

Sudhoff and medical history*

Gundolf KEIL

THE GERMANIST MEDIEVALIST

Sudhoff once said that he regarded Charles Daremberg as one of the most significant, if not the most significant, medical historians of the nineteenth century. This judgment made from the perspective of the time before the Great War is remarkable in several respects, not only because we are again approaching a turn-of-the-century and soon will have to ask ourselves how Sudhoff himself ranks among the numerous significant medical historians of the twentieth century, but especially because Sudhoff's esteem for Daremberg reflects a bit of his own self-image, which is expressed similarly in his not untroubled relationship to Julius Leopold Pagel.

Sudhoff, Pagel, and Daremberg (as well as Wickersheimer of course) were strongly heuristically oriented in their research while for them the totality of medieval technical literature was fair game for their scientific efforts. These commonalities of scholarly approach determined their mutual relationship and give us today the possibility of working out and presenting their differences contrastively. All three scholars were outstanding bibliographers and on top of that stepped up as editors of medieval texts, but they differ within this common framework not insignificantly through their relationship to the transmission of artifacts, to iconography, or to the choice of their research specializations. While Sudhoff always allowed the transmission of artifacts and images to speak, the investigations of the others are based on textual traditions. While Sudhoff and Daremberg reached far back into Antiquity, Pagel limited himself much more to the High and Late Middle Ages. While Daremberg and also Sudhoff drew in the Greek texts, Pagel preferred to look at Western European works, and while Pagel and Daremberg took up primarily international topics, Sudhoff's work shows a clear national scholarly focus. This national orientation to Germany and the German Middle Ages is certainly not the most substantive but rather the most obvious characteristic difference. It expresses itself not least in the fact that Sudhoff and his disciples consciously worked out vernacular traditions.

Paying attention to vernacular sources is to be sure nothing unusual for the medievalist, and the range of idioms taken up by Sudhoff extends through Latin, Greek, and Hebrew into Oriental languages. But when the Leipzig medical historian publishes Romance, Slavic, and Persian texts, this happens

* Translated by William C. Crossgrove, Department of German, Brown University, Providence, R.I.

occasionally, occurs in the context of far-reaching source investigations, and always has the authentication of branches of a tradition as its goal, while the preoccupation with early German texts is directed towards German technical literature, takes up Germanistic methodology, and is guided by literary historical goals.

Sudhoff's place in German literary history is conditioned by his particular interests which were formed early and had already been noticed while he was in school. Early German "had gotten to him," and he dedicated "every free hour in his last years in secondary school" to Middle and Old High German texts. It is no wonder that the eye of a representative of the field should rest on him with pride and joy, that the German teacher saw a future Germanist in the Frankfurt preacher's son, and that bitter disappointment followed when the graduate decided in favor of medicine instead of Germanic languages and literatures.

Nonetheless, Sudhoff was not untrue to his philological inclinations. A glance in his course registration book shows that his medical education was accompanied by the study of German, which he did not complete but which made him sufficiently aware of neo-philological methods that he was in a position to orient his own way of working accordingly.

Sudhoff became a physician, but he did not disappear into the practice of medicine. He neither studied only medicine while he was a student, nor was he satisfied to assume the responsibilities of a well-paid public health official. Even in the early stages of his practice he tried to continue his literary tendencies and pursue his interests in early German. This sort of thing is not unusual and artistic endeavors are taken for granted among numerous doubly-gifted physicians. What became characteristic for Sudhoff is the fact that his medical practice and literary interests were bound up and contained under the same theme. Sudhoff had become a physician and remained a Germanist. But while continuing his philological-historical activity, he oriented it as a physician towards medical contents and in the process turned into a medical historian.

Medical history is not Germanistics and it was precisely Sudhoff who pointed the way for his field into the multiplicity of methods of the individual disciplines. The example of his studies that reached far afield showed "that medical history has to orient its way of working in its various subfields according to the method of the relevant humanistic discipline." But in spite of the richness of themes and the multiplicity of methods, it was Sudhoff's own way of working that impressively documents and makes apparent how medical history grew out of Germanistics, as his turn to Early German under the influence of medical viewpoints formed itself into research in medical history that was directed at "medicine in the German Middle Ages" and began by presenting Paracelsus from the perspective of this medieval realm.

Was it the 1880 meeting with Eduard Schubert or was it an orientation to "occult sciences" to which he later admitted that first distracted Sudhoff from the Middle Ages and turned him into a Paracelsus scholar? In any case, even as a young practitioner he approached the man from Hohenheim not from his

arcane side but rather from his literary historical one, with studies of sources and attribution at the beginning of his work. This study of sources and establishing of the bibliography is characteristic for Sudhoff's specific approach to the German Middle Ages, inasmuch as he put a bibliographical field investigation at the beginning of his preoccupation with German medical books.

When Sudhoff began to occupy himself systematically with medical technical literature in 1910, there were already valuable investigations in the field of Germanic medical literature. In the High German region, the studies of medical books by Joseph Haupt and Franz Pfeiffer deserve mention; Johan Hendrik Gallée and Conrad Borchling had already moved into the Low German area; Gustaf Edvard Klemming had edited the Swedish *Läke- och örte-böcker* and Marius Kristensen had started to provide corresponding editions for the Old Danish area. Most of this had been achieved in Medieval Germanistics but interest from medical history was evident through the efforts of Heinrich Haeser, Carl Ehrle, Conrad Brunner, and Felix von Oefele.

Thematically speaking, the numerous publications were concerned with making random finds known, but the number of them was such that they gave an inkling of the scope of the tradition and stimulated first attempts to organize the material made available and to supplement it. For individual texts, the studies of Haupt and Julius Zacher provided models, while in the Nordic realm the editions strove for comprehensiveness and - for example in the case of Kristensen - reached above average solidity.

In the process of wading through this extensive stock of extant texts, Sudhoff established focal points and drew boundaries that reveal his image of Germany in outline. It was one - free of superficial modern damage - that was not shaped by more recent political structures but rather by units sharing cultural features and by language areas. Medieval Germany is coextensive with the German speech area for Sudhoff, that is, it includes in the late medieval times that are especially important for him, the entire southern Baltic coast all the way to the Prussian-Lithuanian border area, reaches north to Holstein, extends west to the Flemish canal coast, swings through Belgian Limburg and Luxemburg over to Lorraine, touches on the Vosges, includes Switzerland up to the Alpine south slope of the Engadine mountains, also extends in the Tyrolean-Carinthian-Styrian region far beyond the main Alpine ridge, crosses the Bohemian-Moravian basin, and connects from Silesia across the Netze and Wartha regions to the Vistula delta.

As far as linguistic subdivisions are concerned, Sudhoff had grown up on the Lower Main and the Nahe rivers and was therefore particularly knowledgeable about the Rhine Franconian dialect, but his family came from Eastphalia "from the northern rim of the Harz Mountains," and this feeling of belonging to the Saxon tribe caused him to open himself up to Low German, for which the knowledge of Westphalian-Low Franconian dialect acquired in Hochdahl undoubtedly smoothed the way. Accordingly he categorized Netherlandic texts as Low German and worked with them as intensively as he

did with texts from other German dialects. He had, however, a less close relationship to other Germanic languages, something that can be readily seen in his sporadic attempts with Old and Middle English texts and in his neglect of Old Norse traditions. In this case it could happen to him despite his excellent knowledge of sources that he recovered a Latin text from manuscripts without noting that it had long been available in a printed edition of an Old Norse translation.

Sudhoff turned to medical history as a literary historian and his masterly control of the historical-philological methodology assured his success. Characteristic for his philological standpoint is the turn to literary sources which he made available from printed books and manuscripts, whereby he proceeded on a large scale, uncovered significant masses of literature, and often lost sight of where he was because of the quantity of things he worked on. In principle he was able to deal with complicated transmissional relationships. A glance at his studies on Salernitan anatomy or on the pseudo-Hippocratic *Capsula eburnea* shows that he was by all means capable of disentangling multi-strand lines of transmission and producing critical editions. But in all cases where not only contamination but also change of language and notable change of form of the texts had occurred, he lost his certainty and occasionally made mistakes. Thus it could happen that he reviewed a doctoral dissertation without noticing that he was dealing with the same text that had been edited shortly before by one of his doctoral candidates; thus it could happen that he let one of his students present various versions of the same text as a series of independent texts; and thus it could take place that in the case of significant textual mutations he could completely deny the existence of a text and, for example, mix up and throw together the Thuringian Bartholomaeus with the *Arzneibuch* (Medical Book) of Ortof of Bavaria. His work with plague literature also led several times to overlapping, and his efforts in connection with Master Albrant's *Roßarzneibuch* (Book of Horse Medicine) and early German veterinary literature were not very successful. But the numerous errors and misreadings should not be evaluated without focusing on the broad background of making sources of medical technical literature accessible.

Sudhoff's approach to early German technical literature was conditioned by the goals of literary scholarship, but it also reveals the influence of medical inquiry. It is based on a methodologically unified procedure which basically is directed towards making texts accessible and shifts only with regard to delimitation of subject matter. Sudhoff worked above all heuristically and occupied himself only secondarily with hermeneutic analysis of the extant materials. He did not always begin his research with bibliographical field studies and many of his publications make accidental finds known that are additively supplemented by later discoveries. Among these incidental communications, however, broader guidelines are discernible whose contours are determined by forms of transmission, individual texts, and both genre historical and medical inquiries.

If we begin with forms of transmission, the first thing that leaps out is an incunabula complex. Prepared by his familiarity with Paracelsus writings, Sudhoff investigates German medical incunabula in 1908 in the course of which he succeeded in genre historical classification and in differentiation of numerous monuments from each other. After this comprehensive inventory in the realm of print, Sudhoff turned to the manuscripts, the extant stock of which, however, proved to be so extensive that, at least for the time being, it was not possible to think of making them comprehensively accessible and Sudhoff saw himself forced to pick out individual areas.

Sudhoff usually followed overarching points of view in delimiting these areas, whereby he was guided by medical questions and - at first in contrast to medieval Germanistics - strove to avoid treating the German texts in isolation but rather to present them imbedded in the flow of general Occidental developments. Among these overarching medical themes the epidemiological sector first comes to the fore which Sudhoff approached together with Georg Sticker and which led him to take up writings on the history of epidemics. Starting from the two late medieval pandemics, he systematically catalogued the literary results of the two epidemics and inventoried plague and syphilis writing, and in the process he succeeded in incorporating extensive German language literary remains in studies that went on for a long time, for decades in some cases.

Sudhoff was comparably successful with his studies of dental, of pediatric, and of anatomical literature. In all three specialties intensively studied by him, he uncovered the medieval Latin texts as well as numerous vernacular monuments that still today belong to the core inventory of early German technical literature on stomatic, pediatric, and anatomical themes. And the harvest that Sudhoff brought in in the area of medieval surgery was even richer. Here he succeeded in unraveling the tangled knot of Roger, Roland, and Roger commentaries and sketching out the area of specialized writings in German down to the short texts of bloodletting literature.

In a number of cases Sudhoff, however, sought out not literary strata but rather single texts that challenged him because of their subject matter, their illustrations, or the state of knowledge about them. As far as the state of scholarship is concerned, that was the motivation in the case of the Bartholomaeus and the so-called Diemerschen Arzneibuch (Diemer's Medical Book). Both texts were in the focus of Germanistic attention to technical literature in the seventies without answers having been found to open questions about size of the texts and sources, and in both cases Sudhoff solved the problems in a pragmatic way. He had texts preserved in Leipzig or easily accessible from Leipzig published and investigated their sources. In the process he introduced the individual recipe as unit of investigation and pushed on to surprising results in both instances. Sudhoff was just as successful in researching the *Älteren deutschen Macer* (Older German Macer).

Sudhoff was stimulated by the subject matter in the case of diagnostic texts, as his own works and those of his students on medieval examination of urine, blood, and pulse demonstrate. In this context, his edition of the pseudo-Hippocratic *Capsula eburnea* turned out to be indispensable for decades. It took into account the Greek original together with the exact wording of the older and younger Latin translation and on top of that includes the German reception of the text from Würzburg to Brabant.

Sudhoff uncovered so many early German texts from the extant manuscripts that - even if only in the interest of the history of scholarship - a bibliographical listing seems sensible. It nonetheless becomes clear from the overview that the weights are varyingly located and that clear emphases of distribution begin to appear. After decades long work as a physician Sudhoff was sufficiently firmly anchored in medical practice that he also looked for the connection to practice in medical sources and believed that he had found it in the Salernitan tradition. That is why he gave clear preference to the Salernitan School in comparison to the *Corpus Toletanum*, and clinical themes always gripped him more than scholastic discussions. Beyond that, however, disciplinary vacillations appear that demonstrate a strong preference for the dramatic action of spreading epidemics, show pleasure in the craftsmanship of surgical interventions and diagnostic identification of diseases, betray enthusiasm for the word-image connection, and in addition express an attraction towards the metaphoric aspects of the human figure in anatomical studies. There are, however, specialties left aside that Sudhoff only touched on or avoided entirely. Gynecology is one of these, which he left to his student Christoph Ferckel, antidotaries and receptaries are among these, which he turned over to Henry Sigerist, the house book literature with its iatromathematic writings that extend into astrology is among them, and herbals, the study of which by historians of botany and pharmacy he never contested, belong among them.

His leaving out of circumscribed areas and assigning certain fields to others make it necessary to cast a glance at the scholarly context and to name those collaborators and students who worked through the extant medical texts together with Sudhoff and made monuments of early German healing arts available. First it should be noted that hardly anyone who worked with Sudhoff could avoid historical-philological heuristics, whether like Georg Sticker he was concerned with epidemics, like Arnold Carl Klebs with incunabula studies, or like Eduard Schubert with occult sciences. That is evident in the case of Paul Diepgen who entered the history of medicine under the supervision of Sudhoff as editor of a Latin compendium. That can be seen in Wickersheimer's studies whom Sudhoff put onto the early German Guy de Chauliac tradition. That can be observed in the most important works of Sigerist who took up the extant early medieval texts under the aegis of Sudhoff. That is demonstrated in the studies of old von Brunn to whom Sudhoff assigned the task of making facsimiles of Stromayr's incision and optometrical medicine and to whom he turned over the Strasbourg surgeons Brunschwig and Gerdorff, whose study his

academic grandchild Johannes Steudel then took up. Many of them also followed Sudhoff's inspiration in the study of German texts insofar as they worked on extant early German technical literature. This was done most skillfully by Sigerist who restylized himself with chameleon-like ability to change as an upper German manuscript specialist and carried out valuable contributions to the study of Middle High German technical literature even after he was in Baltimore. It was done with most lasting effect by Wickersheimer who, despite his dispute with Sudhoff, remained loyal to Leipzig and prepared essential contributions to early German medical literature from Alsatia. It was done most splendidly by Christoph Ferckel, Sudhoff's own student, who published such important and acute investigations in the short years of his medical historical activity that he can be classified as the most gifted and most significant among the collaborators of Sudhoff.

Together with his students and collaborators Sudhoff opened up areas of German literature of unimagined scope although he never worked together with German philologists. In contrast to Felix von Oefele, Gustav Klein, Paul Diepgen, Johannes Steudel, or Edith and Walter Artelt, who sought interdisciplinary conversation, maintained contact with Germanists, in part advised them and in part brought them to their institutes and carried out common research projects with them, Sudhoff felt confident enough as a Germanist to reject neophilological help. That this satisfaction with himself was not always good for him, and that by exceeding his disciplinary competence he more likely obscured some finds instead of making them known, will be shown shortly. Nonetheless, he at least sought connection with the study of early German insofar as he presented his results or placed them on display for evaluation.

A favorable opportunity for this seemed to offer itself in 1913 when Christoph Ferckel succeeded in an exemplary investigation in lifting the veil surrounding Diemers *Arzneibuch* (Diemer's Medical Book) and placed the compendium in the tradition of high Salerno texts. Sudhoff took up Ferckel's results, extended them from his studies on the history of surgery, and brought them together under the title "Zum Breslauer und Diemerschen *Arzneibuch*" (On the Breslau and Diemer's Medical Book). He viewed the concise communication as appropriate for the most famous journal of Germanistics, the *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* and felt confident that his discovery of a *Deutsches Salernitanisches Arzneibuch* (German Salernitan Medical Book) from the thirteenth century would call forth storms of enthusiasm among the specialists in medieval German. The opposite was the case: Sudhoff's manuscript lay on the desk of Eduard Schröder for six years until it finally was typeset in 1919 and appeared in 1920. Visible disappointment is already evident in Sudhoff's proofreading notes and the author likely was even more hurt when even after publication in 1920 there was no response. The edition of the *Breslauer Arzneibuch* recommended by Sudhoff cannot be found - with one

exception - in a single Germanistic reference library and is regarded as non-existent for all practical purposes.

It would take an additional decade for Sudhoff to succeed in breaking through into his own field, Germanistics. The wide-ranging literary concept of Wolfgang Stammer who sought to avoid "skewed ways of looking at things" and broke with "the one-sided focus only on poetry or even only on its high points" made it possible for Sudhoff to bring the harvest of his Germanistic investigations into the appropriate literary historical barn. Among the 107 authors of the first *Verfasserlexikon* volume on medieval German literature one finds "Geheimrat Dr. <med.> Karl Sudhoff, Professor Emeritus of the University of Leipzig" after 1930, and his rich series of articles aimed at "medical and scientific literature" continues until 1953 after the Second World War. In the supplementary volume that appeared shortly afterwards the medical articles were authored by Gerhard Eis and his students.

And with this we are already among the Germanistic successors: Sudhoff's work with early German technical literature had stimulated a lasting echo and the degree of his visibility had gone so far that the Bamberg Eis student and literary historian Siegfried Sudhof had to put up with the nickname "little Sudhof," for one thing because he was short, also because his name was written with one "f," and finally because his scholarly production was by comparison quantitatively small.

Sudhoff is present in Germanistics like no other medical historian. That is the achievement of Gerhard Eis who together with his Heidelberg students built further on the disciplinary foundations laid by Sudhoff. Starting with manuscript studies, the northern Bohemian took up medical as well as veterinary themes already in his Prague and Bratislava days, published after 1942 in Sudhoff's *Archiv*, established himself as a critical Paracelsus scholar, and provided for medical texts in the system of early German technical literature that he sketched in 1944 and built up step by step in later years.

Sudhoff began his scholarly career as a Germanist and his last publications appeared in a Germanistic collective work. Accordingly, he saw medieval German medicine above all as a bibliographer and a literary historian. Establishing and publishing texts therefore were foregrounded in his scholarly approach. This source directed individual scholarship is characteristic for his procedure and the heuristic collection of material caused him to characterize himself resignedly as a carter.

Collecting material was not in itself the goal of his scholarly work and stood in the service of a broader undertaking that terminated in a comprehensive survey that he himself described as a "History of medicine in medieval Germany." In his memoirs he admitted that he had started with this medical history of medieval Germany when he was only 18 and that he was still working on it in his thoughts after six decades. Nonetheless, he never even really took up his life work, let alone completing it. What he finished were only preliminary investigations.

Not without justification Sudhoff was accused of being impetuous and having a high degree of self-esteem. Both apply to him but nonetheless characterize only the way he appeared in public and ignore his activities as a scholar. In his scientific approach Sudhoff was modest and prepared for restrained self-effacement. This modesty is reflected in his willingness to give up on his lifelong ambition and to put the mosaic of individual investigations ahead of the writing of a history of early German medicine. In this way he worked not as lord, but as servant, as "merchant," and satisfied himself by making texts accessible, knowing full well that it is much easier to say something clever about a text than it is to approach it heuristically and to edit it with great effort.

Sudhoff's scientific modesty is reflected in his willingness not to speak himself but to step back behind what the tradition has to say. Whenever he could, he let the sources speak. Without doubt he possessed in a high degree the gift - he himself speaks of an instinct - of "eavesdropping on the texts" as a philologist. What he heard and "caught sight of," he was not always able to express well but often only hinted at or cryptically tossed off. His methodologically conditioned interpretive reticence makes it difficult to say exactly what he actually saw in Germany's medical Middle Ages. This difficulty, caused by a cryptic hermeneutics, can be clearly exemplified if we take a look at the Salernitan medical writings. Paul Oskar Kristeller is regarded with justification as its authoritative interpreter who illuminated the characteristic structures and coined the concept of Salernitan early scholasticism. But these scholastic manifestations of high Salernitan writing were also seen by Sudhoff and - even if only in passing - identified already during World War I.

Sudhoff perceived German medicine in the Middle Ages from the perspective of technical texts, and he placed early German technical prose in the context of the traditions of Occidental medical history. From this viewpoint he discovered that leading Salernitan compendia were available since the thirteenth century in German translation, that the northern Italian surgeons of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries had found their way into the vernacular, that a similarly powerful influence applied to the French military surgeons of the fourteenth century, and that beyond that the most important diagnostic and anatomical technical texts could be traced in the practical vernacular writings. He noted that vernacular medical literature was in circulation already in the high and early Middle Ages before the late medieval wave of reception, but he only took cognizance of its recipes, drug descriptions, and incantations in passing. Similarly, he was more inclined to avoid recipe books, pharmacopoeias, drug handbooks, and pharmaceutical literature than to seek closer acquaintance with it. His connection to dietetic literature is also loose. He did to be sure succeed in contributing substantively to illuminating the Salernitan Verses on Health and to pursuing the path of the pseudo-Aristotelian Alexander Letter from Toledo into Middle High German, but he tried unsuccessfully in several attempts to arrive at

a clarification of the Bämle regimen sanitatis, even though he held the solution to the riddle in his hands with the Sanitatis conservator edition of his student Hugo Faber.

Among the literary genres, Sudhoff decisively preferred the treatise. In that context his preference applied not only to lengthy elaborations such as the *Lilium medicinae*, which he could attest in German in the fourteenth century, or surgical handbooks, such as those assembled by the Low Franconian military surgeons or the Teutonic Knight Heinrich von Pfalzpaint, but he was especially interested in the short medical treatise. In this context, his generically oriented pleasure in the texts was so pronounced that he was prepared to cross disciplinary boundaries and, for example, also to include pharmaceutical themes. In this fashion he ran across the oak mistletoe treatise, took up printed blurbs for miracle drugs, looked into the brandy treatise, and paid particular attention to the early plague and syphilis treatises as well as - on the diagnostic side - to the high medieval urinary treatise.

In establishing dates, however, he occasionally went beyond his competence, and in individual cases he was also too quick to identify texts. Thus he describes a treatise on the vulture as an excerpt from the Bartholomaeus and thereby passed up the possibility of identifying the *Epistula de vulture* in early German literature. Similarly, he determined - what should be seen as a technical error - the age of the Pseudo-Rhazes Anatomy from codicological characteristics and missed the fact that he was dealing with the simple language of the high period of Middle High German - in this case the thirteenth century. It was not granted to him that he could detect the true form of an old German text in the older layer of language under the modern varnish of a later tradition. Similarly, he fails to recognize what is probably his most sensational find, the early German herbal corpus, and publishes from the text that fell into his hands in a transmission of the fourteenth century only two sections, without noticing that it is bursting with Old High German forms and expressions.

On the other hand, Sudhoff did not just identify translations but also independent texts of early German medical literature. He worked with the *Chirurgien* (Surgeries) of Jan Yperman and Thomas Schelling, pursued the *Wundärznei* (Field Surgery) of the famous Pfalzpainter, ran across the surgical recipe books of Peter von Ulm and Hans Beris, paged through the *Kopenhagener Wundärznei* (Copenhagen Field Surgery) as well as through the textual conglomerate of the Jew from Solms, knew the surgical elaborations of Johann Schenk von Würzburg as well as of Pankraz Sommer von Hirschberg, took up the *Wundärznei* (Field Surgery) of Nicholas of Montpellier and also took the *Leipziger Rogerglosse* (Leipzig Roger Commentary) into his hands. All of these more or less independently compiled or authored writings belonged, however, to the Late Middle Ages and were not capable of leading Sudhoff away from viewing early German medical literature above all from the viewpoint of translation literature. He formulated this aspect in the First

Sudhoff Rule which asserts that "everything German that arose before the fifteenth century was translated, and what is more, translated from Latin," a premature assertion that should be regarded only as a rule of thumb and which he himself probably would have been capable of contradicting at the time that he formulated it.

Sudhoff also made a second observation that acquired rule-like character and goes back to discoveries that preceded the decisive investigations of Franz Willeke and Friedrich Wilhelm. As early as 1909 Sudhoff was able to establish dissemination of texts across large regions in the German speech area. These extended across the High German speech areas into the Saxon and Netherlandic realms and exposed the transmitted texts to a noteworthy change of form. This in turn led to significant mutation of the texts, especially in the case of loosely organized works, and in the process destroyed both the macro and the microstructure of the texts. With regard to this exchange of elements Sudhoff distinguished between primary and secondary compilations. He equated primary compilations with retention of the original structure and secondary compilations with new arrangements of textual sub-units of any sort whatsoever. The distinction gave him the opportunity of establishing a rule for getting a grip on floating textual material and stating the recommendation that in working through loosely structured compilations one should start with things that originally belonged together as "separate units" and only turn to the "spare change," that is, the secondary groupings, when the primary ones have been established. This second Sudhoff Rule has subsequently proven its value for numerous text editions and still determines the goals of an editorial project today.

Sudhoff occupied himself above all with establishing and editing texts and never systematically went into to other philological realms, such as lexicography. Perhaps that can be explained by the oppressive competition of Max Höfler and his studies of names of diseases and was certainly also conditioned by the collection of plant names by Erik Björkman, Hermann Fischer, and Heinrich Marzell. It is too bad, however, insofar as Sudhoff, whenever he had to deal with lexicographical questions in passing, demonstrated a not insignificant lexicographical gift.

As a philologist Sudhoff saw German medieval medicine philologically. That means that he perceived it literarily from the perspective of technical literature. Despite all the significant contours that he was able to recognize in early German medical literature, the question remains as to whether he saw only medical prose or whether he could peer through the texts to other factors such as the social context. This question leads us away from literary questions to Sudhoff's archival studies, which are second in importance to judge from their length. They are generally oriented to the history of epidemics but also in passing pick up themes that reveal with what acuity Sudhoff saw not only sick people behind the texts but also cast an eye on the class of people who produced technical literature. He knows the academic physician as well as the surgeon

and the lay practitioner, and his literary sociological interest extends far enough that he picks up on the battle over the use of German or Latin and also critically examines the nationalist prejudices of the Late Middle Ages. If we add to this Sudhoff's iconographic studies, take into consideration his analyses devoted to traditions, and pursue his research on the observation of nature, it becomes clear that Sudhoff had numerous phenomena of the Middle Ages in view beyond literature in general and alongside of technical literature, and we can see that he thoroughly supplemented the written sources with studies of artifacts.

Gernot Rath said once that he was particularly impressed by the timelessness of Sudhoff's work. This judgment of a medical historian of the younger generation is revealing in two ways. On the one hand, it lets you see that Sudhoff did not follow any modish trend in his historical research but was guided above all by his love of the subject. On the other hand, it makes it clear that his study of sources somehow makes Sudhoff's work timeless. This heuristic orientation and editorial turn to the texts has not had any succession at least in the younger generation of German medical historians and has been judged varyingly in its uniqueness. The methodological singularity has as a rule been seen as a result of his exceptional position in the history of the discipline and corresponding has been evaluated as a pioneering achievement. Now Sudhoff was certainly a pioneer not only in German but also generally in institutionalized medical history, and without doubt he was the one who methodologically pointed the way for his discipline. This is, however, not to say that he correspondingly stood at the beginning of medical historical research and that his scholarly approach necessarily bore the signs of a beginner, of a pioneer, in that sense. On the contrary, despite all of our respect for that achieved by Sudhoff and before him, one should not forget that Sudhoff's research even in his most original area of work, the history of medieval medicine, has remained piecemeal and that -even if Sudhoff was the innovator- we are still fifty years after Sudhoff's death just as much at the beginning of research in medieval medical history. Furthermore, today like then the heuristic establishment and editorial assimilation of technical texts is the primary thrust of scholarship.

Obviously scholarship has not stood still since Sudhoff's death, and obviously the winning of terrain through medical historical studies has been by no means trivial in the last five decades. In the sector of Islamic medicine this has led to not insignificant shifts of emphasis and that is as clear as day in the study of western medicine if we page through the famous reference works of Beccaria, Wickersheimer, and Thorndike or if we take up the more recent studies of the history of tradition or reception. These results cannot, to be sure, be laid out here in detail, so it seems sensible to pull out a graspable sector and to present the scope and simultaneously the limitations of modern scholarly achievements using the example of early German technical literature.

The thrust into still unexplored areas of German medical prose is multifaceted and permits the differentiation of several vectors that demonstrate

discipline specific, history of genre, and literary sociological aims. Beyond that it also touches on aspects of the history of manuscript transmission and morphology. A complete overview, such as Sudhoff gave for *incunabula*, has not again been attempted and is taking shape only slowly in the context of the second edition of the *Verfasserlexikon*.

Significant winning of terrain has above all been achieved in discipline specific thrusts. In the first instance, veterinary medicine would have to be mentioned. Here Gerhard Eis was able to expose the significant transmissions and strands of tradition. In this case working together with Reinhard Froehner, Wilhelm Rieck, and other veterinary historians proved to be more fruitful than continuing with Sudhoff's less productive preliminary work. The central focus of the investigations was the *Roßarzneibuch* (Book of Horse Medicine by Master Albrant, whose independence was demonstrated and whose tradition could be followed back to the Staufen Court of Naples in the thirteenth century. It turned out to be a point of crystallization for numerous later horse medicine compilations and determined hippiatric recipe medicine reaching far into modern times. Less influence was achieved by the *Roßavenüre* (Horse Escapades) and the *Liber de cura equorum*, both of which were presented editorially, and the situation was the same with several texts from the transition area between veterinary medicine and hunting.

Winning of terrain was also achieved by the specialty of dietetics. Here Sudhoff -relying on Germanistic work- had emphasized especially the pseudo-Aristotelian *Alexander Letter*, whose area of tradition was made clear to a significant extent through several editions and individual studies. The Konrad of Eichstätt tradition turned out to be just as significant. Its multi-stranded transmission was recognized in 1966 and was later approached editorially. -- Pediatric medicine was also the target of a monographic study that turned out to be disappointing because of its incompetence.

The greatest achievement in terms of its size can be claimed by the history of pharmacy. In this case, the decisive analyses were accomplished by Julius Schuster and his school, who demarcated the terrain up to the herbals and leveled the ground for the follow-up studies by Willem Daems, Willy Braekman, and Leo Jules Vandewiele. The *Macer translations* and the *Gart der Gesundheit* (Garden of Health) were carved out as particular areas that were approached by Rudolf Blum, William Crossgrove, Reimar Walter Fuchs, and Wolf-Dieter Müller-Jahncke.

In the surgical sector Sudhoff took up so many such monuments that modern studies have not been able to advance far beyond his level of scholarship. Growth in knowledge was achieved by Hartmut Broszinski above all for Guy de Chauliac, and in the case of German Lanfranc reception Rolf Müller and Samuel Arthur Joseph Moorat succeeded in valuable identifications of texts. Karl-Wilhelm Grabert and Ria Jansen-Sieben took up surgical and anatomical special purpose language. The edition of the *Cirurgia* by Peter of Ulm opened the way into the Upper Rhenish surgical recipe literature among

whose numerous compilations the *Buch von alten Schäden* (Book of Festering Sores) deserves to be noted for being the first specialized treatise on *Ulcus cruris* complaints.

And thereby we are already at the genre oriented thrust into the realm of specialized medical literature. It is aimed above all at the recipe. First the study of Middle Low German medical books stood in the foreground. We owe major contributions to Walter Lawrence Wardale as well as to the school of Gustav Korlén and Gert Mellbourn who -with regard to the *Benediktbeurer Rezeptar* (*Benediktbeuron Receptary*)- also drew in High German bearers of transmission. The opposite was achieved by Joachim Telle who followed the *Petrus Hispanus* reception discovered by Heinrich Schipperges across the High German area into Low German. In the Low Franconian northwest Willy Braekman continued the work of Willem de Vreese and made bearers of transmission known that not least provided illuminating material for the question of how texts spread.

The short medical treatise was studied in particular detail. It shows how new knowledge was standardized in plague therapy, it makes clear trends in the use of medications, the spread of modern technologies, and reveals in the context of use-conditioned textual wear-and-tear notable changes of form. For individual texts a surprisingly high number of extant witnesses could be established, and in one case it could be shown that the German tradition spread into Old French.

Newly emerged into the field of view are the compendia that join several texts into a corpus and prove to be enormously long lived in the tradition. They usually reveal use-oriented aims in the way they are put together that - especially in the case of the *Iatromathematisches Hausbuch* (*Iatromathematical House Book*) or the *Buch von Menschen, Tier und Garten* (*Book of People, Animals, and Gardens*) - allow conclusions about the social context of the users.

And thus we have arrived at the literary sociological research direction that was first systematized by Gerhard Eis. It showed the bearers of medical writings to be additional levels of society whose range extended out from the head of the household through the lay physician to the itinerant drug dealer and the pharmacist. It pointed beyond that to the princely court as a place where medical writings were produced and recognized members of the nobility as collectors of German medical texts.

Thus the image of German medicine in the Middle Ages sketched by Sudhoff has been extended and rendered more precise in many of its contours. Trade conditioned legal influences could be noted that reach Nuremberg from Venice. Italian, French, and Occitan precursors to Early German technical texts could be identified along with the Latin ones, just as it was conversely possible to attest to the force of influence of Early German medical literature by virtue of translations into Czech, Danish, Italian, and Old French. Early German medical writings turned out in any case to be more indigenous and independent than Sudhoff wanted to admit, and autonomous text outlines can already be attested

in the twelfth century. It also turned out that the path from Latin to Early German was by no means a one lane road but was often traveled in many lanes by multiple translations and that there were texts that traversed it in both directions, in isolated cases even several times.

Sudhoff's image of German medicine in the Middle Ages thus had to put up with varying touch-ups and extensions that for the most part nonetheless verified his overall sketch and developed his contours further. The outlines that so far are taking shape reveal that we are as before at the beginning in the study of German medical technical literature and that the heuristic approach of establishing texts used by Sudhoff will continue to determine the approach to the tradition. As long as the decisive texts have not been critically edited, interpretations need to take the back seat to editions.

Sudhoff's image of German medicine in the Middle Ages has so far not faded. It gets the luminosity of its colors from the density and directness of assimilated traditions. In contrast to today's practice, Sudhoff conducted scholarship without reflection. Still untouched by sociological ideologemes, he was in the happy position of not having to justify his scholarly work socially so that he could turn to the sources in naïve obviousness. Sigerist had once called Sudhoff a scholar with a loving heart. In any case, this love filled turn to the sources is one of the reasons for the success and the long lasting influence of Sudhoff's scholarly work.

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

We have seen that Sudhoff's preoccupation with Old and Middle High German texts started in his secondary school days and that he still signed up for Old High German classes at the university. On the other hand, Sudhoff himself reports with similar thoroughness about his studies of the "old classics." He tells about the Horace interpretations of his teacher in the senior year who "mightily impressed" him. He reports that the interpretations of the Iliad and of Sophocles that he heard from the principal of the Kreuznach secondary school remained "unforgettable" to him. And he writes that he had a copy of his edition of the Anacreon bound with blank pages so he could translate his poetry into German verse, and that he busied himself for an entire summer with translating a comedy of Aristophanes.

If these reports make it clear that Sudhoff originally was interested in Antiquity just as much as in the Middle Ages, then his remark that he had "always seen the task of the historian as recognizing and presenting 'How it really was'" in the sense of Leopold von Ranke and therefore always put "the purely inductive method of working" and "completely objective source scholarship" first is the explanation for why his decision for Paracelsus and medieval medicine had occurred. For he writes in this context that of the three "cherished main periods of history: Antiquity, the Middle Ages, Modern Times," the Middle Ages were most needful "still by far of original work with

sources" and demonstrates thereby that his decision was influenced not only by medieval and Germanistic interests but also by his conception of the tasks of historical research and by the completely natural consideration of a beginning scholar that in the realm of medieval medical history he can conquer something like new territory.

From this conception Sudhoff also derived his program of medical historical research from 1907 that he formulated in the famous foreword leading off the first volume of the *Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin* edited by him. In it he observes that medical history up to that time had remained an "accidental science without planned elaboration and method," underscores that it would be dangerous to see in it an applied science in a utilitarian sense inasmuch as it carries its value "in itself," stresses that the medical historian had become accustomed "on the loose rubble strewn together by the past and on new finds quickly gathered to construct gigantic buildings that could not be borne by the shifting foundations," and concludes that one "is not so far in any area of medical history that anything lasting" can be "carried out." For that reason, "restless work of many years" will be necessary, and just such work will serve the new archive that will therefore publish only scholarly articles and no "popular" works and that is intended to present source publications and "medical and cultural historical artifacts of all sorts."

Sudhoff's verdict on the state of medical history at the beginning of our century, however, contains one characteristic exception. He after all explains specifically that in the case of the "time of Classical Antiquity thanks to the first class work of the philologist" the situation is different even if here there is still endlessly much to do "in the combined effort of research and writing." The exception conceded by Sudhoff for the history of Ancient medicine can be explained by the development that Classical philology had taken at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century.

Since the time of August Böckh, Theodor Mommsen, and Hermann Usener, Classical philology had achieved a new understanding of its discipline as a historical science and accordingly showed increased interest in the history of the individual scholarly disciplines of Antiquity. Usener suggested in Bonn in 1869 to Hermann Diels, his most important disciple, that he study three doxographical collections written in Greek, to which the pseudo-Galenic *Historia philosopha* belonged. Diels discovered, in an experience that was later repeated again and again, that the editions of Ancient physicians prepared up until then by medical practitioners failed when one wanted to use them as historical sources in keeping with the new demands of Classical philology. This inspired him to want "to create a really useful *Corpus medicorum*" which he perceived as "one of the most pressing and timely undertakings of scholarship." We owe it above all to him that the *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* was established in Berlin in 1907, while the Puschmann Foundation founded at the University of Leipzig in 1904 took over the management of the *Corpus Medicorum Latinorum*. Both undertakings established the goal for themselves

of presenting critical editions of Ancient medical authors and in the process took up a trend that since the eighties of the nineteenth century had led to the appearance of the first modern critical editions of Ancient medical texts.

The publication of these editions served, as Johannes Ilberg, likewise a student of Usener, emphasized as forcefully as he could, not just the task of "gaining material for the *Thesaurus linguae Graecae*...and preparing a reliable basis for grammatical or historical linguistic studies." In harmony with the new self-image of Ancient studies, Classical philologists were instead trying with the help of the texts they were preparing to comprehend Ancient medicine has a part of a totality of Ancient culture. They wanted to understand it in its historical contingency and present it in its historical development. In the process, they not only founded a new but also a very much more precise view of this ancient craft of healing. Logically, the same Ilberg, who had become a school man in Leipzig and was regarded as one of the best experts on Ancient medicine of his generation, explained, not without a certain polemical intensity, in a lecture on "The Study of Greek Medicine" held at the International Congress for the Historical Sciences in Berlin on 10 August 1908 that "despite many books and sketches bearing that name, a real history of medicine in Antiquity" did not exist and that the existing presentations as a rule "were not prepared directly from the sources" and the sources used were evaluated with inadequate critical acumen. To be sure, the question as to "whether a future *sospitator historiae medicae antiquae* will be a physician or a philologist" is just as open as the decision about "whether it is easier for the philologist to acquire the necessary specialized medical knowledge than for the modern physician to become familiar with the entire apparatus of philological-historical scholarship." But he was unyieldingly consistent in his demand that "history has to conquer Ancient medicine." Medical history needs to be "philologized" inasmuch as he "who wants to know the past has to acquire the rules of historical source study, whether he learns them from Greek or Roman philology where they were first worked out or from somewhere else."

The lecture set off an intense discussion. Protest was raised above all by Pagel who right after the lecture turned against the "philologizing" of medical history and added later in his report about the congress that "physicians alone" should have "the last word for the really pragmatic evaluation of the views of Ancient medicine." One can assume that the position taken by Pagel expressed the general views of medical historians. Accordingly, Sudhoff's position stands out all the more. He pointed out together with the Danish Classical scholar Johan Ludvig Heiberg and the Berlin Ancient historian Eduard Meyer that the protest was based on a misunderstanding and that Ilberg had only demanded that "scholarship in the history of medicine, if it were to be regarded as such" would have to learn "to engage in the study of historical sources." He then added that he himself had underscored the significance of Usener and the importance of the philological method for the historical sciences in a lecture on

"Tasks, Methods, and Resources for Medical Archaeology" that he gave a year earlier at the Dresden meeting of German natural scientists and physicians. The position taken by Sudhoff is of basic significance for understanding his conception of the tasks of the history of medicine and his place in medical history of the first decades of our century. That he was able to find his way to it, he probably owes to the solid philological general education of his secondary school years and in all likelihood also to his relationship with Johannes Ilberg. They put him in the position, in contrast to Pagel, of recognizing the justification in principle of the demands raised by Classical scholars and of making them useful for his own work. For one will not err in the assumption that Sudhoff had largely borrowed his method of dealing with sources and evaluating them from contemporary Classical philology. Likewise, one will only be able to categorize his call to pursue above all research on artifacts if one recalls that the first volume of the *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* appeared in Stuttgart in 1894. This is the encyclopedia of customs and institutions edited at first by Georg Wissowa that not only significantly expanded the old one founded by August Pauly but also established, through its conception oriented towards the presentation and complete assimilation of precisely these customs and institutions, the standards for the investigation of them.

To be sure, taking over the point of view of Classical philology did not occur without reservations. Sudhoff noted as late as 1914 in his essay dedicated to the new Galen edition and the Greek physician's corpus of the academies not without an edge that the leadership of the undertaking had not believed "it needed even the advice of a physician...in so much as a single question" and that it accordingly had followed the slogan enunciated by Classical philology that "history has to conquer Ancient medicine" in its "most restrictive interpretation." It would be easy to criticize this "since philology had constructed a characterization of the history of medicine to prove the justification of its procedure that did not as a generalization correspond at all to the facts," but he will be content with the simple registration of the fact inasmuch as the most important thing for him is that the undertaking will continue and complete the work begun by Charles Daremberg. The last comment, in which he refers to the achievement of similarly transmitted medical history, is naturally a sarcastic remark, but one that ignores the circumstance that the interacademy physician's corpus represents something basically different: among the co-workers of the *Collection des médecins grecs et latins* planned by Daremberg that foundered after his death there was not a single philologist so that the Collection in principle continued the tradition of the old text editions prepared by philological amateurs and therefore unsatisfactory from a philological perspective. As one sees, Sudhoff also does not skimp with polemics, and therefore one must say, if one wants to establish his position more precisely, that he adopted a mediating position between Classical philology and medical historians, a position, however, and it is important to

stress this, that largely accepted the concerns of the new Ancient studies even if he was not able fully to comprehend the consequences that resulted from them.

It was in any case decisive that Sudhoff was able to muster understanding for the achievements of the Classical philologists in the area of medical history and recognized their significance as, e.g., the praise shows that he paid in the essay just quoted to the plan for the *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* and to the work accomplished with the publication of the first Galenic commentaries on Hippocrates. Thus he, for whom the transcendent contribution of Ancient medicine to the development of medicine as a science was beyond question, and who categorized it alone "alongside modern natural science," saw his task in this area in the first instance to function like a chronicler to instruct colleagues about new finds, discoveries, and publications. These bits of information, which appeared above all in the *Mitteilungen zur Geschichte der Medizin und der Naturwissenschaften*, were often nothing more than brief notices and references. Their content extended from reports on the excavations carried out on Kos by Rudolf Herzog that were linked up with a call for contributions in order to assure the continuation of the excavations, to the announcement of the appearance of the Celsus edition by Friedrich Marx in the series *Corpus Medicorum Latinorum* in 1915. They extended all the way to annotations on the most recent work with medical historical content published in Classical periodicals, including a reference to Karl Kalbfleisch's article "Ein griechisches Zeugnis für den Starstich aus dem 3. vorchristlichen Jahrtausend" (A Greek attestation for a cataract operation from the third millennium BC) accompanied by best wishes for his successful recovery and the summons "to new deeds of noble heroes." His activity as chronicler included whenever possible his own inspection of new archaeological finds - as in 1910 when, after becoming aware through notices in the newspapers of the discovery of the grave of a physician near Verona, he traveled to Italy and afterwards described what he had seen. Sometimes, as a matter of fact, independent works arose from such pieces of information in which the previously published material was evaluated, as in the case of the article about the famous stilt of Capua, now preserved in the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine in London, that had been preceded by two short reports.

Characteristically, all the scholarly publications on Ancient medicine by Sudhoff have artifacts as their subject. They start, in other words, with concrete reports in Ancient texts, with objective archaeological finds and the representations on them, and with accounts offered by the papyri. This circumstance also gives this part of Sudhoff's work that timeless character about which we spoke at the beginning, since the results achieved by him for the most part retain their validity today and have acquired from modern scholarship only a few, to be sure in part important, limitations. This applies both for his work based on a report by Pliny about the iron hand of Marcus Sergius and for his study of the laying on of hands of the god of healing Asclepius in the Attic dedication tables. It applies also for his investigations of Ancient bath culture

which he based on the representations on vases and reliefs as well as terra cottas, and it applies finally in particular measure for his monograph *Ärztliches aus griechischen Papyrusurkunden* (Issues concerning physicians from Greek papyrus charters).

The last title makes it clear how productive the approach chosen by Sudhoff could be. In his recollections he reports that shortly after his move to Leipzig he began to look through published papyri and ostraca for medical and cultural historical content and to note whatever seemed important to him. Before he decided in 1908 to send the collected material to press, 9288 papyrus texts had accordingly passed through his hands. With the publication of the examined and sorted material he proved however for the first time the importance of systematic medical evaluation of the papyri by showing what power of expression they contained with such a procedure. He, for his part, limited himself to the attempt at reconstruction of the medical aspects of daily life, whereby in 18 chapters he treated nutrition, hygiene, married life, birth, circumcision, death, illness, forensic medicine, history of social classes, etc. With these studies he opened up a side of the medical life of antiquity about which we knew little from other sources and founded a distinct specialization in research on Ancient medicine.

In the introduction to this monograph, which by the way was also preceded by two shorter preliminary pieces in the *Mitteilungen zur Geschichte der Medizin und der Naturwissenschaften*, he notes that he generally speaking left the texts in the form in which they were edited inasmuch as it was the calling of the physician "to offer more or to strive towards greater accuracy than the editing philologist." His restraint however did not at all limit itself only to the texts. One finds analyses of the transmitted texts as rarely as one finds studies of the intellectual and philosophical historical connections or of the theoretical systems of Ancient medicine. Here he apparently did not consider himself competent and left discussion of such questions to the Classical scholars who dealt with Ancient medicine and from whose pens in fact at that time the first studies were coming that began to change from the ground up the transmitted view of this medicine.

All of this means, however, that Sudhoff's view of the tasks of the medical historian in the area of the history of Ancient medicine (and the same thing applies to the dissertations that he directed on this topic) were temporally conditioned and shaped by the dispute between Classical philologists and medical historians. He no doubt recognized the justification of the claims made by the former, but he interpreted them differently when he tried to orient the work of the medical historian more to positivistic studies and left research on the history of problems to the philologists instead of furthering the specialization of the medical historian, which he himself undertook with his publications on medieval medicine, in this area and of requiring that they pick up the methodologies of Classical philology. Accordingly, his conception helped shape the development of the following decades and was only

definitively modified in the last 50 years. Nonetheless, his own investigations assure him a significant place in the historiography of Ancient medicine, too.

THE HISTORY OF ARTIFACTS AND THE MUSEUM

It is not the task of this report to present Sudhoff as a superb museum specialist and historian of artifacts, just as it also cannot be the task of my lecture to introduce him as a science manager and to put him forward in the process of building the first medical historical institute that was fully adequate to this designation. The history of objects, however, determined Sudhoff's philological research in no small measure and shaped it down into its details. It ought to be at least sketched in outline with a few coarse strokes what genius Sudhoff also achieved in the history of objects and on how many occasions he proved himself as a museum specialist in four decades.

Sudhoff did not direct a department dedicated to artifacts and did not serve as curator of museum. But he organized countless exhibits, he pulled together enormous collections, he inspired gigantic collecting campaigns, he organized, labeled, and made accessible through catalogues numerous pieces; he worked as turner, shaper, and carpenter, he glued, folded, mortised, riveted, soldered, welded, and forged, he worked with every available material, restored originals or reconstructed them in models, he re-envisioned historical reality, showed it in individual pieces, presented it as an ensemble. A few bare facts about exhibitions can make this clear:

In 1898 he appears for the first time: at his suggestion, the 70th meeting of German natural scientists and physicians is accompanied by a "Historical Exhibition," which Sudhoff presented in the Düsseldorf Crafts Museum, for which he had gathered almost 5000 objects, and which he showed to an enthusiastic public - as "an unprecedented one-time show."

Just a year later he went into action again when the Düsseldorf Academy of Art highlighted Goethe's 150th birthday with a "Rhenish Goethe Exhibit," and named Sudhoff as Vice President of the exhibit committee: the bibliographical-literary historical knowledge of the Germanist was being sought.

Two years later he is drawn in as a historian of artifacts when the Germanic National Museum in Nuremberg is considering the establishment of a "Medico-Historical Department." These plans for - as he calls it - a "medico-historical collection" cause first plans to be formed for a "Central Historical Museum for Medicine in its Totality" in the German speech area.

When the Empress Friedrich House begins its activity in the spring of 1906 as a central continuing education institution for physicians, it accompanies its opening with an "Exhibition on the History of Medicine in the Arts and Crafts," for the organization of which Sudhoff was again able to be engaged - in this case as an art expert: he assumed responsibility for the department "Painting

and the History of Medicine" and beyond that he was also partly responsible for the department "Prehistoric and Roman Instruments."

The highpoint of Sudhoff's museum activity was without doubt his participation in the "International Hygiene Exhibit Dresden 1911," which created a "Historical Division," for which Sudhoff was named chairman of the committee which also made him a member of the directorate and required him to serve as organizer. The work was immense and forced Sudhoff to move his residence to Dresden for several months. He acquired pieces intercontinentally. If one leaves aside the "Islamic Division," ignores the "Literature" group, and sets aside the "Ethnological Sub-Division" (to which Sudhoff likewise contributed), there are still an impressive 17,773 exhibit pieces, which Sudhoff presented in four main groups and with which he filled 46 rooms. He wanted to offer "a rich source of learning for all classes," he strove to contribute "to the education of physicians," and he saw in these sorts of displays "an unavoidable demand on learned scholarship."

Three years later Sudhoff is again in demand as literary scholar and expert on books when Leipzig opens the "International Exhibit for Book Craft and Graphic Art." Sudhoff is a member of the honorary committee (i.e., on the unpaid planning staff) responsible for the special exhibit "Three Thousand Years of Graphic Art in the Service of Science." In four rooms he showed image supported organization and transmission of knowledge in the areas of natural sciences, technology, and medicine, in the context of which in the medical sector along with anatomical drawings - such as the Three Image Series or the Five Image Series - he presented urine glasses, hung up blood letting and blood cupping mannequins, laid out schemas for places to cauterize, and exhibited pictorial instructions for placing hairlines as well as for putting on bandages. The first volume of his *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Chirurgie im Mittelalter* (Contributions to the History of Surgery in the Middle Ages) that appeared at the same time reproduced many of these exhibition pieces in its illustration section.

The outbreak of World War I led to the premature closing of the international graphic arts exhibit. The actions of the war on the other hand offered occasion and motivation for special exhibitions that were organized by the Dresden Museum of Hygiene and whose historical parts were again shaped by Sudhoff. The exhibitions took up the care of the ill and wounded and extended to the care of those disabled by war wounds.

The date of his retirement did not lead to a break: in 1926 we find Sudhoff as a member of the honorary committee when a "Major Exhibition on Health Care, Social Work, and Physical Education" is organized in Düsseldorf. The 73 year old acts as "collaborator" in building up and extending the historical collection. And in 1930 - he has turned 77 in the meantime - Sudhoff participates for the last time when Dresden puts on its International Hygiene Exhibit. In the meantime chairman of the board of the German Museum of Hygiene, he belonged both to the honorary committee and to the scientific

committee and in this way received the opportunity decisively to influence planning and carrying out of the exhibition. In the Historical Department he took responsibility as scholarly leader.

As far as putting together medical historical exhibitions is concerned, Sudhoff implemented different organizations depending on the goals and the availability of space and pieces. We already saw that he oriented medical printed graphics according to schemes defined by points of intervention. In the gigantic 1911 hygiene exhibition he preferred an epochal subdivision in his "Historical Division" that organized things from the early high cultures through "Antiquity" and the "Middle Ages" into "Recent Times." He had, however, already in 1901 sketched a theoretical plan for a medical historical exhibit that was simultaneously intended to apply to the "Central Museum of Medicine in its Totality." *For that he suggested the following possibilities for organization:* history of healing with water, mechanical-therapeutical measures, the physician's instrument in its development, the formation of various methods of operation, "physicians' attempts to illuminate the inner workings of the human body," other methods of diagnostic investigation (examination of urine, checking the pulse, etc.), the history of caring for the ill, popular medicine, medicine in illiterate societies, the history of diseases (such as the pandemics plague, syphilis, etc.). He particularly emphasized instruments, nursing, and historical pathology:

"The physician's instrument in its development, what a promising topic for the Classical scholar, for the physician, for the cultural historian, but also for our contemporary instrument producers. Take a look just at the knife in its changing forms through the centuries. Today we give the scalpels a handle made as smooth as possible into which the steel blade fits smoothly. Our instrument makers were in no small degree proud of this achievement about 15 years ago, but the old Romans did it almost the same way..."

"An entirely new element would come into the exhibition by working out the historical of caring for the sick. Here one could include not only the rooms, such as sick rooms, hospitals, infirmaries, gardens, etc., not only the entire apparatus of care, from store room and utensils to winches and elevators, here one could also include the history of corporations that dedicated themselves to care of the ill..., altogether almost enough to fill a historical museum."

"The history of diseases should also be presented, as it has been eternalized in reports, inscriptions, graphic representations, monuments, plague medals, plague crosses, plague amulets, and brought together in collections."

Finally Sudhoff himself stood out as a collector. Think only of his famous private library, the Paracelsus library segment of which demanded particular attention. In 1937, a year before his death, copies were supposed to be included in an exhibit, and in 1939, after outbreak of the war, the Dresden Museum of Hygiene planned to use the Paracelsus holdings of the deceased medical historian stored there as the basis for "another exhibition" in spite of threatening

"danger from planes" - all the more so because the collection contained "a lot of notes for an apparently planned Paracelsus biography."

These notes - found again four years ago - still await evaluation by Paracelsus scholarship, as many other facets of Sudhoff's reception are not yet worked out. What could be outlined here in coarse contours is Sudhoff's significance as philologist, is his influence on Ancient studies and his effect on the scholarship dealing with medieval technical prose. What could be further sketched here is the fact that Sudhoff's philological scholarship rested on outstanding factual knowledge, was underpinned by the history of objects and images, and was accompanied by activities in the area of artifacts that permit us to identify Sudhoff as a leading museum specialist of his day.

Sudhoff understood how to philologize the history of medicine and to give it rank and standing as a philological discipline, i.e., to assure its prestige. Beyond that, however, he opened the door for it into the museums and demonstrated its standing as a historical discipline in the study of artifacts and books. And through numerous exhibitions he carried the history of medicine into public consciousness and was still able to experience its rise to a required curricular field with interdisciplinary implications in the training of physicians. One should not think that Sudhoff's medical historical activities are exhaustively described in these few pages. A few things from his philological works have been sketched out for the Medium Aevum and for Antiquity. A few things have been said about him as a historian of artifacts and as a museum expert. A few things have become visible in terms of his achievements in the institutionalization of science and in the history of his interdisciplinary reception. But nothing has been said about what he did as manager of the fortune of a foundation. What model he implemented in the building up of his exemplary medical historical institute has not been shown. What he accomplished as organizer of corporations and chair of associations has not even been presented with reference to the "Deutsche Gesellschaft für Geschichte der Medizin" (German Society for the History of Medicine) even though he opened it up to the natural sciences and to technology and even though in the 35 years in which he led it, it stood at the forefront of medical historical professional associations. Sudhoff's gifts were too broad, his influence too manifold to be sketched here from all sides. Sudhoff shaped - and this at least appears to be generally accepted - medical history like no one else, and he also gave it form in areas where no one thinks today of his formative influence.

*Institut für Geschichte der Medizin der Universität
Oberer Neubergweg 10a
D-97074 Würzburg*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Gilardon Klaus, "Karl Sudhoff und die medizinhistorischen Quellen. Ein Beitrag zu seiner Sammel- und Ausstellungstätigkeit," *Sudhoffs Archiv* 76 (1992), p. 106-109
- Harig Georg, "Sudhoffs Sicht der antiken Medizin," *Sudhoffs Archiv* 76 (1992), 97-105
- Kästner Ingrid, "Zum Schicksal der Paracelsus-Bibliothek Karl Sudhoffs," *Sudhoffs Archiv* 79 (1995), 115-119
- Kästner Ingrid, "Walter von Brunn (1876-1952). Versuch einer Lebensbeschreibung <von Sudhoffs Nachfolger>," *Würzburger medizin-historische Mitteilungen* 13 (1995), 449-457
- Keil Gundolf, "[Karl-Sudhoff-Gedächtnissitzung:] Sudhoffs Sicht vom deutschen medizinischen Mittelalter," *Nachrichtenblatt der deutschen Gesellschaft für die Geschichte der Medizin, der Naturwissenschaften und der Technologie* 31 (1981), 94-129
- Keil Gundolf, "Der deutsche Osten im 'Verfasserlexikon' zur 'deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters'," in: *Deutsche Literatur im östlichen und südöstlichen Europa, Veröffentlichungen des Südostdeutschen Kulturwerks, B 69*, ed. Eckhard Grunewald und Stefan Sienert, Munich 1997, pp, 115-134, here pp. 119-20.
- Rütten Thomas, Karl Sudhoff, "Patriarch" der deutschen Medizingeschichte. Zur Identitätspräsentation einer wissenschaftlichen Disziplin in der Biographik ihres Begründers, in: *Médecins érudits de Coray à Sigerist*, éd. par Danielle Gourevitch, Paris 1995, p. 155-171 and 208-211.
- Thom Achim "Karl Sudhoff," in: *Ärztelexikon. Von der Antike bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Wolfgang Uwe Eckart und Christoph Gradmann, Munich 1995, p. 346 [cave!]

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Zentraler Untersuchungsgegenstand ist Sudhoffs Bedeutung als Philologe (etwa auf dem Feld der Sicherung und Herausgabe mittelalterlicher Texte, beispielsweise der Tierheilkunde, Diätetik, Pharmazie oder Chirurgie) sowie sein Einfluß auf Fachprosaforchung und Altertumswissenschaften. Durch seine philologischen Forschungsresultate, die - objekt - wie bildgeschichtlich untermauert - auf einem herausragenden Sachwissen basieren, ist es Sudhoff gelungen, die Medizingeschichte zu philologisieren und ihr Dignität zu verschaffen. Darüber hinaus hat er z. B. als führender Museumsfachmann seiner Zeit der Medizingeschichte den Weg in die Museen gebahnt, sie mit zahlreichen Ausstellungen ins öffentliche Bewußtsein getragen und als objektgeschichtliche wie buchkundliche Disziplin ausweisen können.

RÉSUMÉ

L'objet principal de cette étude est l'importance de Sudhoff en tant que philologue (dans le domaine de la sauvegarde et de l'édition de textes médiévaux concernant par exemple la médecine vétérinaire, la diététique, la pharmacie ou la chirurgie) ainsi que son influence sur la littérature disciplinaire et les sciences de l'antiquité. Par ses recherches philologiques, étayées historiquement et iconographiquement et basées sur une compétence extraordinaire, Sudhoff est parvenu à philologiser l'histoire de la médecine et à lui procurer de la dignité. En plus, en tant qu'éminent muséologue de son temps, il lui a ouvert le chemin des musées. Il a suscité l'intérêt public pour l'histoire de la médecine par de nombreuses expositions et a su l'élever au rang d'une discipline historique et livresque.

SAMENVATTING

Het centrale onderzoeksthema is Sudhoffs betekenis als filoloog (in het domein van de bewaring en uitgave van middeleeuwse teksten over bijvoorbeeld de diergeneeskunde, de diëtetiek, de farmacie of de chirurgie) alsook zijn invloed op de vakliteratuur en oudheidkunde. Met zijn historisch en iconografisch onderbouwd filologisch onderzoek, gebaseerd op een buitengewone competentie, is Sudhoff er in geslaagd de geschiedenis van de geneeskunde te "filologeren" en haar waardigheid te verschaffen. Bovendien opende hij, als eminent museoloog, voor haar de weg naar de musea. Hij heeft, door de organisatie van talrijke tentoonstellingen, de publieke belangstelling voor de geschiedenis van de wetenschap doen toenemen.