

In two helpful appendixes, Kohlstedt provides lists of the officers of the Nature-Study Society and of nature study supervisors in school districts around the country, each of which function as a kind of intellectual and genealogy of the movement. Furthermore, the University of Chicago Press deserves praise for allowing Kohlstedt to provide both endnotes (many of which are richly discursive) and an extensive bibliography, the latter of which is increasingly (and frustratingly) rare in publishing.

Environmental historians, historians of science, and historians of education will all find much of value in this book, above all because, as Kohlstedt observes in the conclusion, nature study has never been more necessary. Although there is considerable overlap between Kohlstedt's and Armitage's earlier book, they generally complement each other and provide a usable past for those of us interested in nurturing and sustaining children's sense of wonder at the natural world around them in a hypermediated age.

**Michael B. Smith**  
Ithaca College

Advance Access published on September 7, 2011  
doi:10.1093/envhis/emr115

**The Culture of Nature in Britain, 1680–1860.** By Peter M. Harman. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010. xi + 393 pp. Illustrations, notes, and index. Cloth \$65.00.

In this fine book, Peter M. Harman lays out the cultural history of nature in Britain in the two centuries leading up to Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859). In a plea for a more interdisciplinary history, he draws up a multilayered interpretation of what historically has been considered "natural." Readers of *Environmental History* may be familiar with Harman's work through his various histories of physics and natural philosophy, such as *The Natural Philosophy of James Clark Maxwell* (Cambridge University Press, 1998). In many ways *The Culture of Nature in Britain* builds on these investigations by connecting historical links between Newtonian science and the arts, literature, and natural theology. At the core of the book is an investigation into the ways in which "Romanticism disrupted these links between natural theology and the aesthetic appreciation of nature" (p. iv).

The strength and limits of Harman's investigations lie in his point of departure in Newtonian science and natural theology. His thorough analysis of the various ways in which the science of physics have inspired interpretations of nature is surely revealing, simultaneously playing down alternative interpretations of the landscape given by botanists, geographers, agriculturalists, and so on. What I found particularly interesting was his discussion of the ways in which natural theology has inspired pre-Darwinian perceptions of natural beauty. Aesthetic appreciations of the environment, Harman shows, were often informed by the ways in which natural theologians imagined God's creative powers.

Harman walks the reader through the importance of physics to the functioning of nature in design, human explorations, use of landscapes, descriptions of flora and fauna, studies of colors, and philosophies of scientific investigations into vitalism. His readings are an interesting blend of history of science and philosophy. Although he does not make a huge point about it, Harman's history reads as a contrast to feminists such as Carolyn Merchant and Sandra Harding, both of whom have argued that Newtonian physics have had an unfortunate historical role in framing our understandings and use of the environment.

There are few references to and barely any discussion of the culture of nature in the British Empire. This is puzzling given all the attention historians of science and the environment alike have given to the intimate proximity between understandings of nature in the colonies and nature in the British Isles. Richard Drayton, for example, has documented in *Nature's Government* (Yale University Press, 2000) how nature at the Botanical Gardens at Kew, London, reflected an imperial image of the empire as a whole. By contrast, Harman writes as if British imperialism was irrelevant to the culture of nature in Britain. This is not to say that the book is not a valuable contribution to the history of nature in Britain, worth both time and attention.

**Peder Anker**

New York University

doi:10.1093/envhis/emr096

**Other Animals: Beyond the Human in Russian Culture and History.** Edited by Jane Costlow and Amy Nelson. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2010. xiv + 312 pp. Illustrations, maps, notes, and index. Paper \$27.95.

This lively collection takes as its point of departure a question raised by John Berger in his article "Why Look at Animals?" (in Berger, *About Looking* [Pantheon, 1980], 1-26). The answer is that one gains insight into any culture by studying how it treats its nonhuman counterparts. Here, the focus is Russia. The articles range broadly, examining how animals have been "talked about, cared for, bred, imagined, illustrated, dreamed of, or used" (p. x) from the eighteenth century to the present, in urban and rural settings, and in high and low culture. Contributors' disciplines range from languages and literature to history and environmental studies.

Olga E. Glagoleva opens with a peculiar legal case from nineteenth-century Russia in which a woman sued after a man threw a live pig at her! The trial stretched on for thirty years and was eventually dismissed, but Glagoleva uses the court records to examine "the pig" as a cultural symbol. Other contributors survey popular traditions of animal medical care, portrayals of wolves and bears, animal imagery in the poetry of Vladimir Mayakovsky, the animal training practices of V. L. Durov, and appropriations of horse imagery in the construction of Russian masculine identity. The final section presents three