

Book Reviews

great *fortuna* in Arabic and then in Western medicine, where it spread and circulated mainly in an anonymous Arabic-Latin version until the beginning of the sixteenth century, when it was again translated into Latin by Wilhelm Kopp of Basle, physician of the French king.

Probably at the same time in which the Arabic-Latin version was made, Burgundio of Pisa (d. 1193) translated the *De loc. aff.* from a Greek manuscript, which is today preserved in the Laurentian Library in Florence, plut. 74, 30. Durling identified this manuscript as the original of Burgundio's translation by collation and analysis of the Greek tradition. Nigel Wilson confirmed this by recognizing Burgundio's hand in the Latin annotations of the Laurentian manuscript.

Burgundio's version is preserved in only five manuscripts, which are all independent and, therefore, useful for reconstructing the original text. It does not seem that this version had a wide circulation, like others of Galen made by this Pisan ambassador and translator. Nevertheless, it was known by Taddeo Alderotti (d. 1295), professor of medicine at Bologna, who used it to correct the Arabic-Latin translation. This conflation is preserved in six manuscripts, which are all independent, and printed in the first Latin edition of Galen by Diomedes Bonardus in 1490, and in the subsequent editions until the Giuntine of 1528. Durling carefully studied the extracts of Burgundio's version made by Taddeo Alderotti, which have only a few good readings. However, they attest that this Greek-Latin translation had a place in medical teaching.

Burgundio's version is edited by Durling on the basis of a complete study of its tradition and in a close comparison with Galen's Greek text. Two apparatus and two indices (Greek-Latin and Latin-Greek) are provided. In the Greek-Latin apparatus five Greek manuscripts of the *De loc. aff.* are considered. Two other manuscripts seem to be independent (Milan, Ambrosian Library, Ambr. gr. 659 and 679), but this is not relevant for the Latin text.

Burgundio's style and vocabulary are studied by Durling in the introduction. His translation of particles, conjunctions and demonstrative pronouns in the *De interioribus*, is compared with that of another version by him (*De complexionibus*) and of other medieval translations. Burgundio used some neologisms, which won later acceptance, possibly independently of him, and he seems to be a "cautious innovator".

Durling's work is an excellent edition and another fundamental contribution of this eminent scholar to the knowledge of the first Greek-Latin translators and to the study of the tradition of Greek medicine in the Western world.

Stefania Fortuna, University of Pisa

SANDER GILMAN, *The Jew's body*, New York and London, Routledge, 1991, pp. xii, 303, illus., £10.99 (paperback, 0-415-90459-5).

"You Jews are so wonderfully clever and inventive, aren't you?", inquired (gushingly not snarlingly) an acquaintance of mine only the other day. Whether the pejorative twist to "clever" is (as is often said) peculiarly English, I'm not sure, but nevertheless the anti-Semitic implications of such "praise" clearly rejoin a long European tradition, as Sander Gilman shows us in *The Jew's body*, a book which runs rather wider than its title suggests. Another line is that the Jews are highly prone to lunacy or, yet again, never truly creative—i.e. always both intellectually and socially parasitic. Gustave Le Bon took that view, which no doubt bolstered his confident insistence that Einstein had pinched the theory of relativity from him. The elaborated models which underpin such wearily familiar and obnoxiously repeated commonplaces—all those confident assertions of the fixed "stigmata" of the Jewish "mind" and "body" (flat feet, "nostrilly" noses and "goggle eyes" or piercing stares feature prominently)—are traced through their dizzying fits and starts in this erudite inquiry. The book considers the effects of all this on both Jewish and gentile perception; it ranges from remarks about the early history of Christianity to the contemporary German novel; from Galton's composite portraits of the essential face of the "Hebrews", through the (as it were) "ethnic cleansing" function of "nose jobs", designed and sometimes eagerly accepted by assimilating Jews in America; from special "syphilitic" dangers to the haemorrhoid peculiarities of these "aliens in our midst". The nineteenth and early twentieth centuries are the periods of particular focus, the eras in which a decisive new network of racial anthropological and degenerationist images was set in place.

Book Reviews

Gilman is alert to the ways in which the “you Jews are so clever. . .” kind of view in fact creates an implicit triangle not a simple polarity: the positioning of a first person plural (us, “wasps”) in contrast with “you” (the clever Jews) are constituted against the still more inalienably inferior (all those other “black races”—“other” in that, as we are shown, Jews are themselves often “blacks” in the history of anti-Semitism). “The Jews” have sometimes been cast as a monolithic group, but just as often as fractured into distinct medico-moral sets (the “pathological”, “dirty” and “unassimilable” new arrivals contrasted, for instance, with the “good”, “healthy” and “respectable” long-time settlers). Whether or not a dose of Gilman would have helped my acquaintance is not clear; racisms after all have functions which precede and endure beyond any rational demonstration of their falsity or perniciousness. But the present inquiry *is* apt and salutary even if its wide-ranging frame of reference occasionally glides too quickly across too much. There is a rather rushed tone about this work, evident in the style, proof-reading and in some strange or at least ambiguous attributions—when we are told that Tarzan was a “British model” is this in spite of or (less likely) in ignorance of its American provenance?

This is in many ways (as we expect from Gilman) a virtuoso phenomenology of stereotypes; if it is bold in conception, it is on occasion glib in its execution (the discussions of Freud and psychoanalysis are less compelling and satisfactory to my mind than many of the others). But the textual allusiveness is often vivid and suggestive, as in the author’s particular emphasis on the (hitherto too little considered) cultural resonances of circumcision, or in the linkage between anti-vivisectionist campaigns in the late nineteenth century (protesting against Kosher meat-treatment practices), social tensions within East End society and the telling fantasies, representations and speculations on the nature of Jack the Ripper: he appeared in pictures at the time as something between Fagin and Mr Hyde (Stevenson’s novella was playing at the theatre in 1888). It is the excessively magisterial singularity of phrase (“the fantasy of the nineteenth century”) and the fiat (“only”) that bothers me in formulations such as the following: “But in the fantasy of the nineteenth century the physician could not remove the prostitute from the street. Only the Whore could kill the whore. Only the whore and Jack . . .”

The Jew’s body suggests the complex interrelation of “Aryanism”, anti-Semitism and the affirmation of Jewishness. We are shown the (sometimes grotesque, sometimes poignant) implication of Jews in the discourses of their own oppression: Austrian Jewish commentators for instance who challenged the frequent turn of the century jibe that Jews were innate military cowards by insisting, armed of course with plenty of statistics, that on the contrary they were really the best of all Habsburg warriors; instead (as in my opening anecdote) the necessary analysis and challenge (to which this book contributes) concern the terms of the question, not simply the odiousness of this or that specific answer.

Daniel Pick, Queen Mary and Westfield College, London

RACHEL G. FUCHS, *Poor and pregnant in Paris: strategies for survival in the nineteenth century*, New Brunswick, NJ, Rutgers University Press, 1992, pp. xvi, 325, illus., \$45.00 (hardback, 0–1835–1779–6), \$18.00 (paperback, 0–1835–1780).

Readers familiar with Victor Hugo’s *Les misérables* need no introduction to the plight of the poor and pregnant in nineteenth-century Paris. Like the fictional Fantine, poor mothers faced a harsh struggle for survival in a society which seldom demonstrated any real sympathy for their problems. Single mothers especially, on whom Rachel Fuchs’s interesting study concentrates, were for much of the century seen as either innately depraved or morally weak; the softening of public attitudes in the last quarter of the nineteenth century was due less to concerns about the welfare of poor mothers in their own right than to anxieties about a declining population and women’s role as producers of babies.

What social commentators and government officials thought about poverty and illegitimacy was of no small consequence to the lives of the poor: it shaped public policy, hence it influenced women’s strategies for survival. During the first three quarters of the nineteenth century, religiously inspired charities dominated the Parisian scene and the limited welfare provisions that such