

also be of importance to modern-day geneticists and evolutionary biologists who seek to understand the origins of their field and approach their work with a philosophical and historical bent.

Michael Yudell

*Michael Yudell is Chair and Associate Professor in the Department of Community Health and Prevention at the Dornsife School of Public Health, Drexel University. He is the author of Race Unmasked: Biology and Race in the Twentieth Century (Columbia, 2014) and, with Samuel Roberts, edits the Columbia University Press series "Race, Inequality, and Health."*

**Uwe Hoßfeld.** *Geschichte der biologischen Anthropologie in Deutschland: Von den Anfängen bis in die Nachkriegszeit.* Second edition. 573 pp., illus., bibl., index. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2016. €79 (cloth).

Uwe Hoßfeld's *Geschichte der biologischen Anthropologie in Deutschland* has now appeared in a second edition, which includes an abundance of new references to literature on the volume's topic as well as a new preface. The new introduction focuses on the lasting relevance of anthropological questions: from its beginnings, anthropology has been a discipline obsessed with the identification of differences in the physique of humans as well as their consequences for the constitution of ethnic groups. Turning to the formation of anthropology thus might be one of the most productive ways to engage with the history of some key concepts that have been dominating debates in the humanities in recent decades, such as diversity, gender, or, even more prominently, race.

Hoßfeld cleverly addresses these current discourses by avoiding continuously naming them; rather, he gives an account of how their conceptual history can be traced along the lines of a history of anthropology. In his presentation, he chooses an enumerative or encyclopedic style, taking the reader from the very first publication mentioning the notion of "*Anthropologie* [Anthropology]" in a sense akin to its modern usage (Magnus Hundt's *Anthropologium de hominis dignitate, natura et proprietatibus, de elementis, partibus et membris humani corporis etc. de spiritu humano etc. de anima humans et ipsus appendiciis*, which dates to 1501) to the diversity of anthropological research in the twentieth century. The latter has not only brought about the gruesome application of anthropological knowledge in the teachings of *Rassenkunde* and eugenics during the reign of National Socialism, but has also witnessed its longevity in science as well as culture entrenched in racism.

Hoßfeld's approach is chronological and centered on the preeminent figures of anthropological research in Germany. After some remarks on his basic division into periods before and after Darwin's groundbreaking work *On the Origin of Species* (1859) (p. 34)—in the aftermath of which mankind stood as just one creature among others, instead of ruling the animal kingdom as its finest creation—Hoßfeld provides a survey of the usage of the term "anthropology" in scientific cultures other than the German and thus clarifies his decision to concentrate on national endeavors that sought to contribute to knowledge of the human.

One striking reason for a history of German anthropology is certainly the absence, before Hoßfeld's book, of a coherent and all-encompassing overview of this influential field of research; another is to be found in the eager reception of and outstanding contributions to evolutionary thought in Germany, which shaped the discipline's history existentially. A major site for these developments has been the University of Jena, situated in Germany's eastern *Bundesland* (federal state) of Thuringia. By meticulously unfolding the history of this university (p. 222 ff.), Hoßfeld gives a very valuable example of how to write the history of anthropology as the history of a distinctive institution—one where famous as well as infamous anthropologists like Ernst Haeckel (p. 147), Karl Astel (p. 249), and Gerhard Heberer (p. 283) have taught.

Among the many virtues of Hoßfeld's book, the abundance of material reviewed, works cited, authors quoted, and illustrations provided is the most salient one; this commitment to coverage will certainly stand

the test of time, making this volume a standard work for anyone interested in anthropology, a work of reference that also offers the most complete history of certain strands of the discipline to date. Yet this encyclopedic drive has some peculiarities that might come across as shortcomings to a more epistemologically inclined readership. The absolute linearity of this historical account is based on the assumption that knowledge develops without ruptures, that paradigms shift with the accumulation of new arguments and information on questions like inheritance, descent, and morphology. Hoßfeld presents the history of the discipline by parading its great men through the course of the book—even though, as he shows in two lengthy chapters, their work contributed to the implementation of a grueling ideology that used anthropological findings as scientific justification for the mass murder of some of the most vulnerable members of society.

But anthropology's built-in racism and its ties to neighboring disciplines (e.g., ethnography) are hardly touched on, not to mention all the ways in which anthropology was enmeshed in culture, especially during its "hot phase" in the first decades of the reception of Darwinism. Hoßfeld's book offers numerous illustrations, stemming from scientific journals and popular publications, but never do they rise above the level of mere evidence of a historical instance. *Die Geschichte der biologischen Anthropologie in Deutschland* is of course not a work by an art historian, but the lack of interest in mediality or the methods of pictorial representation shown in all these fascinating illustrations poses questions regarding the possible impact of a historical study free from any theoretical metareflection on its own methods. Anthropology is and will remain a privileged topic for pondering science as a cultural rather than "just" a scientific discipline, meaning that its relevance depends like that of no other discipline on the cultural reception of its findings. Still: further research on these matters will always have to return to Hoßfeld's comprehensive study.

Hanna Engelmeier

*Hanna Engelmeier is a postdoctoral researcher in cultural studies at the Kulturwissenschaftliches Institut (KWI) in Essen. Her dissertation was published in 2016 under the title Der Mensch, der Affe: Anthropologie und Darwin-Rezeption in Deutschland, 1850–1900 (Böhlau). Her recent work focuses on anti-academicism, as well as on solace as a mode of reception.*

**Gisela Parak.** *Photographs of Environmental Phenomena: Scientific Images in the Wake of Environmental Awareness, USA 1860s–1970s.* 256 pp., figs., bibl. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2016. \$45 (paper).

In this volume Gisela Parak examines mostly outdoor photographs taken under institutional auspices within the United States across the long century preceding the Carter Administration. She is centrally concerned with images that fall outside what she thinks of as the self-consciously "artistic" genres of landscape and nature photography, and she is at some pains precisely to specify her category of analysis, which is the titular "photographs of environmental phenomena." Here is her definition: "I define photographs of environmental phenomena as those produced in order to research in an investigative manner 'nature' and 'landscape' from the perspective of economic, infrastructure-related, and critical-environmental perspectives" (p. 12). Under this rubric she wishes to hold together, *inter alia*, topographical survey photographs from the second half of the nineteenth century, documentary images of the Dust Bowl produced by federal agencies in the interwar period, and EPA-commissioned representations of pollution from the early 1970s. Parak understands all of these diverse images to entangle science and politics, and all of them contribute, in her view, to an emerging "understanding" of the environment in the United States. "Understanding" here spans both the technical command of geophysical/biological processes and the popular appreciation/awareness of the milieu (particularly its fragility or vulnerability). Which is to say, Parak is interested both in knowledge production and in its public dissemination/reception. Here is her central contention: "photographic images of environmental phenomena . . . played a decisive role within the mechanisms of the state and the US gov-