I. Jacobus Lotichius, a student at Academia Gustaviana Dorpatensis

The author of *Oratio de musica*, Jacobus Lotichius (born in 1617), a son of Jacobus Lotichius, the cantor of the cathedral at Riga, was probably preparing to follow his father’s career as a cantor, as well as a poet. From music, composed by Jacobus Lotichius the Elder, at least some pieces are extant, but it is unknown, whether his son ever published (or wrote) music. We do not know much about the younger Lotichius: he studied at Academia Gustaviana in Dorpat (Tartu) in 1637-1642 as many other young Livonians from Riga. The corpus of printed books from Academia Gustaviana (1632-1656) reveals that he was active as an author of occasional poetry (mainly in Latin). There are some proofs of his participation in academic exercises: in 1641-1643 Lotichius was respondens in disputations, organised by professor of poetics and rhetoric, Laurentius Ludenius. As often in the case of student exercises, these were written by the praeses Laurentius Ludenius, whereas Lotichius had...
only to study them by heart and present to the public. Lotichius himself wrote and published at least two speeches (*oratio*), which he presented in the series of public speeches, organised by professor Laurentius Ludenius: in 1640 *De Musica* and in 1642 *De Poetica*. However, the small number of Lotichius’ academic performances (3+2) should not be interpreted as a sign of his passive attitude to the studies, but as reflecting his focus of interests: music and poetry. This is confirmed by the relatively great number of his occasional poems (24).

II. Occasional poetry by Jacobus Lotichius

According to the analysis of the occasions and the addressees, Lotichius’ poems can be divided into following groups: 1) gratulatory poems for the academic achievements of his co-students from Livonia (especially Riga), which reflect fraternity relationships between the members of the same nationality in *Academia Gustaviana* (3 poems); ⁹ 2) participations in the collections of occasional poetry, organised by Laurentius Ludenius; whereas the addressees, connected to Dorpat (and/or the Academy) or to Reval (Tallinn) can be regarded as possible patrons (6 poems); ¹⁰ 3) gratulations for his other co-students’ academic achievements: presentation of disputations or speeches before public. Here it is difficult to see, whether occasional poetry is the result of official companionship, search for future patrons or just friendship. Part of these gratulations is for the students of philosophy (mostly participating in exercises of professor Ludenius); ¹¹ eight poems indicate another circle where Lotichius was active: the students of theology, who participated as respondentes in the disputations, directed theology in *Academia Gustaviana* wrote often their disputations for themselves, too, corresponding to their more advanced level of studies.

⁹ In 1637 to Johannes Schlechter (Jaanson, nr.143); in 1638 to Johannes Günterbach, a Livonian nobleman (Jaanson, nr.161) and to Jacob Taube (Jaanson, nr.193). J. Günterlach might occur in the list of addressees also as a possible patron, however, the signature ("with friendship") reflects good relationship of the students.

¹⁰ In 1638 *Sacris Nuptiarum honoribus* to J. Balcius and A. Korfes (Jaanson, nr.182); *Sceptris Academicis* to S. Matthiae (Jaanson, nr.184), *Vota, quibus abitum* to G. Mancelius (Jaanson, nr.198 two poems, in German and Latin); in 1639 *Sceptris Academicis* to H. Hein (Jaanson, nr. 217); in 1640 *Sacris ministerii honoribus* to P. Turdinus (Jaanson, nr.258) and in 1641 *Sacris nuptiarum honoribus* to C. Buchovius and A. Burchardi (Jaansoon, nr.304, in German). Four of the addressees are connected to Academia Dorpatensis (Balcius, Matthiae, Hein and Mancelius, who left for Kurland) and two with Reval (Turdinus, Buchovius). Lotichius had also connections to Reval’s society of Blackheads, as revealed by dedication in his disputation (Jaanson 294, see n.7).

¹¹ Overlapping with the first group, see n.9. These poems were written to Ulricus Volberg (Jaanson 272) in 1640; Martin Hintelmann (Jaanson, nr. 277) in 1641 and Johannes Petrejus (Jaanson 301) in 1641 in the occasion of their public orations; and to Johannes Petrejus (Jaanson, nr.302) in 1641, Christoph Kühn (Jaanson, 353) and Michael Stultetus (Jaanson, nr. 362) in 1642 (respondentes in disputations, written by Ludenius), as well as to Nicolai Rundelius, who performed a disputation in 1642 (praeses Johannes Erici Stregnensis, Jaanson, nr.332).
by the first professor of theology Andreas Virginius. This could reflect either, that Lotichius was studying theology as well, or that he was friendly with students of theology: and indeed, for a son of a cantor, pastors and future pastors were not unlikely companions. Several addressees in this third group seem to be similar to Lotichius, being students with enough poetic and rhetorical skills and aspirations, which enabled them to write their orations or exercises for themselves and not just to present the disputations, written by their professor. This tendency to independence can be seen in two orations (speeches) by Lotichius.

III. Lotichius’ speeches and Laurentius Ludenius role in these

Laurentius Ludenius leading position in the poetic life of Academia Gustaviana is clear, it can be seen from the many collections of poetry, dedicated to different occasions and directed by him (Viiding 2002 and Viiding in Viiding e.a. 2007: 18-20, 379). But Ludenius also organised disputations on different subjects of philosophy (elementary or preparatory education) and open speech contests for his students. He had a strong influence on the structure and content of the speeches of his students (Viiding 2006, Kaju 2007), but it was not always even. As stated in Ludenius’ prefaces to several student speeches, they had written these for themselves (\textit{a se scripta}), whereas the extent of independence depended from every single student and varied according to the subject. This can be seen from the comparison of Lotichius’ two speeches. Both of them (as some other speeches from Dorpat) have more or less the same structure, which is indicated in the margins. This type of university orations was frequent: they were based on logical argumentation, whereas the argument was illustrated with a great number of examples from Antiquity and Christian authors. These speeches stress the great importance of their subject and give its basic theoretical principles, presenting definitions and discussions (according to discussing causes, purposes, material, means, use, cognition, pleasure etc). Thus it can be presumed that in the general structure of his speeches, Lotichius followed the guidelines, given by his professor.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{12} To Adrianus Verginius (Jaanson, nr. 197) and Petrus Lang in 1639 (Jaanson, nr. 229); to Johann Gutsstaff (Jaanson, nr. 268), P. Sandhagius (Jaanson, nr. 269) and Adrianus Verginius (Jaanson, nr. 271) in 1640; to Martin Henschelius (Jaanson, nr. 374, 375) and Christoph Kühn (Jaanson, nr. 376) in 1642.
\textsuperscript{13} However, there are no references to his participations in exercises or disputations of theology.
\textsuperscript{14} According to the constitutions of \textit{Academia Gustaviana}, music had to be taught according to Freigius (Sak ed.1997: 58-59), whether Freigius, \textit{Paedagogus} (Basel 1582) was indeed used in Dorpat during the 17th century, is not yet clear.
Another set of comparisons helps to see variation in professor’s influence. Both speeches by Lotichius were dedicated to the subjects, which occurred already in the series of Laurentius Ludenius’ disputations, published in Greifswald in 1925 and used later in Dorpat for teaching. All disputations in this series have the same structure, reflecting Ludenius’ early principles of teaching: each disputation is presents a collection of numbered theses (definitions, divisions) without examples, presenting the backbone of the argument.¹⁵

In the case of Lotichius, *De Poetica* (1642) the influence of the professor in the work of the student is not difficult to see. Lotichius speech is in its outlines modelled on Ludenius’ Greifswald disputation about poetics.¹⁶ Most of Ludenius’ 95 theses reappear *De Poetica* in unchanged order. Although about one third of them (31 theses) has been omitted,¹⁷ this omission is systematic, expanding the examples, which are enumerated by Ludenius, and leaving out complicated logical argumentation and ramified divisions. Although Lotichius has taken his basic arguments from Ludenius disputation, it is never a word-to-word copy: he rephrases Ludenius’ theses, connects them and adds other examples. He does not focus on the scientific system of poetics as Ludenius, but on the discussion of the influence of poetry and the importance of its study.

On the basis of similarity between the structures of Lotichius’ two speeches, we could expect that his *De Musica* (1640) would equally be based on a Greifswald disputation by Ludenius. The main purpose of Lotichius, *De Musica* is to describe the influence of music and stress the importance of its practice and study, corresponding thus to his *De Poetica*. However, the influence of his professor appears as considerably different. Ludenius had published in Greifswald a disputation concerning the influence and the theory of music.¹⁸ Although there are some parallels between this disputation and *De Musica*, it cannot be regarded as its

¹⁵ Although the university constitutions demanded teaching rhetorics according to Ramus (see Sak ed. 1997: 60), the Ramistic-Aristotelian character of Ludenius’ and his students dissertations has been brought out rightfully (Viiding 2006: 16-17, 23-24, Kaju 2007: 219-220, see also Viiding to appear). However, what does the „Ramistic-Aristotelian” eclecticism mean in the case of Academia Gustaviana dissertations, needs yet to be established through close analysis of single dissertations by different students and professors. A neat and clear-cut division might not be waiting, as demonstrated by the analysis of the philosophy schools in Danzig, Upsala or Rostock by Elsmann, Sellberg or others in Feingold, e.a. eds. 2001 and Hotson 2007.

¹⁶ *Disputatio LXXXII. De bono animi acquisitio; Quoad poeticam* (Ludenius 1625: 921-928), with Ludenius himself as praeses and Ulricus Iacobi as respondens. The possible connection between these two disputation was indicated to me by Kristi Viiding, who lend me her copy of these disputations, acquired from Greifswald University Library with the subsidy of the grant of Estonian Science Foundation (ETF nr. 5846).

¹⁷ Completely missing from Lotichius are following Ludenius’ theses: 1-2 (introduction), 5 (the art of muses), 9-10 (division of poetics), 12 (the entity); 17-19 (division of rhythm according to Aristotle); 21-27 (metre concerning poems and affections); 32-37 (syllable types); 47 (feet); 64-65 (division of speech matter); 74 (division of arguments); 88, 90 (disposition types); partly also theses 8 and 61.

¹⁸ *Disputatio LVI. De bono animi acquisitio, Quoad Musicam: respondente Salomone Wiesnero, Bolcolucan. Siles* (Ludenius 1625: 537-544).
principal model. From 92 theses of Ludenius, *Disputatio*, only the first six (concerning the importance, influence and etymology of music) are directly reflected in *De Musica*. Theses 7-92 in Ludenius present divisions concerning the theory of music, very much according to the 8th book of Alsted’s *Methodus admirandorum mathematicorum studio*, concerning music. The use of Alsted’s works in *Academia Gustaviana* has been attested already for its first year of activity, and the disputation proves that at least in his Greifswald period Ludenius followed more or less faithfully Alsted’s Ramistic method and his divisions. Other parallels between Ludenius’ theses 7-92 and Lotichius seem at first seem to confirm Lotichius’ debt to Ludenius. However, the number of Ludenius’ theses reappearing in Lotichius is much smaller than in the case of *De Poetica*, and their original order has not been maintained. A closer analysis reveals that there is no direct reflection of Ludenius’ disputation; the parallels can be much more easily explained as a result of the usage of close sources: Alsted’s *Methodus* in the case of Ludenius and possibly Alsted’s *Encyclopaedia* in the case of Lotichius (see below).

### IV. Lotichius, *Oratio de Musica* and its sources

Jacob Lotichius wrote „Oratio de Musica“ himself (as stressed by Laurentius Ludenius in the preface to it) and performed it in the contest in the Church of St. Mary in January 4th 1640. „Oratio de Musica“ does not reveal much about Lotichius’ actual knowledge of musical theory and practice. Its long first and final parts are close to a widespread type of speeches in the praise of music (*laudes musicae, encomion musices*), as well as another genre, an apology of music. However, the long central part of the speech, dedicated to musical theory (although superficially), does not allow to classify it strictly as a *laus musicae*. The combination of ethical and theoretical resembles another speech type: inauguration and programmatic speeches by professors. These speeches stress the importance of their subject,

---

19 Alsted 1613: 419-460 begins with a comparison between optics (preceding music in his method) and music (according to qualities: visible and audible), presents a definition of music as a science of numerical sounds (scientia de sono numeroso) and then proceeds with divisions (theoretical and practical; theoretical into communis and propria etc.). The same divisions (omitting more subtle ones) occur in Ludenius.

20 As confirmed by the title of M. Savonius’ (praeses) disputation, presented by G. Zethraeus: *Disputatio II de philosophia in genere quae est de arte... ex 6. Ethicorum desumptus, quem Alstedius sub titulo de hexilogia persequitur* (Jaanson, nr. 9). See also Viiding 2006.

21 For Alsted’s method and his debt to Ramism, see Hotson 1997: 169-273.

22 The constitutions of *Academia Gustaviana* recommended to teach music according to Johannes Thomas Freigius (Sak ed. 1997: 58-59), who was a student of Petrus Ramus. Whether Freigius *Paedagogus* (Basel 1582) could be the model or one of the models for Lotichius, I have not yet been unable to verify.

23 For this speech type in German-speaking regions, see Niemoller 2003: 72-74.

including its praise, the discussion of its influence and history, together with general theoretical principles. Publishing a speech like this would have given Lotichius a good opportunity to present himself, when he was applying for a post.

It has not been possible to establish one certain model for De musica. Lotichius begins the introduction (Propositio) with references to the pleasure, given by music and the closeness of the harmonies of music, angels and skies. He proceeds with examples of music’s influence (Atheas, Minerva and Satyros, David, emperors), naming only one of the original sources (Plutarch for the chreia about Atheas). As he is vague on most biblical, historical and mythological references and the number of examples is great and varied, it might indicate an intermediary source, which remains unknown. The introduction ends with a prayer in a form of a distich: Tu mea, Christe, tuo rege sacro Numine verba, Juhus et eloquij, laus tua, finis erat. This forms a passage to the first argument, which expands theses 1-6 from Ludenius disputation: the influence of music on manners, the importance of its knowledge and the etymology of the word. Ludenius’ list of irrational animals, who like music, is presented in a changed order and developed into long periods. Lotichius begins with two verse passages on birds: at first nightingale, whose song echoes back in the skies and is praised by humans, and then the lark, who praises God with its sweet song. Other examples concerning the love of music by animals occur in the end of Lotichius’ speech (ratio 11) in a reversed order, beginning with mules, who carry bags more easily to the ringing of the bells, continuing with horses, who go to the battle to the sound of the trumpets, and ending with other similar examples (deer, turtle-dove, dolphin), which appear in different treatises and cannot be traced back to one ancient or modern source.

From thesis 7 onwards, Ludenius’ disputation follows Alsted’s Methodus closely. It seems at first, that Lotichius is going to do the same, as he gives the same definition of music, which occurs in Alsted (and consequently, Ludenius). However, probably Lotichius is still relying on Ludenius, as only after this passage he refers to a new source (alij). This source is not

25 For compilative literature in the context of Dorpat, see Viiding (to appear).
26 The same distich occurs in some other speeches, written under Ludenius, as well.
27 ... divina Musica animalibus etiam irrationalibus perplacet; sic, equi in praelijs excitantur tubis; delphinus musica delectatur: gaudet musica Philomela: Muli sunt, qui tintinnu collis suspensorum tintinabulum sarcinas levis ferunt.
28 Egregium philomela melos modulatur; et aether Ad cantum resonat, plaudit et omnis homo.
29 Blanda voce canens laudat Alauda deum (the example of lark is missing in Ludenius). Because of the pun (alauda... lauda) similar verses are not infrequent, but as I have not found an exact match yet, it is not excluded that these are from Lotichius himself.
30 Musica scientia de sono numero. This definition occurs in the beginning of Alsted’s Methodus, but not in his Encyclopaedia. For the changes and development of Alsted’s views, see Hotson loc.cit.
Alsted’s *Methodus*, but could be his other work, *Encyclopedia*, which has several parallels with *De Musica*, especially in the order of arguments and general tendencies in structure. Alsted’s *Encyclopaedia* presents an eclectic choice of information on music theory, where his *Methodus* presents his system of divisiones. The tendency to compilation of different sources and discussions, which were current in music theory, can be seen in Lotichius as well. One of the examples for it is solmisation: Alsted’s *Methodus* (with Ludenius) names only six notes, illustrating it with Guido’s Hymn (*ut queant laxis*....), whereas his *Encyclopedia* and Lotichius give the same number and example, but add a reference to another method of solmisation, so-called bo-ce-di-sation by David Mostart. The latter is based on 7 notes, which can form a full octave. Lotichius praises this system for the possibility to write melodies without complicated mutations.

Although in its outlines the central part of Lotichius speech corresponds to the structure of Alsted’s *Encyclopedia*, there are serious discrepancies. Corresponding to the nature of public speech, everything complicated in musical theory has been left out from *De musica*: the scales are named without descriptions (from which note to which); the intervals are named, but not their proportions, the divisions of intervals into dissonances and consonances are explained, but the intervals are not named etc., whereas counterpoint is not even mentioned. Lotichius is much more explicit, when it concerns the philosophical questions: he discusses the characters of modes (as the ancient tradition, beginning with Damon and Plato), draw parallels between the voices in music and primordial elements (relating discantus to fire, alto to copper, basses to earth and tenor to water). These parallels occur in Alsted’s encyclopedia (1989: 1203, cap.viii), as well as in other treatises, but Lotichius presents it in a form of a distich: *Igni discantus respondens, Aeri et Altus, Bassus Terrae et Aquae proximate Tenor*. He repeats also the parallels between the movements of the planets and the Muses from the theory of the

---

31 Parallels in the lists of notes, modes, claves, instruments etc occur in both works by Alsted, as well as Ludenius and Lotichius, but these are not original and occur in many treatises, concerning music

32 However, these are almost never exact. E.g. we can see Alsted’s order of the presentation of theses (cap.III De efficienete e fine, cap.IV De quantitate soni musici, divided into discussion of matter and form) in the order of the arguments in Lotichius: Arg.6 A causa efficiente, Arg.7 A fine, Arg.8 A materia, Arg.9 A forma, as well as several parallels within these chapters, but this cannot be indicating more than closeness in outlines.

33 See Lotichius, *De Musica* C1v, and Alsted 1630:1200 (*Encyclopaedia*, lib.xx.cap.vi De litteris soni musicî). However, even when Lotichius had used *Encyclopedia*, it is not probable, that it was his only source, as Alsted refers to Mostart without his first name (David), whereas Lotichius refers to the introduction of David Mostart and refers to the usefulness of having a full octave (cf. the introduction to Mostart’s *Dat boek der Psalmen*, Amsterdam 1606. The principle of this system dates already from B. Ramis, see Schüter 2000.

34 The tradition of giving short verse precepts comes already from the treatises of Middle Age, I’ve not been able to find an exact source or even parallels for it.
harmony of spheres (in Pythagorean and Platonic tradition, as well as Boethius), but again his direct source is impossible to establish.

In the final part of De Musica Lotichius returns to the discussion of the influence of music, partly resuming his arguments and examples from the beginning, partly adding new examples, although not any more in verse. The abundance of different examples in prose and verse in the introductory ethical part of Lotichius speech suggests, that Lotichius had either used another intermediary source-collection next to or instead of Alsted’s Encyclopedia or compiled his speech from multiple sources himself. Although some of the verse examples might be of the authorship by Lotichius, several others are passing from treatise to treatise. For example a passage from Lucretius, De rerum natura 5.1379-1387: Et liquidas avium voces imitarier ore... on the origin of music as imitation of the song of birds, can be found in a popular treatise by S. Calvisius.\(^{35}\) Another parallel seems to be more than a coincidence. These are anonymously presented verses about music’s soothing influence on the soul: Musica turbatas animas aegrumque dolorem Sola levat: Merito Divumque Hominumque voluptas. This passages occurs in John Case’s treatise from 1588, Apologia musices (Sutton ed. 2003). Another place in Lotichius speech, a reference to the discussion of music’s position in church and the following apologetic seems to be influenced by Case’s treatise or other similar works.\(^{36}\) In the very end of the speech, this apologetic part is presented as a short music history, again justifying the practice of music.

V. Conclusion

As a result we can conclude, that Laurentius Ludenius dissertation (or its unknown source) could be regarded as one source for the beginning of Lotichius, De Musica, whereas Lotichius expansion and examples indicate that he certainly had used parallel intermediary sources (or gone directly to the ancient authors). The stock examples from the Bible and Antiquity, concerning the influence of music and occurring in the beginning and the end of the speech, indicate that an intermediary source is more probable. As for the middle part of the speech, concerning music theory, Alsted’s Encyclopedia could be regarded as one of Lotichius’ sources on the ground of the correspondences in general construction of both arguments and

\(^{35}\) However, there are some textual divergences (including replacing of v. 1387 of modern editions by v.1388 by Calvisius), which indicate, that Lotichius had another source for it, cf. Sethus Calvisius, Exercitationes Musicae duae (Leipzig 1600), p.78 in: \texttt{http://www.chtml.indiana.edu/ml/17th/CALVEX\_TEXT.html} (TML).

\(^{36}\) The citation is longer in Case, see Sutton 2003 ed. (or TML).
the information that Alsted was used in Academia Gustaviana; the knowledge of John Case’s *Apologia musices* or similar apologetic works are not excluded either. The treatise belongs to the tradition, studying the ethical side of music, especially its influence on the soul.
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