

LETONICA

HUMANITĀRO ZINĀTŅU ŽURNĀLS
30 • 2015 • *The Riga Humanists
and Beyond*

Izdevējs · Publisher

LATVIJAS UNIVERSITĀTES LITERATŪRAS, FOLKLORAS UN MĀKSLAS INSTITŪTS
THE INSTITUTE OF LITERATURE, FOLKLORE AND ART OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LATVIA
Izdevniecības vadītāja · Publishing director ANITA ROŽKALNE

Redakcijas kolēģija · Editorial board

DACE BULA, PĪTERS BĒRKS (PETER BURKE, Lielbritānija · The United Kingdom), RAIMONDS BRIEDIS, DACE DZENOVSKA (Lielbritānija · The United Kingdom), DIDJĒ FRANKFŪRS (DIDIER FRANCFOURT, Francija · France), BENEDIKTS KALNAČS, INTA GĀLE-KĀRPENTERE (INTA GALE CARPENTER, ASV · The USA), DENISS HANOVS, IEVA E. KALNIŅA, JANĪNA KURSĪTE, LALITA MUIŽNIECE (ASV · The USA), JURIS ROŽĪTIS (Zviedrija · Sweden), SANITA REINSONE, ANITA ROŽKALNE, PĀVELS ŠTOLLS (PAVEL STOLL, Čehija · The Czech Republic), JANA TESARŽOVA (Slovākija · Slovakia), RITA TREIJA, KĀRLIS VĒRDIŅŠ, GUNA ZELTIŅA

Žurnāls *Letonica* ir iekļauts EBSCO datubāzē

Žurnālā ievietotie zinātniskie raksti ir anonīmi recenzēti

Journal *Letonica* is included in the EBSCO's database

Articles appearing in this journal are peer-reviewed

Redakcijas adrese · Address of the editorial office:

Mūkusalas ielā 3, Rīga, LV-1423, Latvija

Tālrunis · Phone +371 67357912

Žurnāls izdots ar Valsts kultūrkapitāla fonda atbalstu

Žurnāls izdots Valsts pētījumu programmas "Letonica" ietvaros



VALSTS
KULTŪRKAPITĀLA FONDS

LETONIKA

VALSTS PĒTĪJUMU PROGRAMMA

The assistance and support of the Academic Library of the University of Latvia in research of visual sources is gratefully appreciated

Galvenais redaktors · Editor-in-chief PAULS DAIJA

pauls.daija@lulfmi.lv

Numura redaktori · Issue editors OJĀRS LĀMS and PAULS DAIJA

Vāka mākslinieks · Cover design by KRIŠS SALMANIS

Literārā redaktore un tulkotāja · Proof reader, translator LAINE KRISTBERGA

Maketētāja · Layout by BAIBA DŪDIŅA

Iespiests SIA "Jelgavas tipogrāfija"

ISSN 1407-3110

© LU LFMI, 2015

Contents

INTRODUCTION

<i>Ojārs Lāms, Pauls Daija</i> . Mapping the Trajectories of Riga Humanist Literature.....	5
---	---

ARTICLES

<i>Ojārs Lāms</i> . Who are the Humanists of Riga: a General Introduction to the Phenomenon	9
<i>Gita Bērziņa, Brigita Cīrule</i> . The Classical Basis of Education at Riga Dome School during the 16 th and 17 th Centuries	21
<i>Mārtiņš Laizāns</i> . Hyperborean Poetics: Greek Mythology in Some Texts of Riga Humanists	35
<i>Magnus Frisch</i> . Daniel Hermann—a Well-Travelled Prussian Humanist and His Poetic Work in Riga	44
<i>Kristi Viiding</i> . Latin in Early Modern Riga: Remarks About Languages in David Hilchen's Epistolography	58
<i>Mindaugas Strockis</i> . Sirvydas and Elger: The Founding Fathers of Latin Lexicography in the Baltics	69
<i>Māra Grudule</i> . Sapphic Stanza in the 17 th Century Latvian Literature.....	79
<i>Ieva Kalniņa, Mārtiņš Laizāns</i> . Johann Gotthelf Lindner and Riga Dome School	94
AUTHORS	110

Saturs

IEVADS

<i>Ojārs Lāms, Pauls Daija. Kartējot Rīgas humānistu literatūras trajektorijas</i>	5
--	---

RAKSTI

<i>Ojārs Lāms. Kas tie tādi – Rīgas humānisti: vispārīgs ievads fenomenā</i>	9
--	---

Gita Bērziņa, Brigita Cīrule. Rīgas Domskolas izglītības klasiskie pamati 16. un 17. gadsimtā	21
--	----

<i>Mārtiņš Laizāns. Hiperboreju poētika: grieķu mitoloģja dažos Rīgas humānistu tekstos</i>	35
---	----

<i>Magnuss Frišs. Daniels Hermanis – daudzceļojis prūšu humānists un viņa daiļrade Rīgā</i>	44
---	----

<i>Kristi Vīdīnga. Latīņu valoda agrīno jauno laiku Rīgā: piezīmes par valodām Dāvida Hilhena epistologrāfijā</i>	58
---	----

<i>Mindaugs Strockis. Sirvīds un Elgers: latīņu leksikogrāfijas dibinātāji Baltijā</i>	69
--	----

<i>Māra Grudule. Sapfo strofa 17. gadsimta latviešu literatūrā</i>	79
--	----

<i>Ieva Kalniņa, Mārtiņš Laizāns. Johans Gothelfs Lindners un Rīgas Domas skola</i>	94
---	----

AUTORI	111
------------------	-----

Introduction

Mapping the Trajectories of Riga Humanist Literature

This issue of *Letonica* is dedicated to a significant, consequential and so far rather understudied phenomenon—Neo-Latin humanist literature and cultural activities as they appeared in the furthest reaches of the territory they originally touched—on the Eastern shore of the Baltic Sea.

The issue puts the ideas of humanism as they came to be understood in Riga, the metropolis of Livonia and the current capital of Latvia, under a magnifying glass. During the geopolitical tremor and times of change at the turn of the 16th and 17th centuries, when Medieval Livonia collapsed and the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation arose, Riga was not only the political and economic centre of the region. It was also a hub for the ideas of humanism in education, culture, and literature, thus following the intellectual and aesthetic trends of the West. During those times of turbulent change, the integration of such ideas strengthened the region's Western identity and laid foundations for the development of the vernacular cultures shortly after the boom of the Neo-Latin humanism in the region. This issue of the journal is structured around two thematic subjects—research materials concerning Neo-Latin humanism and articles focusing on the reception of antique culture and Latinity in regard to the inheritance of traditions in 17th and 18th century Latvian and Baltic German literature and culture.

This issue is the first extensive compilation of studies on Rigan humanism in English. However, it is by no means an attempt to provide a comprehensive view of the subject. Rather, the approach taken in this issue can be described as mapping the trajectories and highlighting the dominant trends of this movement so that it might serve as a good foundation for more comprehensive and in-depth research.

The journal contains eight articles that have been written for the project *The Riga Humanists and the Heritage of Antiquity: Texts and Contexts*. Research results were presented during an academic conference that was part of the official programme of Riga as European Capital of Culture in 2014.* The research project on the heritage of the Riga humanists was financially supported by the *Deutsch-Baltisches Hochschulkontor*, the Riga City Council, the Latvian State Cultural Capital Foundation, the National Library of Latvia, and the University of Latvia (UL).

* The Conference was organised as a part of the *Colloquium Balticum*, a network of Baltic region classicists. The coordinator of the network in Latvia is Vita Paporinska, professor of ancient literature at the University of Latvia.

The conference was organized within the framework of the Latvian State Research Program “Letonika” and the project involved researchers from the UL and four other universities—the University of Marburg, Lund University, the University of Tartu and the University of Vilnius. These universities provided funding to carry out the necessary research and to organise the conference.

Out of thirty papers presented at the conference, covering not only the issues directly related to the Riga humanists, but also providing a wide diachronous and synchronous perspective, eight articles have been chosen for this issue in hopes of providing information on the connections, succession of ideas, and interactions characteristic to this period. The authors of these articles provide significant insight into the key issues faced by the Riga humanists and analyse the fate and transformations of Humanism in the Baltics.

Ojārs Lāms wrote the article chosen to introduce the issue. He maps the most significant aspects of the Riga humanists, characterises the key institutional events in culture and education in Riga during that period, and names the most prominent figures among the Riga humanists. Lāms’ article also contains compelling historiographical information. In the next article, Gita Bērziņa and Brigita Cīrule offer a comprehensive study of the changes that took place at the Riga Dome School at the end of the 16th century. Those changes gave rise to a fruitful and productive environment for the dissemination of humanist ideas and laid the foundations for the educational system that prepared the future members of the vernacular culture.

In further articles, the period of the Riga humanists is viewed through the prism of certain texts and individuals. Mārtiņš Laizāns draws attention to the poetics of the Neo-Latin texts written in Riga, examining the cases of antique mythology in the poems of Augustinus Eucaedius and Basilius Plinius. Magnus Frisch gives readers a detailed and comprehensive introduction to Daniel Hermann, one of Riga’s most productive humanists, who, after a diverse and rich professional life in the West, decided to spend his old age in Riga and its vicinity. His works also include observations of the local traditions and way of life. Kristi Viiding examines another prominent Riga humanist, who was born in Riga, David Hilchen and his oeuvre. Viiding draws attention to the specifics of Hilchen’s use of the Latin language and the features of his linguistic environment.

The second part of the journal contains articles that focus on the cultural heritage of Humanism and its reverberations in the processes of the local vernacular cultures over the course of the 17th and 18th centuries.

Mindaugas Strockis inspects the work of Latvian author Georg Elger and Lithuanian author Konstantinas Sirvydas on Latin lexicography in the 17th century. Strockis compares the sources that Elger and Sirvydas referred to and concludes that, with the help of modern digitalisation, the work of these pioneers of Latin lexicography has essentially provided us with a virtual Latvian-Lithuanian dictionary. Māra Grudule focuses on reflections of classical literature in Latvian poetry written in the 17th century, providing an in-depth analysis of the use of the Sapphic stanza. Finally, Ieva Kalniņa and Mārtiņš Laizāns give an overview of the activities of the transformed Riga Dome School during the 18th century,

focusing on the activities of pedagogue and literary writer Johann Lindner. Echoes of Humanism and its traditions seen from the perspective of the ideals of Enlightenment can be found in his works.

The studies contained in this issue map the features and trends of the period, when the furthest periphery of Europe was created.

*

This issue of *Letonica* has come to press thanks to close collaboration between the Institute of Literature, Folklore and Art of the UL and the Department of Latvian and Baltic Studies of the Faculty of Humanities of the UL. We would like to acknowledge the Latvian State Culture Capital Foundation and State Research Program “Letonika” for supporting the publication of this journal. During 2015, the journal *Letonica* has implemented significant changes in its publishing and editorial policy. Since 2015, the journal has been indexed in the EBSCO database and has launched an open access publishing platform along with its printed copies.

We would like to express our gratitude to the staff of the Academic Library of the UL and especially Dr. philol. Aija Taimiņa for her assistance and support in accessing the academic research and data collection.

Ojārs Lāms
Pauls Daija

Ojārs Lāms

Who are the Humanists of Riga: a General Introduction to the Phenomenon

Keywords: Humanism, Riga humanists, Neo-Latin literature, education, book publishing

The Riga humanists are part of a rather recent academic notion that was introduced in the 1920s by scholars of the newly established University of Latvia. This notion referred to a group of intellectuals that attempted to continue European traditions of Neo-Latinist humanism here, in the European Hyperborean latitudes. Their activities took place in a period of geopolitical change when after the disintegration of the medieval, feudal and conservative state of Livonia the north-east coast of the Baltic Sea became a place where over several centuries pendular disputes went on, and not only the political but also cultural boundaries were disputed.

The notion of the Riga humanists was elaborated and it became constant mainly in the context of the national trends mentioned and characterized by Jozef IJsewijn in the second half of 20th century. IJsewijn wrote: “If, nevertheless, nowadays most scholars prefer to study Neo-Latin literature within a national context, which very often did not even exist at the time of the Latin authors under consideration, they do it for practical reason. Nobody can encompass the whole body of Neo-Latin literature. It is also easier to know an author’s world if one knows the country where he lived”¹. The scholarly thought of Latvian humanities finds it easier to attach itself to Riga, the metropolis during long centuries that became the capital of a national state in 1918. While the broader and more inclusive notion of the Livonian humanists is difficult to understand because, to some extent, it is anachronistic; it refers to historical facts that are no longer there, because nowadays notion of Livonia is out of use.

It is also ambivalent because ‘Livonian’ can be understood not only as referring to a state but also comes to be associated with the Finno-Ugric population, an ethnic group that has almost vanished; there is just a small group of Latvia-based enthusiasts that try to maintain Livonian culture and language alive. Nobody can claim it to be their mother tongue and it is not used on a daily basis. But it is exactly this Livonian ethnicity that lends the name to the medieval Livonia, with the Livonians themselves being left somewhere at the backstage of history.

It is useful to illustrate the relationship between Riga and its humanists by a characteristic inscription on an ancient 16th century etching from Riga, which says:

Autortiesību ierobežojumu dēļ
attēls nav pieejams.

<p>“Riga, percommode ad Duna Amnem sita, Emporium cele: Bre, & Livoniae metropolis.”</p>	<p>(Riga, very convenient located at river Duna, celebrated for the trade, Livonia’s Metropolis)</p>
--	--

This image concisely characterises Riga. With the help of this we will try to approach and understand the humanists of Riga. So, first, the character and essence of Riga must be explained.

City in a very convenient location, the celebrated capital of Livonia

A convenient location—for whom and why celebrated? The answer is included in the word of Greek origins “emporium”. Riga was a perfectly convenient trading place on the border of different worlds—that was the fortune of Riga at the times when it was founded in 1201 by bishop Albert (populated place is mentioned three years earlier) and it is the same nowadays. The Rigans have long been known for their persistency and the skill to to survive no matter what political winds were blowing. The situation of *percommode sita* has made Riga an object of continuous desire for every power with interests in this region. Riga has always held on to pragmatic and trade-orientated strategies. On the other hand, this city has always been a meeting point for cultures, nations and religions. This multicultural melting pot has made Riga *celebre* in many ways. The efforts to endow the goods with additional value created a tradition of refined craftsmanship, whereas the sophisticated skills went beyond the function and utility and created miracles such as *Art Nouveau*. The new National Library in Riga (opened in 2014) is a proof for the ability to step away from the practical and to create something worth of pride—*celebre*. Culture as a practical cultivation of life and culture as the spiritual growth of a human is like swings, where the fortune of Riga is swinging.

Humanism arrived relatively late in Riga in comparison with blossom time of Neo-Latin humanism in Italy some decades earlier. “..the culminating point as reached in the decades immediately before and after 1500”² claims Ijsewijn and remarks: “In Sweden that point lies around 1640”³. So we can conclude that humanism in Livonia and Riga although late however is quite vivid – after some swallows in the first half of the 16th century at the time of the Reformation, main activities such as educational reforms, poetical activities, books publishing happened in the second half and at the end of century when it was already burning out elsewhere in Europe, though it succeeded to lay important foundations here.

In the last decades of the 16th century a small group of intellectuals, who may not have been able to radically change the basic values of this city, created an atmosphere that helped the city to survive in very hard times. The 16th century was marked by very harsh crossroads in the history of Livonia. Deep traces in the fate of the region left Livonian War (1558–1583). One of the most prominent Latvian expert of humanists’ era Arnolds Spekke

wrote about that time: “One can say that this epoch is almost uninterrupted external or internal war”.⁴ In the fundamental study “History of Latvia” the same Spekke together with historian Edgars Dunsdorfs characterized era by the following: “War with Ivan the Terrible drying up of the Livonian forces. Ivan the Terrible was unable to realize his intention to conquer Livonia, but the land was devastated and state of Livonia ceased to exist”.⁵

But some turbulences already came to Riga and Livonia some decades earlier. A significant turning point was the Reformation that culminated in Calendar revolts in 1584, but started already in twenties. Riga among other Livonian cities became a significant stronghold for Protestantism. Luther was a fierce supporter of such success in his letters still preserved in the libraries of Riga. The fundamentals of the Livonian State of Order were crushed by Moscovia. Afterwards Riga was a free city for 20 years, but in 1581 it was incorporated in the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth and the so called Polish times begun. King Stephan Batory, Chancellor Jan Zamoyski and other commonwealth noblemen left a certain impact on Humanist activities in Riga. But in general the atmosphere in the land which had been devastated by the war was not too lively. Many inhabitants criticised trade impediments, others – the disrupted connections with the Holy Roman Empire. Under these circumstances the conceptions about humanity, which was united in one world, about a world without borders, with these ideas being firmly rooted in the antiquity, were a safe haven for searching souls.

Regarding the universal character of humanism, the Latin language as a tool for communication and thinking, as well as the predilection for antiquity, with which an uninterrupted continuity was felt, it can be questioned if there is a reason to talk about some particular movement that could be called the humanism of Riga. This notion appeared in the first encyclopaedic articles and was emphasised in the studies written in German in the 19th century. It is known and used in contemporary studies in German, but is not to be found in English. Issues about humanism in Baltic region until now is very poorly integrated in Anglophone research tradition in general, because Livonian Neo-Latinity is mostly connected with German cultural space. One can also come across such expressions as “the so called Livonian humanists”⁶ and “humanists of Livonia”⁷. It must be noted that only a few humanists, who were active in Riga, had a long-lasting connection with this city.

Because of that, it is not possible to define one specific idea or show a manifesto, which could be attributed to the humanists of Riga in general. One could say that the notion “the humanists of Riga” mark a particular place of activity for several people, however at the same time the most prominent humanists of Riga Basilius Plinius, Augustinus Eucaedius, Cigler (Zigler), incomers in Riga Frenzelius, Daniel Hermann etc. with the help of the characteristic arsenal of expression and imagery of humanism, created a specific narrative about the place and time, in which the tension between the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation was depicted, as well as the multicultural environment, representing the complex past and unclear future, and the borderline feeling of the inhabitants of Riga, that they were living in the utmost outskirts of the civilised world.

The spread of the ideas of humanism in a favourable environment was related to three essential events: the establishing of a library, the establishing of a printing house and the reform of the Dome School. Of great significance were the Polish noblemen who were interested in the life of Riga—the Rigans got involved in the intellectual and educational activities of the Polish courts. Though, it lasted only at the times of Stephen Báthory (King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania 1576–1586) Sigismund the Third (monarch of the united Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth from 1587 to 1632, and King of Sweden, where he is known simply as *Sigismund*, from 1592 until he was deposed in 1599) held a much more dogmatic position in relation to education and the generation of Humanists had already gone their separate ways, had become old or had died.

The beginning of humanist activities coincided with the movement of the Reformation. From the outset, the changes were mostly brought about by religious practices but over the course of time broader secular humanist trends could be seen in the Neo-Latinist literature and education circles. The historian of Latvia's culture Ojārs Zanders⁸ points out that “Humanism in Riga in the first half of 16th century is closely connected with the movement of Reformation. One of the first Riga humanist was Burchard Waldis”⁹. Nevertheless, former Franciscan monk and later convinced protestant Waldis with his activity in the field of religious propaganda and with his literary work (first schooldrama in Riga) gave fresh impact on cultural life of Riga, in general he remained aloof, since his writing German and in Neo-Latin literature did not take a part. Historian of Baltic German literature Gero von Wilpert mentions that “Paul Oderborn alongside church hymnals in German has written a Latin biography of Ivan the Terrible”¹⁰. There are another examples, too.

As regards the institutional developments in Riga, the 16th century was favourable to the humanist mind-set. Several important institutions were founded, for instance, a public library and a printing house. The Riga Dome School was reformed as well. All these changes transformed Riga into the most significant cultural and educational centre in the entire Livonia—until 1632 when the University of Tartu was established. At that moment the centre of intellectual activities shifted towards the North. Riga regained its status as the centre of economy and trade; however, the Neo-Latinists were active throughout the entire 17th century and even thereafter.

Quite later, in the 19th century the issue of a university in Riga was debated again. It was eventually established but as a technical university. Despite the strong humanist heritage that was still felt in the intellectual circles of Riga even in the 17th and 18th centuries, it was only in the 20th century, when the independent state of Latvia was founded and Riga saw a classical university open its doors in 1919. In the framework of the newly established institution the local humanist heritage became a natural source of scholastic interest. This material was researched thoroughly by professor Arnolds Spekke who brought the humanist texts into international circulation in German¹¹ and in French¹² and also translated them into Latvian¹³ thus making them available to a wider readership.

Unfortunately, this dynamic work was terminated when the Soviet Union seized Latvia during the Second World War. Professor Spekke left the country and continued

Autortiesību ierobežojumu dēļ
attēls nav pieejams.

Panorama of Riga. Academic Library of the University of Latvia, Department of Manuscripts and Rare Books. Brotze Monumente. R4965

his research in exile but, as he was deprived of the archives, his work for the most part exhibits journalistic features not grounded on academic research. In the occupied Latvia, due to ideological constraints, Neo-Latinist studies were completely excluded from scholarship and only in the cultural and historical contexts of the 1970s the material was slowly brought back into the scientific discourse. At first Ojārs Zanders included mostly informative data in his research. Yet, broader scholarly work and translations became possible only after 1991, when the independence of the state was regained.

Now, coming back to Riga as the intellectual and cultural capital of the Hyperboreans in the second half of the 16th century, it is necessary and worthwhile to examine the institutional activities that enabled Riga—be it only a half of a century—to become a

Autortiesību ierobežojumu dēļ
attēls nav pieejams.

significant centre for humanist activities. At that time, not only the locals that were interested in the topic came to the fore, but also various Western humanists settled down here and shared their rich experience with significant educational and cultural centres of that time. Thus, it is necessary to examine the importance of the Library of Riga, the Riga Cathedral School and the Riga printing house.

The Library of Riga

Usually 6 March 1524 is mentioned as an inception date of the Library of Riga, when Councilman Paul Dreiling handed a small collection of books from monasteries “to serve the public good” to the priest of a Latvian parish Nicholaus Ramm. It must be noted, however, that there is somewhat less appealing background that predates the founding

of the Library of Riga because one cannot say that before 1524 books were not to be found in Riga. It is plausible that the libraries of monasteries had accumulated rather rich collections. We do not know their fate in the turmoil of the Reformation but still it is a significant fact that the little amount of books that had remained of that collection was brought to the funds of the public library and marked a new and important turning point in the intellectual life of the city because, no matter how rich the monastery libraries had been, their collections were not available to laymen and other outsiders. Among the key characteristics of the Riga Library can be mentioned such features as the public collection, which provided a possibility to accumulate the works of Western humanists and make them accessible to everyone interested; the basic collection, which grew larger from contributions; and the books, which were mainly written on theological and philosophical issues, with some exceptions on medicine.

The printing house of Riga

In 1588 a typographer of Dutch origin Nicolaus Mollinus started working in Riga.¹⁴ His printing house became an essential factor for the spread of humanist works, though there was an opposition from the practically-minded Rigans towards his intellectual intentions to establish a printing house. The council of Riga delayed as far as possible the opening of the printing house and only the opening of a printing house in Vilnius and the inflow of Catholic works which endangered the life of Riga made the Council change its mind. Historian Jānis Straubergs wrote: “The establishment of this printing house would have been delayed even more, if the fight against Jesuits did not force the Rigans to pay the utmost attention to their own cultural institutions, thus creating a counterforce to catholic aggression, which was fostered by the earlier founded printing house in Vilnius.”¹⁵ A fervent enthusiast and promoter of the Riga printing house was the legal counsellor of the Riga Council, David Hilchen. Baltic German scholar of 19th century Arend Buchholz wrote about Hilchen: “It is the merit of the Riga City Council and mainly of its secretary general and, later, its legal counsellor David Hilchen, that Riga printing house was founded.”¹⁶

Until 1625 the output of the Riga printing house amounted to 160 books. From a contemporary perspective it could seem very little, but for a town where no books had ever been printed before this was a real explosion in terms of the literary production. Out of these, 117 were printed in Latin and, interestingly, already in 1615 three books were printed in Latvian.¹⁷ This is quite an inconspicuous but an important turning point in the Livonian political and cultural landscape.

This printing house also contributed to the publication of educational literature, for instance, Greek and Latin study books. The printing house also published works by humanists from Riga and Livonia, and a considerable part among these was formed by collections of occasional poetry. Hence, the activity of the printing house significantly and permanently influenced the life of the city dwellers. The role this institution played

in the city life, as well as its curriculum can be assessed from the materials printed for the Riga Dome School.

The Dome School

The works printed in the printing house allowed to get acquainted with the events at the Riga Dome School. During the surges of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation the work of the school was impeded. The city of Riga sought to maintain an education of a high quality at the school, so that its graduates would be useful employees to the City Council, diplomatic relations area and private businesses. During the troubling times of the 16th century there was a repeated proposal to convert the Dome School into a university, but it was rejected on the basis that the students were too promiscuous and noisy. The five-year school with a hard discipline was completely satisfactory for the needs of Riga. The study language was Latin and the 1594 Mollinus' edition of *Orationes tres* is a great example of the Humanistic tendencies. These speeches were given on the occasion of the school reforms and the authors were Nicolaus von Ecke, David Hilchen and Johann Rivius.

It must be emphasized, though, that the key component to the Riga humanist phenomenon was the active, creative, altruistic and enthusiastic people. They brought the ideas of humanism to Riga dwellers, the winds of change started to blow on the eastern shores of the Baltic region, and with their Latin works they told the stories about Riga, its people and history to the rest of the world.

Personae

The form of gathering and conversations of the Riga humanists is not possible to restore. At those times there were no fancy restaurants, only wine and beer cellars, that perhaps served as places for informal gatherings, thus assumptions can be made about *otium* in Riga from the impressions in the poetry of humanists. Formal gatherings were held at the town hall, where some of them were councilmen, or at the Dome School, where some of them were teachers. Part of the humanists were immigrants, some, on the other hand, went abroad and some even never returned, some of them were born Rigans, and some found a safe shelter in Riga in their old age.

As regards the most influential figures both in terms of their textual work and impact on the city life, two generations can be distinguished. In the first generation the religious enthusiast Burchard Waldis, school rector Jacobus Batus, both of them newcomers; poet Augustus Eucaedius; school rector and poet Heinrich von Berg can be mentioned. These authors worked while the Livonian state still existed and in their work one can feel the radical geopolitical shock waves in the Catholic Order State brought about both by the precursors of the Reformation and also the imminent proximity of external, mainly Eastern, enemies. Most of the oeuvre of these authors consisted of occasional poetry

but there were also various large poems on Livonian topics, for example, the poem by Eucaedius was reprinted in the 18th century and quite recently saw the light in a Latvian translation.¹⁸ The author and his work are now being researched by several scholars, for example, Lora Poelchau.¹⁹ Another voluminous work dedicated to Livonia but not yet brought back into the light is *Oratio de Laudibus Livoniae* by Heinrich von Berg. In general, the authors of this first period remind of the first swallows in a harsh winter. It is significant that Humanism flourished at the end of the 16th century and at the beginning of the 17th following the collapse of the Livonian state when the Livonians were still unsure about their political future and when the territory of disintegrated state turned into a coveted bite in the conflicts among the new great powers, Lithuania and Poland, Sweden and Russia.

As regards the second generation in the late 16th century when some united and organized activities could be observed due to the changes in the public life of the city, there were David Hilchen, an indigenous nobleman, diplomat and politician, a leading figure in humanists activities, but due to the controversies of his activities expelled from the city; Johann Rivius, Daniel Hermann and Salomon Frenzelius, excellent humanists from Western Europe, who spent the end of their lives in Riga; Basilius Plinius, the most famous Riga indigenous Neo-Latin poet; Georg Ciegler (Ziegler), on his way from Reval to Königsberg spent about fifteen years in Riga, wrote both in Latin and German, receiving special attention to his work *Weltspiegel* – first edition in German was published in 1599, in Latin two editions in 1598 and 1599, followed by translation in Swedish in 1620 and in Dutch in 1663 and other edition in German so mirroring dialectics between Neo-Latin and vernacular languages as well.

Works

Numerous cases of occasional poetry can be encountered among the works of the local humanists. The printed speeches play a significant role in the organization of the city life. There are some philosophical treatises and descriptions of empirical studies presented at times with a symbolic layer. Only a few of the publications circulate among wider audiences. From the perspective of Latvian cultural history and the reception of antiquity in terms of local peculiarities, the most exciting part of the humanists' heritage is poetry. Two works have been translated and published as facsimiles and have lately raised scholarly interest as well—*Aulaeum Dunaidum*²⁰ by Augustinus Eucaedius and *Encomium inclitae civitatis Rigae metropolis Livoniae*²¹ by Basilius Plinius. Most of the attention has been drawn to Basilius Plinius. In 1927 Arnolds Spekke published Plinius' poem with a broad commentary in German. In the dawn of the 20th century he, looking on to the future of classical education with optimistic illusions, did not translate the poem. A facsimile version with translations in Latvian, Russian, German and English was published in 1997. In this edition there were numerous historical and philological essays but it lacked thorough commentaries. Another approach can be seen in the edition of Eucaedius' poem. The poem was a monument for the Livonian Riga, archbishops of Riga being the main subject of

the poem. This edition consisted of a facsimile of the original poem, a Latvian rendition in verse, commentaries, an introductory essay and an epilogue, edited by Brigita Cīrule.

The 21st century has been kind to the Riga humanists. Owing to digitalization, the speed of modern means of transportation and increased academic cooperation opportunities the heritage of the Riga humanists is now a focus of various scholarly activities in various contexts. Still, a relatively large part of the material is not mapped, the interaction of the 17th century vernacular traditions in particular²².

The 17th century saw a rapid and dynamic upsurge of Latvian, Estonian and Baltic German literary traditions. A new generation of authors has been raised with the humanist tradition but it already has a different *Weltanschauung*. The period of tradition transfer and transformation will be an area of future research. Today, the heritage of the Riga humanists is a subject of research in doctoral studies in Latvia, Estonia and Germany, thus raising hopes for many new discoveries and revelations.

Notes

- ¹ IJsewijn J. *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*. Leuven-Louvain: Leuven University Press–Peeters Press, 1990. P. 39.
- ² Ibid. P. 44.
- ³ Ibid.
- ⁴ Spekke A. *Latvieši un Livonija 16. gs.* Rīga: Zinātne, 1995. 133. lpp.
- ⁵ Dunsdorfs E., Spekke, A. *Latvijas vēsture. 16. gadsimts*. Stokholma: Daugava. 1964. 110. lpp.
- ⁶ Misāne A., Priedīte A. National Mythology in the History of Ideas in Latvia. In: Hosking G., Schöpflin G. (Eds.) *Myths and Nationhood*. New York: Routledge, 1997. P. 168.
- ⁷ Apskats. *Izglītības Ministrijas Mēnešraksts*. 1926. Nr. 7., 58. lpp.
- ⁸ Sander or Sanders in German language publications: Sander O. Bibliotheka Rigensis und ihre Bücher. 15. bis 18. Jahrhundert. *Nord-Ost Archiv*. 1995. Nr. 4. S. 203.–211.
- ⁹ Zanders O. *Tipogrāfs Mollīns un viņa laiks*. Rīga: Zinātne, 1988. 126. lpp.
- ¹⁰ Wilpert G. *Deutschbaltische Literaturgeschichte*. München: Beck. 2005. S. 56.
- ¹¹ Spekke A. *Alt-Riga im Lichte eines humanistischen Lobgedichts von Jahre 1595*. Rīga: Drück von W. F. Häcker, 1927.
- ¹² Spekke A. L'influence italienne sur la côte orientale de la Baltique avant et pendant la Renaissance. *Latvijas Universitātes Raksti. Filoloģijas un filozofijas fakultātes sērija*. 1935. Nr. 1. P. 33.–57.
- ¹³ Spekke A. Rīgas humānista Basilijs Plinija poēma "Par vējiem". *Latvju grāmata*. 1924. Nr. 4. 423.–431. lpp.
- ¹⁴ More detailed excursus one can find in: Sander O. Nicolaus Mollin, der erste Rigaer Drucker. Sein Schaffen in Riga von 1588 bis 1625. *Stadt und Lieteratur im deutschen Sprachraum der früher Neuzeit*. Hg. von K. Garber et al. Tübingen: Niemeyer. 1998. S. 786.–800. This article is based on monograph in Latvian: Zanders O. *Tipogrāfs Mollīns un viņa laiks*.
- ¹⁵ Strauberģs J. Latvijas pirmās grāmatu spiestuves 350 gadu atcerei. *Sējējs*. 1940. Nr. 1. 17. lpp.
- ¹⁶ Buchholz A. *Geschichte der Buchdruckerkunst in Riga 1588–1888*. Rīga: [n.p.], 1890. S.15.
- ¹⁷ Ibid.
- ¹⁸ Eicēdijs A. *Daugavas paklājs*. B. Cīrules priekšvārds. Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 2014.
- ¹⁹ Poelchau L. Auf den Spuren einer lateinischen Dichtung im Livland des 16. Jahrhunderts. *Syntagmatia. Essays on Neo-Latin Literature in Honour of Monique Mund-Dopchie and Gilbert Tournoy*. Leuven-Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2009. S. 345.–353.
- ²⁰ First edition in 1564 in Wittenberg.
- ²¹ First edition in 1595 in Leipzig.
- ²² Cf. Svēlpis A. Daži aktuāli Latvijas kultūras mantojuma izpētes aspekti. *Karogs*. 1989. Nr. 4. 133. lpp.

Ojārs Lāms

Kas tie tādi – Rīgas humānisti: vispārīgs ievads fenomenā

Kopsavilkums

Atslēgvārdi: humānisms, Rīgas humānisti, neolatinītāte un literatūra, izglītība, grāmatu izdošana

Humānisms Baltijas austrumu krastu un Livonijas (tagadējās Latvijas un Igaunijas teritoriju) sasniedza vēlīni salīdzinājumā ar neolatiniskā humānisma uzplaukumu Rietumeiropā, bet veicināja nozīmīgus kultūras un izglītības procesus reģionā, nodrošināja ģeopolitisko pārmaiņu un cīņu laikā Livonijas zemju palikšanu Rietumu kultūra lokā, neraugoties uz svārstveida pārbīdēm teritorijas saimnieku ziņā.

Rakstā sniegts vispārīgs humānisma reģionālo izpausmju raksturojums, koncentrējoties uz jēdziena “Rīgas humānisti” saturu un tām kultūras norisēm, kas 16. gadsimta otrajā pusē un 16./17. gadsimta mijā Rīgu padara par nozīmīgu kultūras un izglītības procesu centru.

Humānisma izpausmes Rīgas dzīvē aplūkotas diahronā aspektā, iezīmējot divu secīgu paaudžu devumu humānisma ideālu izplatībā un neolatiniskās literatūras kā būtiskākā šo ideālu nesēja tradīciju tapšanā. Uzmanība pievērsta arī institucionālajam aspektam, jo humānisma ideju izplatību un literāro izpausmju uzplaukumu lielā mērā nodrošina pilsētas jaunās izglītības un kultūras dzīve institūcijas – izveidotā bibliotēka un tipogrāfija, kā arī reformētā Domskola.

Tomēr kā galvenais dzinulis humānisma ideju un literāro izpausmju izplatībai raksturota aizrautīgu un dedzīgu iesaistīto cilvēku kopa, kas pragmatiski orientētajā tirdzniecības un varas pilsētā rada gluži jaunu atmosfēru. Raksta noslēgumā dots īss pārskats par aktuālākajiem Rīgas humānistu mantojuma pētījumiem dažādās pasaules augstskolās un arī tulkojumiem latviešu valodā, kas latīņu valodā sacerētos tekstus padara pieejamus arī mūsdienu lasītājiem.

Gita Bērziņa, Brigita Cīrule

The Classical Basis of Education at Riga Dome School during the 16th and 17th Centuries

Keywords: Riga Dome School, humanism, education, classical values

It is a well known fact that classical heritage with its manifold ideas and values is at the basis of humanism and without it this intellectual movement cannot be imagined. Considering *studia humanitatis* as the highest manifestation of intellectual gratification and human esteem, as well as the way of life saturated with moral/ethical activity, humanists based themselves on the acquisition of classical languages and cultural values of antiquity. They indulged in studying texts of ancient Greek philosophers, orators, prose and poetry texts of classical authors, as well as the Holy script.

Changes in intellectual life spreading across Europe during the 15th and 16th centuries reached also its Northern territories and were disseminated in Livonia and its metropolis Riga during the 16th century. It can rightly be admitted that humanism ideas having found perceptive hearts and minds flourished also in Livonia though on a different, narrower scale. The new world view seems to have taken roots gradually but its impact on the intellectual life of Riga was manifest as it promoted several intellectual activities, namely, the first city library *Bibliotheca Rigensis* was founded (1524), book printing was introduced (1588), a variety of Latin and Greek texts were created and efforts to perfect education were taken.

The Reformation with its domain of strong centres of humanistic education in Europe also left its impact as it gave impulse to transform the character of education in Riga which gradually became the greatest centre providing humanistic education in Livonia due to the Dome School.¹ Favourable conditions were created for the advance of education giving classics an important place in the curriculum of Riga Dome School. Thus, humanistic education based on the acquisition of classical texts fostered the dissemination of European cultural identity also in this part of Europe. The aim of the present paper is to indicate how classical values and ideas found their place at Riga Dome School in the 16th and the 17th centuries.

Riga Dome School has a long history. Gotthard Schweder connects its beginnings with a parish school that was opened in one of the aisles of the Cathedral of Virgin Mary in Riga soon after it was built in 1211. Since then, the school had undergone significant changes, especially in the 16th century. In 1528, the city of Riga—which was now predominantly Protestant—took charge of this oldest and most popular school in Riga, and transformed it into a protestant school.²

Educated, illustrious persons from European centres, whose humanistic education acquired in the greatest universities of Europe undoubtedly determined the classically oriented course the school was to follow, arrived in Riga to hold the post of rector at the Dome School, and quite often also books from their libraries travelled the distance from European cities to Riga. All this enhanced the quality of education, but it should be admitted that the transformation of the school from Catholic to Protestant and the saturation of it with classical disciplines was not an easy task and it took quite a long period because rectors had to lead the Dome School through political and confessional conflicts, as well as the wars and plagues of the 16th century. However, at the very end of the century after the reorganization, the school was highly successful and could duly boast of being a school, which provides a good humanistic education.

An important role in establishing classical pedagogical traditions at the Dome School was played by Jacob Batt (*Jacobus Battus*), a native of the Netherlands who had studied in Leuven, Paris and Spain. In 1528, Jacob Batt came to Riga from Wittenberg with recommendations from Luther and Melanchthon to become the first rector of the Protestant Dome School (1528–1542).³ Most likely the school in his day followed the principles worked out by Melanchthon who is known to have established the foundations for instruction at many humanistic schools in Europe. Jānis Krēsliņš pays attention to the fact that Melanchthon's *Loci communes* could be found everywhere in Northern Europe. The *Loci communes* of Melanchthon with its many editions was not merely an important textbook in the Lutheran system of education. It was also a policy statement and a curriculum. No education was regarded complete, if this work, which Luther in his *Tischreden* considered as the most important work after the *Bible*, was not included.⁴

Jacob Batt's role in laying a sound foundation for the growth of the school as a humanistic educational establishment cannot be overestimated since he was a keen advocate of ancient culture. Consequently, classical studies became dominant at the Dome School. Such subjects as Latin, Greek and Hebrew first were taught at a three-year gymnasium.⁵ It is known that towards the end of his life, Jacob Batt donated his private library containing many works from classical antiquity, to the Dome School—works by Homer, Herodotus, Aristotle, Plutarch, Lucian, Hippocrates, Galen, Ptolemy, Livy, Caesar, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Pliny, etc.⁶ Thus, he was among those who contributed to the dissemination of works of ancient authors in Livonia.

Humanistic spirit seems to have been enhanced also by poets-humanists who at times took up the post of rector at the Dome School, for example, Rotger Becker (*Rutgerus Pistorius*) was the rector of the school in the middle of the century (1545–1554). Bernhard Hollander supposes that Jacob Batt could have invited him to Riga as early as in 1540 to take up the post of sub-rector.⁷ Later, Becker's *Epicedion*⁸ was composed to commemorate Jacob Batt's death. Another poet-humanist was Hermann Wilchen also known as Wilikandus. He had been recommended by Melanchthon, and came to Riga in 1552. First he served as a teacher of Latin and Theology, and he was the rector from 1554 until 1561.⁹ When Hermann Wilchen was forced to leave the Lutheran Riga because he somehow gradually

had become a follower of Calvinism, he moved to Heidelberg where he became a professor of Greek philosophy at the Heidelberg University, but in 1569 he became the rector of this university.¹⁰

Gradually, the Dome School headed by prominent persons became the higher Latin school in Livonia teaching Ancient Literature, works by the Middle Age enlighteners, Grammar, Metrics, Mathematics, as well as the basics of classical languages, later on also such subjects as Physics, History and Geography. However, its growth was now and then hindered by inner disturbances and wars imposed from the outside. The mid-16th century in Livonia was marked by constant conflicts that created serious obstacles for the growth of the school. Historically, this period is marked by political conflicts caused by the Livonian War that lasted for twenty-five years (1558–1582). As regards inner conflicts, the Dome School was drawn also into the rivalry between several political movements then raging in Riga. The school seems to have avoided direct involvement in these conflicts—it is known that its reaction took an artistic turn. Gotthard Schweder mentions that these political controversies were ridiculed in a Latin drama with a seemingly innocent title “The Fight of the Horatii and the Curatii for Alba Longa”. This play, with political connotations, was written by rector Georg Marsow (1565–1578), and staged in 1576.¹¹ Actually, it can be characterized as quite a *classical* way of reacting to events taking place in society.

On the one hand, political disturbances hindered the growth of the school; on the other hand, a certain benefit was derived because they seem to have given an impulse to the development of dramatic art at the Dome School. Extant texts provide evidence of it. For example, Basilius Plinius, a 16th century poet-humanist, in his poem *Encomion civitatis Rigae* mentions plays staged by the school. As can be seen from the poem, the climax was apparently reached during the time of rector Stephan Teuthorn (1580–1583, 1589–1615), whose activities are betrayed by two lines from the poem in which he is described as a man who:

*comica cum structis praebet spectacula scenis
qui tenet ingenuae virgea scepra scholae.*¹² (Plinius *Encomium* 877–878)

Towards the end of the century, Riga was subjected to the reign of Poland (1582) and another important event—the Counter-Reformation started. In Riga, inner conflicts manifested themselves as growing disputes between the City Council and the citizens. The Dome School again responded to the situation in the city, especially when Heinrich Meller (Heinrich Möller) became the rector of the Dome School (1583–1588).¹³ During the five years Heinrich Meller was the rector, the Dome School was involved in conflicts, which were caused by the introduction of the Gregorian calendar. The decision of the City Council to adopt the new calendar had led to discontent among the citizens of Riga. Rector Meller regarded it as a curb on Protestantism, and he held his Christmas service at the school according to the old calendar—in his sermon on this occasion he ardently attacked the innovation. All this led to unrest known in history as the Calendar Revolts in 1584. Apparently, the situation at the Dome School in terms of the behaviour of pupils was not

Autortiesību ierobežojumu dēļ
attēls nav pieejams.

satisfactory because the rector Heinrich Meller is known to have compiled a small ethical anthology of instructions dealing with school regulations, some of them in verse, during this time. Unfortunately, Heinrich Meller was made to leave Riga soon after the Calendar Revolts.

This booklet of ethical instructions vividly reflects the reception and acquisition of classical values at the Dome School. As one of the first books it was printed at Nicolas Mollyn's (*Nicolaus Mollinus*)¹⁴ printing shop in 1589, under the title *Libellus ethicus*.¹⁵ These are the oldest ethical instructions written in Latin for the use of Riga Dome School. Poems, orations, maxims and *sententiae* of various authors on the virtues of pupils are added. At the beginning there are some verse lines by poet Claudian on the utility of ethics, and one can see there an interesting figurine of a woman in wood-carving technique on the opposite side of the title-leaf—she is holding a mirror in one of her hands and compasses in the other.

The booklet contains school regulations devised by German humanist Adam Siber (*Leges scholasticae Adami Siberi*). In more than one hundred and a half verse lines pupils are urged to observe piety and display veneration, to be obedient and honour parents at home and to be polite and diligent at school.

There are reflections by other authors on virtues of pupils, for example, by poet Nicolas Bourbon (*Nicolaus Borbonius*) (*Carmen de moribus puerorum*, and *Paraenesis de officio pii ac diligentis scholastici*). *Carmen Borbonii* consists of more than 300 elegiac lines, and it gives a lot of instructions many of them quite practical, but *Paraenesis* is a prose text which also abounds in instructions how to start a day, how to behave at school, how to observe modesty, but some of them are offered as *sententiae*, e.g., *Legere enim et non intelligere, negligere est*.

Some of Cicero's maxims are also added under the title *Sententiae Ciceronianae, puerorum ingeniis, moribus atque studiis recte formandis accomodatae* as well as *Oratio Ciceronis Pro Archia poeta*. Cicero's maxims are short quotations selected from various Cicero's writings and they cover different fields, e.g., philosophy which is *dux vitae*, literature studies so important in human life because they, as said by Cicero—*adulescentiam alunt, senectutem oblectant, secundas res ornant, adversis perfugium ac solacium praebent, delectant domi, non impediunt foris, pernoctant nobiscum, peregrinantur, rusticantur* (Cicero *Pro Archia poeta* 7.16. 36-40). Also maxims on memory which is *thesaurus omnium rerum*, on diligence—*diligentia in omnibus rebus plurimum valet*, on liberty which is *potestas vivendi*, also on virtue, on human dignity, on the power of conscience, and many other.

The booklet ends with *Oratiuncula Arnoldi Burenii de literarum humanitatis dignitate et usu, Rostochii habita*, which permits to think that such school regulations were characteristic of the period in the humanistic schools of Europe.

All the texts included in *Libellus ethicus* in one or another way reflect such ideas as human esteem, human potential, the potential for creative growth of individuals, the harmony of physical and mental growth, human progress and personal liberty. These values

were very common and understandable in antiquity, but neglected and lost during the Middle Ages. In the age of humanism and consequently at Riga Dome School they raised an undivided interest.

The school managed to survive through different collisions, and to flourish after the reorganization at the end of the century. The Jesuit College which was founded in Riga in 1583 also played a role in the conflict between the City Council and the Dome School's rector Meller. The activities of the Jesuits in Riga in the mid-80s of the 16th century led to concern in the City Council, which now risked losing control over education. This risk was very real, since European universities, too, demanded higher standards for their new students, and the citizens of Riga were no longer satisfied with the results obtained at the Dome School.

Thus, it was necessary to reorganize the school. Reorganization took place in 1594 under the guidance of two educated men (scholarchs)—David Hilchen, the syndic, and Nicolaus Ecke, the burgomaster.¹⁶ They were both persons of great merit not only in the political history of Riga, but also in the cultural life of the city and of Livonia. Nicolaus Ecke was the burgomaster of Riga, he defended the interests of Poland, and consequently, he had an important role in the Calendar Revolts. But David Hilchen having acquired education in the universities of several German cities such as Tübingen, Ingelstadt and Heidelberg was a famous public figure in Riga, a lawyer and a man of letters. He had held such posts as the secretary of the Polish king, the notary of Livonia land court, the syndic of Riga (1589–1600); he was the author of the *Liefländische Landrechte und Constitutiones*, and he was the chief promoter of the activities of Riga humanists and of the intellectual life in Riga in general at the end of the 16th century.¹⁷ The printing shop, enriching of the city library and the reorganization of the Dome School would have hardly been possible without his direct help.

In order to reorganize the school, Nicolaus Ecke and David Hilchen already in 1589, when Stephan Teuthorn became the rector of the school for his second period, asked Johann Rivius (*Johannes Rivius*) to become the inspector of the Dome School.¹⁸ Before working at the Leipzig University, he had been the rector of Halle Gymnasium but later he became a private teacher of the sons of the voivode of Trakai Jan Hlebovitch and of the duke of Courland Gotthard Ketler (Friedrich and Wilhelm later became dukes).¹⁹

There were three aspects to the reorganization of the Dome School: firstly, the three-year gymnasium was transformed into a five-year Latin school, secondly, a school curriculum was established, and, thirdly, school results were improved, thus preparing pupils for university studies. This reorganization started the transition of the school into the status of an academic gymnasium (1631).

The opening festivities of the reorganized Dome school took place on July 18, 1594, with speeches by David Hilchen, Nicolaus Ecke and Johann Rivius. These speeches, together with a detailed instruction programmes and curricula were later printed in a special collection under the title *Orationes tres*.²⁰ We need not emphasize the importance of this

Autortiesību ierobežojumu dēļ
attēls nav pieejams.

“Orationes tres: e quibus duae honoratissima dignitate”, Academic Library of the University of Latvia, Department of Manuscripts and Rare Books. R2048

publication for the history of the Dome School: here the three speakers set out the future tasks and aims of the school.

Nicolaus Ecke began his speech by reminding his listeners of the merits of the past, of those who had gone before—*maiores nostri, quorum memoria sit in benedictione*. According to him, the task of the school was to train the pupils in piety and wisdom, so that the City Council and the citizens might rejoice in school leavers who are, as said by Ecke, *non modo literati, sed etiam moribus exculiti atque elegantes*.

David Hilchen in his speech *De magistratus, parentum, praeceptorum in educandis liberis atque adolescentum in studiis opimarum artium officio: quodque omnibus fere idem sit scopus, sed non idem tropus*, in his turn, saw intelligence/wisdom and eloquence (*sapientia et eloquentia*) as the aim of education and training. He says: *Duo sunt, quae in homine, ut homo est atque ut huius divini animalis conditio postulat, principaliter desiderantur. Unum quidem, ut sapiat, alterum vero, polite ut eloquatur*. If this aim is to be fulfilled, the City Council, the parents, pupils and teachers must all attend to definite duties and undertake definite obligations. The City Council takes care of the school in bounden duty, and therefore it may rightfully demand understanding from school as well as the homes. The homes must beware lest they hinder or altogether destroy what the school has exerted itself to create.

Johann Rivius addressed the meeting as the third speaker (*De coniungendis philosophiae studiis et cognitione multiplici rerum cum studio eloquentiae: sive de conjungenda sapientia et*

eloquentia). His rhetorically elaborated speech was most vivid and suggestive since Rivius having discussed the particular significance of religion and Church in the introduction further reminded his listeners about the values of classical heritage which were to be acquired in the reorganized school. Rivius emphasized *pietas*, *honestas* and *erudita doctrina* as important qualities and discussed the role of speech in disclosing human character and education. He, in a truly Ciceronian manner, insisted on the union of philosophy and rhetoric, on close union of good, honourable content and perfect and magnificent form. Rivius demanded diligence, and advocated the study of Plato and Aristotle, because *ex tractatione literarum, quibus ingenium excolitur, conciliatur ista quam quaerimus cordis et linguae coniunctio*.

Rivius ardently and in great detail speaks about skilful, impressive speech qualities, emphatically and widely resorting to ancient sources, quoting ancient authors, for instance, Horace and Juvenal, and mentioning Pericles, Demosthenes and, of course, Cicero (*sapientiae et eloquentiae Romanae parens*) as ideals to be followed and imitated.

Thus, the collection *Orationes tres* provides us with a fairly clear picture of the important values to be pursued by the renovated Dome School, the pursuit of eloquence being the cornerstone, as said by Jānis Krēslīņš, was an on-going process, which had the harmonious union of wisdom and style as its goal.²¹ Hanna H. Gray admits that for the humanistic tradition of the Renaissance education was as a pursuit of eloquence, which had to be divorced from its pejorative associations. Eloquence was not an empty pomposity, a wilful mendacity, a love of display for its own sake, an extravagant artificiality or a singular lack of originality.²²

Not only the speeches but also the subjects taught at the school display this pursuit. As we can see from the extant school curriculum included in the collection *Orationes tres*, the subjects were varied, and they betray the influence of European humanistic schools. The acquisition of religious and classical disciplines seems to have been equally important. The pupils were expected to learn the Catechism in both, German and Latin, as well as to study extracts from the Gospels and the Psalms.

However, great attention was also paid to language studies, for example, German, Latin and Greek. During the first year of studies, pupils mastered writing and reading skills in German, but later Latin and Greek became the core subjects to be acquired. Also the syntax, etymology and prosody of Latin and Greek were learned by pupils. The study of classical authors included such Greek authors as Homer, Theognis, Sophocles, Xenophon, Isocrates, Demosthenes, Lucian, Plutarch, and Theocritus, while the Latin authors on the syllabus were Livy, Caesar, Cicero, Tacitus, Sallust, Terence, Virgil, and Ovid. The predominance of Greek and Latin is obvious; purely practical subjects are not mentioned in the curriculum.

A more detailed account of the curriculum of the Dome School would require a separate discussion. But there can be no doubt that this curriculum testifies to the level of classical studies achieved at the Dome School in the late 16th and early 17th century.

Books used in the process of studies provide evidence of the way the various disciplines were acquired, and of the importance of classical values proposed at the Dome School. It is known that the Latin language was studied according to Aelius Donatus's *Grammatices rudimenta*, but for the study of the Greek language, *Elementa linguae Graecae* by the Dome School conrector Thomas Hildendorph (published by Mollyn in 1594) was used.

One part of the books were brought from Europe, and another part of them were compiled and published in Riga. As, for example, the book *M. T. Ciceronis epistolarum libri tres*, which was compiled after the model of Johannes Sturm's *Epistolarum libri tres*, was published in Riga in 1614 for the needs of the Dome School.²³

The book contains texts well selected for the use in teaching process from different Cicero's letters to his family members, as well as to his friends, particularly to Atticus. There are simple, concise up to five lines long text fragments rich in ordinary phrases in the 1st book, up to longer fragments from two up to six pages, abounding in thought on various issues in the third book. Evidently, the collection was intended for teaching the Latin language, as well as for perfecting pupils' oratory and argumentation skills, as well as for the acquisition of theoretical propositions of this celebrated Roman orator.

Not only Cicero's epistles but also his orations were widely used in the process of studies. There is a collection *Decas orationum Ciceronis selectiorum*²⁴ comprising some of Cicero's orations in the Academic library of Riga. The collection was printed in Riga, in Schreder's printing shop in 1648. Cicero's most essential speeches are included in this collection, as, for example, *Pro A. Licinio Archia poeta*, *Pro M. Marcello*, *In L. Catilinam oratio I; IV*, *Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino*, *Pro T. Annio Milone*, *In M. Antonium Philippica secunda. Exordium*, and some other. These orations served as perfect examples for the Dome School pupils in the acquisition of rhetorical principles and for the improvement of their speaking skills.

Autortiesību ierobežojumu dēļ
attēls nav pieejams.

²³“M. T. Ciceronis epistolarum libri tres”, Academic Library of the University of Latvia, Department of Manuscripts and Rare Books. R2078



Autortiesību ierobežojumu dēļ
attēls nav pieejams.

“M. T. Ciceronis epistolarum libri tres”, Academic Library of the University of Latvia, Department of Manuscripts and Rare Books. R2078

The extant collections show that a great attention was paid also to the acquisition of prosody and the heritage of ancient poets. Such are, for example, *Prosodiae Latinae brevia praecepta, in usum Scholae Rigensis edita*, compiled by conrector A. Cuperus and printed by Mollyn (1623),²⁵ and a collection of selected Roman elegies by Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid *Loci communes*,²⁶ collected by Johannes Murmelius and used in teaching the Dome School pupils.

In the first book, one can find a thorough material acquainting pupils with significant issues of versification. It starts with short but at the same time exhaustive explanations of general conceptions of stress, syllable, sound, etc., and ends with a survey of figures, meters, verses.

For a better understanding, frequently a comparison with the Greek language is given, and persuasive quotations from various classical authors such as Catullus, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Martial and other, are added as an illustrative material.

But in the second collection *Loci communes*, one can find verse lines of three Roman elegiac poets selected for teaching purposes. Various essential thoughts are excelled there, and these thoughts are supposed as didactic instructions quite often in the form of

sententiae important for memorization. Further on they are illustrated by two up to six verse lines from such poets as Tibullus or Propertius, but most often from Ovid's *Amores*.

Some of the *sententiae* are more practical, some suggestive, for example, *puđicitia non est auro vendenda* (for illustration cited verse lines from Tibullus I); *opes non levant nos curis* (Tib. III); *foeminae sunt inconstantes* (Tib. III); *in puellis non est fides* (Ovidius *Amores*); *aliena ne cupias* (Ovidius *Heroides*); *laude & obsequio vincuntur homines* (Ovidius *Ars amatoria*); *aurum nunc in terris dominatur* (Propertius III); *nox, amor & vinum turpia suadent* (Ov. *Amor.* I); *poetica ars facit ad bonos mores; munera sunt grata; vim vi repellere licet* (Ov. *Ars am.*); *laudes vini* (Ov. *Ars am.*), but some of them tend to express a more general truth, for example, *utendum est florida aetate* (Tib. I), *fructus ante maturitatem non sunt carpendi; omnia mutantur; nihil homini est diuturnum* (Prop. II); *mors est inevitabilis* (Prop. III); *varias hominibus dotes natura distribuit* (Prop. III).

The selected ideas of classical authors, selected verse lines of Roman poets included in the collection obviously and vividly reveal life perception at the period and a purposeful actualization of classical values in teaching process in the late 16th and early 17th century.

In addition, mastering of versification principles and heritage studies of classical poets stimulated pupils to develop their own creativity, which later resulted in various artistic activities. They wrote and staged plays, they composed orations and poetry texts in both, Latin and Greek, on various solemn occasions. In doing so, they were concerned with classical heritage not for the sake of simple imitation, but because they sought to draw ethical and aesthetical ideals from the classical antiquity.

Although humanism in Riga did not last long and had a local character and even the educated noblemen valued political and mercantile interests higher than profound education or cultural aspirations, classical values, mastering of Greek and Latin, studies of ancient texts, views and thoughts, ideas, ethical and aesthetical ideals, derived from classical authors had their place in education processes of the region and particularly in pedagogical activities of Riga Dome School.

Notes

¹ For school organization in Livonia see also: Ćirule B. The Organization of Schools in the Century of the Reformation in Livonia. *Reformation and Latin Literature in Northern Europe*. Ed. by I. Ekrem, M. Skafte Jensen, E. Kraggerud. Oslo et al.: Scandinavian University Press, 1996. P. 98–105.

² For a detailed history of the Dome school see Schweder G. *Die alte Domschule und das daraus hervorgegangene Stadt-Gymnasium zu Riga*. Riga/Moskau: J. Deubner, 1910. S. 3–4.

³ Hollander B. *Geschichte der Domschule des späteren Stadtgymnasiums zu Riga*. Hannover: H. v. Hirschheydt, 1980. S. 5.

⁴ Krēslinš J. The Dissemination of the Latin Book in the Baltic Sea Region During the Sixteenth and the Seventeenth Century. *Mare Balticum Mare Nostrum, Latin in the Countries of the Baltic Sea Region (1500–1800)*. Ed. by O. Merisalo, R. Sarasti-Wilenius. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 1994. P. 111.

⁵ Arbusow L. *Die Einföhrung der Reformation in Liv-, Est- und Kurland*. Leipzig: Heinsius Nachfolger, 1921. S. 634, 666.

- ⁶ Buchholtz A. *Leben und Testament des Superintendenten Jacobus Battus. Sitzungsberichte der Gesellschaft für Geschichte und Alterthumskunde der Ostseeprovinzen Russlands aus dem Jahre 1876.* Riga: Müllersche Buchdruckerei, 1877. S. 12; Buchholtz A. *Geschichte der Buchdruckerkunst in Riga.* Riga: Müllersche Buchdruckerei, 1890. S. 11.
- ⁷ Hollander B. *Geschichte der Domschule.* S. 8.
- ⁸ Pistorius R. *Epicedion pii et eruditi viri Dn. Jacobi Batti, quondam Superattendentis Ecclesiae Rigensis in Livonia, cui obiter inserta est brevis commendatio urbis Rigae.* Lubecae: [n. p.], 1584.
- ⁹ Schweder G. *Die alte Domschule.* S. 63.
- ¹⁰ Stradiņš J. *Zinātnes un augstskolu sākotne Latvijā.* 2. izdevums. Rīga: Latvijas vēstures institūta apgāds, 2012. 108. lpp.
- ¹¹ Schweder G. *Die alte Domschule.* S. 6.
- ¹² *Bazīlija Plīnija Slavav dziesma Rīgai.* Rīga: Latvijas Kultūras fonds, Jumava, 1997.
- ¹³ Schweder G. *Die alte Domschule.* S. 7.
- ¹⁴ More about Nicolas Mollyn, the first book printer in Riga, see Zanders O. *Tipogrāfs Mollīns un viņa laiks: pirmās Rīgā iespiestās grāmatas.* Rīga: Zinātne, 1988.
- ¹⁵ *Libellus ethicus, scholasticae iuventutis conditioni et captui accommodatus, et in gratiam puerorum qui in Schola Rigensi informantur, collectus et seorsum editus. Adjectae sunt due orationes, altera Ciceronis, altera Burenii.* Rigae Livonum: Officina Typographica Nicolai Mollini, 1589.
- ¹⁶ Hollander B. *Geschichte der Domschule des späteren Stadtgymnasiums zu Riga.* S. 17–18.
- ¹⁷ More about David Hilchen, his driving out of Riga after a conflict with Nicolaus Ecke see Stradiņš J. *Zinātnes un augstskolu sākotne Latvijā.* 134.–135., 180. lpp.
- ¹⁸ Schweder G. *Die alte Domschule.* S. 57–58.
- ¹⁹ Recke J. F., Napiersky K. E. *Allgemeines Schriftsteller- und Gelehrten Lexikon der Provinzen Livland, Esthland un Kurland.* Bd. 3. Mitau: J. F. Steffenhagen und Sohn, 1831. S. 553–554.
- ²⁰ *Orationes tres: e quibus duae honoratissima dignitate, tum sapientia et virtute ornatissimorum D. D. Scholarcharum Nicolai Ekii, Proconsulis et Davidis Hilchen, Syndici, tertia Joannis Rivii, cum solenni et publico ritu produceretur ad demandatam sibi ab Amplissimo Senatu inspectionem scholasticam subeundam. Habita in restitutione seu instauratione Scholae Rigensis.* Rigae Livonum: Officina Typographica Nicolai Mollini, 1597.
- ²¹ Krēsliņš J. The Dissemination of the Latin Book. P. 111.
- ²² Gray H. H. Renaissance Humanism: The Pursuit of Eloquence. *Journal of the History of Ideas.* 1963. No. 24. P. 500–501.
- ²³ M. T. Ciceronis *epistolarum libri tres. A Iohanne Sturmio pro puerili educatione confecti: Et ex castigatissima editione Dionysij Lambini recens expressi.* Rigae Livonum: Typis Nicolai Mollini, 1614.; see also Buchholtz A. *Geschichte der Buchdruckerkunst in Riga.* S. 57. On the influence of Johannes Sturm, see Hollander B. *Geschichte der Domschule.* S. 25.
- ²⁴ *Decas orationum Ciceronis selectiorum, in usum studiosa iuventutis separatim edita.* Rigae: Typis Schröderianis, 1648.
- ²⁵ *Prosodiae Latinae brevia praecepta, in usum Scholae Rigensis edita. Ex optimis autoribus collegit Arnoldus Cuperus, conector ibidem. Cum gratia et privilegio S. R. M. Sveciae.* Rigae: Nicolaus Mollynus typis excrispsit, 1623.
- ²⁶ *Loci communes sententiosorum versuum ex elegijs Tibulli, Propertij & Ovidij. A Johanne Murmelio diligenter collecti. Accessit, in gratiam puerorum, index vocum hujus libelli, ad dignoscendam syllabarum quantitatem.* Brunsvigae: Apud Andream Dunckerum, 1605.

Gita Bērziņa, Brigita Cīrule

Rīgas Domskolas izglītības klasiskie pamati 16. un 17. gadsimtā

Kopsavilkums

Atslēgvārdi: Rīgas Domskola, humānisms, izglītība, klasiskās vērtības

Viens no humānisma balstiem, bez kuriem šī intelektuālā kustība nav iedomājama, ir klasiskais mantojums un tajā rodamās idejas un vērtības. Humānisti balstās uz klasisko valodu un daudzpusīgu antīkās pasaules kultūras vērtību iepazīšanu un apguvi, līdzās baznīcas tēvu darbiem nepagurstoši studējot sengrieķu filozofu, oratoru un latīņu prozas un dzejas klasiķu tekstus.

Pārmaiņas intelektuālajā dzīvē, kas 15. un 16. gadsimtā izplatās visā Eiropā, 16. gadsimtā ieplūst arī Livonijā un tās citadelē Rīgā. Arī šeit – tiesa, šaurākā, lokālā mērogā – uzplaukst humānisma idejas, tiek ieviesta grāmatu iespiešana, dibināta pilsētas bibliotēka, radīti dažādi teksti un nozīmīgas pārmaiņas piedzīvo Rīgas Domskola, viena no nozīmīgākajām reģiona mācību iestādēm.

Šī raksta mērķis ir iezīmēt, kā klasiskās vērtības un idejas te rod savu vietu, cik nozīmīgu un daudzveidīgu izpausmi gūst.

16. gadsimta sākumā Reformācijas rezultātā Rīgas Domskola nonāk pilsētas pārziņā un pārtop par protestantu skolu. Nākamajās desmitgadēs dažādu rektoru – izcilu personību, kas savu izglītību guvuši Eiropas, sevišķi Vācijas, labākajās augstskolās – vadībā skolā pamazām nostiprinās izglītības klasiskie pamati.

Te līdzās citām svarīgām disciplinām – matemātikai, loģikai, vēsturei, senebreju valodai, seno Baznīcas tēvu darbiem u. c. – māca latīņu un grieķu valodu un antīko literatūru.

16. gadsimta vidū politiskie un konfesionālie konflikti ietekmē skolas dzīvi, tomēr arī šajos sarežģītajos apstākļos sava vieta ir klasiskajām vērtībām. To apliecina gan, atsaucoties uz tā laika politiskajām cīņām, skolā uzvestā ludziņa “Horāciju un Kurāciju cīņa par Alba Longu”, gan Kalendāra nemieru laikā Domskolas zēnu vajadzībām latīņu valodā tapusi ētisko pamācību antoloģija *Libellus ethicus* (1589).

16. gadsimta beigās, lai paaugstinātu skolas beidzēju izglītības līmeni, Domskola piedzīvo nozīmīgu reorganizāciju: tā kļūst par piecgadīgu latīņu skolu un tiek ieviesta noteikta izglītības programma, lai sagatavotu absolventus turpmākām studijām Eiropas augstskolās.

Reorganizācijas būtību spilgti apliecina tās veicēju sindika Dāvida Hilhena, burggrāfa Nikolaja Ekes un pārmaiņu realizēšanai īpaši ataicinātā Johana Rīvija runas skolas atklāšanā, kas līdz ar detalizētiem mācību plāniem iespiestas krājumā *Orationes tres*.

Pēc reorganizācijas Domskolā vienlīdz būtiska ir reliģisko un klasisko priekšmetu apguve: gan katehisms vācu un latīņu valodā, gan evaņģēliju un psalmu fragmenti, gan latīņu un grieķu valoda, t. sk., sintakse, etimoloģija un prosodija, plašas dažādu romiešu un grieķu autoru (Homēra, Dēmostena, Ksenofonta, Lūkiāna, Plūtarha, Līvija, Cēzara, Cicerona, Vergilija, Ovidija u. c.) tekstu studijas.

Spilgtas liecības par attiecīgo priekšmetu un tajās proponēto vērtību apguvi Domskolā sniedz arī mācību procesā izmantotās grāmatas, no kurām daļa pārņemta no Eiropas, bet daļa – sastādīta tepat uz vietas, atlasot nepieciešamo antīko autoru tekstu materiālu, tostarp gan Cicerona vēstuļu un runu, gan latīņu versifikācijas krājumi un Domskolā izmantotā J. Marmelija sastādītā triju izcilo romiešu elēģiķu fragmentu izlase.

Tādējādi, lai gan Rīgā humānisma uzplaukums ir īslaicīgs, klasiskajām vērtībām, latīņu un grieķu valodas apguvei, antīko autoru studijām, no antīkiem tekstiem gūtām atziņām, uzskatiem, idejām, ētiskiem un estētiskiem ideāliem ir sava vieta arī šī reģiona 16. gadsimta beigās – 17. gadsimta sākuma izglītības procesos un jo īpaši Rīgas Domskolas kā vienas no nozīmīgākajām reģiona izglītības iestādēm pedagoģiskajās aktivitātēs.

Mārtiņš Laizāns

Hyperborean Poetics: Greek Mythology in Some Texts of Riga Humanists

Keywords: Augustinus Eucaedius, Basilius Plinius, *Aulaeum Dunaidum*, *Encomium Rigae*, allusion, mythology, poetics

The use of images and symbols from Ancient Greek mythology in neo-Latin texts of Riga humanists will be described from the perspective of two texts—*Aulaeum Dunaidum*¹ (“The Tapestry of Daugava”) by Augustinus Eucaedius and *Encomium inclitae civitatis Rigae metropolis Livoniae*² (“Encomium to Riga, the metropolis of Livonia”) by Basilius Plinius. These texts belong to the tradition of Renaissance humanist texts, namely, one of the main characteristics of these texts is the extensive use of Ancient Greek and Latin mythology, as well as history, thus making the allusions and references to the Western Antiquity the prevailing and dominant poetical vehicle.

Although there is still a lack of comprehensive studies on both authors that would scrupulously examine their works, nevertheless some former and contemporary investigations concerning the particular questions should be mentioned. A general overview about the humanist letters in Livonia can be found in the *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies* by Joseph IJsewijn.³ The life and times of Eucaedius are described in the foreword written by Brigita Cīrule of the Latvian translation of *Aulaeum Dunaidum*⁴ where an outline and extensive commentary on the poem is provided as well. Brigita Cīrule has also researched Eucaedius’s oeuvre regarding pedagogical matters.⁵ The latest research on the literary activities of Eucaedius includes an article by Lore Poelchau who focuses on the poetics of Eucaedius in the description of bishops and archbishops in *Aulaeum*.⁶ Other works by Eucaedius spark the interest of contemporary scholars⁷ as well, for example, the poem *Danubius* (“Danube”), which is of the same type as *Aulaeum Dunaidum*. In comparison, Plinius is an author from the circle of Riga humanists who has enjoyed the attention of historians. For example, Arnolds Spekke has written a thorough biography of Plinius and published his *Encomium Rigae* with comprehensive commentary.⁸ Spekke was eager to translate another work by Plinius *De Ventis* (“On Winds”)⁹, but succeeded to translate only part of it and did not include a verse translation or commentary. A concise description of *Encomium* is available in Latin written by Ināra Ķemere.¹⁰ The novelty of this paper is the comparison of the use of Greek mythology in the works mentioned previously.

One of the reasons for providing many references to the mythology of Antiquity as employed on the North-eastern outskirts of Europe is *aemulatio* and *imitatio* of the

Autortiesību ierobežojumu dēļ
attēls nav pieejams.

Western Renaissance tradition belonging to the Western cultural heritage. Equivalency to Western humanists is asserted by making *Matière de Livonie* understandable to the West with the help of imagery familiar and common to the educated Europe. Another reason is the lack of works that would describe local events and heroes—Eucaedius expresses his opinion in the foreword—

*multorum summorum hominum in his ad Septentrionem populis non modo virtutes non celebratae, sed etiam ne quidem memorata videntur, atque tacta .. id vero cum de multis aliis vere dici potest: tum praecipue de Livonia [...] hoc dolendum est [...] illum deplorandum—tot bella, tot victorias, tot triumphos non conscriptos*¹¹

(“..the virtues of a lot of the best Northern people seem to lack not only any record of them, but have no memory of them altogether and no one have touched upon these subjects [...] it truly can be said about many others, but especially of Livonia [...] it is miserable [...] and it is to be wept upon as so many wars, so many victories, so many triumphs have not been written about”).

By committing himself to writing a poem about the local heroes in the manner of *εὐῶν κατάλογος* Eucaedius emphasizes the importance of them—*exemplum domesticum* .. *vehementissime animos hominum ingenuos accedunt, atque ad rem gerendam idoneos reddunt*¹² (“..the local example inspires the human souls most powerfully and makes them ready for action”) and adds that *Principes Germani* would now be amazed about their ancestors who fought in Livonia, if their deeds had been praised in literary works—so it is important to write your own history, putting your heroes into the foreground. To some extent, Eucaedius had an opportunity to set the ideological *status quo*, as there was no thorough historical account of the German deeds in Livonia at the time that would describe the events dated after *Chronicon Heinrici* and *Älteste Livländische Reimchronik*, which dealt with the events up to the 13th century.

As regards mythological figures, it must be noted that although poems are throughout Christian in the subject matter, the Biblical imagery is used far more less than the Ancient Greek or Latin mythology—even the Christian god is frequently referred to as Zeus or Jupiter. The mythological and historical characters and events are represented exuberantly in both poems, but only the most significant examples will be mentioned and examined in detail.

At first it must be specified how the geographical location of the Livonians is referred to—*extremas Boreae oras*¹³ (the outermost coasts of Boreas), thus the Greek mythological name for the North wind is used to incorporate the Ancient Greek world-view in the *legenda* of a poetical 16th century world map. It must be noted that not only Greek mythology is used for the poetical structure of these texts, but also Latin equivalents to Greek symbols, for example, the same *extremas Boreae oras* are called *orae Aquilonis*¹⁴ (Aquilo’s coasts). Although this article will focus on the Greek imagery, the reader should keep in mind that these texts do not use Greek mythology exclusively, but a constant mix of the

Autortiesību ierobežojumu dēļ
attēls nav pieejams.

two mythologies of Antiquity can be observed. On a fewer occasions one can observe a mixture of even more mythologies, for example, the ruler of the underworld is called by the Ancient Greek (*Pluto*), Latin (*Dis*) and Prussian-Baltic (*Pocculus*) name, and footballing between calling the same deities *Camenae* or *Musae* is constant in *Encomium* by Plinius. Further on, the cultural setting as described by Eucaedius is *limes Christiani orbis* (the borders of Christian world)—*terra Hyperboreana* (Hyperborean land). Hyperboreans is the name of the people that supposedly live beyond the north wind (Herodotus 4, 36¹⁵), so Eucaedius identifies the Livonians as being Hyperboreans, the people known to be farthest away from the Ancient Greeks.

To characterize the particular use of Greek mythical figures, the work of Eucaedius should be examined in detail. The *Aulaeum* is being woven by *naiades* (water nymphs), called the *nymphae textrices*¹⁶ (the weaving nymphs). Eucaedius refers to them mostly as *Dunaidae* (the nymphs of *Duna* (Daugava)). It is evident that he uses the word formation model from the Greek language by adding the suffix—*idae* to create the name for the deities of a local river *Duna*, thus a poetical illusion is made as if the *Dunaidae* were known to the ancients. By employing such methods he makes these deities seem more familiar to those who are not acquainted with the local cultural peculiarities of Livonia. By this sort of hybrid hellenisation they are de-barbarized and made appropriate to fit in the cultural heritage of Europe, nevertheless he names one of the nymphs *Liva*¹⁷ as a reminder of the milieu where the described events take place. The *aulaeum* woven by the *Dunaidae* is an allusion to the shield of Achilles described by Homer in chant 18 of the *Iliad*, as it tells the valorous deeds of German crusaders and baptizers in Livonia. Although the river Daugava is referred to by its Latin name—*Duna*, another local river Gauja becomes *Alphaeus*,¹⁸ a name for a river and river-god in Greek mythology. The name of the local god of *Duna* (Daugava) for Plinius is plain—just *Duna pater*¹⁹ (father of *Duna*), but for Eucaedius it is *Rubo*—a borrowing from Claudius Ptolemaius (III, 5, 2 ‘Ρουβώνος ποταμοῦ ἐκβολαί²⁰) in his description of Daugava, where *Rubo* (in Latin translation) is the name of the river, but Eucaedius transfers this name to the river deity, thus finding a new use for a geographical name to suit his poetical goals. A similar approach can be observed in the poetical technique used by Plinius, who localises Greek gods by giving them a new epithet—the god of the Baltic sea is referred to as *Nereus Balticus*.²¹

A similar approach in the use of ancient deities can be seen in *Encomium* by Plinius. He describes ancient nymphs as refugees from the realms of the Hellenistic world who now have founded their new home in Livonia—*hic [...] et Nymphae profugae constituere lares*.²² The notion of *Θέμις* (‘right’, ‘law’) is used to illustrate the arrival of law and justice in this corner of Europe together with German crusaders, but Plinius tells it with the help of non-Christian symbols, but pre-Christian pagan ones—*sibi templa scholasque / Musis cum sociis extruet alma Themis* (Justice together with Muses will build temples and schools) as the Livonians were described as a *gens .. cui neque lex, nec cultus erat*²³ (“nation [...] who had neither law, nor culture”). Thus it is clear that Greek mythology can be used as a poetical vehicle to describe Christian deeds and it is not to be viewed as an opposing ideology

to Christian symbols, but a helpful tool for the poet to enrich his text. As the Christian imagery is well established in the Livonian region, it is possible to introduce material of classical paganism and describe phenomena from the Christian world with equal or similar ones from Ancient Greek ones, for example, when bishop Albert dies, he does not go to heaven or paradise, but *Albertus succedit Olympo*²⁴ (he ascended Olympus), and the *post-mortem* situation of bishop Bartoldus is described in a similar manner, as he goes to *Elysiis agris*²⁵ (Elysian fields).

In some cases it is possible to observe Alexandrine approach to the use of mythology as not widely known myths or names are used in the texts. When describing the unsuccessful Livonian resistance against *Teutones* (also called *Bremenses* or *Saxoni*), Plinius uses the name *Daulia*—*pro libertate repugnat / Daulias exsertans retibus*²⁶ (fought for freedom by putting forth Daulia's nets)—which is a lesser-known name for Prokne. Also references to quasi-mythical figures are employed in a learned manner, for example, Homer is called *Maeonides* (Maeonid, the son of Maionos), and it seems that it is not only a whim of the author *metri gratia*. Also the Greek language is called in an unorthodox manner as *lingua Pelasga* (the Pelasgian language).²⁷ At times the need for a cultured and educated reader can be suspected from periphrastic descriptions, for instance, referring to Hermes as *Atlantis Nepos*²⁸ (Atlanta's grandson), thus anticipating a reader is familiar with the genealogy of Ancient Greek gods. Though not published in Riga, Eucaedius even writes at the end of his poem—*DOCTIS*²⁹ (for the educated), so giving a clear sign about the intended target readership.

In the majority of cases the use of Ancient Greek mythology can be regarded as a tool for comparison and/or exaggeration. When Plinius describes the girls in Riga, he hyperbolises their beauty stating that not even the most beautiful woman of the Ancient Greek world Helen or goddess of beauty could compete—*non praelata tibi Cypria pulchra foret*³⁰ (“..and Cypris [=Aphrodite] in front of your eyes would not seem beautiful to you”). The addition of virtues to their beauty would make any of them the fourth Charita—*charitum quarta vel esse queat*³¹, a motive probably borrowed from Callimachus³² when he speaks about Berenice as a fourth Charita in his epigrams. With these comparisons Plinius in his *aemulatio* with the ancients gets overwhelmed even belittling Ancient deities when expressing that Momus, the god of satire, could not make fun of the Riga girls as they are astonishingly beautiful—*Hic nil quod possit carpere mutus habet*³³ (“[Momus would be] mute as he would not have anything to take from here”).

To establish the good and evil characters, for the description of Ivan the Terrible who had devastated Livonia during the Livonian War, Plinius chooses the image of Charybdis, an all-devouring sea monster, to assign it to Ivan. Thus he is called by the localised epithet *Scythica charybdis*³⁴, transferring it to mainland from the sea, or *Hydra Scythica*³⁵, thus alluding to the Ancient Greek water monster Hydra of Lerna.

However, Plinius writes about the life of the simple folk as well, not only the deeds of bishops or German warriors. When praising Riga mead Plinius is not restrained by saying it is the best in the world—*Non melior toto cerevisia venditur orbe*³⁶ and when compared

to Ancient wine from Crete, the mead of Riga is far more superior—*An Cretense merum se comparat illis / Cedite, longe illi subiacet inferius*.³⁷ So from a mythological perspective, Orpheus would have succeeded in bringing Eurydice back to the earth if he had only given a cup of Riga mead to Pluto—*Atque hac donasset rigidum Plutona, secundo Euridice coniunx chara recepta foret*,³⁸ thus an exaggeration by Pliny shows how the course of mythology could even be altered.

Some mythological notions are constantly being used as euphemisms, for instance, Eucaedius uses Lethe, the river of eternal oblivion in the Greek underworld, in its substantive form as an euphemism of death—*horrida lethe* (horrifying death) and *demergere letho* (to sink in the river of death) or *lethiferum annum* (the death bringing year), or others with the same meaning—*ad Orcum ire* (to go to Orcus), or *ad tartara tendere* (to move to Tartarus).

The use of symbols from Greek mythology that are familiar to most of Europe is a comfortable approach to evaluate and compare your own culture with others belonging to European cultural network. Although the Hyperboreans are Christianized, the heritage of Classical Antiquity is to be cultivated for educational purposes and thus its incorporation in works of poetry becomes a natural occurrence.

As the European tradition holds the knowledge of Ancient Greek mythology in high esteem, by using this mythology in their poems, not only they show their knowledge, but also indicate that now the Hyperborean part of Europe is not barbarous anymore, as both the cultural fountain of European civilisation and Renaissance ideas have reached the Northeast corner of Europe.

To some extent, the Hyperboreans, in this case the Livonians, do not have a single identity, but a double one; on one hand, there are the barbaric Livonians, that do not yet know the European cultural heritage, including Greek mythology, and are on their way to eliminate their barbarian nature, and on the other hand, there are the new Livonians that bring European cultural values to Livonia and Greek mythology in their poems. As such, it is a great example how the European and Hyperborean cultures are compared and juxtaposed.

Notes

¹ First edition in 1564 in Wittenberg. References to this work are given from the 2014 edition where a facsimile version is provided. (Eicēdijs A. *Daugavas paklājs*. Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 2014.)

² First edition in 1595 in Leipzig. References to this work are given from the 1997 edition where a facsimile version is provided. (*Bazilija Plīnija Slavus dziesma Rīgai*. Rīga: Jumava, 1997.)

³ IJsewijn J. *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*. Leuven-Louvain: Leuven University Press-Peeters Press, 1990. P. 258.–262.

⁴ Eicēdijs A. *Daugavas paklājs*. B. Cirules priekšvārds. Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 2014. 7.–18. lpp.

⁵ Cīrule B. Augustīns Eicēdijs un viņa poēma “Daugavas paklājs” *PAIDEIA* diskursā. *Antiquitas Viva*. 4. Rīga: Latvijas Universitātes Akadēmiskais apgāds, 2014. 127–135. lpp.

⁶ Poelchau L. Auf den Spuren einer lateinischen Dichtung im Livland des 16. Jahrhunderts. *Syntagmatia. Essays on Neo-Latin Literature in Honour of Monique Mund-Dopchie and Gilbert Tournoy*. Leuven-Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2009. S. 345.–353.

- ⁷ Amann-Bubenik J. Ein Flussekonzil zu Ehren Kaiser Maximilians II: Das *carmen* "Danubius" des Augustinus Eucædius. *Official Program of the XVIth International Congress Of The International Association for Neo-Latin Studies (IANLS)*. ianls.com/conferences/2015_vienna/vienna_2015_programme.pdf pp. 37.–38. [Accessed 20 October 2015.]
- ⁸ Spekke A. *Alt-Riga im Lichte eines humanistischen Lobgedichts vom Jahre 1595*. Riga: Druck von W. F. Häcker, 1927.
- ⁹ Spekke A. Rīgas humanista Bazilija Plinija poema "Par Vējiem." *Latvju Grāmata*. 1924. Nr.4.–5. 312.–323., 423.–431. lpp.
- ¹⁰ Kemere I. *Encomium inclitæ civitatis Rigæ metropolis Livoniæ conscriptum a Basilio Plinio Rigensi Livono. Acta selecta Octavi Conventus Academiae Latinitati Fovendæ*, Roma: Herder, 1995. P. 397.–403.
- ¹¹ Eicēdijs A. *Daugavas paklājs*. 23.–40. lpp.
- ¹² Ibid, 31. lpp.
- ¹³ Ibid, 51. lpp.
- ¹⁴ Ibid, 48. lpp.
- ¹⁵ *Herodotos*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1868. S. 200.–201.
- ¹⁶ Eicēdijs, A. *Daugavas paklājs*. 71. lpp.
- ¹⁷ Ibid, 48. lpp.
- ¹⁸ Ibid, 96. lpp.
- ¹⁹ *Bazilija Plinija Slavas dziesma Rīgai*. Riga: Jumava, 1997. [17]. lpp.
- ²⁰ Ptolemaius. *Geographia*. Hg. von K. F. A. Nobbe. Lipsiæ: Sumptibus et typis Caroli Tauchnitii, 1843. S. 167.
- ²¹ *Bazilija Plinija Slavas dziesma Rīgai*. [31]. lpp.
- ²² Ibid, [21]. lpp.
- ²³ Eicēdijs, A. *Daugavas paklājs*. 51. lpp.
- ²⁴ Ibid, 65. lpp.
- ²⁵ Ibid, 55. lpp.
- ²⁶ *Bazilija Plinija Slavas dziesma Rīgai*. [23]. lpp.
- ²⁷ Ibid, [65]. lpp.
- ²⁸ Ibid, [61]. lpp.
- ²⁹ Eicēdijs, A. *Daugavas paklājs*. 131. lpp.
- ³⁰ Plinius, B. *Bazilija Plinija Slavas dziesma Rīgai*. [43]. lpp.
- ³¹ Ibid, [44]. lpp.
- ³² Callimachus. *Works*. Ed. by W. R. Mair. London: W. Heinemann, 1921. P. 174.
- ³³ *Bazilija Plinija Slavas dziesma Rīgai*. [41]. lpp.
- ³⁴ Ibid, [38]. lpp.
- ³⁵ Ibid, [39]. lpp.
- ³⁶ Ibid, [47]. lpp.
- ³⁷ Ibid.
- ³⁸ Ibid.

Mārtiņš Laizāns

Hiperboreju poētika: grieķu mitoloģija dažos Rīgas humānistu tekstos

Kopsavilkums

Atslēgvārdi: Augustīns Eicēdijs, Bazilijs Plīnijs, *Daugavas paklājs*,
Slavas dziesma Rīgai, alūzija, mītoloģija, poētika

Baltijas jūras apgabalā radītajos neolatīniskajos humānistu tekstos 16. gadsimtā izmantotie sengrieķu mītoloģijas un vēstures tēli ir viens no poētikas pamatpaņēmiem. Šajos sacerējumos minētais kultūrtēlu izmantošanas paņēmiens lietots ar nolūku, lai iekļautos ar šiem tekstiem plašākā Rietumeiropas renesanses humānisma tekstu un kultūrvērtību tradīcijā, vienlaikus uzsverot Livonijas, it īpaši Rīgas, savdabīgo un atšķirīgo kultūru, kas rietumos ir mazpazīstama. Lai gan rakstā aplūkoto autoru un viņu darbos – Augustīna Eicēdija *Daugavas paklājā* un Bazilija Plīnija *Slavas dziesmā Rīgai* – vērojams vairāku mītoloģisko sistēmu vienlaicīgs sajaukums un lietojums, pastiprināti tiek iztirzāta tieši sengrieķu mītoloģija, kas ir visvairāk lietotā, cenšoties noskaidrot, uz kādām Livonijas kultūras iezīmēm autori cenšas norādīt, izmantojot konkrētus sengrieķu mītoloģijas tēlus.

Magnus Frisch

Daniel Hermann—a Well-Travelled Prussian Humanist and His Poetic Work in Riga

Keywords: Daniel Hermann; Neo-Latin literature; Neo-Latin poetry; humanism; Riga humanists; Renaissance

1. Introduction

Daniel Hermann is an important Neo-Latin poet not only because of the extent of his oeuvre but also because of the poetical value of his poems.¹ Jozef IJsewijn refers to the posthumously published collection of his works (Riga 1614–1615) as “one of the most important Neo-Latin publications to come from the Riga press.”² Daniel Hermann is mentioned in many sources dedicated to the history of Baltic, Polish or Neo-Latin literature.³ Unfortunately, however, he has been nearly neglected in the academic research until very recently.⁴ The aim of this paper is to provide a detailed overview of Daniel Hermann’s life and his works with a focus on the poems written in Riga, and to provide a short summary of the research on Daniel Hermann.

2. Biography

The main sources about Daniel Hermann’s life are the booklet by Georg Christoph Pisanski, the lexicon articles of Friederich Konrad Gadebusch, Johann Friedrich von Recke and Karl Eduard Napiersky, and Theodor Schiemann⁵ as well as more detailed papers by Theodor Schiemann, Herta von Ramm-Helsing, and Kurt Forstreuter.⁶ Of course, there are pieces of information about his life scattered across numerous occasional poems written by him and also in the preface of his collected poems. It seems that most of the information in the articles and papers about Daniel Hermann has been derived from these sources.⁷ However, it must be emphasised that Schiemann, von Ramm-Helsing, and Forstreuter had access to the sources, which were lost after World War II, for example, the *Acta Internuntiorum* of the *Stadtarchiv Danzig*.⁸

Probably the most coherent source about Daniel Hermann’s life is the epitaph composed by the poet himself. It is no longer legible on his tomb in the Riga Cathedral, yet it has been published in the collection of his poems and is often cited in papers.⁹

Autortiesību ierobežojumu dēļ
attēls nav pieejams.

Daniel Hermann's epitaph (transcribed by Johann Christoph Brotze). Academic Library of the University of Latvia, Department of Manuscripts and Rare Books, Brotze Monumente. R4964

2.1. *Origin, family, and childhood*

According to the oldest reports,¹⁰ Daniel Hermann was probably born in 1543 in Neidenburg (East Prussia). Nearly all later biographers have accepted this date. Forstreuter, however, doubts this information. He argues that nobody would have expected a fourteen or fifteen year old boy to travel alone from Neidenburg to Königsberg in 1557 and later to Strasbourg in 1558; he further argues that Herta von Ramm-Helsing tells us that Hermann died in 1601 at the age of 62.¹¹ Thus, Forstreuter suspects that most likely Hermann was born in 1540.¹²

Hermann was the youngest of four sons of Andreas Hermann, the mayor of Neidenburg, and had two sisters, too. His father was a Lutheran and had helped to establish the Reformation in Neidenburg. He seems to have been wealthy and enabled his sons to receive a good education.¹³

2.2. *Studies*

In 1557 Daniel Hermann went to the University of Königsberg, but in 1558 he moved to Strasbourg where he studied at the Protestant Gymnasium, which had been established by Johannes Sturm in 1538. This school and its students had a great influence on the European humanism.¹⁴ There Hermann seems to have attracted the attention of the school leader Johannes Sturm by his abilities and his achievements. Strasbourg had no university at that time, so a few years later Hermann went back to Königsberg, with stops at different universities according to von Recke and Napiersky, for instance, Heidelberg.¹⁵ Yet he returned to Strasbourg for further studies immediately when Sturm's Gymnasium was raised to the rank of an Academy by Emperor Maximilian II in 1566.¹⁶ On request of Johannes Sturm, Hermann even composed and recited a poem about the foundation of the *Academia Argentinensis*, as the Strasbourg Academy was called, at the official foundation ceremony, which was proceeded on 1 May 1567.¹⁷

During the years 1568 to 1569 he continued his studies in Basel. The information about the following time is contradictory. Either he fought against the Turks as a soldier¹⁸ or he studied in Ingolstadt. In 1569 or in 1571 he registered at the University of Wittenberg.¹⁹ While he had studied languages, law, and philosophy until then, at Wittenberg he started studying natural sciences, too, especially geology.²⁰

Hermann's studies were financially supported not only by Hermann's family but also by a grant from Duke Albrecht of Prussia, at least in 1566 as historical documents prove.²¹ However, it seems he never graduated, although sometimes he is called Dr Daniel Hermann.²²

2.3. *At the Imperial Court at Vienna*

In 1572 or 1573 Hermann moved to Vienna. There he first worked for the Imperial Councillor Kaspar von Minkwitz, who had also studied at Wittenberg and was a friend of

Autortiesību ierobežojumu dēļ
attēls nav pieejams.

“De Monstroso” by Daniel Hermann. Academic Library of the University of Latvia, Department of Manuscripts and Rare Books. R3506/9

his.²³ Later he became a secretary at the Imperial Court. After the death of Emperor Maximilian II in 1576, however, most of his Protestant friends left the Imperial Court. Hermann himself remained there. However, when the city of Danzig offered him a position as a secretary in 1579, he was pleased to accept this offer.²⁴

2.4. In the Service of the City of Danzig and at the Court of the Polish King Stephan Báthory

Hermann's new employer, the city of Danzig, had been besieged, because it had refused to accept the new Polish king Stephan Báthory as a ruler, and had had to accept him and to pay tribute to him at the end.²⁵ Therefore, it was necessary to arrange the diplomatic relations and the payments to the king. Consequently, Hermann became a permanent ambassador of the city of Danzig at the Royal Polish Court, which was an army camp at that time due to the Polish-Russian War. Apparently he was also involved – at least as a correspondent – in the peace negotiations in 1581–1582, as a result of which Livonia became incorporated in Poland. From Vilnius, where the peace treaty was symbolically celebrated during a catholic mass in the presence of King Stephan, he hurried to Riga ahead of the king. On 1 March 1582 Hermann arrived in Riga.²⁶

2.5. Riga

In Riga it was hard for Hermann to find an accommodation because of the quartering of Polish troops and guests who wanted to see the king. Only by intercession of Councillor Andres Coye, Hermann found a room at the house of Coye's sister-in-law, a young widow Ursula Kröger. Hermann fell in love with Ursula Kröger and wrote to Danzig on 3 April 1582 that he was going to get engaged, followed by a letter on 9 April 1582 that he was already engaged to her. He became a citizen of Riga, married Ursula Kröger, and after uncertain negotiations about his possibilities of future service for Danzig he finally terminated his employment. He became the Secretary of the Royal Polish governor, Cardinal Georg Prince Radziwil (Polish: Jerzy Radziwiłł, Lithuanian: Jurgis Radvila). Later he became the Secretary of Georg Fahrensbach (today better known as Jürgen von Fahrensbach; also in the variations of spelling as "Farensbach", "Fahrenbach", "Farenbach" or "Fehrenbach"), a Polish-Livonian general and voivode. As Schiemann writes, Hermann always represented the interests of Riga, as far as it was possible for him.²⁷ Hermann seems to have been involved in all political decisions and in the intellectual life of Riga.²⁸ After some years, possibly around the turn of the year 1599 to 1600, he left his service to dedicate himself only to poetry.²⁹

3. Works

3.1. Synopsis

Daniel Hermann's oeuvre is quite extensive and diverse. He was a creative poet with an ability to compose ambitious poems even about minor events.³⁰

Most of his oeuvre consists of occasional poems of varied length: on academic occasions as the founding of the Academy of Strasbourg or the University of Zamość as well as on the promotion of fellow students or their parting from the university; *epithalamia* on the weddings of friends and colleagues as well as of respected individuals and princes; on the occasion of the death of relatives, friends, and other individuals and even kings; letters to friends and other individuals in a poetic form and poets on occasion of the coronation of sovereigns. There are also longer poems on theological, philosophical, even scientific, and political subjects. He even composed an epic on the Polish king Stephan Báthory which remained unfinished. The earliest poems known date back to 1566, when he studied in Königsberg and later in Strasbourg, whereas the latest poems were written in 1601, the year of his death. Apparently, he composed poems throughout his entire lifetime and in every situation, even when he was ill. Most of his poems have been collected and edited posthumously by his widow. The first volume contains poems written during his studies, the second one – poems he wrote during his time at the Imperial Court of Vienna, and the third one – poems written during his time at the Royal Polish Court and in Riga. (See the list of editions of Hermann's works in 5)

3.2. Works Written and Published in Riga

Nearly all poems written by Hermann in Riga are included in the third volume of the collection published by his widow.³¹ During this time he composed poems on topics referring to Riga, Livonia and Poland.³² The first works of Hermann published in Riga are the first two books of his *Stephaneis*, which he must have written during his time at the Royal Polish Court during the Polish-Prussian War. Even after the publication of these two books in 1582 he continued writing this epic. In the third volume of Hermann 1614–15 not only the first two completed books are included, but also some fragments of the third one, which had never been finished.

In 1583 he published a philosophical or rather scientific essay *De rana et lacerta succino prussiano insitis* (“On a toad and a lizard encased in Prussian amber”) written in verses, which also contained geological considerations about the causes of the salt deposits in the mines of Krakow.

After the death of King Stephan Báthory in 1586 he wrote a grief poem,³³ as well as a poem on the coronation of Stephan’s successor Sigismund III in 1588.³⁴ For the next few years Hermann seems to have been kept from poetry by his official obligations or maybe by serious health problems. The next poem was published in 1594 and dealt with the foundation of the University of Zamość.³⁵ In 1596 Hermann discussed the ethical, physical and historical aspects of the birth of a deformed baby in Ascheraden/Aizkraukle and the miracles, which were reportedly linked to this monstrosity in the poem *De monstro partu*.³⁶

There was also a poem *De certamine inter ursum et aprum, in quo aper victus occubuit anno 1592 mense Decembri* (“About a fight of a bear and a boar in which the boar died in December 1592”), which seems to have been written several years later, as it was printed after the poem on the monstrosity in the collection.³⁷ It was followed in 1595 by a poem of gratitude to god for all the physical and mental benefits *Gratiarum actio ad Deum omnem potentem*.³⁸ In 1599 Hermann published a biographical poem about his employer Georg von Fahrensbach (see above 2.4) in German.

In 1601, when the Polish-Swedish War and the Battle of Kokenhusen/Koknese had begun, he wrote *Livoniae afflictæ ... supplicatio* to the Polish king and Grand Duke of Lithuania Sigismund III on behalf of the city of Riga to express their loyalty to him.³⁹ At nearly the same time he wrote the poem *De Livoniae statu instabili, ex fundamentis philosophicis* about the uncertain political situation of Livonia,⁴⁰ a poem on the conquest of the city of Wolmar/Valmiera *De expugnata Wolmaria*⁴¹ and a consideration of a prudent and pious Christian soldier about the behaviour at war: *Meditatio militis christiani cordati et simul pii*, which was dedicated to King Sigismund III.⁴²

Hermann wrote a poem about the coat of arms of the family of Cardinal Radziwil, too,⁴³ as well as a poem about the white eagle as the heraldic animal of the Polish king.⁴⁴ There was also a short inscription composed for an aqueduct in Riga.⁴⁵

During his time in Riga, Hermann apparently wrote much less private poems than during his studies or his time in Vienna. We find only a few *epithalamia*: for Hieronymus Coler and Magdalena Mulich,⁴⁶ for Jacob Monaw and Susanne Vogt⁴⁷ and for Thomas Ramus and Anna Ekius.⁴⁸ The volume ends with the epitaph for Hermann that he had composed for himself in 1594, seven years prior to his death.⁴⁹

4. Research on Daniel Hermann

As already mentioned above, apart from some encyclopaedia articles and entries in books on literary history, there has been virtually no research on this really great and important Neo-Latin poet. The first writings dealing with Daniel Hermann were the report on his life and the overview of his works given by Pisanski (1758), as well as the shorter entries in the literary histories of Gadebusch, Pisanski and von Recke and Napierksy, which seem to have been based on the readings of Hermann's works.⁵⁰ Those are followed by lexicon entries apparently only reproducing their information.⁵¹

The first author who dealt with Hermann and his works more intensively after a long time was the Prussian historian and archivist Theodor Schiemann.⁵² He studied Hermann's works as well as older sources on him and seems to have used the *Acta Internuntiorum* of the city of Danzig to obtain information about Hermann's role in the Polish-Russian War 1579–1581, which apparently are lost now.⁵³ He wrote a biographical paper on Hermann⁵⁴ and also an article on Hermann in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*.⁵⁵

Furthermore, Herta von Ramm-Helsing studied Hermann's life and in 1942 wrote a paper on his engagement and marriage on the basis of Schiemann's paper and intensive individual studies of letters written by Hermann, which were still available at Danzig at that time.⁵⁶ This paper is very important because von Ramm-Helsing replicates some of the letters, which were written in German. She had also mentioned Hermann earlier, but only *en passant*, in her paper about David Hilchen.⁵⁷ Arnolds Spekke only mentions Hermann and his works in the introduction to his book about Basilius Plinius' *Encomium Rigae*.⁵⁸

In the following period of time Hermann is almost only mentioned in lexica which apparently reproduce the information of the older lexica and of Schiemann's paper.⁵⁹ The sole exception among the lexicon articles is the entry in Starnawski's literary history,⁶⁰ because Starnawski himself had studied Hermann's poems dealing with the foundation of the University of Zamość earlier.⁶¹

Another exception is the Prussian historian Kurt Forstreuter who had studied the historical sources on Hermann during his time as archivist at the Staatsarchiv of Königsberg from 1927 to 1945. Unfortunately his paper on Hermann⁶² was only printed in an anthology published as part of a series about the history of Prussia, so that the research on Hermann has apparently been ignored until now. Forstreuter obviously knew all the previous studies on Hermann including von Ramm-Helsing's papers and seems to have compared the information given in Hermann's poems and by Schiemann with historical

sources as well as archival documents in order to put them into a wider historical context. He also reproduced excerpts of letters written by Hermann to other historical figures in his environment. He had already mentioned Hermann in his book about the history of Prussia and Russia.⁶³

Hermann's poems have been scarcely studied up until now. There is Starnwaski's edition of the poems on the foundation of the University of Zamość with a short introduction,⁶⁴ as well as Czarski's edition and analysis of a letter to Friedrich von Nostitz.⁶⁵ Kristi Viiding (Tartu) studies Hermann's *Stephaneis* and the circumstances of the posthumously published collection of his works by his widow Ursula Kröger. In contrast the *album amicorum* of Daniel Hermann, which is in Lund (Sweden) now, is already well researched especially by Åke Davidsson and Christa Schwarz⁶⁶ as well as Johanna Svensson (Lund). It is now also available online at the National Swedish book catalogue LIBRIS.⁶⁷ Similarly well researched is Hermann's own library, which was later integrated into the municipal library of Riga.⁶⁸

5. Editions of Daniel Hermann's Works (in a Chronological Order)

[This list is compiled after comparison of the lists given by Gadebusch, Lilienthal and von Recke / Napiersky.⁶⁹ All lists presented in later literature seem to follow von Recke/ Napiersky.]

Abbreviations:

s. l. *sine loco*

s. d. *sine dato*

Epithalamion illustri principi ac domino, D. Gotthardo in Livonia Churlandiae et Semigalliae duci, S. R. M. Polonorum supremo terrarum Livoniae gubernatori et locum tenenti, sponso ac domino suo clementissimo: et illustrissimae principi ac dominae, dominae Annae, natae ex illustrissimorum ducum Megaloburgensium familia etc. sponsae ac dominae suae clementissimae scriptum a Daniele Hermanno Neydenburgense, Borusso. Regiomonti Borussiae in officina Ioannis Daubmanni 1566.

Carmen de vita litterata. Regiomonti Borussiae 1575. [reprinted in Hermann 1614–1615 tom. I]

Danielis Hermanni Borussi *Stephaneis moschovita, sive de occasione, causis, initiis et progressibus belli, a serenissimo potentissimoque Polonorum rege magno duce Lithuaniae etc. Stephano primo contra Ioannem Basilium, Magnum Moschorum ducem, gesti et hoste represso fractoque ad aequas pacis conditiones feliciter deducti, libri duo priores.* Excusae Gedani a Iacobo Rhodo 1582. [reprinted in Hermann 1614–1615 tom. III]

De rana et lacerta succino prussiaco insitis Danielis Hermanni discursus philosophicus; ex quo occasio sumi potest de causis salis fodinarum Cracoviensium naturalibus ratiocinandi. Cracoviae 1583. [3rd edition Rigae 1600; also reprinted in Hermann 1614–1615 tom. III]

Panegyris in coronationem serenissimi principis ac domini Sigismundi tertii Regis Poloniae et designati Sueciae, magni ducis Lithuaniae, Russiae, Prussiae, Masoviae, Samogitiae, Kyouiae, Volhiniae, Podlachiae, Livoniae etc. principis. Scripta a Daniele Hermanno Prusso. Cracoviae 1588. [reprinted in Hermann 1614–1615 tom. II]

De Marte cum Musis in nova Academia Samosciana conjunctio, carmen. Rigae Livonum exc. Nicol. Mollinus 1594.

Gratiarum actio ad Deum omnipotentem pro omnibus corporis atque animae beneficiis. Rigae 1595. [Latin and German]

De monstro partu, die XVIII. Aug. 1595 in districtu Ascheradensi Livoniae ultradunensis in lucem edito; et de rebus, quae praeter naturae ordinem fiunt, discursus ethicus, physicus, historicus. Autore Daniele Hermanno Borusso, Rigae in officina Nicolai Mollini 1596. [reprinted in Hermann 1614–1615 tom. III]

Joanni Samoscio, Regni Poloniae Cancellario et exercituum regni praefecto generali, Trophaeum. Cracoviae typis Matthiae Wirzbietae [s. d.].

Livoniae afflictae ad S. R. Majestatem et ordines reipublicae Poloniae magnique Ducatus Lithuaniae supplicatio. Rigae 1601. [reprinted in Hermann 1614–1615 tom. III]

Meditatio militis christiani cordati et simul pii. Rigae 1601.

De Livoniae statu instabili ex fundamentis philosophicis. [s. l., s. d.]

Leben Georg Fahrensbachs. In: Georg Zieglers Weltspiegel. Riga 1599. [in German verses]

Danielis Hermanni Borussi secretarii regii *Poemata. Academica, aulica, bellica.* Rigae [postum] 1614–1615. [= Hermann 1614–15]

Notes

- ¹ Cf. Schiemann T. Daniel Hermann. Ein livländischer Humanist. *Riga'scher Almanach*. 1878. Nr. 21, S. 1–19. (Reprinted in: Schiemann T. *Historische Darstellungen und archivalische Studien. Beiträge zur baltischen Geschichte*. Hamburg/Mitau: Behre's Verlag, 1886. S. 51–74.); Forstreuter K. Daniel Hermann – Literat und Diplomat in Frieden und Krieg. In: Forstreuter K. *Wirkungen des Preußenlandes. Vierzig Beiträge*. (Studien zur Geschichte Preußens; Band 33.) Köln/Berlin: G. Grothe'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1981. S. 9.
- ² IJsewijn J. *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies*. Amsterdam/New York/Oxford: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1977. P. 77.
- ³ Gadebusch F. K. *Livländische Bibliothek*. Band II. Riga: Johann Friedrich Hartknoch, 1777. S. 52–64; Pisanski G. C. *Entwurf der Preußischen Litterärsgeschichte*. Königsberg: Hartung'sche Buchhandlung, 1791. S. 366; Recke J. F., Napiersky K. E. *Allgemeines Schriftsteller- und Gelehrtenlexikon der Provinzen Livland, Estland und Kurland*. Band 2. Mitau: Johann Friedrich Steffenhagen und Sohn, 1829. S. 256–259; Wiszniewski M. *Historia literatury polskiej*. Vol. 6. Kraków: Giszowski., 1844. S. 331–332; Estreicher K. J. T., Estreicher S. *Bibliografia polska*. Vol. 8. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 1882. S. 66; Lehnerdt J. M. Hermann, Daniel. In: Krollmann C. (Hg.). *Altpreußische Biographie*. Band 1: Abegg – Malten. Königsberg: Gräfe und Unzer Verlag, 1941. S. 270 (Reprinted: Lehnerdt J. M. Hermann, Daniel. In: Krollmann C. (Hg.). *Altpreußische Biographie*. Band 1: Abegg – Malten. Marburg: N. G. Elwert Verlag, 1974. S. 270; IJsewijn J. *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies* (see note 2). P. 176–177; Starnawski J. *Odrodzenie casy – ludzie – książki*. Łódź: Uniwersytet Łódzki, 1991. S. 395; Wilpert G. *Deutschbaltische Literaturgeschichte*, München: C. H. Beck, 2005. S. 79; Gottzmann, C. L., Hörner P. *Lexikon der deutschsprachigen Literatur des Baltikums und St. Petersburgs: Vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*. Band 2. Berlin, 2007. S. 570–572.
- ⁴ Cf. Forstreuter K. Daniel Hermann – Literat und Diplomat in Frieden und Krieg (see note 1). S. 9.
- ⁵ Pisanski G. C. *Nachricht von dem preußischen Dichter Daniel Hermann, theils aus den eigenen Schriften desselben theils aus anderen Quellen zusammengetragen*, Königsberg: [n.p.]: 1758. [Apparently only available now in the British Library in London]; Gadebusch F. K. *Livländische Bibliothek*. Riga: Hartknoch, 1777 (see note 3). S. 52–64; Recke J. F., Napiersky K. E. *Allgemeines Schriftsteller- und Gelehrtenlexikon*, S. 256–259 (see note 3); Schiemann T. Hermann, Daniel. *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*. Band 12. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1880. S. 166–167.
- ⁶ Schiemann T. Daniel Hermann. Ein livländischer Humanist (see note 1); Ramm-Helsing H. Brautwerbung, Verlöbniß, Lebensgestaltung und Leichenbegängnis nach Rigaschem Recht und Brauch um 1582. *Niederdeutsche Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*, 1942. Nr. 20. S. 18–36; Forstreuter K. Daniel Hermann – Literat und Diplomat in Frieden und Krieg (see note 1).
- ⁷ Cf. Forstreuter K. Daniel Hermann – Literat und Diplomat in Frieden und Krieg (see note 1). S. 10, Anm. 2.
- ⁸ Cf. Ramm-Helsing H. Brautwerbung, Verlöbniß, Lebensgestaltung und Leichenbegängnis (see note 6), passim; Forstreuter K. Daniel Hermann – Literat und Diplomat in Frieden und Krieg (see note 1). S. 15.
- ⁹ Cf. *Danielis Hermannii Borussi secretarii regii Poemata*, vol. 3 at the end; Schiemann T. Daniel Hermann. Ein livländischer Humanist (see note 1). S. 74; Anonymous. Denkmäler im Dom zu Riga. *Riga'scher Almanach*. 1886. Nr. 29, S. 51–53 [with an accompanying German translation]; Forstreuter K. Daniel Hermann – Literat und Diplomat in Frieden und Krieg (see note 1). S. 23–24.
- ¹⁰ Cf. Recke J. F., Napiersky K. E. *Allgemeines Schriftsteller- und Gelehrtenlexikon* (see note 3). S. 256.
- ¹¹ Cf. Ramm-Helsing H. Brautwerbung, Verlöbniß, Lebensgestaltung und Leichenbegängnis (see note 6). S. 35, Anm. 36.
- ¹² Cf. Forstreuter K. Daniel Hermann – Literat und Diplomat in Frieden und Krieg (see note 1). S. 10–12.
- ¹³ Cf. Schiemann T. Daniel Hermann. Ein livländischer Humanist (see note 1). 1878. S. 2. (=1886. S. 54–55); Ramm-Helsing H. Brautwerbung, Verlöbniß, Lebensgestaltung und Leichenbegängnis (see note 6). S. 34; Forstreuter K. Daniel Hermann – Literat und Diplomat in Frieden und Krieg (see note 1). S. 10–12.

- ¹⁴ Cf. Sohm W. *Die Schule Johann Sturms und die Kirche Straßburgs in ihrem gegenseitigen Verhältnis 1530–1581. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte deutscher Renaissance*, München/Berlin: Oldenbourg, 1912; Krey H. J. Sturm, Johannes. *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*. Hg. von F. W. Bautz und T. Bautz. Band 11. Herzberg: Verlag Traugott Bautz, 1996. S. 145–149; Schindling A. *Humanistische Hochschule und freie Reichsstadt. Gymnasium und Akademie in Strassburg 1538–1621* (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für europäische Geschichte Mainz; Band 77), Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1977; Arnold M. (Hg). *Johannes Sturm (1507–1589)* (Spätmittelalter, Humanismus, Reformation; Band 46). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- ¹⁵ Cf. Recke J. F., Napiersky K. E. *Allgemeines Schriftsteller- und Gelehrtenlexikon* (see note 3). S. 256; Forstreuter K. Daniel Hermann – Literat und Diplomat in Frieden und Krieg (see note 1). S. 12.
- ¹⁶ Cf. Schindling A. *Humanistische Hochschule und freie Reichsstadt* (see note 14). S. 55–56.
- ¹⁷ Cf. Schiemann T. Daniel Hermann. Ein livländischer Humanist. S. 3; Forstreuter K. Daniel Hermann – Literat und Diplomat in Frieden und Krieg (see note 1). S. 11.
- ¹⁸ Cf. Recke J. F., Napiersky K. E. *Allgemeines Schriftsteller- und Gelehrtenlexikon* (see note 3). S. 256
- ¹⁹ Cf. Gadebusch F. K. *Livländische Bibliothek* (see note 3). S. 54; Schiemann T. Daniel Hermann. Ein livländischer Humanist (see note 1). 1878. S. 4–5 (=1886. S. 57–58); Forstreuter K. Daniel Hermann – Literat und Diplomat in Frieden und Krieg (see note 1). S. 12.
- ²⁰ Cf. Schiemann T. Daniel Hermann. Ein livländischer Humanist (see note 1). 1878. S. 4–5 (=1886. S. 57–58); Forstreuter K. Daniel Hermann – Literat und Diplomat in Frieden und Krieg (see note 1). S. 12.
- ²¹ Cf. Forstreuter K. Daniel Hermann – Literat und Diplomat in Frieden und Krieg (see note 1). S. 11.
- ²² Ibid. S. 12; Simson P. *Geschichte der Stadt Danzig. Band 2: Von 1517 bis 1626*. Danzig: A. W. Kafermann, 1918. S. 345. (Reprinted as: Simson P. *Geschichte der Stadt Danzig bis 1626. Band 2: Von 1517 bis 1626*. Aalen: Scientia, 1967.)
- ²³ Forstreuter K. Daniel Hermann – Literat und Diplomat in Frieden und Krieg (see note 1). S. 13
- ²⁴ Cf. Recke J. F., Napiersky K. E. *Allgemeines Schriftsteller- und Gelehrtenlexikon* (see note 3). S. 256; Schiemann T. Daniel Hermann. Ein livländischer Humanist (see note 1). 1878. S. 6–9 (=1886. S. 58–63); Simson P. *Geschichte der Stadt Danzig* (see note 22). S. 345; Forstreuter K. Daniel Hermann – Literat und Diplomat in Frieden und Krieg (see note 1). S. 13–15.
- ²⁵ Cf. Gralath D. *Versuch einer Geschichte Danzigs aus zuverlässigen Quellen und Handschriften*. Band 2. Königsberg: Gottlieb Leberecht Hartung, 1790. S. 287–309; Lepszy C. Gdąnsk et la Pologne à l'époque de Batory. *Étienne Báthory, Roi de Pologne, Prince de Transylvanie*. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 1935. S. 212–241; Bilmanis A. *A History of Latvia*. Princeton (N. J.): Princeton University Press, 1951. P. 145; Simson P. *Geschichte der Stadt Danzig* (see note 22). S. 277–318.
- ²⁶ Cf. Recke J. F., Napiersky K. E. *Allgemeines Schriftsteller- und Gelehrtenlexikon* (see note 3). S. 256–257; Schiemann T. Daniel Hermann. Ein livländischer Humanist (see note 1). 1878. S. 9–14 (=1886. S. 63–69); Ramm-Helsing H. Brautwerbung, Verlöbniß, Lebensgestaltung und Leichenbegängnis (see note 6). S. 18–22; Forstreuter K. *Preußen und Rußland von den Anfängen des Deutschen Ordens bis zu Peter dem Großen* (Göttinger Bausteine zur Geschichtswissenschaft; Band 23). Göttingen: Musterschmidt, 1955. S. 193–194; Forstreuter K. Daniel Hermann – Literat und Diplomat in Frieden und Krieg (see note 1). S. 15–18. For the Polish-Russian War cf. Bilmanis A. *A History of Latvia* (see note 25). P. 145–150 and Donnert E. *Der livländische Ordensritterstaat und Rußland. Der Livländische Krieg und die baltische Frage in der europäischen Politik 1558–1583*. Berlin: Rütten & Loening, 1963, esp. S. 5861.
- ²⁷ Cf. Schiemann T. Daniel Hermann. Ein livländischer Humanist (see note 1). 1878. S. 15 (=1886. S. 69)
- ²⁸ Cf. Ramm-Helsing H. Brautwerbung, Verlöbniß, Lebensgestaltung und Leichenbegängnis (see note 6). S. 35; Ramm-Helsing, H. A. David Hilchen. Syndikus der Stadt Riga. *Deutsche wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für Polen*. 1936. Nr. 31. S. 172–173, 189, 197.
- ²⁹ Cf. Schiemann T. Daniel Hermann. Ein livländischer Humanist (see note 1). 1878. S. 15 (=1886. S. 69); Ramm-Helsing H. Brautwerbung, Verlöbniß, Lebensgestaltung und Leichenbegängnis (see note 6). S. 22–35 [who presents several letters written by Hermann]; Forstreuter K. Daniel Hermann – Literat und Diplomat in Frieden und Krieg (see note 1). S. 20–22.

- ³⁰ Cf. Ramm-Helsing H. *Brautwerbung, Verlöbniß, Lebensgestaltung und Leichenbegängniß* (see note 6). S. 19.
- ³¹ Danielis Hermanni Borussi secretarii regii. *Poemata. Academica, aulica, bellica*. Rigae [postum] 1614–1615.
- ³² Cf. Ramm-Helsing H. *Brautwerbung, Verlöbniß, Lebensgestaltung und Leichenbegängniß* (see note 6). S. 35
- ³³ Danielis Hermanni Borussi secretarii regii. *Poemata. Academica, aulica, bellica*. Tom. III. P. 127–137.
- ³⁴ Danielis Hermanni Borussi secretarii regii. *Poemata. Academica, aulica, bellica*. Tom. III. P. 140–157. Individually published in Krakow 1588.
- ³⁵ Not contained in the collection Hermann 1614–1615; cf. Starnawski J. Poems of Daniel Hermann Borussus on the Foundation of the University of Zamość (1594). *Humanistica Lovaniensia*. 1977. Nr. 26. P. 204–218.
- ³⁶ Danielis Hermanni Borussi secretarii regii. *Poemata. Academica, aulica, bellica*. Tom. II. P. 158–174, also published individually.
- ³⁷ *Ibid.* Tom. III. P. 175–179.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.* Tom. II. P. 180–189, also published individually.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.* Tom. III. P. 195–197, also published individually.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.* Tom. III. P. 201–202, also published individually.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.* Tom. III. P. 203–206.
- ⁴² *Ibid.* Tom. III. P. 198–200, also published individually.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.* Tom. III. P. 192–192.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid.* Tom. III. P. 194.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.* Tom. III. P. 194.
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.* Tom. III. P. 103–104.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.* Tom. III. P. 103–104.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.* Tom. III. P. 207–209.
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid.* Tom. III. P. 210–212.
- ⁵⁰ Gadebusch F. K. *Livländische Bibliothek* (see note 3). S. 52–64; Pisanski G. C. *Entwurf der Preußischen Litterärsgeschichte* (see note 3). S. 366; Recke J. F., Napiersky K. E. *Allgemeines Schriftsteller- und Gelehrtenlexikon* (see note 3). S. 256–259.
- ⁵¹ Wiszniewski M. *Historia literatury polskiej*. S. 331–332; Estreicher K. J. T., Estreicher S. *Bibliografia polska* (see note 3). S. 66.
- ⁵² Cf. Altrichter H. Schiemann, Theodor Heinrich Christian Karl. *Neue Deutsche Biographie*. Band 22. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, ²2005. S. 741–742.
- ⁵³ Cf. Forstreuter K. Daniel Hermann – Literat und Diplomat in Frieden und Krieg (see note 1). S. 15.
- ⁵⁴ Schiemann T. Daniel Hermann. Ein livländischer Humanist (see note 1).
- ⁵⁵ Schiemann T. Hermann, Daniel (see note 5).
- ⁵⁶ Ramm-Helsing H. *Brautwerbung, Verlöbniß, Lebensgestaltung und Leichenbegängniß* (see note 6).
- ⁵⁷ Ramm-Helsing H. A. David Hilchen (see note 28). S. 141–212.
- ⁵⁸ Spekke A. *Alt-Riga im Lichte eines humanistischen Lobgedichts vom Jahre 1595 (Bas. Plinius, Encomium Rigae)*. Riga: W. F. Häcker, 1927. S. 11–14.
- ⁵⁹ Lehnerdt J. M. Hermann, Daniel; Wilpert G. *Deutschbaltische Literaturgeschichte* (see note 3). S. 79; Gottzmann, C. L., Hörner P. *Lexikon der deutschsprachigen Literatur des Baltikums und St. Petersburgs*. S. 570–572.
- ⁶⁰ Starnawski J. *Odrodzenie casy – ludzie – książki* (see note 3). S. 395.
- ⁶¹ Starnawski J. Poems of Daniel Hermann Borussus (see note 35). P. 204–218.
- ⁶² Forstreuter K. Daniel Hermann – Literat und Diplomat in Frieden und Krieg (see note 1). S. 9–35.
- ⁶³ Forstreuter K. *Preußen und Rußland* (see note 26). S. 193–194.
- ⁶⁴ Starnawski J. Poems of Daniel Hermann Borussus (see note 35). P. 204–218.
- ⁶⁵ Czarski B. Daniela Hermanna spotkanie z Mużą. Elegia ‚Ad Fredericum a Nostitz‘. *Głosy filologiczno-filozoficzne na marginesie prac Profesora Juliusza Domańskiego w osiemdziesiątą piątą rocznicę Jego urodzin*, Wyd. J. Kwapisz, W. Olszaniec. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Sub Lupa, 2012. S. 151–65.

- ⁶⁶ Cf. Davidsson Å. Några stamböcker i Lunds universitetsbibliothek. *Nordisk tidskrift för bok- och biblioteksväsen*. 1968. Nr. 55. S. 35–38; Davidsson Å. Deutsche Stammbücher in schwedischen Sammlungen. Ein Verzeichnis. *Stammbücher als kulturhistorische Quellen*. Hg. von J. U. Fechner. (Wolfenbütteler Forschungen; Band 11). München: Kraus International Publications, 1981. S. 91; Schwarz C. *Studien zur Stammbuchpraxis der Frühen Neuzeit. Gestaltung und Nutzung des Album amicorum am Beispiel eines Hofbeamten und Dichters, eines Politikers und eines Goldschmieds (etwa 1550 bis 1650)* (Mikrokosmos; Band 66). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2002. S. 29–76, 305–322; cf. also: Klose W. *Corpus Alborum Amicorum – CAAC. Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der Stammbücher des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Hiersemanns Bibliographische Handbücher; Band 8). Stuttgart: Hiersemann 1988. S. 45; Hojda Z. Der Hofstaat Rudolfs II. und die Gesellschaft Prags im Lichte des Stammbuchs des Hartschiers David von Krakau. *Rudolf II. Prague and the World. Papers from the International Conference Prague, 2–4 September 1997*. Hg. von L. Konecny, B. Bukonvinská, I. Muchka. Prague: Artefactum, 1998. S. 244).
- ⁶⁷ National Library of Sweden. <http://libris.kb.se/bib/17126829>. [Accessed 20 November 2015].
- ⁶⁸ Cf. Garber K. *Schatzhäuser des Geistes. Alte Bibliotheken und Büchersammlungen im Baltikum* (Archive, Bibliotheken und Museen Mittel- und Osteuropas; Band 3). Köln/Weimar: Böhlau, 2007. S. 58–59; Busch N. Die Geschichte der Rigaer Stadtbibliothek und ihre Bestände. *Nachgelassene Schriften von Nicolaus Busch, Stadtbibliothekar zu Riga*. Band 2. Hg. von L. Arbusow. Riga: Rigaer Stadtverwaltung, 1937. S. 10–11; Klöker M. Bibliotheksgeschichtliche Einleitung. Garber, K. (ed.), *Handbuch des personalen Gelegenheitsschrifttums in europäischen Bibliotheken und Archiven*. Hg. von K. Garlber. Band 12: *Riga – Teil 1*. Hg. von S. Beckmann, M. Klöker, S. Anders. Hildesheim/Zürich/New York: Olms, 2004. S. 30. The Rare books and manuscripts collections of the Academic Library of the University of Latvia contain a collection of those works by Hermann, which were printed in Riga by Nicolaus Mollin and some books from Hermann's private library, too, as the librarian of the Academic Library of the University of Latvia Dr Aija Taimiņa informed me.
- ⁶⁹ Cf. Gadebusch F. K. *Livländische Bibliothek* (see note 3). S. 57–64; Lilienthal M. *Acta Borussica ecclesiastica, civilia, literaria. Oder Sorgfältige Sammlung allerhand zur Geschichte des Landes Preußen gehöriger Nachrichten, Urkunden, Schriften und Documenten*, Bd. 2, 1, Königsberg Leipzig: Christoph Gottfried Eckart, 1732. S. 121–122; Recke J. F., Napiersky K. E. *Allgemeines Schriftsteller- und Gelehrtenlexikon* (see note 3). S. 257–259.

Magnuss Frišs

Daniels Hermanis – daudzceļojis prūšu humānists un viņa daiļrade Rīgā

Kopsavilkums

Atslēgvārdi: Daniels Hermanis, neolatiniskā literature, neolatiniskā dzeja, humanisms, Rīgas humānisti, renesanse

Prūšu protestants Daniels Hermanis ir nozīmīgs neolatiniskās dzejas pārstāvis, kura dzīves laiks ir no 1543. gada līdz 1601. gadam. Hermanis ir studējis Kēnigsbergā, Strasburgā, Bāzelē (iespējams, arī Ingolštatē un Heidelbergā) un Vitenbergā. Vēlāk viņš ir strādājis par sekretāru ķeizarskajā galmā Vīnē, pēc tam par Dancigas pilsētas sekretāru un par patstāvīgu vēstnieku Polijas karaļa galmā karu ar Krieviju laikā. Pēc kara viņš apcējās un apmetās Rīgā, un kļuva par Polijas karaļa gubernatora kardināla Radzivila sekretāru, vēlāk strādādam pie ģenerāļa Georga Fārensba.

Dzīvodams Rīgā, Hermanis ir sacerējis lielu skaitu veltījuma dzejoļus dažādos akadēmiskos, politiskos un privātos gadījumos, kā arī teoloģiskus, filosofiskus un politiskus darbus dzejā. Rakstā ir sniegts pārskats par Hermaņa dzīvi un daiļradi, īpašu uzmanību pievēršot darbiem, kas sacerēti un publicēti Rīgā, kā arī apkopojums par dzejnieka daiļrades izpēti.

Kristi Viiding

Latin in Early Modern Riga: Remarks About Languages in David Hilchen's Epistolography¹

Keywords: Humanism in Riga, early modern epistolography, multilingualism, vernacular languages *versus* Latin, David Hilchen (Heliconius)

Riga humanists' use of language and their attitudes towards it have not been extensively examined yet. Buchholtz's (1890) bibliography of Riga's early modern print shop (established 1588) contains an inventory of works with the titles in German or Latin.² The titles of Lutheran Church prints were predominantly in German; the works of humanist authors at the turn of the 16–17th centuries were in Latin. The works of Riga humanists were in Latin throughout (including the prefaces).³ Annotated new editions of humanists' work are scarce⁴ and do not explain whether Riga's humanists operated in a multilingual environment, or if they expressed any opinions on the linguistic landscape surrounding them.

It can be questioned, whether Riga humanists were such adamant users of Latin as Buchholtz's bibliography and other publications suggest. To answer this question, I have investigated a source that has only sporadically been used regarding the history of Northern Baltic literatures, languages, education and political history, but which has conversational intimacy due to the genre—the so-called *Nähesprachlichkeit*.⁵ Letters are a genre where one can expect vivid, open and honest expressions of opinions. This article focuses on the Latin correspondence of the main representative of Riga's humanism—Riga's town secretary and syndic David Hilchen (*Heliconius*, 1561–1610)—from 1600 to 1610. The main collection of Hilchen's letters contains more than 700 items, which were allegedly divided in the 1630s into six books by Caspar von Ceumern, a lawyer and syndic from Riga.⁶ The first two books—the so-called *epistulae officiales*—are letters to high Polish and Lithuanian secular and clerical dignitaries. The third and fourth books contain letters that Hilchen wrote in the name of other people. In the last two books, one can find *epistulae familiares*—letters to people close to him—to humanist scholars and students with a similar worldview. The fifth book contains letters to Lithuanian and Polish noblemen and citizens, the sixth—letters to famous Western European humanists (e.g. to Justus Lipsius, Isaac Casaubonus, Johannes Caselius, Friedrich Taubmann). The letters in the books are in neither a chronological nor alphabetical (by recipient's name) order.

I surveyed how often, in which contexts and to whom Hilchen wrote about Latin, and what these writings tell us about his opinions of other languages compared to Latin.

Hilchen touches upon the topic of language in total of twenty six letters. These are without exception letters of his own authorship, i.e. from books I, II, V and VI. In letters written in the name of others (including his sons, *epist.* 3,9; 17; 18, and daughter Jesella *epist.* 3,88),⁷ Hilchen does not mention the topic of choice of language. As might be expected, the choice of language is discussed more in books V–VI, i.e. in the letters to familiar Humanists and intellectuals.

All Hilchen's remarks about languages are short — from one to six sentences. He does not present a complete, systematic description of his theoretical and normative views about Latin — a language programme — in any of his letters. Therefore Hilchen's views on language will be assessed on the basis of sporadic evidence.

Latin as a modern means of communication

Out of twenty-six text segments on the subject of language, three are about Latin, four—Polish, two—High German, one—Turkish and sixteen combinations of two or three languages. Thus, the discourse on Latin is not particularly significant, but nevertheless includes:

- (1) To the Livonian official and nobleman Magnus Nolde in 1609 (*epist.* 5, 192): “Allow me please that I could write in Latin as is customary, without offending you.”⁸
- (2) To his son David in 1609 (*epist.* 5, 258): “See, I wrote one or two things shortly down, to congratulate your young lords as you asked: here are two versions for you. Use one of them as it looks to you. If I would have to say this, I would speak in Latin — do that as well!”⁹
- (3) To his son David in 1609 (*epist.* 5, 256): “I forgive you for not writing to me in Latin. But correct that mistake in future. I interpret this act as a benevolent father.”¹⁰

These examples show two of Hilchen's principles regarding the use of Latin. First, he does not present theoretic or normative views about Latin, nor the history of the language in a diachronic or synchronic way, but reflects upon Latin as a modern means of communication. Latin is not a dead language to him; it obeys the same developmental logic as other languages Hilchen knows or discusses.¹¹ Second, either using or not using Latin could offend the addressee(s). This is valid both for family and in public life, in written (examples 1 and 3) and oral communication (example 2). Choosing the most appropriate (*aptum*) language and tone for a situation is in Hilchen's opinion a skill hard to master and one that demonstrates a person's language skills. Inappropriate choice of language is allowed only for the very young and should certainly be corrected in the course of learning/teaching languages.

Autortiesību ierobežojumu dēļ
attēls nav pieejams.

Axis function of Latin among other languages. Social suitability of language choice

In the sixteen letters where Hilchen mentions Latin in the context of other languages, it is predominantly evident that when writing about language combinations he almost never excludes Latin. The language combinations he uses are the following: as a scholar he discusses Latin with Greek (four times); being brought up in German family, Latin with German (three times); and being exiled from Riga to Poland, Latin with Polish (eight times). Only in one example (*epist.* 1, 36) it is obvious that Latin is not incorporated in the *linguis quotidianis* (“everyday languages”), but is a scholarly language.¹² Thus Latin becomes an axis that other languages are referenced and positioned to. In Hilchen’s mind, languages do not form hierarchies based on their values or other criteria, i.e. Latin (or any other language) does not rule almighty. Latin ranks as an equal among other languages, sometimes preferred and other times in the background.

When discussing several languages together, the communicative side of language is most important to Hilchen. He believes that an appropriate language for both written and oral communication needs to take into account the addressee’s and writer’s language skills and wishes, as well as the potential distribution of the communication. For Hilchen himself Latin would be the most suitable language for communication, because thanks to his command of it he would be able to express himself most easily. Yet he is readily prepared to use a language more suitable for the addressee and recommends others to express their thoughts in several languages:

- (4) To Raphael von Leszno, the Voivode of Brest in 1609 (*epist.* 5, 239): “I ask only one thing: being allowed to write in Latin without offending, as I understand I have to write to Your Highness. Although I am not outstanding in this language, I can accomplish more thanks to it in comparison to any other language. But if I feel that Your Highness does not expect any elegance from me, then I could write in Polish to practice it and to give Your Highness the opportunity to reply pleasantly.”¹³
- (5) To his son Franciscus Hilchen in 1610 (*epist.* 5, 216): “My son Franciscus. I wish you would think not just of a farewell speech, but of three. First one in Latin for Lord Thomas, second one in Polish for mother, third one in Latin for professors.”¹⁴

According to Hilchen, choosing the appropriate language for any communication situation involves constant analysis of the addressee’s language choices, because even after 20 years of communication a change in language on the part of the addressee can be an indirect sign that a change of language is also expected from the other side, such as taking up Latin:

- (6) To Leo Sapieha, Grand Chancellor of Grand Duchy of Lithuania, in 1607 (*epist.* 2, 40): “What is this? Writes in Latin to me, he who after such a long time—does Your Excellence know how long? It has been 20 years—has sent only in Polish. I know that Your Excellence

Autortiesību ierobežojumu dēļ
attēls nav pieejams.

is equally outstanding in both Latin and Polish (*stylus Lachicus*). But why has he exchanged his old and accustomed style? Perhaps to indirectly invite me, who is more expressionless in Polish, to change my language too? Thus I do it at last. But Your Excellence should not expect elegance of me.”¹⁵

When Hilchen feels he has himself used an inappropriate language for a communication situation by choosing Latin, he does not avoid criticism about circumstances beyond his control, which he does not assess adequately. Hilchen believes the language selected for the self-defence print *Clypeus innocentiae et veritatis* (“The Shield of Innocence and Justice”) published in 1604, should have considered the addressees’—Riga’s Aldermen and Mayor—language skills more and been produced in German instead of Latin:

- (7) To Johannes Cawelius in 1604 (*epist.* 5, 87): “I am namely preparing my ‘The Shield of Innocence and Justice’, as fate forces me to dissert my whole story. After a few days you will see it appearing in print in Latin. I wish in German instead.”¹⁶
- (8) To Atarias Sturckius in 1604 (*epist.* 6, 88): “Soon you will see the piece appear in print in Latin. Fate forces me to publish it in German too.”¹⁷

Language studies in service of the ideal of multilingualism

The next linguistic aspect of interest to Hilchen is the acquisition of languages. He discusses this topic most often in connection with the Classical languages and less often in connection with Polish. In Hilchen’s opinion, language acquisition should take into account the suitability for different ages both in terms of the learned language and the learning method. For example, he considers Old Greek to be too complicated for his 14 years old son, recommending the son first to learn how to write the Greek alphabet:

- (9) To Albertus Calissius (Wojciech z Kalisza), Polish humanist educator and poet, in 1603 (*epist.* 5, 61): “In my son’s case it would be sufficient if he would make progress in Latin and start writing Greek letters.”¹⁸

For young students Hilchen thinks Greek is a waste of time—instead they should practice writing a speech in Latin:

- (10) To his son David Hilchen in 1603 (*epist.* 5, 127): “However I am not encouraging you to waste more time on Greek literature, but spend it on one short speech [in Latin] and learn and acquire it as vivaciously and passionately as possible, even though it presents you some difficulties.”¹⁹

In the case of older students, Hilchen equally values skills in Greek as Latin, emphasising how necessary it is to have good, expressive writing and verbal skills in both languages:

- (11) To Abraham Wisoczki in 1608 (*epist.* 5, 26): “I do not renounce from recommending Lord Vladislav base his writings on both Latin and Greek. A fair few times he begins or stops his written or oral barrage of words here in Zamość.”²⁰
- (12) To Seczinsky, the bishop of Przemyśl, in 1609 (*epist.* 1, 106): “Perhaps Your Reverence does not yet know him. Thus I will characterise. In a few years he has laudably and usefully passed the philology course here in our Zamość academy. He is equally spectacularly knowledgeable in both Greek and Latin. His writing style is elegant in both prose and poetry.”²¹

In Hilchen’s opinion, it is more appropriate to study Polish at a young age than either Greek or Latin. His own high education does not allow him to demean himself to teach vernacular languages, not even to his sons. For a Polish teacher he instead recommends to his sons their mother Katharina, who although a Baltic German by ethnicity, is supposed to have acquired a certain level of Polish:

- (13) To Albertus Calissius in 1604 (*epist.* 5, 65): “Franciscus barely leaves his mother’s side, hanging from her like children do. I want him to learn and read Polish prayers every day. But I am not a reader to him in this matter, because I have an abundance of school education.”²²
- (14) To sons David and Franciscus Hilchen in 1604 (*epist.* 5, 128): “Meanwhile you, my David, let Latin, and you Franciscus, let Polish, impregnate and shape you.”²³

Hilchen believes that the methods of language study are universal: recommending to begin learning languages by writing letters, then learning texts [by heart], moving on to reading/writing and finally learning to deliver speeches. The aim of the whole language learning process is to reach the ideal of multilingualism. He thinks successful learning should be followed by intermittent use of several languages in written and oral communication:

- (15) To his son David in 1603 (*epist.* 5, 126): “In the letters that you send me, use languages alternatingly, so that Latin ones follow Polish.”²⁴
- (16) To Matthias Bialobowsky, the rector of the school in the near of Lublin in Krasnobród, in 1610 (*epist.* 5, 265): “The Voivode of Brest intends to travel through here in eight days, stopping at my place with his wife and sister. The guests are expecting two or three welcomers. I wish that Franciscus would greet the Voivode in Polish and present it a second time to the Voivode’s spouse. I ask you to prepare something in Latin for Aleksander, but it should not be long.”²⁵

To Hilchen, multilingualism does not mean mixing of languages (language shifting)—where elements of one language penetrate into another. Language shifting within one piece is only acceptable in longer sections, not at the level of morphology or syntax.

Exceptions to the ideal of multilingualism

In spite of generally favouring multilingualism, Hilchen is of the opinion that for some subjects translating and multilingualism are not appropriate. For example, Hilchen's own speciality of law should always be in Latin. Translating—which is often an act of interpretation—can in Hilchen's opinion result in false interpretations:

- (17) To Christophorus Pelargus, German theologian, professor in Frankfurt/Oder, about the work *Clypeus innocentiae et veritatis* in c.1606 (*epist.* 6, 10): “I ask you, my Pelargus, to take the trouble of expressing all your advice in Latin, so that translation would give no reason to countermine.”²⁶

Conclusion

David Hilchen's observations on languages above all show that Riga's leading humanist had considerable language skills and habits for language use. Although possessing Latin-Ancient Greek-German-Polish quadrilingualism, he preferred Latin for praying, written communication with scholars, learned writings and legal scripts. Hilchen's preference for Polish over German in later life was the result of his personal fate and should not be extrapolated to all Riga humanists of his generation.

As Hilchen shared his linguistic views with many people in a communicative epistolary way, touching upon them predominantly in letters to his sons, other studying juveniles and young men's tutors—that is to the next generation and their teachers—his standpoint might therefore be seen as representative of the wider community, especially in the sense that it is directed to future generations. His letters suggest that among Riga humanists *circa* 1600, Latin was by no means an elite language meant only for written communication, but one of ordinary writing and oral communication (amongst other languages). There were alternative languages to Latin, because German and Polish had already undergone the process of becoming written languages. When writing about German and Polish languages, Hilchen used verbs similar to Latin in his correspondence: e.g. *legere*, *scribere*. In the town chancellery of Riga official written and oral multilingualism was imposed by Hilchen with the reforms of 1598.²⁷ As a language pragmatist, Hilchen advocated the same ideal of multilingualism in his correspondence.

To conclude, on the basis of David Hilchen's correspondence there is reason to claim that at the turn of the 16–17th centuries—the peak of Riga humanisms—oral and written multilingualism took place in Riga.

Notes

- ¹ I thank Ann and James Phillips for this English translation and The Estonian and Latvian Academy of Sciences and The Estonian Ministry of Education and Science (base funding programme for national research project PFLGR12915) for their support. For help in Latvian State Historical Archives (Latvijas Valsts Vēstures Arhīvs, LVVA) I am thankful to Valda Kvaskova.
- ² Buchholtz A. *Die Geschichte der Buchdruckerkunst in Riga: Festschrift der Buchdrucker Rigas zur Erinnerung an die vor 399 Jahren erfolgte Einführung der Buchdruckerkunst in Riga*. Riga: Müller, 1888.
- ³ E.g. Basilius Plinius. *Encomium inclitae civitatis Rigae Metropolis Livoniae*. Lipsiae: Berwald, 1595; Frenzel von Friedenthal, S. *De vera nobilitate et Litterarum dignitate Ad Joan[nem] Gothardum Tisenhausen, Eq[ui]tem Livonum*. Riga: Mollyn, 1599; Hermann D. *Poemata academica, aulica, bellica*. 3 vols. Riga: Mollyn, 1614–1615.
- ⁴ E.g. Spekke A. Rīgas humanista S. Franceļa poēma “Par isto dīzciltību un zinību cieņu”. *Filologu Biedribas Raksti*. 1925. Nr. 5. P. 18–101; Spekke A. *Alt-Riga im Lichte eines humanistischen Lobgedichtes vom Jahre 1595 (Basilius Plinius, Encomium Rigae)*. Riga: Häcker, 1927; Viiding K., Päll, J. Die Glückwunschedichte der Rigaer Gelehrten zur Inauguration der Academia Gustaviana im Jahre 1632. *Humanistica Lovaniensia*. Vol. LIII. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2004. P. 299–321; Dobreff J. *Hermannus Samsonius to Axel Oxenstierna. Latin Correspondence from 1621 to 1630 with Linguistic and Historical Commentaries*. Lund: Lund University Press, 2006; Cīrule B. *Augustīns Eicēdijs, “Daugavas paklājs”*. Riga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 2013.
- ⁵ Leonhardt J. *Latein-Geschichte einer Weltsprache*. München: Beck, 2009. S. 222, translation into English by Kenneth Kronenberg: Leonhardt J. *Story of a World Language: Latin*. Cambridge and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013. P. 220.
- ⁶ Main manuscript in LVVA, 4038 f., 2. apr., 297 l. *Epistolae Davidis Hilchen, sex libris digestae ab anno 1600 usque ad annum 1610 in unum volumen redactae, ubi 715 epistolae reperiuntur*. The other MS in Linköping City Library contains only a selection of letters. Ramm-Helmsing, H. *David Hilchen (1561–1610)*. Posen: Concordia, 1936: p. 70.
- ⁷ The numbering of letters in the MS in LVVA, 4038 f., 2. apr., 297 l is used.
- ⁸ *Quaeso patere me nulla tua cum offensione ex usu latini sermonis scribere*. (Here and henceforth all abbreviations in the letters have been given in full).
- ⁹ *Quod et petieras in gratulationem tuorum herulorum, aliquid breve scribi, ecce feci: dua hic habes formulas: utaris alterutra, ut tibi visum. Mihi si dicendum esset, latine eos alloquerer: et tu facias*.
- ¹⁰ *Iam ignosco quod latine ad me non scripseris, sed corrige in posterum illum laborem. Ita factum interpretaor [sic!], ut pater benigne*.
- ¹¹ *Epist.* 5, 4 and 6, 17 are about the German language; *epist.* 5, 129, 5, 143, 6, 26 and 6, 32 the Polish language.
- ¹² *Cognatus meus est nobilis Livonus nuper adeo ex remotioribus Academiarum locis reversus. Plane illum cupidum esse animadverto in Regia servire. Fide est integra: moribus commodis: eruditione aetati conveniens. Talium certe usus esse potest, praesertim si sint in linguis quotidianis, ut hic exercitati. Si licet admissionem impetrare, rogo faciat Illma D.V. mea et causa, ut inter familiares suos eum ponat* (To Matthaeus [Pstrokowski (c.1553–1609)], the vice chancellor of Poland, in 1606 (*Epist.* 1, 36): “My acquaintance is a nobleman from Livonia, who has recently returned from far away academies. I understand that he is very interested in serving the [Polish] Kingdom. His faith is certain, manners appropriate and his education measures up to the era. Those can be surely used, especially if they are experienced in everyday languages, like he is.”
- ¹³ *Unum hoc deprecor: patiatu me nulla cum offensione latine scribere, cum mihi ad Illustritatem Vestram scribendum esse intelligo. In eo sermone etsi non excellam, plura tamen ab eo, quam a quovis alio impetrare possim. Si tamen sensero Illustritatem Vestram nulla a me elegantiam expectare, scribam et polonice ut me exerceam et occupationem suaviter redendi subinde Illustritati Vestrae praebeam*.
- ¹⁴ *Francisce fili mi. De Valedictione cogitare te cupio; non simplici, sed triplici. Prima Domino Thomae debetur latina, altera matri, Polonica; tertia ibidem Latina professoribus*.

- ¹⁵ *Quid hoc est? Latine ad me scribit, qui a tanto tempore (scit Illustrissima Dignitas Vestra quanto? viginti anni sunt), nonnisi Polonicas misit. Scio Illustrissimam Dignitatem Vestram aequae in Latio atque Lachico stylo expellere. Sed cur veterem et solentem stylum mutavit? Fortassis, ut et ego, qui in Polonicis aridior sum, stylum vertam, tecte me invitat. Faciam igitur deinceps. Sed non expectet Illustrissima Dignitas Vestra a me elegantiam.*
- ¹⁶ *Paro nam Clypeum innocentiae et veritatis, in quo rem meam totam redigere, fama mea me cogit. Videbis intra paucos dies latine editum. Velim ut germanice.*
- ¹⁷ *Rem ipsam brevi videbis latine editam. Ut etiam germanice edatur, fama me coegit.*
- ¹⁸ *Filius mihi satisfecerit, dummodo in latina lingua proficiat, et graecas literas scribere incipiat.*
- ¹⁹ *Nec tamen sic efflagito ut litteris graecis plus temporis tribuas, sed quod uni duntaxat oratiunculae tribuis, eo ipsam alacriter, quantaque potes, contentione discas, quamvis aliquid tibi adhuc molestia adferat.*
- ²⁰ *Dominum Vladislaum non desino commendare de literis tam latinis quam Graecis. Erumpat aliquando et vel voce vel litteris sistat se Zamosciolo nostro.*
- ²¹ *Fortassis Reverendissima Dignitas Vestra non novit eum. Dicam igitur. Is per aliquot annos in Academia Samosciana laudabiliter et utiliter cursum Philologiae direxit. Doctrina excellenti est, in Graecis aequae atque in Latinis: Stylus tam in prosa quam ligata oratione elegans.*
- ²² *Franciscus vix a matre avellitur. Ita haeret, ut pueri. Preces quotidie polonicas velim eum discere et legere. Sed non praeeo, quia prudentia scholastica me superat.*
- ²³ *Interim tu, mi David, Latina, tu vero, Francisce, Polonica oratione imbui et efformari patiaris.*
- ²⁴ *In litteris quas ad me mittes deinceps, utere quadam vicissitudine linguarum, ut latinas polonicae sequuntur.*
- ²⁵ *Palatinides Brestens[is] intra octiduum hac transiturus, ad me deflectet cum uxore et sorore. Hospites salutationem duorum desiderant vel trium. Franciscum velim Polonice salutare Pal[atini]dem eundemque alteram expedire ad Conjugem Pal[atini]dae. Alexandro pares quaeso ex latinis aliquid. Sed hic nihil longum esse oportet.*
- ²⁶ *Te autem, mi Pelarge, oro, ut quam adjeci, et consilium totum latine exprimi cures, ne versio causam det obtrectandi.*
- ²⁷ Schmidt G. *Das Eindringen der hochdeutschen Schriftsprache in der Rigaschen Ratskanzlei*. Riga: E. Bruhns, 1938. (Gesellschaft für Geschichte und Altertumskunde zu Riga. Mitteilungen aus der Baltischen Geschichte. N.F. der Mitteilungen a.d. livländischen Geschichte 25 Bd).

Kristi Viidinga

Latīņu valoda agrīno jauno laiku Rīgā: piezīmes par valodām Dāvida Hilhena epistologrāfijā

Kopsavilkums

Atslēgvārdi: Rīgas humānisms, agrīno jauno laiku epistologrāfija, daudzvalodība, sarunvaloda *versus* latīņu valoda, Dāvids Hilhens (Heliconius)

Dāvida Hilhena valodu lietojuma izpēte vispirms apliecina, ka viens no vadošajiem Rīgas humānistiem ir bijis prasmīgs valodu zinātnieks un lietotājs. Pārvaldīdams latīņu, sengrieķu, vācu un poļu valodu, viņš deva priekšroku latīņu valodai lūgšanās, sarakstē, izglītības un tieslietu sacerējumos. Poļu valodas izvēle vēlākos dzīves posmos ir saistīta ar viņa personisko likteni, un šāda izvēle nav uzskatāma par būtisku pazīmi, kas raksturotu viņa paaudzes Rīgas humānistus.

Tā kā Hilhens dalījās savos valodnieciskajos uzskatos ar daudziem laikabiedriem, izmantodams saraksti, galvenokārt šos jautājumus skarot sarakstē ar dēlu, citiem jauniešiem un izglītības darbiniekiem, tad var uzskatīt, ka viņa uzskati pārstāv plašāku sabiedrības daļu, īpaši attiecībā uz jaunās paaudzes uzrunāšanu.

Hilhena vēstules apliecina, ka Rīgas humānistu vidē ap 1600. gadu latīņu valoda bija ne vien neapšaubāma elites valoda, kas tika lietota sarakstes vajadzībām, bet arī ikdienas mutvārdu un rakstveida saziņas valoda, kas tika lietota līdztekus citām valodām. Pastāvēja arī latīņu valodai alternatīvas iespējas, jo vācu un poļu valoda jau bija kļuvušas par rakstu valodām. Rakstot par vācu un poļu valodu, Hilhens sarakstē lieto latīņu valodai līdzīgus darbības vārdus: piemēram, *legere*, *scribere*. Rīgas pilsētas kancelejā Hilhens pats bija ieviesis mutvārdu un rakstisku daudzvalodību, īstenojot 1598. gada reformas. Būdam lingvistisks pragmatīks, viņš praktizēja šo daudzvalodības ideālu arī savā sarakstē. Balstoties Dāvida Hilhena sarakstē, ir jāsecina, ka 16. un 17. gadsimta mijā Rīgā – Rīgas humānisma uzplaukuma laikmetā – ir pamats runāt par mutvārdu un rakstu daudzvalodību Rīgā.

Mindaugas Strockis

Sirvydas and Elger: The Founding Fathers of Latin Lexicography in the Baltics

Keywords: Sirvydas, Elger, Cnapius, lexicography, Latin

The earliest known monument of Latin lexicography in Lithuania is the list of 74 Latin words in the treatise *De moribus Tartarorum, Lituānorum et Moschorum* (“On the Customs of Tartars, Lithuanians, and Muscovites”), composed in 1550 and published in 1615 by the author whose pen-name was written in Latin as Michalo Lituānus, in modern Lithuanian Mykolas Lietuvis (c. 1490–1560).¹ The list was compiled to demonstrate the affinity of Latin and Lithuanian languages, including those words whose appearance and meaning was very close in both languages. The words were given only in their Latin form and in a few cases, deliberately altered Latin, such as in the genitive case instead of nominative, to emphasise the similarity to the Lithuanian equivalent. For example, *ignis* (the Lithuanian equivalent would be *ugnis*, ‘fire’), *aer* (*oras* ‘air’; the Latin word is actually a loan word from Greek), *sol* (*saulė* ‘sun’), *mensis* (*mėnuo*, *mėnesio* ‘month’), *dies* (*diena* ‘day’), *noctis* (deliberately in the genitive; Lithuanian *naktis*, *nakties*, ‘night’), *ros* (*rasa* ‘dew’), etc.² This word list does not yet merit the title of a ‘dictionary’, but it is the earliest known rudiment of Latin-Lithuanian lexicography.

The earliest known proper dictionary in Lithuania was the first version of the Polish-Latin-Lithuanian lexicon by Konstantinas Sirvydas (1579?–1631), published ca. 1620. The single remaining copy of this book has survived without the beginning or the end, so its exact title and date of publication is unknown, but from bibliographical sources it is surmised that it could have been titled *Promptarium dictionum Polonicarum, Latinarum et Lituanicarum*.³ It is often referred to as the ‘first edition’ of Sirvydas’ dictionary, but in fact it is a different dictionary from the subsequent editions, with differences both in the list of headwords and in their definitions. The database created at the Digital Philology Centre of the University of Vilnius shows that in the extant pages there are 8224 dictionary articles.

The second version of the dictionary, titled *Dictionarium trium linguarum*, was published in 1631. Although different from the first version, it is usually referred to as ‘the second edition’. No copies are now extant. Another edition of this version appeared in 1642, published in Vilnius, at the University of Vilnius printing house; this is the so-called ‘third edition’.⁴ It is this edition that is available in the publicly accessible database *Thesaurus Latino-Lituanicus*, created by the Digital Philology Centre of the University of

Autortiesību ierobežojumu dēļ
attēls nav pieejams.

Vilnius.⁵ There are 14597 entries in this dictionary and it was republished in 1677 and 1713.⁶

Sirvydas' work soon was followed by the Polish-Latin-Latvian dictionary *Dictionarium Polono-Latino-Lottavicum* by Georg Elger (1586?–1672), published posthumously in 1683 in Vilnius, at the University of Vilnius printing house.⁷

As it has been established by scholarship, Sirvydas based the second version, namely, the second edition and the subsequent posthumous editions of his dictionary, on the first edition of the Polish-Latin-Greek lexicon titled *Thesaurus Polonolatinograecus* and compiled by Gregorius Cnapius (in modern Polish known as Grzegorz Knapski; 1561?–1638).⁸ Scholarly comparison of Cnapius' and Sirvydas' dictionaries has revealed that Sirvydas borrowed the list of Polish and Latin headwords from Cnapius with some alterations and wrote the Lithuanian part.

It was also established that Elger likewise based his dictionary on that of Sirvydas, from which he borrowed the Polish and Latin word list, and wrote the Latvian equivalents. The first scholar who pointed out this fact was Daina Zemzare in 1961.⁹ Later other scholars argued that Elger's dictionary was based not only on Sirvydas' work, but also on that by Cnapius, which, as mentioned above, was Sirvydas' source of Polish and Latin headwords.¹⁰ Furthermore, Gintarė Judžentytė and Vilma Zubaitienė studied the evolution of scholars' views in terms of how Elger's dictionary was compiled. In their presentation of findings at the conference on the history and dialects of Baltic languages in November 2014 Judžentytė and Zubaitienė also accepted the view that Elger's dictionary was based not only on Sirvydas, but also on Cnapius.¹¹

However, this conclusion needs to be addressed and revised. There are no dictionaries without errors; some errors have crept into Sirvydas' dictionary as well. Naturally, Elger could not use the erroneous material found in Sirvydas for his own dictionary. It seems to be a reasonable assumption that upon noticing an error, Elger must have corrected it in some way. It should not be understood that Sirvydas' dictionary was faulty; on the contrary, it was an excellent dictionary: in its nearly fifteen thousand entries there are very few errors. However, in works of such complexity some errors are inevitable. By all likeness the errors have occurred due to the typesetter's negligence. As manifested by the entirety of his dictionary, Sirvydas was a competent scholar and would not have let obvious slips remain uncorrected; but the third edition of Sirvydas' dictionary was published posthumously in 1642, and the previous, second edition was published the same year Sirvydas died, so apparently, in the terminal months of his life, he did not have an opportunity to do proper proofreading.

In Sirvydas' dictionary the typesetter's errors have crept into the words of various languages, but particularly into Latin. It would be quite natural to presume that Latin was the language of which the typesetter had the least knowledge of all three, so that it was particularly in need of the author's attention. Especially interesting for the purpose of this study are such errors where missing or superfluous characters rendered the Latin

word incomprehensible. When compiling his dictionary, Elger had to correct the words in order to use them. For instance, in the third edition of Sirvydas' dictionary the following entry is provided:

WŃpak, ná wŃpak. Retro ordinem. **AtŃagaray.**¹²

Obviously, the Polish words mean 'backwards' or 'conversely' (*wŃpak* in modern orthography), likewise does the Lithuanian word (*atŃagariai* is the modern form). The Latin *retro* means precisely that, but the addition of *ordinem* seems to be unnecessary and ill-fitting to the Latin syntax. When compiling his dictionary, Elger must have rectified this in some way; and indeed, there is the following entry provided:

WŃpak ná wŃpák. Retro. **Atpákkał.**¹³

Here, the Polish expressions are the same and the omission of comma between them can be considered the typesetter's error. The Latvian word (*atpakaļ* in modern orthography) has the corresponding meaning, and the Latin is given only as *retro*, without the addition or *ordinem*, which is perfectly correct.

It can be questioned how and why the word *ordinem* appeared in Sirvydas' dictionary. If we inspect the corresponding entry in Cnapius' dictionary, the following entry can be found:

WŃpák, ná wŃpák (...) Retrò agere ordinem (...) ¹⁴

Thus formulated, *retro agere ordinem* is a correct phrase, 'to do things in reverse order'. Hence, it can be concluded that Sirvydas' intention was to take the whole phrase *retro agere ordinem* from Cnapius, but the word *agere* was omitted by, most likely, the typesetter's error. Elger, having found in Sirvydas' text an apparently meaningless phrase, corrected it by removing *ordinem* and leaving only *retro*.

There is another example of a simple error corrected by Elger (although garbled in yet another way by his own typesetter). In Sirvydas' dictionary the following entry is provided:

Zakończánie, zákończenie. Executio [sic]. **AŃzufmaylinimas.**¹⁵

The Polish word stands for 'sharpening' or 'finishing'; the Lithuanian word (*aŃzushima* in modern orthography) means 'sharpening', but the Latin says *Executio*, which looks meaningless in the context. It takes a moment to realise that what Sirvydas meant to write was *Exacutio*, 'sharpening', and *Executio* was the typesetter's error (it should be noted that it is not *Exfecutio*, which would be the expected spelling for the meaning 'execution'). Apparently, Elger understood the intended meaning and corrected the word; however, by incidence, the typesetter of Elger's dictionary garbled the same word in a different way. In Elger's dictionary the following entry is provided:

Zakończánie, zákończenie. Exucatio [sic], finitio. **AŃtru dárrifzáná.**¹⁶

The meaningless *Exucatio* here is clearly a typesetter's error for *Exacutio*. Elger also added another Latin word, *finitio*, 'finishing', although the Latvian equivalent stands only for 'sharpening' (*astru darīšana* in modern orthography, 'making sharp', the common modern Latvian equivalent being *asināšana*, 'sharpening'). Whereas in Cnapius dictionary the following entry is provided:

Zakończánie, zákończenie. (...) Exacutio calami (...) ¹⁷

Autortiesību ierobežojumu dēļ
attēls nav pieejams.

“Dictionarium Polono-Latino-Lottavicum” by Georg Elger. Academic Library of the University of Latvia, Department of Manuscripts and Rare Books. R1913

The entire phrase in Cnapius is *Exacutio calami*, ‘sharpening of a calamus’, and there is no *finitio*.

These examples provide grounds for suggesting that when borrowing Sirvydas’ material for his dictionary, Elger relied only on his own competence in Latin to correct the erroneously printed words, without looking up the corresponding places in Cnapius’ dictionary. Further examples corroborate this suspicion.

In one and the only instance in the entire Sirvydas’ dictionary there is an entry which looks like a case of haplography, as if the typesetter had omitted some lines and joined similar lines of adjacent entries into one garbled entry. It is the following entry:

zátwardźiałość, Duratus, induratus. ***ażukieteis***.¹⁸

The Polish word stands for ‘rigidity’ (as if the Latin were *duritas* or *durities*); the Latin equivalent, however, is *Duratus*, *induratus*, which means ‘rigid’, not ‘rigidity’; and the Lithuanian word (*ażukietėjjs* in Sirvydas’ dialect but modern orthography, *użkietėjęs* being the standard modern equivalent) corresponds to the meaning of the Latin *duratus*. There is a strong suspicion that what Sirvydas actually had written in his manuscript were two separate entries for ‘rigidity’, *durities*, and ‘rigid’, *duratus*, and the two similar entries were

garbled by an inadvertent typesetter. Indeed, this is exactly what can be seen in Cnapius' dictionary:

Zátwárdziáłość (...) Durities animi (...) ¹⁹

Zátwárdziály, Duratus, induratus (...) ²⁰

It would be natural to suppose that, had Elger consulted Cnapius, he would have accordingly corrected the haplography in his dictionary, making two separate entries. However, in Elger's dictionary only one entry is provided:

Zatwardziáłość. Obftinatio. **Cetufyrdyba**. ²¹

The Polish word is the same as in Sirvydas, and stands for 'rigidity' (or 'stubbornness'). Instead of the unfitting *duratus* Elger put a different Latin equivalent, *obstinatio* ('stubbornness'), and translated the entry into Latvian as *Cetufyrdyba* (*cietsirdība* would be the modern Latvian equivalent).

Also, there is a curious entry in Sirvydas' dictionary where the Latin word was garbled by the typesetter in such a misleading way that Elger could not figure out its correct form and omitted the whole entry from his dictionary. In Sirvydas' dictionary the following entry is provided:

Przedzielnicá, Difcerniculum, acus criminalis [sic], **perfskirkle**. ²²

The Polish word (*przedzielnica* in modern orthography) is rare (besides, incidentally, it is also the Polish name of a village in modern Ukraine near the Polish border). The Lithuanian word is also little known, even if we presume that Elger had a good knowledge of Lithuanian. The Latin *discerniculum* means either 'bodkin' (a type of hair-pin, which parts the hair), or 'difference'; and *acus criminalis* looks like funny nonsense ('criminal needle?'). It takes a while to realise that the typesetter had added two superfluous letters, and the mysterious 'criminal needle' is in fact *acus crinalis*, a hair-pin, which is the meaning of the entire Sirvydas' entry. Had Elger had a copy of Cnapius' dictionary and consulted it, he would have seen the correct answer to this puzzle:

Przędzielnicá (...) Acus crinalis (...) ²³

Instead, Elger omitted the troublesome entry altogether: in Sirvydas' dictionary, the *Przędzielnicá* entry is alphabetically between *Przędzielam* and *Przędzieram*, and in Elger's dictionary there is nothing between them. This proves that Elger did not use Cnapius' dictionary and relied only on Sirvydas' version. When correcting Sirvydas' errors, Elger relied only on his own competence in Latin, without looking up and checking the correct answers in Cnapius. When the accurate form of a garbled entry could not be easily resolved, Elger chose to omit it altogether.

In defence of Elger it could be said that he was not the only lexicographer who failed to decipher the funny *acus criminalis* error. A prominent 19th century Lithuanian linguist and lexicographer Fridrikis Kuraitis, in German known as Friedrich Kurschat (1806–1884), in his 1883 Lithuanian-German dictionary²⁴ included the Lithuanian word *perskirkle*. The entry was made on page 307 and marked with square brackets, which in Kuršaitis' dictionary indicate that the word was not known to him as a native speaker, but was taken from written sources. Kuršaitis explained it as a 'division line' or a 'separation

mark' (*die Theilungslinie, das Unterscheidungszeichen*). Such an explanation is obviously a guess. The word is, indeed, little known in Lithuanian, and the meaning 'division line' could be arrived at by analysing the word's etymology, since *perskirklē* can be etymologically interpreted as a 'tool of separation'. Such an explanation of this little-known word has survived in modern Lithuanian dictionaries, too. It can be considered a monument to the 17th century typesetter at the University of Vilnius printing house, who once inadvertently inserted two superfluous letters into a Latin word, thus making the whole entry in Sirvydas' dictionary incomprehensible.

Such are the proofs that upon compiling his Polish-Latin-Latvian dictionary, Elger used only a copy of Sirvydas' Polish-Latin-Lithuanian dictionary, without consulting Cnapius.

However, the juxtaposition of the two dictionaries by Sirvydas and Elger provides us something more than a mere possibility to compare them and to make philological conclusions about the sources used by their authors. Indeed, there are two competently written dictionaries – with an exception of a few errors – published in the 17th century: one Lithuanian and one Latvian. With a few differences, both dictionaries are based on the same word list in Polish and Latin; in other words, a Polish-Latin-Lithuanian dictionary was directly translated into a Polish-Latin-Latvian dictionary. Thus, it is a *virtual Lithuanian-Latvian dictionary*. It comprises a wealth of words, from inherited Baltic lexicon to loanwords, from basic to abstract concepts. To illustrate the idea, a few, quite randomly chosen entries can be inspected:

Pies, Canis. *Szuo*.²⁵

Pies, Canis. *Suns*.²⁶

Dąb. Quercus, robur. *Vžuolas*.²⁷

Dąb. Quercus (vs f:) *Ozols ozolkoks*.²⁸

Miasto, Ciuitas, Vrbs. *Miestas*.²⁹

Miasto, Ciuitas (atis f:) urbs. *Læla pyls, pilšfæta*.³⁰

Kot, kotká. Felis, feles, catus. *Katinas*.³¹

Kot, kotká. Felis (is f. m.) feles (is) catus. *Kakys*.³²

Czytam. Lego, recito. *Skaytau*.³³

Czytam. Lego, recito. *Es las*.³⁴

wizerunk, Archetypus, exemplar, idea, specimen. *Paweykštas*.³⁵

Wizerunk. Idea, exemplar, Archetypus, specimen. *Prekfázymá*.³⁶

As it is universally known, dedicated Lithuanian-Latvian dictionaries were composed centuries later; however, a juxtaposition of these two works by the founding fathers of Latin lexicography in the Baltic nations provides us with an unexpected linguistic treasure: a *de facto* Lithuanian-Latvian dictionary of nearly fifteen thousand entries, compiled in the 17th century.

Notes

- ¹ Michalo Litanus. *De moribus Tartarorum, Litanorum et Moschorum fragmina X, multiplici historia referta*. Basileae: Apud Conradum Waldkirchium, 1615.
- ² Ibid. P. 23–24.
- ³ Lukšaitė I. Humanistinė S. Risinskio biblioteka Vilniuje. *Bibliotekų darbas*. 1983. Nr. 1. P. 30–31; Lukšaitė I. Salomono Risinskio bibliotekos Vilniuje sąrašas. *Iš Lietuvos bibliotekų istorijos*. Vilnius: Lietuvos valstybinė respublikinė biblioteka, 1985. P. 17–45.
- ⁴ [Sirvydas K.] *Dictionarium trium lingvarum, In ufum Studioſæ Iuuentutis, Auctore Constantino Szyrwid è Societate Jesu, Cum Superiorum permiſſu editum. Tertia editio recognita & aucta*. Vilnæ: Typis Academicis Societatis Jesu, M. DC. XLII [1642].
- ⁵ *Thesaurus Latino-Lituanicus. Jungtinis lotynų-lietuvių kalbų žodynas nuo XVII iki XXI amžiaus*. www.thesaurus.flf.vu.lt [Accessed 20 November 2015]
- ⁶ 1667 edition: [Sirvydas K.] *Dictionarium trium lingvarum, In ufum Studioſæ Iuuentutis, Auctore R. P. Constantino Szyrwid è Societate JESU, Cum Superiorum permiſſu editum. Quarta editio recognita & aucta*. Vilnæ, Typis Academicis Societatis JESU, Anno Domini M. DC. LXXVII. 1713 edition: [Sirvydas K.] *Dictionarium trium lingvarum, In ufum Studioſæ Iuuentutis, Auctore R. P. Constantino Szyrwid è Societate JESU, Cum Superiorum permiſſu editum. Qvinta editio recognita & aucta*. Vilnæ, Typis Academicis Societatis JESU, Anno Domini M. DCC. XIII.
- ⁷ Elger G. *Dictionarium Polono-Latino-Lottaicum. Opus poſthumum R. P. Georgii Elger Soc. IESU. In gratiam Studioſæ Iuuentutis in lucem datum*. Vilnæ: Typis Academicis Soc. IESU. A. D. 1683.
- ⁸ Cnapius G. *Thesaurus Polonolatinogrecus, seu Promptuarium linguæ Latinæ et Græcæ, Polonorum uſui accomodatam*. Cracoviæ: Typis Franciſci Cefarii, 1621.
- ⁹ Zemzare D. *Latviešu vārdnīcas līdz 1900. gadam*, Rīga: Latvijas Zinātņu akadēmijas izdevniecība, 1961. 64.–72. lpp.
- ¹⁰ Urbutis V. *Senieji latviešu kalbos žodynai, Knygos apie žodžius*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 2010. S. 71–107; Beitiņa M. Sintaktiskā sinonīmija Georga Elgera vārdnīca “Dictionarium Polono-Latino-Lottaicum” (1683). *Baltu filoloģija*. 2013. Nr. 22(1). 5–30. lpp.
- ¹¹ The presentation title: Judžentytė G., Zubaitienė V. Dėl Konstantino Sirvydo *Dictionarium trium lingvarum* (1642) ir Georgo Elgerio *Dictionarium Polono-Latino-Lottaicum* (1683) lietuviškosios resp. latviškosios dalies; presentation delivered at 2014-11-07 at the conference *Aktuali baltu valodu vėstures un dialektologijas jautājumi: veltījums valodnieces Martas Rudzītes (1924–1996) piemiņai*.
- ¹² Sirvydas K. *Dictionarium trium lingvarum*. P. 488. (Here and further the third edition of 1642 is quoted.)
- ¹³ Elger G. *Dictionarium Polono-Latino-Lottaicum*. P. 597.
- ¹⁴ Cnapius G. *Thesaurus Polonolatinogrecus*. P. 1350.
- ¹⁵ Sirvydas K. *Dictionarium trium lingvarum*. P. 519.
- ¹⁶ Elger G. *Dictionarium Polono-Latino-Lottaicum*. P. 626.
- ¹⁷ Cnapius G. *Thesaurus Polonolatinogrecus*. P. 1437.
- ¹⁸ Sirvydas K. *Dictionarium trium lingvarum*. P. 533.
- ¹⁹ Cnapius G. *Thesaurus Polonolatinogrecus*. P. 1467.
- ²⁰ Ibid. P. 1467.
- ²¹ Elger G. *Dictionarium Polono-Latino-Lottaicum*. P. 641.
- ²² Sirvydas K. *Dictionarium trium lingvarum*. P. 350.
- ²³ Cnapius G. *Thesaurus Polonolatinogrecus*. P. 874.
- ²⁴ Kurschat F. *Wörterbuch der litauischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil: Littauisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Weisenhauses. 1883.
- ²⁵ Sirvydas K. *Dictionarium trium lingvarum*. P. 194.
- ²⁶ Elger G. *Dictionarium Polono-Latino-Lottaicum*. P. 369.
- ²⁷ Sirvydas K. *Dictionarium trium lingvarum*. P. 44.
- ²⁸ Elger G. *Dictionarium Polono-Latino-Lottaicum*. P. 54.
- ²⁹ Sirvydas K. *Dictionarium trium lingvarum*. P. 169.
- ³⁰ Elger G. *Dictionarium Polono-Latino-Lottaicum*. P. 217.

- ³¹ Sirvydas K. *Dictionarium trium lingvarum*. P. 169.
- ³² Elger G. *Dictionarium Polono-Latino-Lottaicum*. P. 125.
- ³³ Sirvydas K. *Dictionarium trium lingvarum*. P. 169.
- ³⁴ Elger G. *Dictionarium Polono-Latino-Lottaicum*. P. 54.
- ³⁵ Sirvydas K. *Dictionarium trium lingvarum*. P. 169.
- ³⁶ Elger G. *Dictionarium Polono-Latino-Lottaicum*. P. 587.

Mindaugs Strockis

Sirvīds un Elgers: latīņu leksikogrāfijas dibinātāji Baltijā

Kopsavilkums

Atslēgvārdi: Sirvīds, Elgers, Knapijs, leksikogrāfija, latīņu valoda

Raksts veltīts latīņu leksikogrāfijas pirmsākumiem Baltijā 17. gadsimtā, vispirms sniedzot nelielu pārskatu par senākajiem latīņu leksikogrāfijas materiāliem Lietuvā, ko jau 16. gadsimta vidū apkopojis Mikols Lietuvis. Turpmākajā izpētes gaitā autors pievēršas nozīmīgiem 17. gadsimtā tapušiem latīņu-lietuviešu un latīņu-latviešu leksikogrāfijas materiāliem – 1620. gadā publicētajai poļu-latīņu-lietuviešu vārdnīcai, ko veidojis Konstantins Sirvīds (*Konstantinas Sirvydas*, 1579?–1631), un Georga (Jura) Elgera (1586?–1672), sastādītajai poļu-latīņu latviešu vārdnīcai, kas publicēta pēc autora nāves 1683. gadā Viļņā.

Pētījumā veikts abu leksikogrāfisko avotu salīdzinošs izvērtējums, noskaidrojot iespējamās Elgera vārdnīcas attiecības ar poļu autora Gregorija Knapska veidoto senāko latīņu-poļu vārdnīcu, ko izmantojis Sirvīds. Lietojot kļūdu analīzes metodi, autors nonāk pie secinājuma, ka uzskats, ka Elgers izmantojis Sirvīda un Knapska vārdnīcu ir pārskatāms, jo Elgers nav novērsis kļūdas, kas sastopamas Sirvīda tekstā, bet kuru nav Knapskim. Tas liek secināt, ka Elgers izmantojis Sirvīda vārdnīcu un paļāvis pats uz savu lingvistisko kompetenci.

Vienlaikus autors nonāk pie secinājuma, ka, tā kā abi vārdnīcu veidotāji 17. gadsimtā, izmantojot vienu un to pašu latīņu un poļu vārdu sarakstu (ar nelieliem izņēmumiem), de facto ir izveidojuši virtuālu latviešu un lietuviešu valodas vārdnīcu.

Māra Grudule

Sapphic Stanza in the 17th Century Latvian Literature

Keywords: Sapphic stanza, Latvian poetry, 17th century, Christophor Fürecker

The Sapphic stanza was named after a Greek poetess Sappho, who lived in the 6th century BC on the island of Lesbos. Lesbos literature is characterized by deliberate avoidance of long stanzas, epic meter or elegy. Lyrics are often written in quatrains; it is well illustrated by the works of Sappho and the second most lauded poet of Lesbos, Alcaeus. The literature of Lesbos is different also in terms of the style, as its short form requires concentration and specific, relatively limited, subjective selection of language means.

Sappho today is mostly associated with homosexual revelations in poetry. Sappho's poetry contemplates a youthful female beauty and love; it is very personal and prone to metaphysical generalizations. Sappho is regarded as a discoverer of female psychology and aesthetics of Eros. Her poetry has miniature compositions, often with a single image hardly different from the narrator, sometimes the two merge into the author's voice to become one.

The paper will not focus on the reception of the content and subject matter of Sappho's poetry but would rather offer an insight into the use of the Sapphic stanza in Latvian literature while focusing on the early examples from the 17th century Latvian hymns.

Most of the 17th century Latvian Sapphic stanzas are translations from German. Before moving on to Latvian texts, it makes sense to establish a diachronic perspective on the place and use of the Sapphic stanza in the history of poetry, with a special focus on German poetry. The oldest form of stanza, used by Sappho is metric, i.e. short and long syllables relation is significant. The Sapphic stanza is articulated into four lines consisting of a long syllable (-), a short syllable (v), long or short, or two short syllables (x) and a pause or caesura (/); it should be noted that the end of the word is to be observed at certain places in the verse (:). Its metric scheme might be represented as follows:

- v - x - v v - v - x //
 - v - x - vv - v - x //
 - v - x - vv - v - x :
 - v v - x //

The ancient Greeks perceived the first two verses as an indivisible whole, the third and fourth—as yet another indivisible unit. The last two verses were recited without any rhythmic breaks—as one long verse. Line break, creating the fourth short verse, supposedly appeared for aesthetic reasons—the ancient Greeks did not favour very long lines.¹

Horace (65–27 BC) introduced into Latin the spirit of classic Greek poetry, which is also indicated in one of his odes: “..from dimness he wax`d bright / First of his race to wed the Aeolian lay / To notes of Italy.”² Horace uses a classic Greek stanza form with a caesura in the middle, thus providing for the fluidity of lines. This also applies to the Sapphic stanza:

- v - - - // v v - v - x
 - v - - - // v v - v - x
 - v - - - // v v - v - x
 - v v - x.

The metrical scheme shows that Horace introduces another innovation to the Sapphic stanza—the fourth syllable of the long verse should always be long.

Medieval poetry and Christian hymns in general, on the one hand, stem from the Hebrew poetic tradition, and, on the other hand, rest on the Latin poetic heritage. Since the 5th century poets had been writing spiritual songs that accurately imitated Latin stanzas, where the relation between the length and brevity of syllables still played an important role. The Sapphic stanza was used in religious poetry already in the 8th century, most likely firstly borrowed from Horace, by Paul the Deacon (c. 720–799), a Benedictine of Monte Cassino. He used the stanza in the Latin hymn *Ut queant laxis* (“So that your servants may”), in honour of St. John the Baptist:³

Ut queant laxis resonare fibris,
 Mira gestorum famuli tuorum,
 Solve polluti labii reatum,
 Sancte Iohannes.

[So that your servants may, with loosened voices, / resound the wonders of your deeds, / clean the guilt from our stained lips, / O Saint John.]

Latin and German have a fixed stress and thus, medieval poets eventually switched to stress when stressed syllables gradually replaced metric long syllables, while unstressed syllables replaced the short ones. This time also welcomed the introduction of rhyme. Latin poetry did not use rhyme deliberately, but it may appear due to certain relatedness in endings; this very reason or the influence of Hebrew poetry most likely led to the idea of rhyming. The first informed and intentionally used rhyme was *vocalic assonance* where a vowel was complemented by another vowel, then by two, and the rhyme very soon acquired the shape we know today. In the 12th century metrical and rhymed poetry was already well developed⁴. The Sapphic stanza shows rhyme already in the Middle Ages: *aabb* or less frequent variation—*abab*, generally a two syllable rhyme with the last syllable unstressed.

In the 16th century Europe, during the late Renaissance, interest in the cultural heritage of antiquity was confirmed by returning to the primary sources—ancient Greek poetry

studies and translations thereof. The middle of the century welcomed the publications of a number of anthologies of Sappho poetry. The Sapphic stanza was used in Horatian and medieval poetry metrical feet—with a caesura in long verses, as well as returning to the original, without a caesura in the middle of the verse. These parallel forms remained in poetry throughout the following centuries.

Three stressed contiguous syllables required by Horatian variation of the Sapphic stanza are not typical of the German language due to stress timing. In German poetry long verses of the Sapphic stanza show various modifications in the relations of short and long or stressed (/) and unstressed (v) syllables, but the caesura (√) introduced by Horace is optional, and its location is not fixed, it may come after the fifth, sixth or even seventh syllable, to wit:

/ v v / v / v √ / v x v or
 / v / v v / v √ / v / v , or
 / v / v x v √ v / v / v

The fourth stanza constantly remains dactylic and trochaic: / v v / v.

Let's turn to the first examples of the Sapphic stanza in the 17th century poetry written in Latvian. The territory of modern Latvia was conquered by German crusaders already in the 13th century and by the early 20th century, regardless of its territorial affiliation and culture, the economic and social life of the region was dominated by the Germans. The concept "German" does not carry only ethnic, but also social significance; it represents the privileged *strata* of society. Most of the ethnic Latvians of the examined period were uneducated peasants from the countryside or else belonged to the low stratum of the cities.

The development of Latvian written language and literature is closely related to the reformation movement of the 16th century. The Germans compiled the first Latvian texts, mostly translations for religious purposes, including Catholic and Lutheran hymns. Those texts mark the starting point of Latvian poetry. In the 17th century, as elsewhere in Europe, much interest was paid to the local language studies and collection of lexical material. Baltic Germans, mainly pastors working at Latvian churches, published the first Latvian dictionaries and grammar books. The Baroque era and language studies contributed to the flourishing of poetry. The number of hymns, which were mostly translated from German, was rapidly growing and in the late 17th century it already reached almost half a thousand. A variety of forms proliferated, expression and style got improved and the range of translated authors expanded. The supply considerably exceeded demand and versification in Latvian among German pastors became a hobby.

The year 1697 welcomed the publication of the first Latvian poetics, and its author was a German pastor working in Latvian congregation, Johann Wischmann (?–1703). His work, based on the work of his colleagues, the translations prepared by other German pastors was, on the one hand, the compilation of existing poetry, on the other, it served as a guide for the acquisition of new genres of literature. Wischman's target readership was his

Autortiesību ierobežojumu dēļ
attēls nav pieejams.

fellow clergymen, and thus, the theoretical part was in German, but examples in Latvian. The book also explained the Sapphic stanza. In this respect, there was no shortage of illustrative material for Wischmann to support his claims: the Sapphic stanza by that time had already been used in one Catholic hymn and six Lutheran hymns. Wischmann complemented those by two epigrams serving as an example for theoretical description of the Sapphic stanza in Latvian. All the texts will be discussed in a chronological order starting with the catholic example from 1621.

Urban Latvians attended the Catholic Mass already before the Reformation: historical evidence shows that a number of Riga craftsmen fraternities owned priest served altars in churches already in the Middle Ages.⁵ Hence, Latvians, just like Germans and other nations might have sung Catholic hymns in their own language outside the Mass already before the Reformation. Although in the early 16th century the Reformation won in Riga, in the second half of the century the major part of the Baltics came under the Polish rule and in Riga, as well as elsewhere the Jesuits got actively involved, though after the Polish-Swedish War of 1629 they left Riga and Livonia.

The year 1621 welcomed the first Catholic hymnal in Latvian *Geistliche Catholische Gesänge* (“Spiritual Catholic Hymns”).⁶ The book represented the initial stage of the Jesuit activity—a new path searching within the Catholic Church. The Jesuits set a primary task of raising a free personality by means of catechization and comprehensive education for the young generation. By and large, they did not oppose the popular pagan manifestations but tried to tolerate and integrate them into the Catholic world; moreover, religious texts tended to incorporate folk language with its conversational style and idiomatic expressions as well as cultural and social realia. The compiler of the hymnal, a Jesuit Georg Elger (1585–1672) admitted that the book was prepared in collaboration with his colleagues. It held at least 96 hymns: the last pages have not survived to nowadays. Most of the texts were accompanied by musical notations, and the greatest part was constituted by translations from German or Latin, relatively less — from the Polish language, whereas the identity of 15 songs has not been established yet. Since the latter part of the texts was in a rather decent Latvian, elegant and rhythmical, they could be either Elger’s compositions, or the texts familiar in Latvian Catholic environment and sung already in the pre-reformation period. Church historian Staņislavs Kučinskis, having studied documentary materials, maintains that Elger is of Latvian origin.⁷ However, the written Latvian in the hymnal was quite poor, brimming with numerous mistakes, which was not, in fact, surprising because it was only the second book ever created by Catholics for Latvians.

Although not divided into chapters, the hymnal covers the church year with a separate cycle devoted to Mary and other saints, as well as repentance. The book concludes with litany and some texts for different purposes, including Catholic catechization. Quite unique is *Viena dziesma no tems čtremš pēdīgēms letēms. Raudat kam ne mīl vairāk ne kā līksmot* (“One song about The Four Last Things Those who love not, shall cry more than rejoice”)⁸, containing 49 Sapphic stanzas. That is the first time we find the Sapphic stanza used in Latvian poetry ever. Also this hymn is accompanied by musical notation and set

for two voices. The song contemplates a motif of Death, the Last Judgement, Heaven and Hell, which is much exploited in Renaissance and Baroque culture. The mentioning of Dante's "Divine Comedy" or Hieronymus Bosch's painting "The Seven Deadly Sins" would suffice to illustrate the above mentioned. In the early 17th century the motif of death and destruction was quite represented because of war, famine and plague. In the late 16th century Europe suffered through a 'small glacial period', which led to crop failure and famine; the Baltics faced the Livonian and the Polish-Swedish War with subsequent plague epidemic; Europe was fighting the 30 Years War that at that time was only gaining its momentum. Thus, rhythmic and formal arrangement of poetry, including the Sapphic stanza, might have been a response to an overwhelming instability and chaos.⁹ Almost each stanza of this hymn might be perceived as an epigram, as a separate unit, however content-wise we may follow the trail of themes of Death, the Last Judgement and Hell/Heaven concluded by a reminder not to sin and to live as if every day was the last. From this perspective, the hymn might have had a special task among Latvian audience because as the German scholar Helmut Husenbeth maintains, Catholic priests used this kind of texts as an aid for youth education and maintenance of moral standards among adults.¹⁰

"One song about the Four Last Things. Those who love not, shall cry more than rejoice" has not been so far aligned with German or Latin texts and by its content it might have been penned by the compiler of the Catholic hymnal Georg Elger himself. Some stanzas refer to Latvian household and culture elements, such as an ornament typical of a Latvian folk-maid—a silver brooch:

Tur pretī nepalīdzēs zelts, nedz sudrabs,
Sudraba sakta, gredzens virsū pirkstiem,
Zeltaini mati, sarkans vaigs no nāves
Tevi neatpestīs¹¹.

[Neither gold nor silver will help there / Silver brooch, ring on the finger, / Golden hair, rosy cheek, / Will not deliver you from death.]

Not only the proximity of life and death or the expressive language, but also quite specific elements such as a church and a cemetery remind of the presence of distinct baroque space, for instance, the church and its rectangular churchyard establish a complex "with a church itself forming one of its four sides. The three others were often decorated with arcades or charnel houses. Above these galleries were the ossuaries in which skulls and limbs were artistically arranged. This striving after artistic effects with bones—a form of decoration which was both baroque and macabre—ended the mid-eighteenth century".¹² These bones were obtained from the remains of poor people who were buried in large common burial pits in churchyards; pits were filled up, the flesh was left there to rot and then after a while the pits were opened for the new burials, and to have a room for new burials the bones and skulls were taken out and arranged in a *decorative* manner *around* a *church fence*. Latvian Sapphic stanza makes instructive or educational use of these elements, too:

Ej vīrsū baznīcēt lūko tos kaulus,
 Visi kā tu bij ar mies` un ād` abdot,
 Bet no tiem tārpiem aprīti un aplaupīti,
 Tev nebūs labāk¹³.

[Go to the church yard, look at those bones / They all once had skin and flesh as you do, /
 But worms robbed them of it, / And you will not be doing better.]

The form of the song is of a particular interest—all 49 closing verses in quatrains typical of the Sapphic stanza are of five syllables and almost always an example of Adonic verse consisting of a dactyl followed by a trochee, such as:

Bet kurš cilvēks dzīvo un nenomiris?
 Lai jauns, lai stiprs, lai krāšņs, bagāts un mācīgs,
 Vīriem un sievietēm, pušiem līdz ar meitām,
 / v v / v
 Visiem būs nomirt¹⁴.

[But what human lives and does not die? / Even if young, strong, beautiful, rich and educated, /
 Men and women, lads and maidens, / Everyone shall die.]

Most of the long three lines of 49 Sapphic stanzas are of 11 syllables, an occasional verse is of 10 syllables, and relatively more often—even of 12 and 13 syllables. These Sapphic stanzas by their form do not follow the pattern set by the ancient Greek variation, they do not respect the quantitative relations among syllables, nor do they follow a relatively more recent Horatian Sapphic stanza, viz. though a caesura is observed in the middle of the verse, it is not regular. In my opinion, the first Latvian Sapphic stanzas continue the medieval tradition striving towards the tonic versification system, i.e. respecting the natural word stress and observing a variable number of unstressed syllables between the stressed ones. There is no consistency in terms of the number of stresses in long verses, the number ranges from three to five, the average and the most common count stays at four or five stresses per line:

v v / v v / v / v / v	
It kā zivis to tārps` ar makšķer` aprij	11 syllables, 4 stresses
/ v v / v / v v / v / v	
Neredz ka apakš barib` tā nāve paslēpt	12 syllables, 5 stresses
v / v / v / v v / v v / v	
Bet iekšan acemirkle to nāvīgu kārum	13 syllables, 5 stresses
/ v v / v	
Dārgi atmaksā ¹⁵ .	5 syllables, 2 stresses

[As fish swallows the worm from the hook of a fishing line / It does not see that the food
 hides its death / But for this delicacy inside / It pays a high price.]

v / v / v / v / v / v	
Tā te bez briesmes laikīg` kārīb` aurē	11 syllables, 5 stresses
/ v v v / v v v / v v	
Pieēšēn un piedzeršēn un smaidišēn	11 syllables, 3 stresses
v / v v v / v v / v	
Ar nekaunīgiem vārdiem un darbiem	10 syllables, 3 stresses
/ vv / v	
To elli pelnī ¹⁶ .	5 syllables, 2 stresses

[He is ignorant of danger / Cares only to eat, to drink, to have fun / With shameless words and deeds / Thus deserving Hell.]

This Catholic hymnal experienced a second edition after Georg Elger died in 1673¹⁷ but rather interestingly, the previous arrangement of verses for this hymn was dismantled, fourteen stanzas explicitly marked by the references to daily cultural and social realia were not retained. The other 35 Sapphic stanzas were arranged into three different cycles, *De morte* (about death), *De iudica* (about the Last Judgement) and *De inferno* (about Hell), thus reflecting changes in the Catholic Church—in the late 17th century the Catholic Church stabilized its position and plunged into conservatism.

However, the Sapphic stanza was also used in the Lutheran hymns. Paul Graff in the history of German church services mentions that for the first time the Sapphic stanza appeared in a German hymn composed by Pastor Johan Heermann (1585–1647) *Herzliebster Jesu* (“Ah, Holy Jesus”) in the first half of the 17th century¹⁸, but one can find this stanza already in the German Protestant hymns of the Reformation period. Heermann’s hymn consists of eleven syllables in the first three lines and an Adonis. There is no regular caesura, the long lines sound much like iambic; all the stanzas have rhymes. Already in the second half of the century, the hymn, with due respect to the form of the original was translated into Latvian by Christophor Fürecker (1615?–1685?). He was the first to introduce the Sapphic stanza in Latvian Lutheran hymns. Besides, Fürecker translated three other hymns resorting to the Sapphic stanza:

- Justus Gesenius, David Denicke. *In dieser Morgenstund* (“In this early morning hour”) / *Šai rīta stundā* (“In this early morning hour”);
- Bartholomäus Gesius. *Wend ab deinen Zorn, lieber Herr* (“Turn away your anger, dear Lord”) / *Ņem no mums tavas dusmas* (“Turn away your anger from us”);
- *Lobet den Herren, denn er ist sehr freundlich* (“Praise the Lord, for he is gracious”) / *Lai mēs tam Kungam pateicību dodam* (“Let us give Lord our gratitude”), based on Psalm 147, which acquired the form of the Sapphic stanza in the Baroque period and was attributed to Paul Gerhardt.

All four hymns were published in 1685 editions of Latvian hymnals, perhaps some of these translations were created earlier, but unfortunately, the older hymnals with Fürecker’s texts have not survived to the present day. Fürecker, who was of German origin, studied

Autortiesību ierobežojumu dēļ
attēls nav pieejams.

“Der Unteutsche Opitz” by Johann Wischmann. Academic Library of the University of Latvia, Department of Manuscripts and Rare Books. MR16826

at the University of Dorpat/Tartu, but presumably never completed his studies and, thus, never worked as a pastor. He collected materials for the Latvian language dictionary and grammar. Both in translated and in his own versed Latvian Lutheran hymns, Fürecker combined baroque imagery and excellent sense of form. His translations sometimes appear to be artistically brighter than the original texts in German. All Fürecker’s translations of the Sapphic stanzas into Latvian were rhymed, iambic, with the Adonis in the concluding line.

Christophor Fürecker also corrected, edited, and polished clumsy Latvian translations prepared by his predecessors by giving the old texts the rhythm and rhyme, thus ensuring the accuracy of metrical pattern against the original. For example, Bartholomäus Gesius’ (1555–1613) hymn *Wend ab deinen Zorn* (“Turn away your anger from me”) written in the Sapphic stanza was first translated into Latvian in the first half of the 17th century by a German pastor Georg Manzel (1595–1654). He ignored eleven syllables and the Adonis. Fürecker adjusted the number of syllables, but apparently relied on Manzel’s translation—both translations show similarity of expression that is close to the source text:

Bartholomäus Gesius	Georg Manzel	Christophor Fürecker
4. Sind wir doch arme würmlein, staub und erden, Miterbsünd, schwachheit, noht und tod beladen; Warum solten wir gar zu nichte werden Im zorn ohn gnade ¹⁹ ? [We are poor worms, dust and earth / Inherently sinful, weak, deficient and full of death; / Why should we perish / In anger and with no mercy?]	4. Jo mēs esam nabagi tārpi, pišļi un zeme, Ar dzimtiem grēkiem, vājību un nāvu aprūtenāti. Kāpēc bij mums viskim bojā iet Dūsmās bez žēlastības ²⁰ ? [We are poor worms, dust and earth / Inherently sinful, burdened by weaknesses and death / Why shall we all die / In anger without mercy?]	4. Redz, kas mēs esim; vāji zemes tārpi, Mūs grēki kremt, mūs Bēdas spiež in Darbi: Kāpēc būs mums tapt visai iz- nikušiem? Jeb pazudušiem ²¹ . [Look, what we are; weak earth- worms, / Our sins burn us, our troubles and work press us: / Why shall we become extinct? / Or lost.]

The mastery of Fürecker shines particularly bright in the translation of Johann Heermann's hymn *Herzliebster Jesu* ("Ah, Holy Jesus") / *Ak! taisnais Jēziņ* ("Ah! Truthful Jesus"). Fürecker retained the original idea and form—eleven iambic syllables in the first three lines and the Adonis in the fourth, but treated the expression within the stanzas freely. Originally, the hymn was a sinner's conversation with Jesus, consistently set in I-YOU relationship by the very verse fifteen. Fürecker took our inherent sinfulness (we are) as a venture point in the individual's monologue (I AM); from a past event to the individual choice of action in the future, thus exacerbating the sense of duality inherent in the baroque era. In addition, Fürecker wrote directly to Latvian audience and used elements characteristic of Latvian language and images typical of the peasant culture. Some excerpts are provided below to illustrate the above mentioned:

- 1) reduplication or close repetition of the same root or stem, widely used in Latvian folk songs, in this hymn condenses the sufferings of Christ and adds to musicality:

Johann Heermann	Christophor Fürecker
v / v / v / v / v / v / v 2. Du wirst gezeißelt und mit dorn gekrönet, Das angesicht geschlagen und verhönet; Du wirst mit essig und mit gall getränkhet, / v v / v Ans kreutz gehäncket ²² . [You will be hostage and crowned with thorns / Slapped in the face and ridiculed; / You will be given vinegar and gall to drink, / Hung on the cross.]	v / v / v / v / v / v / v 2. Tu tapi sašausts in kā sūcin sūkāts / Ar ērkšķiem badīts in kā plūcin plūkāts / Ar etiķim in rūktām žultīm dzirdīts / / v v / v Kā ne=kā tirdīts ²³ . [You will be shot and sucked / With thorns gored / and plucked / Given vinegar and bitter gall to drink / Tormented.]

- 2) The allegory of human/ nature bond inherent to Biblical texts and popular with Latvian sermons made it easier for peasants to understand the content and was also found in Fürecker's songs:

Johann Heermann	Christophor Fürecker
<p>6. <i>Ich war von fuß auff voller schand und sünden, Biß zu der scheidel war nichts guts zu finden. Darfür hätt ich dort in der hölle müssen Ewiglich büssen</i>²⁴.</p> <p>[I was brimming with dishonour and sins from the very bottom of my feet / To the very top of my head there not anything good in me / Therefore I was doomed to Hell / Eternal repentance.]</p>	<p>6. <i>Kur man bij kokam labam būt in zaļam; Tur es pilns grēku līdz pat kāju galam Par to bij mūžam gruzdēt maniem kauliem/ Ar elles =prauliem</i>²⁵.</p> <p>[Where could I have been a green and solid tree;/ There I was full of sin from the bottom of my feet / For that my bones will eternally burn / On the rotten wood of Hell.]</p>

And, thirdly, Fürecker in his translation accommodated Heermann's worldly pleasures, viz. life in joy and lust, that sounded rather abstract for peasants, was aligned with singing and dancing well known for this target group:

Johann Heermann	Christophor Fürecker
<p>7. <i>O grosse lib, o lib ohn alle masse, Die dich gebracht auff dise marter-strasse! Ich lebe mit der welt in lust und freuden, Und du must leiden</i>²⁶!</p> <p>[O great love, o unconditioned love / That took you to the path of martyr! / I live in the joy and lust of this world, / And you have to suffer!]</p>	<p>7. <i>Es gāju dziedams in iekš rokām sisdams; Bet Jēziņš krusta nes, pie zemes krisdams: Redz kāda karsta mīlestība rodās, Viņš nāvei dodās</i>²⁷.</p> <p>[I went singing and clapping hands; / But Jesus carries cross falling to the ground: / Look what all-consuming Love comes into being! / He goes to Death.]</p>

After the death of Fürecker, in the year 1686 a new Latvian hymnal was published in Riga. Supposedly, the compiler of it was a German pastor Ernst Glück (1654–1705), the Latvian Bible translator. Glück had a persistent interest in poetry, which did not, though, bear many a fruit. He translated and composed lyrics in German, Russian and Latvian, he wrote dedication poems, translated Lutheran hymns into Latvian and Russian, made use of a sonnet form, alexandrines, and hexameters. The Latvian hymn *Klaus, mana dvēsel, kāda grūta vaida* ("Listen, my soul, what a moan") is a paraphrase of the German hymn *Da Jesus an dem Creutze stund* ("There was Jesus on the cross") by Vincentius Schmuck (1565–1628), based on John's Gospel and contemplating Christ's seven words on the cross. Glück referred to it with the first line from Schmuck's hymn at the beginning of his Latvian version. The

content of both hymns was the same, but the German original, Schmuck's text, differed in form—each couplet was an iambic quint. In Latvian translation Glück transformed the quints into Sapphic stanzas and for the sake of visibility bolded the excerpts of Bible texts. Glück's translation is iambic, melodious and rhythmical, to illustrate the point, one stanza is given below:

Vincentius Schmuck	Ernst Glück
<p>8. Zum siebndn befehl ich mich vatr in deine händ: Dein heiligen geist du zu mir send, In meinen letzte zeiten, Wen sich mein seel vom leib abscheid Und mag nicht länger beiten²⁸.</p> <p>[In the seventh time the Son of God called out: / My Father, take my spirit / In your divine hands! / With that he hangs his holy head / And thus he dies.]</p>	<p>8. Un kad viņš Dievam savu dvēsel sniedze. Tad viņš it gauži stiprā balsnī kļiedze, Tēvs es nodom` iekš tavu roku varu Šeit manu garu²⁹.</p> <p>[And when he gives his soul to God / Then he cried out in a loud voice / My Father, I pass into your hands / Here my spirit.]</p>

And, finally, in the year 1697 Latvian poetics written by a German pastor Johann Wischmann, *Der Unteutsche Opitz. Oder kurtze Anleitung zur Lettischen Dicht-Kunst* (“Non-German Opitz or a Short introduction to Latvian Poetics”) was published.³⁰ Wischmann, in the title of his book, seems to refer to the author of the first German poetics, Martin Opitz (1597–1639), and one might think that he simply replants Opitz's ideas into the field of Latvian poetics, but it is not quite true. Following the spirit of the time, Wischmann used Opitz's name as a synonym for poetics; he used Opitz to denote the proposed set of theoretical knowledge obtained from the works of antique as well as the 17th century German scholars.³¹ Several pages were devoted to the description of Latvian Sapphic stanza,³² by generalization of all the features that were inherent to the above mentioned writings of Wischmann and Glück: firstly, quantitative, thus pointing to 11 syllables and 5 syllables in the fourth line and offering an option—both a customary Adonis and three partial iambic feet (and in the previously introduced examples the fourth Latvian Sapphic stanza may be read variously); secondly, he emphasized that Latvian Sapphic stanza was exclusively iambic; thirdly, that it was rhymed, mostly by the first two and second two lines adjacent dissyllabic rhyme, not excluding cross-rhyme as an option.

Wischmann mentioned stanza's name, pointing to its use in Latin texts. He referred to Horatian tradition still present in the hymn written in the Sapphic stanza by the 16th century neo-Latin poet Matthias Bergius (1536–1592)—*Aufer immensam Deus aufer iram* (“Take away, God, take away your boundless”) and pointed out that in Latin stanza structure was different. Wischmann believed that Latvian Sapphic stanza should be rather called the quasi or resembling-, almost- Sapphic stanza as its roots were in German poetry. Wischmann complemented the theoretical part by three examples, one—Fürecker's already

mentioned hymn *Herzliebster Jesu* and two of his own. Interestingly, Wischmann was not only the first to establish theoretical description for the Latvian Sapphic stanza, but also with his own examples to emphasize the initial idea of the Sapphic stanza, namely, its laconism and conciseness. Both his Sapphic stanzas were poignant epigrams. Moreover, those were the only Sapphic stanzas in Latvian of that time that were devoid of religious content, while by form they supported both Wischmann's variations (first—adjacent rhymes, second—cross-rhyme, the fourth line of the first may be read as iambic, of the second as the Adonis):

Neesi draugs uz manām domām čaklis
 In paša darbos vairs kā kurmis aklis:
 Kas man ar skauģa acīm grib zudušu,
 v / v / v
 Sprāgs vidū pušu³³.

[Do not, my friend, go after my thoughts / And be blind as a mole in your own tasks: / The one who envies me and wants my ruin / Shall die himself.]

Tas godīgs Draugs, kas ne priekš acīm slavē,
 Kas šķīstu muti tur, kas ņem par labu,
 Man raudot raud, man gavējot līdz gavē:
 / v v / v
 Sveiks, kas to dabū³⁴!

[The trustful friend who praises not to please, / Who is chaste and pure in his speech, and grateful / Who weeps when I weep, who fasts when I fast: / Be safe and sound, the one who gets that!]

The Sapphic stanza, that entered the 17th century Latvian poetry through the medium of German poetry and German contributors, found its continuation in Latvian national poetry of the second half of the 19th and 20th century, thus demonstrating not only the viability of stanza in global culture, but also artistic abilities of each and every of its poets. And precisely this latter aspect—self-affirmation—was likely to be primary, for Georg Elger, Christopher Fürecker, Ernst Glück and Johann Wischmann. In the late 17th century almost 100 hymns in reprint were published in Latvian Catholic hymnals, more than 400—in Lutheran Hymnals. However, judging by the archives, rural parishes due to a low literacy rate sang only about six to eight, seldom those were the twelve, most popular hymns learned with the help of a parish pastor or a church foresinger.³⁵ Hardly any of those was versed in the Sapphic stanza.

Notes

- ¹ Battezzato L. Metre and music. In: *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*. Ed. by Felix Budelmann. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. P. 135.
- ² Q. Horatius Flaccus (Horace). Ode 30, Book III, Ed. by John Conington. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.02.0025%3Abook%3D3%3Apoem%3D30> [accessed 15 October 2015]
- ³ *So that your servants may, with loosened voices, resound the wonders of your deeds, clean the guilt from our stained lips, O Saint John*. Introduction. The Hymns of the Breviary and Missal. Historical <http://www.cathcorn.org/hotbam/intro.html> [accessed 15 October 2015]
- ⁴ Jackson, W. T. H. *Medieval Literature. A History and Guide*. New York: Collier Books, 1966. P. 59
- ⁵ Strenga G. *Remembering the Dead: Collective Memoria in Late Medieval Livonia*. Doctoral Thesis (London: Queen Mary, University of London, 2013). [Manuscript]
- ⁶ *Geistliche Catholische Gesänge / von guthertzigen Christen / auß de Lateinischen / Teutschen / vnd Polnischen Psalmen / vnd Kirchengesängen in Unteutsche sprach gebracht. Jetzt aber mit vielen schönen Liedern vermehret vnd in Druck verfertiget Durch Societet IESV. Braunsberg: G.Schönfels, 1621.*
- ⁷ Kučinskis S. *Jeziuits Juris Elgers. Dzimtenes Balss*, 1953. Nr. 8. 17.–23. lpp.
- ⁸ *Geistliche Catholische Gesänge*. S. 180–189.
- ⁹ Faber du Faur C. *German Baroque Literature. A catalogue of the Collection in the Yale University Library*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958. P. XLII.
- ¹⁰ Husenbeth H. “*Es ist ein Schniter / heißt: der Todt*”. *Sterben, Tod und Auferstehung im geistlichen Lied des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2007. S. 200.
- ¹¹ *Geistliche Catholische Gesänge*. S. 184.
- ¹² Ariès P. *Western attitudes toward Death from the Middle Ages to the present*. Baltimore, London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1974. P. 20
- ¹³ *Geistliche Catholische Gesänge*. S. 184.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.* S. 183.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.* S. 181.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁷ *Cantiones Spirituales ex Latinis, Germanicis, Polonicis & translatae in idioma Lothavicum additis pluribus per Georgium Elger è Societate Iesu*. Vilnae: Typis Acad. Soc. Iesu, 1673.
- ¹⁸ Graff P. *Geschichte der Auflösung der alten gottesdienstlichen Formen in der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands*. Bd.I Nachdruck der Auflage von 1937. Waltrop: Hartmut Spenner, 1994. S. 248.
- ¹⁹ *Neu Vollständiges Rigisches Gesangbuch*. Riga: H. Bessemesser, 1670. S. 292–293.
- ²⁰ *Lettische Geistliche Lieder und Pssalmen, Collecten und Gebehte*. Riga: G. Schröder, 1631. S. 132.
- ²¹ *Lettische Geistliche Lieder und Collecten*. Mitau: G. Radetzky, 1685. S. 152.;
- ²² *Neu Vollständiges Rigisches Gesangbuch*. S. 611.
- ²³ *Lettische Geistliche Lieder und Collecten*. S. 39; *Lettische Geistliche Lieder und Psalmen*. S. 56
- ²⁴ *Neu Vollständiges Rigisches Gesangbuch*. S. 611.
- ²⁵ *Lettische Geistliche Lieder und Collecten*. S. 39; *Lettische Geistliche Lieder und Psalmen*. S. 57
- ²⁶ *Neu Vollständiges Rigisches Gesangbuch*. S. 611.
- ²⁷ *Lettische Geistliche Lieder und Collecten*. S. 39; *Lettische Geistliche Lieder und Psalmen*. S. 57
- ²⁸ *Neu Vollständiges Rigisches Gesangbuch*. S. 46
- ²⁹ *Latviska dziesmu grāmata*. Riga: G. Wilcken, 1686. S. 81.
- ³⁰ Wishmann J. *Der Unteutsche Opitz oder Kurtze Anleitung zur Lettischen Dicht-Kunst*. Riga: G. M. Nöller, 1697.
- ³¹ Kessler S. Johann Wischmann’s “Der Unteutsche Opitz” (1697). *Letonica*. 2014. Nr. 27. P. 91–108.
- ³² Wishmann J. *Der Unteutsche Opitz*. S. 41–44.
- ³³ *Ibid.* S. 43.
- ³⁴ *Ibid.* S. 43–44.
- ³⁵ Herl J. *Worship Wars in Early Lutheranism: Choir, Congregation, and Three Centuries of Conflict*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. P. 104–106.

Māra Grudule

Sapfo strofa 17. gadsimta latviešu literatūrā

Kopsavilkums

Atslēgvārdi: Sapfo strofa, latviešu dzeja, 17 gadsimts, Kristofors Firekers

Sapfo strofas radītājas gods pienākas grieķu dzejniecei Sapfo, kura dzīvojusi 6. gadsimtā pirms mūsu ēras Lesbas salā. Lesbas literatūrai raksturīgā isā forma prasa koncentrētu domu un nelielu, bet trāpīgu valodas līdzekļu izvēli. Sapfo radītā strofa sastāv no četrām vārsēm, trīs pirmajās ir vienpadsmit zilbes un cezūra rindas vidū, pēdējo veido septiņas zilbes, tradicionāli – daktila un trohaja vai spondeja pēda. Latviešu dzejā Sapfo strofa izmantota jau 17. gadsimtā katoļu un luterāņu garīgajās dziesmās. Senākā no tām četrdesmit deviņas Sapfo strofās publicēta 1621. gadā Georga Elgera sastādītajā latviešu katoļu dziesmu grāmatā. Tā apcer nāvi, elli, pastaro tiesu un paradīzi, un ved cauri apziņai par pasaulīgās mantas zudību, par cilvēka grēcīgumu, nāves nenovēršamību un elles šausmām. Dziesma noslēdzas ar atgādinājumu būtu gatavam nāves stundai jau šodien, tās saturs ir lakonisks, katra strofa uztverama kā neatkarīga epigrama. Iespējams, šī dziesma ir G. Elgera oriģinālsacerējums.

Latviešu luterāņu garīgajās dziesmās pašsacerētu Sapfo strofu nav. Tās ienāk ar vācu atdzejojumu starpniecību. No 17. gadsimta otrās puses līdz 18. gadsimta sākumam Sapfo strofa lietota trīs Kristofora Firekera, vienā Bernharda Vilhelma Binemaņa un vienā Ernsta Glika atdzejotajā vācu luterāņu garīgajā dziesmā. Strofas iespējamība latviešu dzejā pirmoreiz teorētiski pamatota poētikā *Der Unteutsche Opitz* ("Nevācu Opics", 1697), tās autors Dundagas mācītājs Johans Višmanis savam izklāstam pievienojis arī formāli precīzas un saturā trāpīgas epigrammas latviski. Ar baroka laikmeta norietu no latviešu dzejas pazūd arī Sapfo strofa. Tā atkal atgriežas ar Jura Alunāna "Dziesmiņām" (1856) pusotru gadsimtu vēlāk.

Ieva Kalniņa, Mārtiņš Laizāns

Johann Gotthelf Lindner and Riga Dome School

Keywords: Riga Dome School, J. G. Lindner, school drama

This article is dedicated to Johann Gotthelf Lindner, the rector of Riga Dome School, his time spent in Riga and the school dramas he wrote. The article consists of three parts—a brief outline of Lindner’s biography followed by a description of his work at Riga Dome School and the last part takes a look on his literary works.

In the context of Western humanism Johann Gotthelf Lindner can be regarded as the successor of humanist ideas on the threshold of the Enlightenment era. As a teacher at Riga Dome School that was founded during the humanist period in Riga he continued the educational course set by Riga humanists carrying on the humanist ideals (literacy in ancient languages and culture, poetics, rhetoric), on the one hand, and transforming it accordingly to the discourse of the Enlightenment (rational sciences), on the other hand.

Life and times of Johann Lindner

Johann Gotthelf¹ Lindner was born on 11 September in 1729 in Hinterpommern, Schmolsin (now Smołdzino in Poland) in a pastor’s family. In the circles of Baltic Germans the name Lindner was well-known—his brothers were acknowledged physicians.² From the age of seven to fifteen Lindner was studying at the Collegium Fridericianum in Königsberg³ with distinct success. Its superintendent at the time was a recognised pietist Franz Albrecht Schultz (1692–1763).⁴ In 1733 Lindner’s father moved to Königsberg, where he was the school counselor, professor and pastor. From 1744 Lindner was studying at the Königsberg University (*Königliche Albertus-Universität zu Königsberg in Preußen*) and in 1744 he received the academic citizenship.⁵ From 1740 to 1750 Lindner anonymously in cooperation with other students—Johann Friedrich Lauson (1727–1783), Johann Christoph Wollson (1727–1765), Johann Christoph Berens (1729–1792) and Johann Georg Hamann (1730–1788) created and published the newspaper for culture *Daphne*. In 1750 Lindner received Master’s degree in Philosophy, specializing in French, history, philosophy, mathematics, rhetoric and poetics. He had a good command of French, English, Italian, Ancient Hebrew, Ancient Greek, Latin and in Riga he even tried to learn the basics of Latvian. He composed poems, minor articles and philosophical treatises. During his time at the university one of his closest friends was Johann Georg Hamann

and he was acquainted with the young Immanuel Kant as well. From 21 March 1755 to 22 March 1765 he was the rector and superintendent of Riga Dome School⁶—it seems that someone from the Berens family had encouraged the Riga City Council to address him to take this post. Lindner was part of the so-called Berens intellectual circle (*Berensscher Kreis*), which consisted of the former students from the Königsberg University who were inspired by the ideas of the Enlightenment. In 1765 Lindner was invited to take the post of a full professor of poetics in Königsberg, where he became the council superintendent of Collegium Fridericianum. In 1773 he became a Doctor of Theology and associate professor at the Königsberg University, but from 1775 he was a counsellor for the church and schools, and a pastor at Löbenicht.

Lindner's most important works include *Lehrbuch der schönen Wissenschaften, insonderheit der Prose und Poesie* ("Textbook of Fine Arts, Especially Prose and Poetry", in two volumes, 1767, 1768),⁷ *Kurzer Inbegriff der Ästhetik, Redekunst und Dichtkunst* ("Short Epitome of Aesthetics, Rhetoric and Art of Poetry", in two volumes, 1771, 1772) and *Beitrag zu Schulhandlungen* ("Treatise on School Spectacles", 1762).⁸ He was one of the most significant figures in the renewal (1765) of German Royal Society (*Königliche Deutsche Gesellschaft*) and its activities in Königsberg. He was also a member of *Zu den drei Kronen* masonic loge. He died in 1776 in Königsberg.⁹

Johann Lindner as the rector of Riga Dome School

The aftermath of The Great Northern War (1700–1721) and the subduction of Riga to the Russian forces (1710) was a tough time financially and politically for the city, the Dome School, and the Riga Dome Church as the supervisor of the school, due to the fact that all these institutions had to adapt to Russian laws and the school system. The Dome School had to survive in severe competition as the other school in Riga—*Schola Carolina* (founded in 1675), later renamed Lyceum of Riga—was state-funded and supported by Russian Tsars, the relatives of Peter I. Nevertheless, at the time of Lindner's arrival in Riga, the financial situation had improved to a level that it was possible to invite educated and young individuals for teaching work, though they lacked serious experience in education.

Lindner's official inauguration speech was *Introductio solenniter et solito more* at the Dome School on 8 May 1755 from eight o'clock until eleven, and its subject was the sensual cognitive culture of young boys. In contrast to his predecessors, Lindner had composed his speech in German, not Latin.¹⁰

The ideas of the Enlightenment and the Russian school order had reached Riga, so a special committee from the Riga City Council elaborated changes in the education plans of the Dome School, and Lindner had to introduce them into the school curriculum. One of the first rules was in regard to the Ancient Hebrew lessons – they became private and the previously used Johann Andreas Danzen's textbook was changed to Joachim Justus Rau's *Kurtzgefasste Anfangs-Gründe der Ebräischen Grammatic*.¹¹ From 1727 to 1764 Russian empresses Catherine I and Elizaveta Petrovna gave orders to expel Jews from Riga and

Autortiesību ierobežojumu dēļ
attēls nav pieejams.

Johann Gotthelf Lindner's record in the Riga Dome School rector's office book. Academic Library of the University of Latvia, Department of Manuscripts and Rare Books. R7615

Kurland, and the consequences of these orders could be observed in the changes of school programme as well.¹²

Due to the influence of the Enlightenment, the educational focus at school moved towards natural sciences by increasing the number of lessons, and reducing the number of lessons in classical philology. Thus two lessons from a course on Plutarch were substituted by metaphysics and physics, and four lessons of rhetoric were reduced to three in favour of general history.¹³ The study of antiquity was reduced to the study of one particular Greek author.¹⁴ The rector emphasized at the Riga City Council that Biblical Greek is being studied increasingly intensely. Latin and Greek languages were still kept as part of the curriculum, as well as the readings of Cicero, Ovid, Horace, Suetonius, Livius and Tacitus. The curriculum included French and private lessons in mathematics as well.¹⁵

Lindner changed the beginning of lessons in winter time from 7 to 8 am, so the students would not freeze and get sore throats, and on certain days the lessons were running until 5 pm, in order to include additional courses in history, general history, special geography in the two first classes and to have time to learn arithmetics with a private teacher.¹⁶ Lindner's innovation was the introduction of open exams at the beginning of which he gave a speech in Latin.¹⁷

In Riga Dome School the rector tried both to follow the new pedagogical ideas of the Enlightenment and support traditions, as the parents of school children represented both sides. Hans Graubner supposes that in Riga it was not generally acknowledged that a public school was better than the usual home-schooling in Livonia, thus the open events (exams, performances, school dramas) gave parents the chance to control the school more directly and made the school trustworthy in their eyes.¹⁸

In Lindner's time the influence of the Enlightenment and the new political order made the school use less and less Latin on festive occasions, giving rise to the use of German in speeches, leaving Latin only to the speeches of address, gratitude, and encomiums, in which Lindner excelled. In his Latin speeches, especially *Oratio Sollemnis*, when addressing the councilmen of Riga, he used a row of superlative exclamations (e.g., *virī generosissimi, amplissimi, nobilissimi, doctissimi*) and praised them exuberantly. A much used figure was *congeries*, when enumerating their noble deeds – *Maecenates! Patroni! Fautores!* One can clearly see, that the use of exclamation marks was almost excessive. In showing gratitude to the councilmen for offering him a post at the Dome School, he accounted for his fitness for the post – *natus, imbutus et arte compositus mihi videor ad erudiendam iuventutem* (“It seems to me that I was born, I am fit, and I have acquired the skill to educate the youth”), that it was a destiny for him chosen by God—*me a Deo factorum moderatorem scholae circulis esse destinatum*. A gratification to God was provided after these paragraphs.

After his first performance with students on 21 December 1755 in honour of the celebration of the Russian Empress's birthday where the students gave prose speeches in German and French, Latin speeches in hexameter and German speeches in verse, the Riga City Council decided that from then on Lindner would have to organize festive activities for the state celebrations—the Empress's birthdays and coronations—and he had to publish a

festival programme as well.¹⁹ The programmes, speeches and essays composed in Riga he published repeatedly in various arrangements of the material.²⁰

The rector of the school took care of the social securities for the teacher. Following the initiative of the school, the Riga City Council decided that “for a year the successors give half of their salary and other income to the widows and orphans of former teachers. In the same year the position of a collaborator was established.”²¹ In 1757 a new post for collaborator was introduced, who had to work with the senior classes to strengthen their knowledge of Latin and German, natural history, and geography, and to perfect their skills in letter writing.²² The first who took the post was Johann Georg Hamann’s brother, who did not fulfill the expectations. In 1764 another post for the collaborator was announced and Lindner, responding to Hamann’s request, invited Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744–1803) to take the post in Riga and become the teacher of junior classes, as the records in the Dome School Rectorate’s book²³ and Herder’s letters to Lindner show.²⁴ The correspondence between them endured for quite a long time before Herder could move to Riga, as he had to obtain his Master’s degree (received in October 1764), he had to receive a permission and a passport (he wrote a request for a 3-year working permit in Riga). The manner of work at the Riga City Council was rather slow and disorganized as Herder pointed out immediately in a letter to his friend Hamann by calling it ‘chaos’.²⁵

Latvian pedagogy historians Aīda Krūze and Alīda Zigmunde emphasize: “Just as Herder, Lindner had studied in Königsberg and brought the spirit of Enlightenment to Riga. The rector of the Dome School (..) was acquainted with Herder and chose him due to his

Autortiesību ierobežojumu dēļ
attēls nav pieejams.

progressive opinions and views on history and philosophy and the importance he ascribed to aesthetics. Johann Lindner saw in him a teacher that stood far above mediocrity.”²⁶

In February 1764 Herder came to Riga to work as a cover teacher in junior classes. Riga Dome School consisted of 4 classes and in Lindner’s time 181 students were enrolled, and often brothers and close relatives were studying together (e.g., Martin Glock and Valentin Glock, Johann Heinrich Teen and Peter Herbert Teen, etc.). In unsuccessful years only 6 or 8 new students were enrolled, but usually the number of new students per year was from 15 to 26.²⁷ It is difficult to determine the number of students in each school year and for how many years they were studying, but the school drama programmes provide evidence, that some names have been mentioned repeatedly (e.g., Melchior Adam Schulz, Eberhard David Vieting, Adam Heinrich Schwarz).²⁸ Lindner’s care for his students can be observed in the Dome School Rectorate’s book²⁹—for those who went to study at the Königsberg University he wrote a letter of recommendation that were handed to Immanuel Kant who was an external lecturer at the time.³⁰

Herder in his letter to Hamann left an expanded characteristic of Lindner as a school superintendent and teacher:

H. Professor Lindner läßt viel Gutes nach: das meiste hat seine Bestrehsamkeit im Denken u. Handeln, u. etwas weniger sein Patriotismus gestiftet: so lange der Baum lebt, genießt das Publikum seiner Früchte, ohne auf die Wurzel nachzugraben; wird er verpflanzt, so sieht man seine Wurzel, u. riecht ihre Sänfte eher. Da wird mehr anatomiert, ob der Baum mehr Anziehungs- oder Zurückstossungskraft geäußert: ob er mehr Mensch oder Bürger gewesen. Als Professor der schönen Wissenschaften ist er mehr in seiner Sphäre, als in die Schule: nur seine Nordische Entfernung hat ihm etwas von dem Modernen entzogen; doch selbst diese Antike ist vor Königsberg gut, wo man noch immer lieber Mosaische Arbeit, als Hagedornsche Cabinetter sieht. Die hiesige Geschäftfülle hat ihm unendliche Zerstreuungen auf Kosten des schönen Geistes, u. Philologen; nie aber des Schullehrers gemacht. Königsberg wird ihm mehr sammel, aber auch mehr in bürgerliche Gesellschaften zerstreuen: u. überhaupt reiset er ins Vaterland, nicht aber in das Land seiner Jugend.³¹

These letters were of subjective nature, taken into consideration the situation that Lindner was very close to Hamann at this time and Herder was becoming close to him as well. It seems unlikely that Herder had fully understood what it meant to be the superintendent of the Dome School in Riga, as the superintendent had to show loyalty to Russia, the Riga City Council, the Berens Circle, and had to work with the sons of local patricians and nobility, who did not hold teachers in high esteem.

German scholar Renate Knoll has examined the reasons for arrival and departure of both Riga Dome School teachers and their relationship.³² The year 1764 in the title of her article is a symbolic indication for the exchange of cities between the two, as Lindner left Riga in May of 1765. Knoll believes that their exchange marks the shift from Lindner’s conservative approach to education and pedagogy to more modern views of Herder and Hamann:

In this era the new standard for writers and philosophers was a life that would be subordinated to thinking; the creative productivity is superior to any systematics, the 'word' justifies 'being'. The spiritual and sensual whole sought for in [the 'word'] would be recognized by poetry as the ground for possibilities. Not just Greece or the Nordics anymore, but Curonia and Livonia are becoming a sobering embodiment for the direction of a satisfactory discussion about metrical questions in the future.³³

Indisputably, Lindner was not captivated by search for innovation or new approaches in philosophy, society or literature. He was looking for a stable work and his interests covered aesthetics, rhetoric and poetics. Though he was able to gain trust from the Dome School and during his service time the number of students increased (during the service time of the next rector it decreased). He established the number of teachers and took care of their social securities. Little by little and quite cautiously he began modernising of the school, but return to Königsberg and academia was the fulfilment of his life.

Lindner and the language in Riga

In his solemn speeches Lindner turned to various questions that he tried to connect with the history and life of Riga and Livonia. In his collection *Beitrag zu Schulhandlungen* he included an article *Abhandlungen von der Sprache überhaupt, und insbesondere eines Landes, nebst einer Sammlung einiger Liefländischen Provincialwörter und Ausdrücke* ("Discourses on Language in General, and Particular on a Country, Accompanied With a Collection of Some Livonian Provincialisms and Idioms").³⁴ Its origins can be traced back to his speech on 26 November 1759 in honor of the coronation of Elizaveta Petrovna.³⁵ Lindner devoted this speech to councilmen, guests, students, and it included references to the local situation (in Livonia), and he spoke as a scholar, a theologian, a pedagogue and as school director as well. He began his speech with the thesis: "Die Sprache des Menschen redet von der Weisheit seines Schöpfers ebenso deutlich, als sein ganzer Bau, und es kann hier in einem besonderen Sinne gesagt werden, das wir mit der Zunge Gott loben."³⁶ Further he presented the main insights on language, speech and writing of the time: language was the main difference between a man and an animal, language was connected with memory and the acquisition of language in family, and he showed the relation between speech and writing. In his opinion, two tenets were of a novel value:

Erstlich, das obgleich alle Menschen dieselbe Werkzeuge der Sprache an sich haben, doch nicht nur unzählige Dialecten oder Mundarten in einer und derselben Sprache herrschen, ja das fast jeder Mensch, so wie sein eignes Gesicht, also auch seine eigene Aussprache habe, welches freilich auf der im zufälligen so vielfach veränderlichen inneren Bildung dieser Sprachgliedmassen beruhen kann, sondern, das auch eine Nation vor der andern sich zu gewissen schnarrenden, zischenden, oder lispelnden Tönen des Mundes gewöhnen kann, und daher einem, der seine Zunge zur Aussprache weicher oder harter Buchstaben von kleinauf geformet, ähnliche Schalle in einer fremden Sprache leichter, anderer aber unaussprechlich

warden. [...] Zweitens, da Himmelsgegend, Neigungen, Sitten und Umgang immer viel Einfluß in die Sprache eines Landes geäußert; so wird man auch bemerken, daß man durch seinere, und, wenn ich so sagen soll, menschliche Töne, wie überhaupt durch die Sprache, also destomehr sich über die Thiere erhoben hat; je mehr der Gebrauch der Vernunft uns über diese weggeseßet, und von der Gemeinschaft oder Ähnlichkeit mit ihnen unterschieden hat.³⁷

As the main topic of the article was speech, Lindner gave his opinion on local languages. He did not use the notion *Undeutschen*, but instead used *Lettischen*, and he assumed that the local languages were comparatively new, as they changed in close distance similarly to Indian language:

..fast wie bei uns in einem Strich von etwa hundert Meilen an dem Strande der Ostsee das Litauische, Curische und Lettische, Abkömmlinge vom Litauische, dessen Ursprung vermischt zu sehen scheineth, das Estnische, ein Zweig von Finnischen, und das Oseselsche³⁸ bekannt sind, zu geschweigen des untergegangenen alten Preußischen zur Zeit des Heidentums, und Altlivischen, wovon noch Spuren um Salis herum, etwa 18 Meilen vom Riga, am Meer sehen soll.³⁹

At the end of his speech Lindner turned to the problems in school and enumerated the main elements of student errors: wrong use of articles, incorrect use of endings in writing and speech, the use of provincialisms. When used in Germany, the use of provincialisms can cause misunderstandings. For his examples Lindner had chosen different weights, in order for parents to understand the significance of a correct speech and writing, as they mostly were tradesmen or noblemen who sold their agricultural goods in Riga. *Aršina* and *Puds* were not used in German—they were loanwords from Russian. In the appendix to his article one can find a concise etymological dictionary (*ein kleines Register*) of German used in Riga showing its peculiarities.⁴⁰

Lindner had observed that the German in Riga, which he called a provincial language, differed lexically from the approved German, which was used at the Königsberg University, and for this reason he included the provincialisms in his dictionary. He came to a conclusion that the language in Riga consisted of many German language strata and was influenced by various foreign languages as well. He conceded that in Riga the language was more influenced by Plattdeutsch than by Hochdeutsch, which was in use in Königsberg. For example, instead of *Birne* (pear) *Boombeeren* was used, also *Apseldwatssch* (*nicht so klug, einer, der albern schwatzt*) was known, as well as *Borkanen* (a loanword based on East Frisian *bure*⁴¹) was used in Riga, whereas in Germany—*Mohrrüben*, in Prussia—*gelbe Möhren*, *Spuck* instead of *Gespens*, and the women in Riga were wearing *krelles* (*gläserne Perlen aus Korallen*) around their necks.⁴² A loanword from English unknown to Lindner, but still in use in contemporary Latvia, was a sweet dish *Bubbert*, he observed a French origin in *Krämbrot*, and noticed loanwords from Polish—*starost* (head of a district), and Swedish – *Bärn* (child).⁴³

The first entry in the dictionary was *Ausch*—*so viel als närrisch, wild, aus dem Lettischen oder hier so genannten Undeutschen*.⁴⁴ He had noticed some German words in Riga that were of Latvian origin—*kullit* (bag, from Latvian *kulīte*), *voi* (from Latvian *voi* and *vai*), also *luppat* (rag, cloth, from Latvian *lupata*) and *pielbeeren* (rowanberry, from Latvian *pīlādzis*): “Pielbeeren, in Preußen Ovitschen, Beeren, wohin man die Drosseln lockt. Sonst bedeutet Piel im lettischen eine Ente. Sollten sie wo daher den Namen, weil die Enten sie auch gerne fressen.”⁴⁵ Rowan berries were used to lure small birds during hunting.⁴⁶ In Latvian *pīle* is a bird, but a tree with red berries—*pīlādzis*.

His dictionary shows that he had acquainted himself with Latvian in home environment, as the words mostly came from cuisine, nursery and chambermaid lexica. Although he was one of the first scholars that paid attention to German used in Riga, his dictionary has not come into contemporary scholarly circulation. An important aspect in his speech for the Dome School and the society in Riga, that was driven by mercantile goals, was his focus on scientific topics that were *en vogue* in Königsberg: the origin of language, language and speech, language and mind, language and the character of a nation.⁴⁷

Johann Gotthelf Lindner as an author of school drama

The emergence of school drama in the 16th century was closely tied to the expansion of humanism and Protestantism ideas in Europe. Harald Zielske writes: “The connection between Protestantism, schools and theater results in the emergence of a great number of Protestant playwrights of school dramas that employ school drama as a medium for the fight and propaganda of the new faith. At the same time a goal is set to effect the transformation from Neo-latin to German drama in order to influence a wider audience.”⁴⁸

In the 16th century there were many occasions of school drama performance—in 1519, 1523, 1525, 1545, 1576, 1588, and 1600. The most famous author of school dramas in Riga was the rector of the Dome School Stephan Teuthorn, but the only surviving text is Burkart Waldis’ *De parabell vam vorlorn Szohn* (“Parable of the Prodigal Son”) that was performed in 1525 in Riga.⁴⁹

School drama was well known in the Catholic environment between the 16th and 18th centuries—in Jesuit schools and colleges. Latin, theatricality, flamboyant costumes and decorations, developed stage equipment, massive crowd scenes were the main characteristics of a Catholic school drama.⁵⁰

In German Protestant schools, however, in the 18th century a school theatre was a rare phenomenon. When Lindner in 1758 staged his first school drama, he emphasized that although for the people of Riga the Catholic tradition was better known, also in Protestant environment school dramas had their own tradition. He expanded on this assertion in the introduction to his collection of school dramas *Beitrag zu Schulhandlungen* by writing that a Catholic school drama invoked fear in humans, but a Protestant school drama educated. Lindner’s school dramas were performed without costumes and decorations and they were dominated by monologues and dialogues. The Protestant school drama had to be ascetic,

it had to differ from Catholic school dramas and the well known traditions of open-air theatre that took place on the squares of Riga.

Lindner's written and published school dramas were: *Abdalonymos* (1758), *Die Krönung Gottfrieds von Bouillon* ("The Coronation of Godfrey of Bouillon", 1758), *Albert, oder die Gründung von Riga* ("Albert, or the Foundation of Riga", 1760), *Der wiederkehrende Sohn* ("The Prodigal Son", 1761).⁵¹ All of them were composed in German. Their subject matter and characters spun from three sources—The Bible (the subject of the prodigal son is popular in the Protestant school drama in general) as the inspiration for contemporary texts and the establisher of ethical values; history of Riga, that had to develop in students a sense of historical memory as part of their social and national identity; and the classical heritage that made an educated man. By choosing different sources, Lindner discussed the many possibilities of education through school dramas.

Lindner has written other works with dramaturgical features—an allegorical dialogue *Die vier Temperamente* ("The Four Tempers", 1759) and a play based on Homer's epic *Odyssey*—*Telemach findet seinen Vater Ulysses wieder* ("Telemachus Finds Again His Father Odysseus", 1762). The school drama *Albert, oder die Gründung von Riga* was a dedication to Riga.

During the reign of Elisabeth I from 1741 to 1762 the relationship between nobility of Livonia and the Riga City Council became tense, as the privileges and economic welfare of Livonia nobility increased, but Berens was an active defender of Riga privileges. Questions concerning the history of Riga must have been in the centre of attention among his circle as the central issue of Lindner's school drama *Albert, oder die Gründung von Riga* was about the foundation of Riga. In the prologue he wrote: "Persons and situations I have borrowed from history, the characters of the persons I have adjusted to it, but all entanglements and complications I have created with the help of duels."⁵² As historical sources he used Johann Daniel Gruber's interpolated *Chronicon Heinricii* from 1740, Johann Gottfried Arndt's translation of it into German from 1747 and obviously Christ

Autortiesību ierobežojumu dēļ
attēls nav pieejams.

"Albert" by Johann Gotthelf Lindner. Academic Library of the University of Latvia, Department of Manuscripts and Rare Books. R10181

Schaller's poem *Encomium Rigae* (1640) that Lindner had translated from Latin into German.

The time of action used in the school drama *Albert* is mentioned in the prologue by the author as the year 1200, but in fact those were the events from 1201. By this time bishop Albert had returned from Germany and Abbot Dietrich announced that the Livonians had betrayed their agreement with Germans, and together with Lithuanians, Curonians and the Knyaz of Polotsk were preparing an attack on Riga. The knights, among which the loyal baptised Livonian leader Aco was, were visited by Imants to persuade Aco to betray the Germans and to attack them. When Aco refused, Imants challenged him to a duel that decided whose gods were more powerful, and also whether Riga would continue to exist. Albert objected to this duel, because such essential matters and the existence of Riga should not be decided by fortune. Aco agreed with Albert, but when Aco went to examine the army of baptised Livonians, Imants attacked him. A duel ensued and Aco was severely injured and Imants, in an attempt to kill him, tripped and fell onto the sword of Aco, and both died. Albert retreated in honour of the miraculous victory and decided to build Riga.

Lindner emphasizes that Riga was built as an act of God's will, in gratitude to God for his support in the battle against Livonians, and Lindner gives less importance to Riga as a fortress for crusaders, from which to make crusades against local nations. The foundation of Riga is the central myth in the development of Baltic German ethnical and national memory and history. Lindner chose for the education of a younger generation a text that was appealing to the students' parents and the City Council.⁵³

For the school drama *Abdalyonimos* events from *Histories of Alexander the Great* by Quintus Curtius Rufus were used as the foundation. The action takes place in Sidon, 322 BC, main characters are Alexander the Great, Hephaistion, Strato and Abdalyonimos, a messenger and two friends of Hephaistion. The drama has three acts and many scenes. It is composed in verse—in hexameter. According to his own opinions, Lindner showed that Alexander the Great and Hephaistion initially did not understand Abdalyonimos' inner pride and views on life, as a descendant from an ancient family of rulers he had to work as a humble gardener. At the end of the drama they understand their mistake and appreciate Abdalyonimos and the fact that he never begs, never asks for help, and always achieves everything by himself—that is the reason why he becomes a ruler in Sidon, designated by Alexander. The position of Alexander is similar to the official attitude of the Russian empire in Baltics—he has gained a good access to the sea and he will develop his country.⁵⁴ The drama emphasizes the necessity to serve a strong ruler and by this Lindner urged his students to become good citizens. In Baltics the mid-eighteenth century was a new situation—after the war and the change of many powers, the nobility and Riga had to learn how to live under the Russian rule.

Lindner's school dramas were popular in Riga, and it is probable that students were excited to perform in a play in front of an audience. Inspired by his success in province, he published a collection of staged plays with an extensive introduction, where he described

the principles of school drama and outlined its further development in the Lutheran culture of Germany. His introduction is a proof of his vast knowledge in drama history and theory, but school drama is characterized from the perspective of pedagogy and didactics. The main components typical for a school drama are *Plan* (episodes, entanglements, action), *Moral* (characters, affects) and *Wohlstand* (inner conviction of characters, the outer appearance of actors). Lindner believed that one had to observe the unity of time, place and action. He especially emphasized that complications could not be too extensive, evil characters were allowed in the plays for students to understand life and as a mechanism to develop action easier, but the evil had to change and it had to manifest itself only due to errors and delusions. The characters played by students had to be virtuous. Lindner attempted to incorporate his drama principles into his school dramas—there were a lot of static dialogues and little action. Danish scholar Sven Aage Jørgensen characterizes them in a harsh manner:

School dramas by Lindner viewed from a literary perspective are as bad as Abbt in his Letters on Literature and Hamann in his private correspondence had described them. They are partly written in alexandrines, partly in prose and the tendency towards didactics and moralising is set in the foreground so brightly that the characters and action fall deep into the background; only by exception a dramatic situation is successfully composed.⁵⁵

The published collection of school dramas came into the hands of Hamann (who tried to convince Lindner not to publish them) and Thomas Abbt (1738–1766) who criticized it fervently.⁵⁶ They both questioned the innovation of his drama principles, but the main reproaches were in regard to the involvement of children in plays and the first part of the name ‘school drama’. They both were of the opinion that it was not clear, who was the addressee of these plays, and if these plays were appropriate for schools. They were not sure, how the children would be able to play adults and show the deepness of their feelings and thoughts. Lindner’s weak understanding of drama was also criticized. Hamann’s and Abbt’s attitude towards Lindner’s plays has been analyzed thoroughly by Sven Aage Jørgensen and Hans Graubner.⁵⁷ The most important Lindner’s merit in German children literature was raising new questions what should children literature and school theatre be like. Lindner’s opponents regarded that his school dramas would not be the ones making a change. Still Lindner’s approach was innovative at times as he allowed for children to be playing adult roles and also controversial ones (e.g., Imants or Dietrich). Another matter was that he had little talent in writing children and adult plays. Though it must be admitted that in Riga, where there were no permanent theatre institutions and the inhabitants could only see plays on city squares, Lindner’s work was enjoyed by audiences (yet the length of the plays burdened the spectators).⁵⁸

In conclusion it must be said that the study of classical subjects receded during the times of Lindner giving way to more exact and contemporary sciences, and the importance of Latin decreased in school curriculum as well. In order to diversify the teaching methods, the study of antiquity was accomplished with the help of school

dramas and other dramaturgical forms. The time Lindner spent at Riga Dome School was fairly successful for him.

Notes

- ¹ In several editions the name *Gotthilf*, not *Gotthelf* can be found (this name is used in the works published during his lifetime).
- ² Ehregott Friedrich Lindner (1733–1816), Gottlob Immanuel Lindner (1734–1818).
- ³ Königsberg—now Kaliningrad (city in Russian Federation). In the article the name of the city from Lindner's times is preserved.
- ⁴ Kohen J. Johann Gotthelf Lindner. Pädagoge, Literat und Freimauer in Königsberg und Riga. *Nordost-Archiv*. 1984. Band/Heft 17 (76). S. 33.
- ⁵ Gadebusch F. K. *Livländische Bibliothek nach alphabetischer Ordnung*. Theil II. Riga: Johann Friedrich Hartknoch, 1777. S. 182.
- ⁶ Schweder G. *Die alte Domschule und daraus hervorgegangene Stadt Gymnasium zu Riga*. Riga/Moskau: J. Deubner, 1910. S. 37.
- ⁷ Lindner J. G. *Lehrbuch der schönen Wissenschaften, insonderheit der Prose und Poesie*. Theil I, II. Königsberg/Leipzig: Johann Jacob Kanter, 1786, 1768.
- ⁸ Lindner J. G. *Beitrag zu Schulhandlungen*. Königsberg: Ludwig Woltersdorffs Wittwe, 1762.
- ⁹ Information about J. G. Lindner can be found in the following editions: Gadebusch F. K. *Livländische Bibliothek nach alphabetischer Ordnung*. Theil II. Riga: Johann Friedrich Hartknoch, 1777. S. 182–190; Recke J. F., Napiersky K. E. *Allgemeines Schriftsteller- und Gelehrten Lexicon der Provinzen Livland, Estland und Kurland*. Band. 3. Mitau: Johann Friedrich Steffenhagen und Sohn, 1831. S. 81–86; Sivers J. *Deutsche Dichter in Russland*. Berlin: 1855. S. 60–67; Fehre E. *Leben und Schriften des Kurländers Friedrich Ludvig Lindner*. Reval: [F. Kluge], 1895. S. 533–534; Eckardt J. *Livland im achtzehnten Jahrhundert*. Band. 1. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1876. S. 495–497; Schweder G. *Die alte Domschule*. S. 35.–37; Kohen J. Johann Gotthelf Lindner. S. 33.–48.
- ¹⁰ Schweder G. *Die alte Domschule*. S. 35; Hollander B. *Geschichte der Domschule der späteren Stadt-gymnasium zu Riga*. Hg. von C. Redlich. Hannover-Doeren: Harro v. Hirschheydt, 1980. S. 59.
- ¹¹ Here and further on the Rare books and manuscripts collection of Academic Library of the University of Latvia: the first numbers indicate the collection followed by the name of the collection. Ms. 496. Riga Domschule Rektoratbuch. S. 66.
- ¹² Dribins L. *Latvijas ebreju kopienas vēsture*. <http://www.mfa.gov.lv/lv/Ministrija/publikacijas/4430> (accessed 24 October 2014)
- ¹³ Ms. 496. Riga Domschule Rektoratbuch S. 66. Rare books and manuscripts collection of Academic Library of the University of Latvia.
- ¹⁴ Ibid.
- ¹⁵ Ibid.
- ¹⁶ Hollander B. *Geschichte der Domschule der spaeteren Stadtgymnasium zu Riga*. S. 67.
- ¹⁷ Ibid.
- ¹⁸ Graubner H. Der “Schuldiderot” Johann Gotthelf Lindner (1729–1776) und sein Schuldrama “Der wiederkehrende Sohn”. *Königsberger Beiträge. Von Gottsched bis Schenkendorf*. Hg. von J. Kohnen. Frankfurt, Main/New York: Lang, 2002. S. 37.–64.
- ¹⁹ Ibid.
- ²⁰ Many volumes have been combined—Lindner's speeches and poems dedicated to various occasions.
- ²¹ “..das den Witwen und Waisen der Lehrer die Halfte des Gehalts und der sonstigen Einnamen für ein Jahr vom Nachfolger gezahlt werde. In derselben Jahr wird die Anstellung eines Kollaborators beschlossen und durchgeführt.” Schweder G. *Die alte Domschule*. S. 35.–37.
- ²² Hollander B. *Geschichte der Domschule der späteren Stadtgymnasium zu Riga*. S. 60.
- ²³ Ms 496. Riga Domschule Rektoratbuch. S. 88. Rare books and manuscripts collection of Academic Library of the University of Latvia.

- ²⁴ Herder's letters to Lindner on 29th of August, 5th, 16th, and 31st October, and 7th November of 1764. *Johann Gottfried Herder. Briefe. Gesamtausgabe. 1763–1803*. Hg. von K. H. Hahn. Band 1. Weimar: Hermann Boehlaus Nachfolger, 1984. S. 29./30., 30./31., 32./33., 33./34., 34./35.
- ²⁵ Letter to J. G. Hamann on 23/24 May 1765. *Johann Gottfried Herder. Briefe. Gesamtausgabe*. S. 40.
- ²⁶ "Lindner hatte ebenso wie Herder in Königsberg studiert und brachte den Geist der Aufklärung nach Riga. Der Rektor der Domschule (..) kannte Herder und wählte ihn wegen seiner fortschrittlichen, historischen, philosophischen Auffassungen und wegen der Bedeutung, die er der Ästhetik beimass, aus. Johann Lindner sah in ihm einen Lehrer, der weit über dem Mittelmass stand." Krūze A., Zigmunde A. Domschullehrer Herder—Rigenser für immer. *Rīgas Domskola un izglītības pirmsākumi Baltijā*. Rīga: RAKA, 2011. S. 146.
- ²⁷ Ms 496 Riga Domschule Rektoratbuch, S. 65–88. Rare books and manuscripts collection of Academic Library of the University of Latvia.
- ²⁸ R22750. Event programmes. Materials of the Riga Dome School. Orders and reports of Russian Tsars. Rare books and manuscripts collection of Academic Library of the University of Latvia.
- ²⁹ Ms 496 Riga Domschule Rektoratbuch, S. 71. Rare books and manuscripts collection of Academic Library of the University of Latvia.
- ³⁰ Hollander B. *Geschichte der Domschule der späteren Stadtgymnasium zu Riga*. S. 67.
- ³¹ Letter to J. G. Hamann on 23/24 May 1765. *Johann Gottfried Herder. Briefe. Gesamtausgabe*. S. 40. (Here and further, the quotes from the 18th century texts are given in German only.)
- ³² Knoll R. J. G. Lindners Fortgang aus Riga (1764) und Herders Ankuft. *Johann Gottfried Herder und die deutschsprachige Literatur seiner Zeit in der baltischen Region. Beiträge der Rīgaer Fachtagung zu der deutschsprachigen Literatur im Baltikum 14. bis 17. September 1994*. Hg. von C. Altmayer und A. Gūtmanis. Rīga: Latvijas Akadēmiskā bibliotēka, 1997. 49.–79. lpp.
- ³³ "Das dem Denken vorzuordnende Leben wird zum epochal neuen Kriterium für Schriftstellerei und Philosophie; das schöpferisch Produktive erhält den Vorrang vor aller Systematik, das 'Wort' relativiert das 'Sein'. Das in ihm gesuchte geistig-sinnliche Ganze wird als Ermöglichungsgrund von versischer Dichtung erkannt. Nicht mehr Griechenland oder der Norden schlechthin, sondern Kurland und Livland werden zum ernüchternden Inbegriff für zukünftige sachadäquate metrische Fragen." Ibid, 67. lpp.
- ³⁴ Lindner, J. G. *Beitrag zu Schulhandlungen*. Königsberg: Woltersdorff, 1762. S. 207–256.
- ³⁵ R10000. Rīgas Domskola. Runas un citi materiāli. 1759. Rare books and manuscripts collection of Academic Library of the University of Latvia. S. 4.–24.
- ³⁶ Lindner J. G. *Beitrag zu Schulhandlungen*. S. 207.
- ³⁷ Ibid, S. 209–210.
- ³⁸ Today the Saaremaa island in Estonia.
- ³⁹ Lindner J. G. *Beitrag zu Schulhandlungen*. S. 216.
- ⁴⁰ Ibid, S. 220–243.
- ⁴¹ Karulis K. *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca*. 1. sējums. Rīga: Avots, 1992. 155. lpp.
- ⁴² Lindner J. G. *Beitrag zu Schulhandlungen*. S. 229.
- ⁴³ Contemporary etymological research of Latvian language conjectures that such loanwords as *Krāmbrot* (cream bread [Brot]) and *Bärn* (bērn) are of Latvian origin. Karulis K. *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca*. 1. sējums. 121., 122. lpp.; 422. lpp.
- ⁴⁴ Lindner, J. G. *Beitrag zu Schulhandlungen*. S. 220.
- ⁴⁵ Ibid.
- ⁴⁶ Woyt J. J. *Gazophylacium Medico-Physicum, Oder Schatz-Kam[m]er, Medicinisch- und Natürlicher Dinge*. Leipzig: Lauckischen, 1722. S. 875.
- ⁴⁷ Cf.: Detlef O. Vom Ursprung lesen. Johann Georg Hamanns Übersetzung der Herdeschen "Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Sprache." *Theorien vom Ursprung der Sprache*. Hg. von J. Gessinger und J. Rahden. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1989. S. 390.–420.
- ⁴⁸ "Die Verbindung von Protestantismus, Schule und Theater ruft in der Folge eine große Zahl protestantischen Schuldramatiker auf den Plan und führt zum Einsatz des Schuldramas als Kampf- und Propagandamittel für die Sache des neuen Glaubens. Dabei erbringt die Absicht, in die breite zu

- wirken, bald den Wechsel vom neulateinischen zum deutschsprachigen Drama." Zielske H. Drama und Theater in England, den Niederlanden und Deutschland. *Propyläen-Geschichte der Literatur 3. Renaissance und Barock*. Frankfurt am Main: Propyläen Verlag, 1988. S. 137. (Here and further our translation—I.K., M.L.)
- ⁴⁹ Wilpert G. *Deutschbaltische Literaturgeschichte*. München: C. H. Beck, 2005. S. 59.–63.
- ⁵⁰ Zielske H. Drama und Theater in England, den Niederlanden und Deutschland. S. 164.–166.
- ⁵¹ An article dedicated to the school drama "The Prodigal Son"—Graubner H. Der "Schuldiderot" Johann Gotthelf Lindner (1729–1776) und sein Schuldrama "Der wiederkehrende Sohn." S. 37.–64.
- ⁵² Lindner J. G. *Beitrag zu Schulhandlungen*. S. 14.
- ⁵³ More on the school drama "Albert oder die Gründung der Stadt" see: Kalniņa I. Zu den historiographischen und literarischen Quellen von Garlieb Merkels Wannem Ymanta. *Triangulum. Germanistisches Jahrbuch für Estland, Lettland und Litauen*. Achte Folge. Riga: Akademische Bibliothek Lettlands, 2001. S. 44.–55.
- ⁵⁴ Lindner J. *Beitrag zu Schulhandlungen*. S. 1.–54.
- ⁵⁵ "Die Schuldramen Lindners sind, literarisch betrachtet, genau so schlecht, wie sie Abbt in den Literaturbriefen und Hamann in den Privatbriefen fanden. Sie sind teils Alexandrinern, teils in Prosa geschrieben, und die didaktisch-moralische Tendenz ist so stark in den Vordergrund gestellt, dass die Charakterzeichnung und die Handlung nebensächlich wirken; nur ausnahmsweise gelingt eine dramatische Situation." Jørgensen S. A. Exkurs II. In: Hamann J. G. *Fünf Hirtenbriefe das Schuldrama betreffend*. Hg. von S. A. Jørgensen. København: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1962. S. 171, 172.
- ⁵⁶ Abbt T. Zweyhundert und ein und dreißigster Brief. Von Herrn Lindners Beitrag zu Schulhandlungen. Die Gattung taugt nichts. – Einige Anmerkungen über die Unbrauchbarkeit der Moralischvollkommenen Charaktere auf dem Theater. *Briefe die neueste Litteratur betreffend*. Theil. 13. Berlin: Nicolai, 1762. T. 13., 249–258. <http://www.ub.uni-bielefeld.de/diglib/aufkl/brieneulit/brieneulit.htm> (skat., 03.11.2015.)
- ⁵⁷ Graubner H. Der "Schuldiderot" Johann Gotthelf Lindner (1729–1776) und sein Schuldrama "Der wiederkehrende Sohn." S. 37.–64.; Graubner H. Sind Schuldramata möglich? Epilog im 18. Jahrhundert auf eine auslaufende Gattung. (Lindner, Abbt, Hamann, Herder). *Aspekte des politischen Theaters und Dramas von Calderon bis Georg Seidel*. Hg. von H. Turk, J. M. Valentin. Bern: Lang, 1996. S. 93.–130.
- ⁵⁸ Sonntag K. G. Zur Geschichte der öffentlichen Vergnügungen. *Rigaer Stadtblätter*. 1821. Nr. 10., S. 77.

Ieva Kalniņa, Mārtiņš Laizāns

Johanns Gothelfs Lindners un Rīgas Domas skola

Kopsavilkums

Atslēgvārdi: Rīgas Doma skola, J. G. Lindners, skolas drāma

Raksts veltīts Johana Gothelfa Lindnera darbībai Rīgas Domskolā un viņa sacerētājām skolas drāmām. Raksts sastāv no trīs daļām, kurās sniegts pārskats par Lindnera biogrāfiju, apraksts par viņa darbību Rīgas Domskolā un laikabiedru un vēlāku pētnieku izvērtējumu par to, kā arī ieskats Lindnera dramaturģiskajos darbos. Lai gan Lindners darbojās laikmetā, kad humānisma idejas sāka lēnām norietēt, piekāpjoties racionālām apgaismības vērtībām (kas atspoguļojas arī izmaiņās Domskolas mācību programmā), viņa centienos tomēr bija mērķis ieaudzināt jaunajā paaudzē humānisma veidoto skatījumu uz pasauli. Viens no šādiem paņēmieniem bija skolas drāmu sacerēšana un uzvešana, kas Rīgā Lindneram izdevies visai labi, turklāt jaunieši tēloja visas lomas – arī pieaugušos un ļaunos tēlus, kas bija netipiski šajā laikmetā.

Lai gan Lindnera lūgām laikabiedri nepiešķir augstu literāro vērtību, tās tomēr bijušas ietekmīgs līdzeklis jauniešu apmācībā, un tas arī bija paņēmieni, kā saglabāt ciešāku saskari ar antīko pasauli mācību procesā.

Authors

Bērziņa Gita (b. 1974) – *Dr. philol.*, classical philologist, FH UL

Visvalža iela 4a, Rīga LV-1050, Latvia
gita.berzina@latnet.lv

Cīrule Brigita (b. 1954) – *Dr. philol.*, classical philologist, FH UL

Visvalža iela 4a, Rīga LV-1050, Latvia
brigita.cirule@lu.lv

Frisch Magnus (b. 1980) – classical philologist, Philipp University of Marburg (Germany)

Wilhelm-Röpke-Straße 6 D 35039 Marburg, Germany
magnus.frisch@staff.uni-marburg.de

Grudule Māra (b. 1963) – *Dr. philol.*, literary scholar, FH UL, ILFA UL

Visvalža iela 4a, Rīga LV-1050, Latvia
mara.grudule@lu.lv

Kalniņa Ieva (b. 1956) – *Dr. philol.*, literary scholar, FH UL

Visvalža iela 4a, Rīga LV-1050, Latvia
ieva.kalnina@lu.lv

Laizāns Mārtiņš (b. 1985) – *Mag. hum.*, classical philologist, FH UL

Visvalža iela 4a, Rīga LV-1050, Latvia
s40083@gmail.com

Lāms Ojārs (b. 1965) – *Dr. philol.*, classical philologist, comparativist, FH UL

Visvalža iela 4a, Rīga LV-1050, Latvia
ojars.lams@lu.lv

Strockis Mindaugas (b. 1969) – *Dr.*, classical philologist, Vilnius University (Lithuania)

Universiteto g. 3, Vilnius 01513, Lithuania
mindaugas.strockis@flf.vu.lt

Viiding Kristi (b. 1972) – *Dr. phil.*, classical philologist, University of Tartu (Estonia)

Ülikooli 18, 50090 Tartu, Estonia
kristi.viiding@ut.ee

FH – Faculty of Humanities

ILFA – Institute of Literature, Folklore and Art

UL – University of Latvia

Autori

- Bērziņa Gita (dz. 1974) – *Dr. philol.*, klasiskā filoloģe, LU HZF
Visvalža iela 4a, Rīga LV-1050, Latvija
gita.berzina@latnet.lv
- Cīrule Brigita (dz. 1954) – *Dr. philol.*, klasiskā filoloģe, LU HZF
Visvalža iela 4a, Rīga LV-1050, Latvija
brigita.cirule@lu.lv
- Frišs Magnuss (dz. 1980) – klasiskais filologs, Mārburgas Filipa Universitāte (Vācija)
Wilhelm-Röpke-Straße 6 D 35039 Marburg, Germany
magnus.frisch@staff.uni-marburg.de
- Grudule Māra (dz. 1963) – *Dr. philol.*, literatūrzinātniece, LU HZF, LU LFMI
Visvalža iela 4a, Rīga LV-1050, Latvija
mara.grudule@lu.lv
- Kalniņa Ieva (dz. 1956) – *Dr. philol.*, literatūrzinātniece, LU HZF
Visvalža iela 4a, Rīga LV-1050, Latvija
ieva.kalnina@lu.lv
- Laizāns Mārtiņš (dz. 1985) – *Mag. hum.*, klasiskais filologs, LU HZF
Visvalža iela 4a, Rīga LV-1050, Latvija
s40083@gmail.com
- Lāms Ojārs (dz. 1965) – *Dr. philol.*, klasiskais filologs, komparatīvis, LU HZF
Visvalža iela 4a, Rīga LV-1050, Latvija
ojars.lams@lu.lv
- Strockis Mindaugs (dz. 1969) – *Dr.*, klasiskais filologs, Viļņas Universitāte (Lietuva)
Universiteto g. 3, Vilnius 01513, Lietuva
mindaugas.strockis@flf.vu.lt
- Vīdinga Kristi (dz. 1972) – *Dr. phil.*, klasiskā filoloģe, Tartu Universitāte (Igaunija)
Ülikooli 18, 50090 Tartu, Igaunija
kristi.viiding@ut.ee

HZF – Humanitāro zinātņu fakultāte

LFMI – Literatūras, folkloras un mākslas institūts

LU – Latvijas Universitāte

Latvijas Universitātes Literatūras, folkloras un mākslas institūts
Reģistrācijas apliecības nr. 90002118399
Mūkusalas iela 3, Rīga, LV-1423, Latvija
Tālr./fakss +371 67229017
<http://www.lulfmi.lv>
info@lulfmi.lv

Iespiests SIA "Jelgavas tipogrāfija"
Langervaldes iela 1a, Jelgava, LV-3022