the term identity often, it is not always clear what he means by it in every context.

But this is a minor quibble on my part, not a debate, and it does not detract from what is a wonderful book. This volume is a must-have for anyone interested in Greek culture and ancient architecture, as it synthesizes the vast literature on Crete from ca. 7000 to 1100 BC. It will serve for many years to come as a mainstay for the training of students of the Minoan past.

JOHN K. PAPADOPOULOS
University of California, Los Angeles

Jeffrey Saletnik and Robin Schuldenfrei, editors

Bauhaus Construct: Fashioning Identity, Discourse and Modernism
London and New York: Routledge, 2009, 278 pp., 72 b/w illus. $49.95 (paper), ISBN 0415778360

There is no shortage of new books about the Bauhaus. As readers of the JSAH well know, the school’s ninetieth anniversary was marked by a plethora of exhibitions and publications that is unlikely to be matched on the occasion of its centennial in 2019. Bauhaus Construct: Fashioning Identity, Discourse and Modernism is based on a conference organized by the editors, Jeffrey Saletnik and Robin Schuldenfrei, and held at Harvard University in 2008. Three of the contributions appear in slightly different form and in German in the edited proceedings of an earlier conference, Anja Baumhoff and Magdalena Droste’s Mythos Bauhaus: Zwischen Selbstfindung und Enthistorisierung (Berlin: Reimer, 2009).

There is nonetheless a freshness about the current collection that was largely missing from the catalogues of the Berlin and New York exhibitions, which were more committed to upholding the importance of their subject than raising provocative new questions about the school and its legacy. Although Bauhaus Construct includes chapters by such well-established authorities on the school as Frederic J. Schwartz and the doyenne of contemporary Bauhaus scholars, Magdalena Droste, the editors and many of the contributors have recently finished or are still completing their doctorates.

The editors describe the focus of the book as the analysis of objects. “This volume,” they declare, “examines how objects produced at the school both reflected and constructed the myriad—and at times conflicting—narratives of the Bauhaus and its discursive practices” (2). However, three of the most insightful contributions, those of Schwartz, Saletnik, and Droste, focus more on ideas than on the analysis of particular objects. Alina Payne, who contributes a summary chapter, more accurately observes that the essays “engage a series of issues that cluster around three major problems: the problem of authorship, that is, of the artist; the problem of the artistic media inside the project of modernity; and finally the problem of reception as the Bauhaus ‘brand name’ bounced off the hard walls of shifting doctrines and political environments in the twentieth century” (248). To this one could add an engagement with gender, a more critical attitude toward Gropius, and a focus upon the work and influence of László Moholy-Nagy.

Among the objects that are provocatively re-examined here are a photograph of a typewriter on Walter Gropius’s desk by Lucia Moholy (in the introduction by the editors), Lyonel Feininger’s cover for the “Bauhaus Program” (Karen Koehler); various objects produced by the metal workshop (Robin Schuldenfrei); a series of paintings by Paul Klee (Annie Bourneuf); photographs by Lyonel Feininger (Laura Muir), Moholy-Nagy’s painting Z VII (Joyce Tsai); a photograph of the stone sculpture workshop (Paul Paret); a series of photomontages by Moholy-Nagy, Marcel Breuer, and Herbert Bayer (Elizabeth Otto); and an application for a patent by Ludwig Mies van der Rohe and Ottilie Berger (T’ai Smith). Particularly notable are Schuldenfrei’s attempt to uphold the importance of Bauhaus rhetoric and the entirely conventional bourgeois purposes and luxurious materials that characterize some of the school’s most iconic products, such as Marianne Brandt’s tea infuser, and Paret and Otto’s focus upon the way in which Bauhaus configurations of masculinity were affected by Germany’s devastating defeat in World War I. Smith’s otherwise thoughtful comparison of the diverse ways in which Mies and Berger approached intellectual property is marred by the omission of the key fact that Berger died at Auschwitz in 1944. What the author reads as Isé Gropius’s concern in 1951 for Berger’s property rights (she fears her ideas will be stolen by Anni Albers), could just as easily be a case of Gropius appropriating for his own purposes the work of one of the female Bauhäusler, like that involving Lucia Moholy documented in the introduction.

Indeed, much of the originality of the book arises from its insightful look at the way in which women and men affiliated with the school attempted to shape their identities and careers, particularly in relation to Gropius and Moholy-Nagy. Women were clearly at a disadvantage, as Droste further clarifies in her comparison of the careers and sense of self of Breuer, Bayer, and Brandt. The latter’s fate was shaped as well by her location after the war in the German Democratic Republic rather than the United States. The critical tone that many of the authors take toward Gropius is almost unprecedented in work by scholars who are clearly engaged by—rather than resistant to—modernism, and this is a welcome correction to the nearly hagiographic way that the school’s founder is often viewed. Although we are still waiting for a definitive reappraisal of Hannes Meyer’s tenure as director, this book breaks welcome new ground in the attention it pays to the impact of Moholy-Nagy on not only students but also his colleagues, particularly the two painters, Klee and Feininger, and to his own paintings.

The remaining essays create a broader context for understanding the pre- and posthistory of the school. Payne proposes that the prehistory be extended back to encompass the writings of Gottfried Semper, especially as mediated by Conelius Gurlitt and Richard Streiter, and out into such fields as anthropology and archaeology, which attached profound significance to objects as bearers of culture. In a book that focuses almost as much on the posthistory of the school as on what happened in Weimar, Dessau, and Berlin, Droste, Schwartz, and Saletnik, in particular, chronicle its afterlife in the two Germanies and the United States. Especially
welcome is Schwartz’s reconstruction of the context in which Martin Heidegger’s famous talk “Building Thinking Dwelling” was given in 1951, which draws attention to the disingenuously evasive way the philosopher avoided addressing exactly why there was a dearth of adequate housing in Germany at the time. Salenik’s essay helps explain the relatively limited immediate impact of Albers’s paintings during the ascendancy of Clement Greenberg but fails to address the degree to which Albers’s teaching nonetheless inspired a diversity ofcompelling alternatives to Abstract Expressionism. Indeed, the school’s importance, long unquestioned in relation to architecture and design, remains still slightly overlooked by many historians of the other visual arts, who tend to focus on its pedagogy rather than its practice. The emphasis of this collection upon objects rather than buildings, and upon paintings, patent applications, and photo-montages as well as industrial design, reminds us of the full scope of imagination and originality that flourished here. The utility of these objects, the editors made clear, was not the way they transformed the daily lives of the working class, but the way they expressed the identity and transformed the careers of their makers.

KATHLEEN JAMES-CHAKRABORTY
University College Dublin

Banmali Tandan
Cambridge: Zophorus Books Limited, 2008, 450 pp., 527 b/w illus. $100 (cloth), ISBN 9780955788000

The architecture of Oudh, and particularly its capital city of Lucknow—legendary for its magnificence and the refinement of Indo-Islamic high culture under its rulers, the nawabs of Oudh—is the subject of Banmali Tandan’s The Architecture of Lucknow and Oudh, 1722–1856: Its Evolution in an Aesthetic and Social Context. Starting in the thirteenth century in northwestern India, the region known as Oudh came under the rule of a sequence of Delhi-based Muslim dynasties. By the late sixteenth century the area became part of the mighty Mughal empire. In 1722 Saadat Khan, a Shi’a nobleman from Persia who was employed by the Mughal emperor, was appointed Subahdar (governor) of Oudh. From 1722 to 1856, these rulers and their successors came to be known as the nawabs of Oudh.

While putatively remaining loyal to the Mughal emperor, Saadat Khan worked to consolidate his position and assert control over his domain by undertaking campaigns against the largely Hindu landlords of Oudh. These semi-independent feudal barons were not entirely suppressed. They were forced to pay tax on a regular basis even as their hereditary rights to their lands remained undisturbed. Some of the landed chieftains would become Nawabi courtiers and officials. Despite the Nawabi overlordship, most continued to grow in strength under Nawabi rule. Their belief that they were independent rulers of their domain was signaled by the construction of numerous mud-forts in their lands during this period. After his death in 1739, Saadat Khan’s nephew and son-in-law Safdar Jang (1739–1753) succeeded him as governor.

At this time Oudh had grown to be a rich province; one that yielded vast revenues, estimated in the 1750s to be twice that of the Mughal empire at its zenith. As governor, Safdar Jang resided in the Mughal capital of Delhi or Shahjahanabad, but also in the cities of Faizabad and Lucknow in Oudh. When Asafuddaula (1775–1797) became nawab of Oudh, he made Lucknow his permanent capital in 1775. Safdar Jang’s successor Shujauddaula (1754–1775) came into conflict with the East India Company and was defeated by the latter (in 1764, in Buxar and 1765 in Jajmau) While Oudh was informally independent of the Mughal emperor before 1765, after this date, through treaties and other agreements, it was progressively shaped by the control of the East India Company. The influence of European architectural styles on the local architecture was increasingly evident after the 1770s, and these Indo-European and even Indo-Islamic buildings have come under much criticism. In 1856 the British deposed Wajid Ali Shah, the last nawab, and annexed Oudh, making this once vibrant independent region just one part of the global possessions of the expanding British empire.

This is the context and background to Banmali Tandan’s ambitious book. In it the author examines a vast terrain as well as a great number of diverse buildings and other elements of the built environment. In doing so, he explores the architectural patronage of the nawabs and their courtiers—including Europeans, Muslims, Hindus, and Jains—in Oudh in the changing political climate of over a century and a quarter of nawabi rule. This book is the author’s second on the subject. According to the author, they can be read independently. However, this book builds on The Architecture of Lucknow and Its Dependencies, 1722–1856: A Descriptive Inventory and an Analysis of Nawabi Types (New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 2001) and is the product of the perusal of a greater array of sources and intensive fieldwork.

Throughout this book Tandan shows a strong commitment to observing and describing the built environment: spatial and living arrangements, gender segregation, response to tropical climate, materials, native building technologies, construction details, finishes, and stylistic and spatial genealogies. The book also discusses an impressive range of secular and sacred building types. Many of the buildings have been documented and drawn by the author, a valuable resource for future scholars.

According to the author, “This work is primarily an analysis of the form and style of Nawabi buildings in Oudh then, but also seeks to investigate how they were intended to function in those days and the social, geographical or other factors which might have also influenced their design” (16). Unfortunately, the book is more of a descriptive inventory (a term in the subtitle of his first book) than a critical historical analysis. This limitation challenges the reader.

The book has a preface and eleven chapters, the first of which is a prologue; the others unfold chronologically. The architecture of three European courtiers is dealt with individually in three chapters. The main criticism is that none of the chapters has an argument and most of them provide little context for the architecture being examined. Furthermore, the