serving the common good. Historians of the past too are exposed, confidently asserting conclusions without a basis in reality so far as Aspaas and Kontler could find. The result is an open but sympathetic portrayal of Hell that documents but does not explain away why his contemporaries accused him of withholding or falsifying data, running an underground network of ex-Jesuits seeking to overthrow the rational, popular Enlightenment, or suppressing Hungarian political ambitions or Calvinist scientists. Nor do we fully understand why past historians depicted Hell as a pseudo-scientist, a liar, and a thief. Instead, the authors focus on the limitations of available sources, unfounded fabrications, and how the man reflects his times, as in the brutality of printed attacks by or about him. Their work may not provide definitive answers about Hell's actions and thoughts, but it exposes sometimes ugly eighteenth-century issues and Central European experiences, like religious intolerance and what constituted scientific practice. Amidst the histories of place and groups of other intellectuals, *Maximilian Hell and the Ends of Jesuit Science in Enlightenment Europe* models how Hell and others are positively and negatively formed by place and communities.

Heather Morrison
State University of New York at New Paltz
doi:10.1017/S0008938921001126

Botanophilie. Mensch und Pflanze in der aufklärerisch-bürgerlichen Gesellschaft um 1800. By Sophie Ruppel. Vienna and Cologne: Böhlau, 2019. Pp. 558. Cloth €59.99. ISBN 978-3412515751.

Much recent scholarship has foregrounded the kinship of humans and nonhumans. Animal studies have dominated writing about the natural world and drawn attention to the cohabitation, co-development, and companionship of sentient organisms. A new concern with plants complements animal studies by recounting the relationships and similarities of humans to all living beings. Regarding plants as living beings with inner lives, with capacities of movement and sensibility, offers an expanded sense of the coexistence of humans and plants.

Sophie Ruppel makes a compelling case that the turn of the nineteenth century was a key historical moment for fostering a fascination with plant life and a sense of kinship between humans and plants. The expansive scope of her book covers developments in the knowledge of plants, in the practices of botanizing, and in bringing plants into domestic spaces between 1750 and 1850. She argues that the second half of the eighteenth century witnessed a rejection of the stark contrast René Descartes posited between the mechanisms of the physical world and the human soul to allow for broader understandings of the interiority of living beings. In the case of plants, this new sense of interiority and even claims for plant souls was developed in the context of new studies of the electrification and revivification of plants, of plant sexual reproduction and the generation of living plants from organic matter, of the sleep of plants, of plant movement, and of plant irritability and sensibility. Ruppel highlights arguments for the homologies of plants, animals, and humans, not in the later nineteenth-century sense of purported evolutionary relationships but in the sense of the recognition of corresponding characteristics between different sorts of living beings.

Ruppel draws the reader into the developing fascination with botanizing in the years around 1800. Botanizing as a practice involved a deep knowledge and a love of plants. It was also an educational and social practice that was embraced across classes and social groups. Before the establishment of botany as a scientific discipline in the nineteenth century, botanizing was a popular pursuit in the countryside and in urban settings. Botanists might be pharmacists, physicians, ministers, bureaucrats, merchants, soldiers, teachers, as well as scholars. Women also participated in botanizing, as gentlewomen or through working marriages. Ruppel traces the range of publications communicating botanical knowledge and encouraging the practices of botanizing—from botanical journals, through handbooks and reference guides, to regional floras and popular magazines. She also highlights the role of the herbarium as contributing to the spread of knowledge of plants across time and space. She presents botanizing and publishing on plants as collective activities, as part of shared passions and the collaborative sharing of knowledge.

Ruppel also highlights how plants became routine aspects of everyday practices and households. She offers a loose connection between household plants and the history of gardening for both practical and aesthetic purposes. But her focus is on the developing fashions for plants in the home and the advice on care of household plants. Ruppel offers an interesting account of the connections between advancements in the science of air and the emerging household plant culture. She recounts Joseph Priestley's and Jan Ingenhousz's experiments in the 1770s and 1780s on the role of plants in the exchange of different kinds of air and their contributions to an understanding of photosynthesis. Ingenhousz argued that at night or in the dark plants no longer purify air or produce breathable air but instead give off a foul or poisonous air. His claim led to debates about the benefits of plants within households. Ruppel relates how these disputes were resolved after the turn of the century and how plants within the home came to be regarded as a health benefit and a growing fashion. She traces the developing passion for flowering plants, the growing number of publications on the care of household plants, and the market for house plants and flowers.

The Enlightenment operates in Ruppel's work more as a set of ideas and ideals across the period of Ruppel's study than as a historical period. She repeatedly emphasizes how the idea of a chain of being drew attention to the similarities and relationships between plants, animals, and humans. She also emphasizes how physicotheological ideas underscored the study of plants as religious and moral endeavors that led to respect for and praise of the power and wisdom of the creator. The pursuit of knowledge and edification was meant to exercise the mind, the heart, and the body. In her book, the Enlightenment is presented as valuing knowledge of nature as a part of human development and characterized as a broad civic and public movement. The development of botanical knowledge and botanizing practices reflected and contributed to these social ideals. Ruppel contrasts the open character of Enlightenment and civic concerns with plants to the closed professionalization of botany and commercialization of plants in the mid-nineteenth century. These contrasts seem too stark and the Enlightened-civic study of plants too idealized. It would be interesting to learn more about how historical shifts unfolded, and how the understanding of plants and practices of botanizing gradually changed from the historical period of the Enlightenment through the Romantic period and into the nineteenth century.

Ruppel presents the diverse ways of knowing plants, of the practices of botanizing, and of everyday relationships to plants in an episodic manner. This reader would have welcomed

more integration between the different parts of her study. But *Botanophilie* provides a wonderful sampling of the relationships between plants and human beings in the second half of the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth century.

Joan Steigerwald
York University
doi:10.1017/S0008938921001230

Heimat. Geschichte eines Missverständnisses. By Susanne Scharnowski. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2019. Pp. 272. Cloth $57.99. ISBN 978-3534270736.

The fraught concept of *Heimat* (homeland) undergoes a partial rehabilitation in this provocative cultural history of its myriad applications since 1800. The divisive and politically charged resonance of Heimat, Susanne Scharnowski argues, rests on misunderstandings, specifically on a distortion and excessive narrowing of its presumed meaning. Her book seeks to broaden the cultural associations of the term in order to defuse its reactionary potential and reclaim for Heimat a progressive, European agenda. Historical excavation is key to this project. Scharnowski liberates Heimat from its encasement within Sonderweg-style historical narratives, a dismantling long in progress. Discrediting Heimat as an irrational, völkisch concept paired with aggressive nationalism and faulting its evocation in romanticism for the blood-and-soil ideology of National Socialism is, in her view, misinformed. Nor should the term be deemed untranslatable, a peculiarly German preoccupation with an ideal of place. Scharnowski proposes that the German fascination with Heimat reflects less a nationalist fear of the foreign than an overwhelming sense of alienation produced by rapid technical-industrial change. Heimat was a symptom of loss and endangerment, an antidote to a pernicious history of imperial expansion, environmental degradation, and the destruction of local traditions and customs.

Heimat's value as an analytical concept useful for probing fissures in German society and correcting historical narrative is most evident in the first section of the book, a chronological rendering of the discourse on Heimat through the 1950s. Drawing primarily on literary texts, film, and other media, the chapters in this section excavate the social, cultural, and political applications of ideas of Heimat against the historical backdrop of modernization and its impact on rural regions. Scharnowski starts by severing the romantic concept of Heimat from nation and Volk, arguing for its inner spiritual significance as a symbol of aesthetic-religious longing. Only in the Vormärz did Heimat designate a concrete place or material reality. The author highlights the emancipatory, liberal-democratic intent behind the *Dorfgeschichten* (village stories) of Jewish-German author Berthold Auerbach, which offered an alternative to Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl's conservative adulation of inherited social structures during the Restoration.

The rift that emerged around 1900 between visionaries of progress, such as engineers and industrialists, and their critics among the *Bildungsbürgertum* decidedly politicized the idea of Heimat. In an important chapter, Scharnowski presents the multifaceted Heimat-hype of the period as a legitimate form of *Zivilisationskritik* that responded to threatened landscapes and traditions (concerns also present in Britain). The real perversion of Heimat occurred,