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$99.95 (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 instrumentize their 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
the writer, the Sydney School was sometimes a group of architects, sometimes a style, sometimes a romantic movement. The buildings, the architects involved, and the dates all shifted, as did the basic principles defining the category; did the Sydney School reflect a concern with style, material, and compositional principles, or did something else bind the work together? Fung argued: “the progressive acceptance of the concept of a ‘Sydney School’ . . . is based only on inconclusive, relatively short discussions, characterised by a lack of methodological discipline” (47). The paper was a clear, cutting attack on the quality of Australian historiography and made over the differentiation between SAHANZ members interested in empirical research and those whose work was more theoretically informed.

Other papers in *Shifting Views* address similar concerns. Paul Walker, in his 1991 paper “Kenneth Frampton and the Fiction of Place,” deconstructs Frampton’s notion of “critical regionalism.” He pays particular attention to the importance of coming to terms with architectural regionalism in the analysis of architectural culture in places such as New Zealand and Australia. Julie Willis and Philip Goad’s “A Myth in Its Making: Federation Style and Australian Architectural History” (2000) examines the creation and definition of the term Federation Style. The authors highlight the difficulty of finding unity in the diverse architectural production of the period to which the label is applied, approximately 1890–1915.

While all the papers aim critical eyes on the intellectual foundations of local architectural culture, other links among them can be discerned. For example, Joan Kerr’s “Why Architects Should Not Write Architectural History” (1984) and Paul Hogben’s “The Aftermath of ‘Pleasures:’ Untold Stories of Post-Modern Architecture in Australia” (2003), are much concerned with the instrumentalization of history by architects. They tease out the ways in which the question of a critical distance between practitioner and historian has been variously framed locally. Thus, as noted above, what emerges is a selection of essays that, in the editors’ words, “share a self-consciousness.”

The focus by the editors on works that largely recalibrate existing historical narratives means there is an overall concern with how architectural history is carried out locally, rather than what that history is. Julie Willis and Philip Goad, in a recent paper in the SAHANZ journal *Fabrications* (June 2008), have suggested that from the 1980s onwards the history of Australian architecture, stimulated by the foundation of *SAHANZ* as well as the journals *Transition, Fabrications*, and *Architectural Theory Review*, “was being discussed in smaller and smaller pieces, albeit more critically.” (19). They go on to argue that, while important, these contributions have done nothing to alter seriously the overall understanding of the country’s architectural evolution. It is perhaps appropriate that the cover of *Shifting Views* is a photographic detail of an unidentified building, revealing a stone wall, partial window frames, and a disembodied section of veranda. It calls to mind David Himmings, the photographer in Antonioni’s *Blow Up*, repeatedly enlarging and scrutinizing a negative in the hope of sighting evidence of a crime he thought he saw.

The way that the editors have framed their selection inevitably leaves other aspects of the body of SAHANZ writing less thoroughly examined. For example, there is little sense given of the pattern of thematic concerns that has emerged over twenty-five years, or much discussion of the gaps in scholarship. The latter seems particularly important given the uncertain place and uneven treatment of research into indigenous architecture within the forum of SAHANZ, a concern elucidated by Paul Memmott and James Davidson (*Fabrications*, June 2008). The selection of essays makes a fairly careful balance of writings, in their geographical and historical focus as well as the authorial voices, but beneath this smooth surface run currents of dispute that would have been useful to chart.

Nevertheless, given the large, extremely diverse body of work produced over the twenty-five years of conferences, the curatorial approach provides a useful perspective, and the papers are an absorbing index of continuity and change within the discipline of architectural history in Australia and New Zealand. With its intensity of focus, this is not an easily accessible text for general readers or those wanting introductory readings in the architectural history of the region. However, it would make an excellent companion to more general sources and would be especially useful in university courses addressing architectural history within the region. It is tempting to suggest this as a determinant of the editorial decisions.

The design of the book is elegant and uncluttered, apart from a slightly distracting cross-hair motif that appears throughout. Reflecting the specialized nature and constraints of a small organization like SAHANZ, *Shifting Views* is not illustrated and published only as a paperback. This economy is no index of the scholarship within; all of the essays are excellent pieces that have been provocative, influential, or expositive. They have broadened the scope of architectural history in New Zealand and Australia and recalibrated its methods of investigation. *Shifting Views* is planned as the first in a series of more substantial publications sponsored by SAHANZ. It is as a happy marker of the society’s sustained intellectual vitality and impact.

LENE STICKELLS
University of Sydney

James R. Lindow

**The Renaissance Palace in Florence: Magnificence and Splendour in Fifteenth-Century Italy**

Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2007, 265 pp., 8 color and 42 b/w illus. $114.95 (cloth), ISBN 9780754660927

Much of the literature on the Italian Renaissance palace treats the architectural type essentially as a façade. This is understandable, considering that façades are typically the least altered and most accessible parts of a palace, and seemingly the focus of most of the design energy. Palace plans have received some attention, but mostly with regard to their use of Vitruvian accounts of the ancient Roman house. Traditionally, the most neglected aspect of the study of the Renaissance palace is precisely that which has the