sydney School’?” Presented at the 1985 SAHANZ meeting, this paper called into question the construction of the term Sydney School, used in reference to the work of a number of young Sydney architects operating in the early 1960s. Fung argued that a range of writers, including well-known and established architectural figures such as Jennifer Taylor, Robin Boyd, and Philip Cox had used the term in ways that were inconsistent and often ill defined. Depending on