

JOLANTA GELUMBECKAITĖ

Sigismundus Lauxmin (1596/97–1670)  
and his *Praxis oratoria*  
*sive praecepta artis rhetoricae* (1648)<sup>1</sup>

„Attamen reperiuntur *nonnulli*, qui [...] *Claram enim & apertam Orationem*  
existimant *rudem esse & simplicem: Eruditam autem & ingeniosam*  
talem debere esse censent, quae habeat *sensus abstrusos*,  
qui non nisi à *Doctis* intelligantur.“

Sigismundus Lauxmin, *Praxis oratoria* (1666, 146)

Sigismundus Lauxmin (lit. Zigmantas Liauksminas) was one of the most prominent and famous professors among Jesuit theologians and rhetoricians at Vilnius University in the 17th century. Lauxmin was born in 1596 (or 1597) into a Lithuanian noble family in Low Lithuania (lat. Samogitia, lit. Žemaitija)<sup>2</sup>. For this reason he used one more surname (the *cognomen*) – Lauxmin Samogita. In 1616 Lauxmin joined the Jesuit Order (the Society of Jesus – *Societas Iesu*). Lauxmin began his studies in Polock (1618–1619). In 1619–1622 he studied philosophy at Vilnius Academy (Vilnius University) and gained the degree of a doctor of philosophy in 1638. In 1625–1629 he continued his studies in Vilnius, where he gained a degree of a doctor of theology in 1642. After the studies Lauxmin taught rhetoric in Polock and in Nesvyžius (pol. Nieśwież, nowadays Nesvish, Belarus). In 1635 he returned to Vilnius to become a professor of philosophy. In 1644 he went back to Polock and from there to Braunsberg, where he worked as a professor of theology. At the Jesuit assembly 1652 in Rome he was the Lithuanian deputy. Afterwards he returned to Vilnius. Besides his academic work, Lauxmin was rector of the Polock Jesuit college (1650), vicerector of Vilnius University (1655–1657) and rector of the Kražiai Jesuit college (1661–1665; located in Low Lithuania, this was a famous Jesuit centre of Lithuania). In the last years of his life Lauxmin was pro-chancellor of Vilnius University (1665–1670). He died in 1670 and was buried in Vilnius.

1 This article is based on the paper, held at the 6th international colloquium on Vulgar and Late Latin in Helsinki (29.08–2.9.2000).

2 Biography of Lauxmin in: *PSB* 16, 578 f.; *EL* 3, 312 f.; *LLE*, 273.

Lauxmin's scientific legacy embraces several theological works<sup>3</sup> as well as textbooks of the Greek language<sup>4</sup>, music<sup>5</sup> and rhetoric<sup>6</sup>. His most important contribution to rhetoric is the textbook *Praxis oratoria sive praecepta artis rhetoricae*<sup>7</sup>. The book is based on a rhetoric course, which Lauxmin taught at the Jesuit college of Nesvyžius in 1631–1635. *Praxis oratoria* was first published in 1645 in Braunsberg<sup>8</sup>. This edition still remains unknown and is only quoted from secondary sources<sup>9</sup>. The copy preserved at the Tübingen University library (TUUB, Sign.: Dh 8) has recently been identified as the one from 1648 and not from 1645 as was thought before<sup>10</sup>. It is possible that a parallel edition appeared in 1645 in Vilnius<sup>11</sup>. The only copy, which cur-

3 *Demonstratio Catholicae Ecclesiae ex certis a prima sui origine notis, in S. Scriptura expresse positae collecta*, Vilnius, 1643 (1645, 1648, 1655 [Vilnius]); *Theologia ecclesiastica, in qua materiae omnes, quae in Ecclesia a concionatoribus et catechistis tractari solent et debent, ordine digestae, stylo populari, clare, succincte explicantur*, Vilnius, 1675 (posthumous). A number of smaller treatises by Lauxmin remained unedited, such as *Controversiae de fide*; *Tractatus de Deo Uno* and *Tractatus de iure et iustitia* (the manuscripts are preserved at the Vilnius University library). The bibliography of known works of Lauxmin as given in this article follows: Sommervogel 4, col. 1569 f.; Estreicher 21, 130 f.; *SPTK* 2, 498 f.; *ILLSSD*, Nr. 598–620.

4 *Epitome institutionum linguae Graecae*, Vilnius, 1655.

5 *Ars et praxis musica in usum studiosae iuventutis in collegiis Societatis Iesu permissu superiorum proposita*, Vilnius, 1667 (1669, 1693 [Vilnius]); *Antiphonale ad Psalmos, iuxta ritum S. Romanae Ecclesiae, decantandos, necessarium*, Vilnius, 1667 (1694, 1742 [Vilnius]); *Graduale pro exercitatione studentium*, Vilnius, 1667 (1693, 1742 [Vilnius]).

6 Furthermore, Lauxmin has edited some shorter occasional texts in Latin as well as in Polish: *Panegyrik Władysława IV po wzięciu Moskwy*, Vilnius (?), 1634; *Panegyricus Vladislao IV Regi Poloniae ex bello Moschovitico redeunti*, Vilnius, 1634; *Oratio de S. Casimiro regni Pol[oniae] et M[agni] D[ucatus] Lit[huaniae] patrono*, Vilnius, 1635; *Mowa na pogrzebie Stanisława Dziewiatrowskiego, Podstolnika Koweńskiego*, Vilnius, 1653.

7 Quotations in this article will be given according to the edition of 1666 (which is based on the Braunsberg edition, as the editor Georg Heinrich Fromann points out in his preface [f. A4r]); the full title is the following: PRAXIS || ORATORIA. || SIVE || Praecepta Artis Rhetoricae, || quae ad componendam Orationem || scitu necessaria sunt, tam separatim || singula, quam omnia simul exemplis || expressa; & ad aemulationem E-||loquentiae Studiosis pro-||posita. || à || P. SIGISMUNDO LAUXMIN, || è SOC. IESU. S. T. D. || Editio Nova || cum Praefatione & Indice || necessario. || Cum Gratia & Privilegio Elect. Saxon. || FRANCOFURTI ad Moenum, || Impensis GEORGII HEINRICI || FROMMANNI Bibl. Lipsiens. || ANNO M. DC. LXVI. ([17 p.], 333 p., [7 p.])

8 In the second half of the 16th century Bishop of Vilnius Valerianus Protasewicz (lit. Valerijonas Protasevičius, 1504–1579) invited the Jesuits from Braunsberg namely to organize a Jesuit higher school in Lithuania. In 1645 Lauxmin himself lived and worked in Braunsberg, so he could take care of the editing of his book.

9 Cf. Barner 1970, 266 (footnote 38), 471.

10 I express my thanks to Iris Biesinger for this information.

11 This Vilnius edition is attested in: Sommervogel 4, col. 1569; *SPTK* 2, 499 and *ILLSSD*, Nr. 611. Sigitas Narbutas points it out as the first publication of the textbook, which appeared under the title *Praecepta artis rhetoricae* (Narbutas 2001, 271, 288).

rently is preserved at the St Petersburg University library (SPb. UB, Sign.: E. I. 746) and which is supposed to be the one from Vilnius, is defective and lacks the title page<sup>12</sup>. Therefore it is also possible that it is one copy of the Braunsberg edition. In 1648 *Praxis oratoria* was reissued in Braunsberg, this time with the permission of Simon Blonensis: „Ego Simon Blonensis Praepositus Provincialis Societatis JESU per Provinciam Lithuaniae [...] permitto, ut Praxis Oratoria à P. Sigismundo Lauxmin Societatis nostrae concinnata, & ab aliquot Theologis ejusdem Societatis revisa, & approbata, Typis mandetur. Vilnae Anno Domini 1648. Julii die 8“. The same approbation is repeated in all later editions of the book<sup>13</sup>. Until 1732 the *Praxis* was edited thirteen times, as follows: 1658 (Munich); 1665, 1666 and 1675 (Frankfurt on Main); 1680 (Cologne), 1682 (Frankfurt on Main), 1690 (Würzburg), 1705, 1707 (Cologne), 1710 (Prague), 1717 (Cologne), 1720 (Vienna), 1732 (Koshice). It occupies an important place not only in the history of teaching in Lithuania but also in European culture generally.

Sigismundus Lauxmin belonged to the generation of native-speaking Lithuanian academics at Vilnius University, who at the beginning of the 17th century started to replace foreign professors (note that many of them knew Lithuanian as well). In the first half of the century up to 40 percent of the Jesuits at Vilnius University were of Lithuanian origin. This created a basis for a new scientific level at the *Alma Mater Vilnensis*. Many original studies and textbooks were prepared by Lithuanians. Partly they were perfect compilations of the European scientific heritage. On the other hand a significant part of these textbooks marked the beginning of new research fields in Lithuania. Among them was the first Lithuanian Grammar, written by the Jesuit theologian Constantinus Syrwid (lit. Konstantinas Sirvydas, pol. Szyrwid, 1578/81–1631) approximately in 1621–1630. This grammar has been mentioned in several works of Jesuit historians under the title *Clavis linguae Lithuanicae*, although the book itself has not been found until today<sup>14</sup>. The other book written by Syrwid and used at Vilnius University was

12 I express my thanks to Dr. Sigitas Narbutas and Dr. Daiva Narbutienė for this information.

13 The Zedler Encyclopedia indicates incorrectly 1618 as the year of the first edition of the *Praxis oratoria* (Zedler, vol. 16, col. 1216). This mistake originates from one of the sources of the Lauxmin article in Zedler – *Bibliotheca scriptorum Societatis Iesu* by Pedro de Ribadeneyra, Philippe Alegambe and Nathanael Sotvell from 1676: „Edidit latinè [...] *Praxim Oratoriam & praecepta artis Rhetoricae*. Braunsbergae 1618. in 12.“ (p. 740). In Martin Lipenius' *Bibliotheca realis philosophica* (1682), which also was a source of the article on Lauxmin in Zedler, the year 1618 is attested as well: „*Lauxmin, Samogitiā-Poloni, S. I. Praxis Oratoria, s. Praecepta Artis Rhetoricae. Braunsbergae 12. 1618. Monach. 12. 1658. Lips. 12. 1665.*“ (p. 1061). The mistake in this case is evident, since Lauxmin at that time had not even started his studies.

14 The grammar is mentioned without the year of edition in *Bibliotheca scriptorum Societatis Iesu* by Pedro de Ribadeneyra and Philippe Alegambe from 1643: „Scripsit idiomate

a Polish-Latin-Lithuanian dictionary *Promptuarium dictionum Polonicarum, Latinarum et Lituanicarum*, edited ca. 1620 (the edition of 1642 and later ones are called *Dictionarium trium linguarum*; altogether five editions are known)<sup>15</sup>. Also worth mentioning is the Lithuanian history by Albertus Wiiuk-Koialowicz (lit. Albertas Vijūkas-Kojalavičius, 1609–1677) *Historiae Lituanae pars prior* (Danzig, 1650) and *pars altera* (Antwerp, 1669). Before the appearance of this book the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania had remained untaught as a subject in its own right at Vilnius University. This was the first history of the State of Lithuania in Latin<sup>16</sup>. It also became the standard text for historians in their studies on Eastern Europe up to the 19th century<sup>17</sup>. One of the main sources for history of the Church in Lithuania was his *Miscellanea rerum ad Statum Ecclesiasticum in Magno Lithuaniae Ducatu pertinentium* (Vilnius, 1650). The brother of Albertus, Casimirus Wiiuk-Koialowicz (lit. Kazimieras Vijūkas-Kojalavičius, 1617–1674), also a professor at Vilnius University, wrote two manuals of rhetoric: *Institutionum rhetoricarum pars prima et secunda* (Vilnius, 1654) and *Modi LX sacrae orationis variae formandae* (Antwerp, 1668). These textbooks on rhetoric did not excel the one by Lauxmin and were less popular in the neighbouring countries (generally only one subject – how to arrange a speech – is distinguished). Among the exact sciences the following theoretical works published by Lithuanians in the first half of the 17th century should be mentioned. After a course taught at University, the professor of mathematics Joannes Rudomina Dusiatski (lit. Jonas Rudamina Dusetiškis, 1615–1652) prepared his *Illustriora theoremata et problemata mathematica* (Vilnius, 1633). This was the first book on the exact sciences published in the Academy. The student of physics and mathematics Albertus Dyblinski (lit. Albertas Diblinskis) published *Centuria astronomica in alma Academia*

Polonico & Lituano: [...] *Clauim Linguae Lituanae*“ (p. 84). The edition of the *Bibliotheca* from 1676 adds the following information: „Edidit *Clauem linguae Lituanae*. Vilnae in 8.“ (p. 157). *Diarium Biographicum* by Henning Witte from 1688 again indicates only the title: „*Emisit Clauem linguae Lituanae*“ (the article „Anno 1631. 23. August. Constantinus Syrwid“). The article on Syrwid in the Zedler Encyclopedia, based on these sources, tells us as follows: „*Clauem linguae Lituanae*, Vilna in 8.“ (Zedler, vol. 41, col. 1206). Considering that this Lithuanian grammar could exist in a convolute or even under a different name (resp. without the title page or in an otherwise defective state), there is still hope that it will be rediscovered one day.

- 15 *Lietuvių kalbos enciklopedija* 1999, 578–579. Up to the middle of the 19th century it was the main lexicographical monument in Lithuania. „Later, in the 19th c., specialists in comparative Indo-European linguistics widely used Sirvydas' dictionary and its lexicon was cited in major Indo-European studies“ (Zinkevičius 1996, 252).
- 16 The author himself considered it very important that the history should be written in perfect Latin in order to achieve a double aim: to teach history as well as excellent Latin style (cf. Jurgelėnaitė 1992, 146).
- 17 Jurginis 1988, 29–32.

*et universitate Vilnensi Societatis Iesu* (Vilnius, 1639), the first book on astronomy in Lithuania. The Lithuanian nobleman and student of philosophy Nicolaus Casimirus Bialkowski (lit. Mykolas Kazimieras Bialkovskis) edited *Theorecentrica sive Mathematicae de punctis et centrīs considerationes in alma Academia Vilnensi Societatis Iesu* (Vilnius, 1644, 1690). The Lithuanian nobleman and professor of astronomy Joannes Poczapowski (lit. Jonas Počapovskis) edited *Universa meteorologia* (Vilnius, 1643). Albertus Wiiuk-Koialowicz also joined this field of studies and in 1648 published a book on optics *Oculus ratione correctus, id est Demonstratio ocularis* (Vilnius). Parts of these studies, which were edited in Vilnius, were accepted as manuals or were at least known at foreign universities as well<sup>18</sup>.

Such studies and a considerably high scientific level at Vilnius Academy were not accidentally gained. Several circumstances led the University to become one of the most flowering centres of education in Europe of that time. Here I would like to briefly recall the main aspects of the history of Vilnius University as well as of the Latin tradition in Lithuania. In the 16th century the Reformation began to spread in Lithuania. In 1539 the Protestant Abrahamus Culvensis (lit. Abraomas Kulvietis, ca. 1509–1545) opened the first secondary school in Vilnius. After the pressure of the Counter-Reformation the school was closed in 1542 and Culvensis himself accepted an invitation from Duke Albertus of Prussia (1490–1568) to move to Prussia, i. e. Lithuania Minor (the Lithuanian-speaking part of the Duchy of Prussia in the North-East of the country). Starting with 1545, Prussia became an important bastion of the Reformation. After the Council of Trent (1545–1547, 1551–1552, 1562–1563) the Counter-Reformation strengthened its forces in Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (i. e. Lithuania Major)<sup>19</sup>. Meanwhile in Protestant Prussia education in vernaculars was promoted<sup>20</sup>, whereas in Lithuania Major it was mainly based on the Latin language. In 1544 Duke Albertus opened Königsberg University (so called *Albertina* resp. *Universitas Regiomontana*), which replaced the former elementary school founded in 1541. As a response to the foundation of this Protestant University and as an affirmation of Catholicism, a Jesuit college was instituted in Vilnius in 1570, by dispensation from the Grand Duke of Lithuania and King of Poland (1548–1572), Sigismundus Augustus (lit. Zigmantas Au-

18 Petrauskienė 1976, 265 f.

19 The Grand Duchy of Lithuania was a Jesuit province of Poland until 1608.

20 Note the first printed book in Lithuanian was prepared and published in the Duchy of Prussia in 1547 – Catechism by Martinus Mosvidius (lit. Martynas Mažvydas, ca. 1520–1563). For a chronological table of Lithuanian writings in Prussia and in Lithuania see the online catalogue of the exhibition „Die Litauische Postille (1573): Dokumente der litauischen Reformation“, which took place at the Herzog August library in 09.03.–01.06.2003: <http://www.hab.de/ausstellung/postille/>

gustas, 1520–1572)<sup>21</sup>. Bishop Protasevičius announced the founding of the College in his pastoral letter and classes began on October 23rd. On October 30th 1579 the College was officially transformed into a University – *Almae Academia et Universitas Vilnensis Societatis Iesu*<sup>22</sup>. „The Academy adopted wholesale the traditional structure of the Jesuit humanistic school, with its principles and teaching curriculum, determined by the unified regulations covering the whole of Europe *Ratio atque Institutio Studiorum Societatis Iesu*“<sup>23</sup> (prepared in 1584–1585 and published in 1591 after some corrections; the second edition of 1599 was confirmed in Rome as an official code of studies). Teaching was based on the traditional Western European system of the Humanities – all students had to be trained in eloquence (oratory and poetry; *docta et eloquens pietas*) and the instruction was to be based on Cicero, Aristotle and Quintilian (using the manual by Emanuel Alvarez *De institutione grammatica*, 1592)<sup>24</sup>. The number of classes of the Humanities at Vilnius University gradually increased. In 1579 a five-year system was introduced (3 years of *infima*, i. e. grammar, later *poetica* and *rhetorica*; instead of the three classes – *infima*, *poetica*, *rhetorica* – of the College); in 1580 it was changed into a six-year system (*infima*, *infima maior*, *grammatica*, *syntaxis*, *poetica*, *rhetorica*); in 1616 the classes of the same six-year system were split into minor subjects (*infima*, *grammatica I*, *grammatica II*, *syntaxis minor*, *syntaxis maior*, *poetica*, *rhetorica*); finally in 1625 the Latin language started to be studied for seven years (*infima minor*, *infima maior*, *grammatica*, *syntaxis minor*, *syntaxis maior*, *poetica*, *rhetorica*)<sup>25</sup>.

The Humanities program of Vilnius Academy became more comprehensive than in other Jesuit schools in Poland. In the beginning, as it was accepted in the rest of Europe, the rhetoric manual of Cyprian Soarez (1524–1593) *De arte rhetorica libri tres ex Aristotele, Cicerone et Quintiliano deprompti* (1560<sup>26</sup>) was widely used. Nevertheless Soarez was not the only author included in the University's study program. The textbook by Nicolas Caussin (1580–1651) *De eloquentia sacra et humana* (Paris, 1619) was popular, as well as the manuals on rhetoric by François Pomey (1618–1673), Jakob Masen (1601–1681), and Nicolaus Radau (1617–1687). The textbook by this Polish Jesuit *Orator Extemporaneus* was published in Vilnius in 1640 (and 1690). Together with the Jesuit textbooks, manuals by the Dutch

21 The library of Sigismundus August was the basis for the foundation of the library of Vilnius University.

22 More detailed in: Venclova 1981.

23 Jurgelėnaitė 1992, 141 ff.

24 Ulčėnaitė 1995<sup>a</sup>, 243 f.

25 Ulčėnaitė 1979, 8 f.

26 By the 18th century its editions grew up to almost one hundred, seven of them appeared in Vilnius (Petrauskienė 1976, 69 f.).

Protestant scholar Gerhard Johann Vossius (1577–1649) were used as representative<sup>27</sup>. Nevertheless the most significant influence on the history of rhetoric in the 17th century generally was that exercised by the Jesuits<sup>28</sup>. Up to the middle of the 17th century professors of the Academy published several original books on poetics and rhetoric which were met with a broad response at other European universities. At Vilnius University, besides the above mentioned textbook by Casimirus Wiliuk-Koialowicz *Institutiones rhetoricae* of 1654, which basically concentrated on the composition of oratorical speeches, a printed course of lectures on poetics by professor Matthias Casimirus Sarbievius (lit. Motiejus Kazimieras Sarbievijus, 1596–1640) *De acuto et arguto liber unicus sive Seneca et Martialis* was of great importance<sup>29</sup>. In this treatise, whose final version was prepared in 1626–1627, Sarbievius examines the theory of the rhetorical concept (*acumen*). Generally based on the ancient rhetorical tradition, for the first time in Lithuania the poetics dealt with the new style of Baroque. Sarbievius created the theory of the moderate and harmonious language (*concor discordia* or *discors concordia*)<sup>30</sup>. He wrote four more treatises: *Characteres lyriici seu Horatius et Pindarus*; *De virtutibus et vitiis carminis elegiaci seu Ovidius*; *De figuris sententiarum* and *De perfecta poesi sive Vergilius et Homerus*. At the beginning of the 17th century the professors of rhetoric took into account the practical needs of their students. Almost all the manuscript lecture courses in rhetoric at Vilnius university show that practical advice in teaching of eloquence increased at the expense of theory.

This was the context in which the publication of Lauxmin's *Praxis oratoria* should be seen. Which features helped the *Praxis* to withstand a competition in the stream of already existing and widely recognized works? The preface of the manual, „Praefatio nova ad lectorem“, written by the editor Georg Heinric Fromann, partly answers this question. The editor stresses that almost all contemporary rhetorics are based on the Vossianian tradition: „hodiè prae caeteris regnare Vossianas [Institutiones]“ (f. A2v), whereas in the present book one can find some new things („Accedit, quod in multis peculiare quid, quodque penes alios | Rhetores frustra quaeras, in hac Praxi

27 Vossius published four works on rhetoric: *Institutiones rhetoricae* (1606), *De rhetoricae natura et constitutione* (1621), *Rhetorices contractae, sive partitionum oratoriarum libri V* (1621), *Elementa rhetoricae* (1626).

28 Conley 1994, 152.

29 For his poetry Sarbievius was crowned with laurels by Pope Urbanus VIII. For his odes written following Horace he was called Horatius Sarmaticus. His *Lyrice libri quatuor*, *Liber epodon*, *Liber epigrammatum* and *Poemata* (starting with 1625 altogether 34 editions in the 17th century) were known and imitated by many authors (Ulčėnaitė 1995<sup>b</sup>, xix–xxxvi).

30 More about Sarbievijus and his style in: Ulčėnaitė 1992, 13–19; Jurgelėnaitė 1992, 143–145; Ulčėnaitė 1996, 40–51.

Compendiosâ docetur“ [f. A2v–A3r]), particularly that the author starts his teaching with a detailed explanation of the syntactical periods and their usage: „Et primo quidem loco doctrinam de conquadrandis, & ut sic loquar, concentrandis periodis proponit, quae quàm necessaria sit ad Eloquentiam germanam comparandam“ (f. A3r). Fromann seems to be convinced that only a proper syntactical structure helps to achieve a harmonious language<sup>31</sup>. And in this aspect Lauxmin's book fulfills the task:

„Deinde nec illud tacendum erat, Lauxminum in Elocutione facem vel lucidissimam omnium praefere. Multi aliàs multa coacervant praecepta, de Confirmatione, quae primiceria Orationis pars dicenda venit, egregiè expolienda, quae argumenta & et ex quibus quasi capsulis adhibenda, quibus coloribus sit utendum. At Lauxminus noster, praeterquam quod in praeceptis breviter & aptè proponendis tantum non omnis est, practicè etiam in quibusdam ostendit exemplis, quomodo argumenta velut in acie quadam locari, & quàm facile extendi queant atque diduci“ (f. A3v)

Lauxmin rejected the traditional scheme of rhetoric teaching, which usually started with the very definition of rhetoric, its main subject, functions and aims<sup>32</sup>. According to the author himself it is especially the capacity to create the rhetorical (i. e. syntactical) periods that determines the harmony, the beauty and the convincingness of eloquence. According to him this method corresponds to nature: „Porro Natura nihil repente agit, sed pedetentim, & ex intervallo. Nam exigua primò in rebus exordia ponit: tum eadem auget sensim: nec nisi cum tempore, ununquodque opus ad destinatam perfectionem perducit. [...] Similiter ratiocinandum est de Eloquendi Scientia“ (f. A4v) – as he says in his preface to the book („Praefatio ad Eloquentiae candidatos“). Furthermore, Lauxmin admits that these thoughts as well as his practical work with students have forced him to rearrange the classical rhetoric, and to start his teaching with syntax:

„Ejusmodi me ratio permovit non paucis ab hinc annis, cùm ad erudiendos in Oratoria facultate Tyrones Societatis nostrae destinatus essem, ut immutarem consuetum docendi modum. Usitatum enim est aliis, ab Inventione ordiri Doctrinam dicendi,

31 On the other hand many falsely believe that only overornamented phrases could help to create a proper speech: „Plurimi certè tum demum ad Eloquentiae fastigium adspirâsse se opinantur, si orationem nescio quibus phrasium purpurissatarum laciniis exornare sciant; sed stultulâ planè & puerili opinione, cum in id potius opera foret danda, ut harmonicum quandam Orationi numerum vel aequilibrium ingenerare discerent. Id verò ex doctrinâ de pe-riodis formandis vel potissimè depromi debere quis ambigat?“ (f. A3r–A3v)

32 Further problems usually being discussed in rhetorics are the following (classical Ciceronian): *inventio* (the theme, i. e. invention), *dispositio* (the best arrangement of arguments and the structure of the whole speech, i. e. arrangement), *elocutio* (the verbal expression of the arguments, i. e. style), *memoria* (memorizing the speech for delivery, i. e. memory), *actio* resp. *pronunciatio* (the process of delivering, i. e. delivery); afterwards different types of speeches were discussed as well as three style-levels: *magnificus*, *humilis*, *mediocris* (cf. Vickers 1988, 62–65; Ulčínaitė 1991, 52–53).

quæ est pars intima & fundamentum Orationis: ego tamen à COMMATIS, MEMBRIS & PERIODIS, quae in extima veluti facie Orationis apparent, initium docendi sumpsit: quòd facilius, nec minus fructuosè hac in parte Juvenes occupari posse animadverti.“ (f. A5r)

He claims that purely theoretical considerations of the matter produce no appreciable result and are too complicated for students to comprehend; besides they are useless for practical purposes:

„Alii de locis Dialecticis, modis inventionis, acumine argumentandi, & his similibus copiosè disserunt: ego haec paucis attigi propterea, quod pleraque ex iis subtilia magis, quàm utilia esse viderem. Praecepta | alii duntaxat, idque ea, quae majoris momenti esse putant, scripto exponunt: ego minuta etiam collegi, exemplisque doctrinam confirmavi, ac ad Praxim deduxi, ut in uno conspectu & Doctrina & Usus doctrinae appareret.“ (f. A5r–5v)

Lauxmin acknowledges the inductive method of teaching: „Principium enim ducetur, quemadmodum dictum est, à facilioribus: inde paulatim, sine magno labore, ad ipsam Orationem pervenimus“ (f. A6r). Generally the manual by Lauxmin is concerned with style. It is to be concluded that he wanted eloquence to return to the Ciceronian rhetorical model from which it had receded in Baroque times. In other words, Lauxmin's work shows a return to classical functional rhetoric, in which a logical exposition of the given material is not drowned by boundless aphorisms and unnatural metaphors. He is no doubt opposed to the macaronic style, the useless word-play and the sacrifice of matter to form. In fact it is a textbook of perfect sentence-arrangement leading step by step to the matters of form, action and affection. It is not without reason, one can assume, that the tenth part of the *Praxis* is called „De actione Oratoria“ (f. A9v) in the summary, although later in the text it appears as „De affectione Oratoria“ (p. 250). The *Praxis* consists of ten parts:

Caput I. De Incisis, Membris, Periodis, & quae ex his consta<n>t.

Caput II. De Argumento & Argumentatione.

Caput III. De Amplificatione.

Caput IV. De Sententia, Transitione, Digressione.

Caput V. De Quaestione, Statu, Causa, Crinomeno.

Caput VI. De partibus Rhetoricae, Officio Oratoris, & Partibus Orationis.

Caput VII. De Genere seu Charactere dicendi.

Caput VIII. De Dispositione Orationis.

Caput IX. De Elocutione Oratoria.

Caput X. De actione Oratoria. Quaestio Unica. Quid sit observandum Oratori, ut benè agat.

(f. A6v–A9v)

The first part of the book describes the syntactic structure of a sentence and different sentence-types. As Lauxmin says, the matter was analysed widely by Cicero and other ancient authors, although it is neglected by his contemporaries: „Doctrinam hujus Capitis Ciceroni & aliis priscis Oratori-

bus fuisse perspectissimam: nostro tamen aevo communiter negligi, nescio quo errore“ (p. 1). Any orator needs to study the subject exhaustively because every educated man should speak as well as write in strict accordance with grammatical rules<sup>33</sup>. Lauxmin starts with the explanation of the least notional syntactical unit, „latinè *Incisum*, est *Pars Orationis brevissima, sensum aliquem exhibens*“ (p. 2), a word group or syntagme which consists of at least two notional words related by an immediate syntactic relation (e. g., „*Actum est, Fuimus Troes*“ [p. 2]). Afterwards he turns to the simple sentence – „*Colon seu Membrum Oratorium*“ (p. 3), a logical word combination which expresses some thought („Latinè *Membrum*, est *Portio orationis verbis absoluta, sensum aliquem exhibens*“ [p. 3])<sup>34</sup>. A word group (*Comma*) and a simple sentence (*Colon*) differ only in the number of syllables: the latter should according to Lauxmin consist of more than ten syllables („*Colon habet plura verba, ut etiam extendatur ultra viginti syllabas: descendere autem non potest infra decem. Nam infra decem non est Colon, sed Comma*“ [p. 3]). Further on the rhetorical or syntactical period is described<sup>35</sup>. Here Lauxmin gives the Aristotelian definition: „*Periodus est Oratio, cuius Principium & finis in conspectu est, & uno intuitu facile spectari potest*“ (p. 5). In the chapter „*Quotuplex sit Periodus?*“ (p. 7–16) he explains what causes diversity of the rhetorical periods (i. e. sentences). Three causes are pointed out: 1) number of the constituents, 2) their proportionality and 3) the way they should be organized („*Diversitas Periodorum ex triplici capite oritur. Ex numero membrorum, ex aequalitate vel inaequalitate eorumdem, & ex modo collocationis*“ [p. 7]).

1. The first type of sentence, the *monocolos* or *unimembris*, is the simple (usually expanded) sentence with a specific sequence of its constituents. It has inverted word order, which helps to create a varied theme–rheme structure<sup>36</sup>. The other three types – *dicolos* or *bimembris*, *tricolos* or *trimembris* and

33 „Nam esse unicè necessariam Oratori indè patet, quòd nihil unquam cultè & ordinate à quoquam scribi aut dici potest, nisi juxta hos dicendi modos.“ (p. 1)

34 „Dixi *sensum aliquem*, quia *Colon* aliquando componit *Periodum*, & tunc non habet perfectum sensum“ (p. 3).

35 „*PERIODUS* à Medicis dicitur febrilium ille circuitus, qui stato die ad aegrum revertitur. Apud Graecos etiam illi, qui Olympia, Pythia, Isthmia, Nemeaea vincebant, dicebantur *Periodo* vincere, quòd illas celebritates ubique vincendo circumirent. [...] a Latinis scriptoribus vocatur *Circulus, Ambitus, Circumscriptio, Comprehensio, Continuatio*.“ (p. 4–5)

36 A sequence of words in a sentence is determined by the communicative intention. In this respect a sentence consists of two parts of a communicative structure, the theme and the rheme. The theme carries information already supplied by the context and the rheme carries a new information. The theme–rheme structure does not necessarily coincide with the syntactic structure and can be altered by changing the word order in a sentence. Lauxmin explains the word order as follows: „*Nos expectamus quotidie Tabellarios vestros. Erit membrum simplex; quia nullum habet flexum circa finem. Sin autem*

*tetracolos* or *quadrimembris* – deal with the composite sentence. The second period, *bimembris* („*Cujus Propositio membro uno, altero Redditio absolvi-tur*“ [p. 8]), is characteristic of moral speeches; such sentences are logical ones, having a statement and its concise explanation (clauses are connected with subordinative or semantic conjunctions, which could also have the intensifying postpositive particles<sup>37</sup>), e. g., „*Si septies percusseris terram, Delebis Syriam*“ (p. 9; note it is a rearranged simple sentence expanded by a participial phrase „*Septies percutiens terram, Delebis Syriam*“ [p. 10]). The third (*trimembris*) and the fourth (*quadrimembris*) type of sentences represent complex sentences with more than one dependent clause. The subordinate attributive clauses are ascribed to the *trimembris* period („in qua aut bimem-bri propositioni unimembris respondet redditio, aut unimembris Prothesi bimembris opponitur Apodosis“ [p. 10])<sup>38</sup>. The *quadrimembris* period in which „cum duabus propositionibus duae redditiones respondent“ (p. 11) is represented as a composite sentence consisting of two main clauses, each having a subordinate clause of its own<sup>39</sup>.

2. According to Lauxmin one should maintain a proportional length of clauses in a sentence. Here he divides the periods into *isocolos* („quando utrumque membrum est inter se ferè aequale numero syllabarum“), *macrocolos* („posterius membrum est longum“ [p. 12]) and *micros* („cùm posterius est brevius“ [p. 13])<sup>40</sup>. The three-part sentence (*trimembris*) could be composed in two ways: either with clauses of roughly the same length (*isopleuros*), or with the third clause considerably shorter (*isoscelès*) (p. 13).

3. The way of collocating clauses into a complex sentence displays two basic types of organization. The first one corresponds to the patterns of subordinate clauses described in the manual mentioned above („*Alia est, quae con-|stat apertè inter se junctis, & sibi oppositis membris, ut sunt illae*

dicas. *Nos Tabellarios vestros, homines diligentissimos, quotidie expectamus. Jam erit Periodus Monocolos: quia verbum expectamus, veluti interruptum, interjectis incisus, redditus ad principium suum, quod vel è pronunciatione facile constat*“ (p. 8).

37 „Nectuntur autem vocibus & verbis, quae includunt in se quandam conditionem, aut quae aliquam redditionem petunt. Prioris generis sunt illae particulae, *Si &, postquam, cùm, siquidem & similes*. Posterioris verò generis sunt istae: *Ille, qui, tantum, quantum, ita ut: toties, quoties, & similes*. Praeterea verba optativi & conjunctivi modi. *vellem facerent &c.* Talibus enim particulis & verbis plures inter se propositiones ita colligantur, ut non nisi simul intelligi petant: quae abstractis illis singulae per se perfectè intelligerentur.“ (p. 9) Note that here among the semantic conjunctions some asemantic conjunctions as well as relative pronouns and adverbs characteristic of completive clauses are named.

38 Lauxmin quotes Demosthenes as an example: „*Quarum rerum gratiam Philippus suis fautoribus debet, || Quarumque poenas nobis exigere convenit: || Earum nunc mentionem facere non vacat*“ (p. 10).

39 „Istiusmodi Periodus est valde elegans & aptissima ad comparandam copiam & elegantiam dicendi, et ad variandam elocutionem.“ (p. 11)

40 „Haec tamen Periodus, si habuerit ultimum membrum valde breve, erit vitiosa iudicio Oratorum.“ (p. 13)

omnes, quas supra posuimus“ [p. 13–14]); the second type explains a chain subordination, in which a subordinate clause is superordinate to another, which in turn is superordinate to one more dependent clause („Alia est, in qua ita sunt permista membra, ut ex duobus vel pluribus membris, unum actu evadat, fiatque Periodus pauciorum quidem membrorum actu, potestate verò plurium“ [p. 14]). Later on in the first part Lauxmin examines some types of complex sentences („Istae dicendi formae ex superioribus oriuntur“ [p. 16]), namely the attributive clauses („Schoenotenes est colon prolixum, quasi in modum longi funis extensum“ [p. 16]), which can also include various interpolated remarks. Several ways of constructing rhetorical periods are discussed, such as expressing opinions either in short simple sentences („Periodica Circumductio [...] ut Pater dat filiae. Prohibes. [...] Hic sunt quidem Protheses & Apodoses, sed neque ligantur simul; neque habent sufficientem membrorum longitudinem“ [p. 18]); or in long complex sentences with several subordinated clauses („pneuma vocatur illa Orationis compositio, quae multa Cola & Commota <sic> simul complectitur & conclu-|dit, & eò usque protenditur, quoad dicentis spiritus & latera perferre <sic> possunt“ [p. 18–19]). The first way is useful in arguing, whereas the second can help in demonstrative speeches<sup>41</sup>. Lauxmin concludes with the practical advice for his students to construct the rhetorical period from a short simple sentence which can be expanded according to the question-chain: „Quis? Quid? Ubi? Quibus auxiliis? || Cur? Quomodo? Quando?“ (p. 25)<sup>42</sup>.

The second part of the book deals with the argumentation of a speech or the invention: „Ideò cognitâ jam exteriori facie Orationis, nunc interiorem ejusdem constitutionem consideremus“ (p. 35). Lauxmin admits that the invention of arguments is of no lesser importance than being able to construct various syntactical phrases and to handle them skilfully: „QVod ossa in corpore, & fundamentum in aedibus est; id sunt argumenta in dicendo; quibus universa Orationis structura innititur. [...] Argumentum est probabile inventum ad faciendam fidem“ (p. 35). Here he turns from the sentence-types to the very structure of a sentence (*Enunciatio*) and explains its parts starting with the predicate and the subject<sup>43</sup>. The expansion of such a basic pattern should be logical, according to the dialectical rules (p. 39). This way the previously explained various syntactical patterns are filled with the necessary content (*Ratiocinatio*), which should be disposed in a proper sequence:

- 41 „Caesim ergò & membratim dicendum est Oratori potissimè in arguendo, refellendo, certando cum adversariis. Periodi propriè dictae apparere debent potissimè in historiâ scribendâ, & in genere demonstrativo.“ (p. 21)
- 42 „Haec prima Tyronum cura esse debet, ut Incisa, Membra, Periodos, expeditè de quavis re construant.“ (p. 23)
- 43 „Propositionem seu Enunciationem omnem, ad quam probandam & confirmandam Argumentum quaeritur, constare subjecto & praedicato, ex quorum utroque eruuntur argumenta“ (p. 37).

„MULTò facilius est, invenire Argumentum, quàm aptè & accommodatè tractare [...] | Haec porrò *Ratiocinatio*, quando plena est, quinque partibus constat. Prima pars est: *Major Syllogismi*. Secunda est *Confirmatio majoris*; quae una vel pluribus rationibus fieri solet. Tertia est *Minor propositio seu Assumptio*. Quarta *Confirmatio Minoris*, quae similiter fit unâ vel pluribus rationibus. Quinta est *Conclusio seu Complexio*.“ (p. 40, 42)

Reviewed shortly in this part, the disposition is discussed more detailed in the eighth part of the manual (p. 111–139)<sup>44</sup>.

The third part of the book describes different rhetorical figures which help to expand a speech in order to gain a higher emotional effect and persuade the audience („AMPLIFICATIO est *exaggerata Ratiocinatio*, Seu, est *gravior affirmatio, quae motu animorum conciliat fidem*“ [p. 54]). Among the tropoi Lauxmin refers to *Epitheton*, *Interrogatio*, *Apostrophe*, *Repetitio*, *Exclamatio*, *Hypotyposis*, *Gradatio*, *Sustentatio*, *Antitheta*, *Ethopoeia*, *Communicatio* and *Prosopopoeia* (p. 56–57). These figures serve to create several functional-psychological effects (*Incrementum*, *Comparatio*, *Ratiocinatio*, *Congeries*). This aim of usage of the rhetorical figures was regularly formulated since the manual by Caussin (1619) and replaced the former pure linguistic (syntactic-semantic) one<sup>45</sup>. Logically this leads to the fourth part of the *Praxis* in which the interaction of the rhetorical figures, i. e. the style is discussed (*Sententia*, *Transitio*, *Digressio*)<sup>46</sup>: „*Transitionum* est facilis usus, dummodo meminerit Orator, quid dixerit & quid deinde dicturus sit.

44 The rhetorical theory of the disposition in the 17th century was understood and explained differently by various authors. Soarez for example distinguished four levels of the disposition: *exordium*, *narratio*, *confirmatio*, *peroratio*, whereas Lauxmin mentions six of them: *exordium*, *propositio*, *narratio*, *confirmatio*, *refutatio*, *peroratio*. Lauxmin interpreted the disposition in an original way: according to him the structure of any speech is twofold, consisting of the matter and the form. The first includes *inventio* and *dispositio*, the second *elocutio*: „CAPUT VIII. DE DISPOSITIONE ORATIONIS. Cognitis Partibus Orationis, tempus est, ut ad ipsam Orationem veniamus. Duo autem in Oratione distinguenda sunt. Unum vocari potest *Materiale*, & est *Inventio* & *Dispositio* rudis adhuc & incompta, sine ornatu & veluti forma verborum. Alterum *Formale*. Estque oratoria *Elocutio* facta verbis selectis, & adhibitis omnibus iis, quae ad cultum & ornatum Orationis requiruntur“ (p. 111). The ninth part of the *Praxis* is devoted to the latter (p. 139–250). (More about disposition theories in the 17th century in: Ulčinaité 1984, 64–76.)

45 Ulčinaité 1984, 91.

46 „Solent autem sententiae non solum à doctis & prudentibus viris, sed etiam à rudibus & pueris non rarò proferri; quamvis ab eis, quid sint, non agnoscantur. [...] Sententia est *Enunciatio quaequam de bonis expetendis & malis fugiendis, de DEO, Religione, Fortuna, Providentia & similibus rebus utilibus, magnis admirandis; ad vitam hominum & mores pertinentibus*“ (p. 69–70); „TRANSITIO EST, quae quid dictum sit, paucis repetit; & quid sit dicendum, breviter exponit. seu, *Transitio* vocatur illa portio Orationis, qua Orator transit ab una Orationis parte ad alteram, vel ab uno Argumento ad aliud“ (p. 74); „DIGRESSIO est rei alicujus ad utilitatem Causae pertinentis extra ordinem excurrens tractatio“ (p. 75).

Tyronibus satis fuerit, formas & modos Transitionum ex Authoribus annotasse. *Digressionum* exercitatio non differt ab iis, quae de Argumentatione & Amplificatione diximus“ (p. 79). In the fifth part of the book Lauxmin turns to the stylistical functions (the affects) of the amplification: „QVAESTIO, STATUS, CAUSA, CRINOMENON ad Substantiam Orationis pertinent. Nam circa haec, ut circa propriam materiam, Orator occupatur“ (p. 80). Only in the sixth part of his manual does Lauxmin give a detailed definition of rhetoric:

„Quinque res agere & efficere Orator debet: PRIMO INVENIRE Argumenta ad Causam seu Propositionem suam probandam. SECUNDO | DISPONERE eadem Argumenta ordine apto. TERTIO ELOQVI eadem verbis & sententiis accommodatis. QVARTO MEMORIAE mandare dicenda. QVINTO PRONUNCIARE voce & gestu congruo. Itaque partes Rhetoricae sunt quinque. *Inventio, Dispositio, Elocutio, Memoria, Pronunciatio.*“ (p. 89–90)

Lauxmin favours the inductive method of teaching at the end of his *Praxis oratoria*, concluding with statements with which other rhetoricians usually start their training. The characteristic feature of his textbook is a simple and methodological exposition. Such consistent teaching, a clear and precise style, and a logical sequence of narration could be interpreted as an answer of the Humanities to the exact sciences, which were becoming more widespread in the first decades of the 17th century. The rhetoric of Sigismundus Lauxmin marks a boundary between classical rhetoric, which is rational, meaningful and exact, and the Mannerian one, which becomes exalted, trivial and refined. He stresses not the formal (*formale*) or the material (*materiale*) side of the subject, but shows the way of combining both of them according to three speech-characters („Summum, Infimum, Mediocre“ [p. 104]): „Nullum ex his Characteribus alteri absolutò <sic!> praefendum esse. [...] Cognosci posse, sitne conveniens Character rei, si Oratio comparetur cum causa, & haec cum Fine; atque cum Circumstantiis Loci, Temporis, Personae & similibus. Eadem enim res diverso fine, & in aliis atque aliis circumstantiis ad dicendum assumpta, diversum exigit genus dicendi. [...] Rursus videndum est, *Ubi, A quibus, Coram qui-bus* dicatur“ (p. 107–108).

## References

- Barner, Wilfred, 1970: *Barockerhetorik. Untersuchungen zu ihren geschichtlichen Grundlagen*, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Bibliotheca scriptorum Societatis Iesu* 1643 – BIBLIOTHECA || SCRIPTORVM || SOCIETATIS IESV; || Post excusum Anno M. DC. VIII. Catalogum || R. P. PETRI RIBADENEIRAE || SOCIETATIS EIVSDEM THEOLOGI, || Nunc hoc nouo apparatu librorum ad annum reparatae || salutis M.DC.XLII. editorum concinnata, & illustrium || virorum elogiis adornata, || A || PHILIPPO ALEGAMBE || BRVXEL-LENSI || EX EADEM SOCIETATE IESV. || *Accedit Catalogus Religiosorum Societatis*

*Iesu, qui hactenus pro Catholicâ || fide & pietate in variis mundi plagis interempti sunt.* || ANTVERPIAE || Apud IOANNEM MEVRSIVM. || ANNO M. DC. XLIII.

*Bibliotheca scriptorum Societatis Iesu* 1676 – BIBLIOTHECA || SCRIPTORVM || SOCIETATIS IESV. || *OPVS INCHOATVM* || A R. P. PETRO RIBADENEIRA || Eiusdem Societatis Theologo, anno salutis 1602. || *CONTINVATVM* || A R. P. PHILIPPO ALEGAMBE || Ex eadem Societate, vsque ad annum 1642. || Recognitum, & productum ad annum Iubilaei || M.DC.LXXV. || A NATHANAELE SOTVELLO || Eiusdem Societatis Presbytero. || ROMAE, Ex Typographia Iacobi Antonij de Lazzaris Varesij. || M. DC. LXXVI.

Conley, Thomas M., 1994: *Rhetoric in the European tradition*, Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.

DIARIUM || BIOGRAPHICUM, || IN QUO || SCRIPTORES SECVLI POST NATVM || CHRISTVM XVII. PRAECIPVI, [...] Juxta annum diemque cujusvis emortuale, || concisè descripti magnò adducuntur numerò. || LIBRI ITIDEM EORVM, [...] Ex variis, tam editis, quàm aliunde acquisitis monumentis literalis, [...] ab || HENNINGO WITTE. [...] *GEDANI*, || Sumptibus MARTINI HALLERVORDII, Bibliopolae Regiomontani. || Imprimebat DAVID-FRIDERICUS RHETIUS, 1688.

*EL 3 – Encyclopedia Lituanica*, vol. 3, edited by Simas Sužiedėlis and Vincas Rastenis, Boston (Massachusetts): Juozas Kapočius, 312 f.

Estreicher 21 – *Bibliographia polska. Stolecie XV–XVIII. Polnische Bibliographie. Jahrhundert XV. bis XVIII.*, Bd. 21, von Karl Estreicher, Krakau: Buchdruckerei der K. K. Jagiellonischen Universität, 1906.

*ILLSSD – Index librorum Latinorum Lituaniae saeculi septimi decimi*, concinnaverunt Daiva Narbutienė et Sigita Narbutas, Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 1998.

Jurgėlėnaitė, Rasa, 1992: „Vilnius University as the centre of the study and creation of Latin literature in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania“, *Mare Balticum – Mare Nostrum. Latin in the Countries of the Baltic Sea (1500–1800)*, Acts of the Helsinki Colloquium 16–21 August, 1992, edited by Outi Merisalo and Raija Sarasti-Wilenius, Jyväskylä: Gummerus Kirjapaino Oy, 139–149.

Jurginis, Juozas, 1988: „A. Kojelavičiaus „Lietuvos istorija“ ir jos reikšmė“, *Albertas Vjūkas-Kojelavičius. Lietuvos istorija*, Vilnius: Vaga, 5–33.

Jurginis, J[uožas]; I[ngė] Lukšaitė, 1981: *Lietuvos kultūros istorijos bruožai (Feodalizmo epocha. Iki aštuonioliktojo amžiaus.)*, Vilnius: Mokslas.

[Lauxmin, Sigismundus, 1648:] PRAXIS || ORATORIA. || SIVE || Praecepta Artis Rhetoricae, || quae ad componendam Orationem || scitu necessaria sunt, tam separatim || singula, quàm omnia simul exemplis || expressa; & ad aemulationem E-||loquentiae Studiosis proposita. || à || P. SIGISMUNDO LAVXMIN, || è SOC. JESV. S. T. D. || BRVNSBERGAE || Typis CASPARIS WEINGARTNERIS || Anno M. DC. XLVIII. (237 p.)

[Lauxmin, Sigismundus, 1666:] PRAXIS || ORATORIA. || SIVE || Praecepta Artis Rhetoricae, || quae ad componendam Orationem || scitu necessaria sunt, tam separatim || singula, quàm omnia simul exemplis || expressa; & ad aemulationem E-||loquentiae Studiosis pro-||posita. || à || P. SIGISMUNDO LAUXMIN, || è SOC. IESU. S. T. D. || *Editio Nova* || cum Praefatione & Indice || necessario. || *Cum Gratia & Privilegio Elect. Saxon.* || *FRANCOFURTI ad Moenum*, || Impensis GEORGII HEINRICI || FROMMANNI Bibl. Lipsiens. || ANNO M. DC. LXVI.



- Lietuvių kalbos enciklopedija* [=Encyclopedia of the Lithuanian language, edited by], sudarė Kazys Morkūnas, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 1999.
- [Lipenius, Martin, 1682:] *M. MARTINI LIPENII* || BIBLIOTHECA || REALIS || PHILOSOPHICA || OMNIUM MATERIARUM, || RERUM, & TITULORUM, || IN || VNIVERSO TOTIVS PHILOSOPHIAE || AMBITU OCCURRENTIUM, || *Ordine Alphabetico sic disposita, ut primo statim aspectu* || TITVLI, || *Et sub Titulis* || AUTORES || *ordinata velut acie dispositi*. [...] TOMVS SECVNDVS. || FRANCO-FURTI AD MOENUM, || Cura & Sumptibus JOHANNIS FRIDERICI. [...] ANNO M DC LXXXII.
- LLE – Asta Vaškeliėnė, „Liauksminas“, *Lietuvių literatūros enciklopedija*, redaktoriai Vytautas Kubilius, Vytautas Rakauskas, Vytautas Vanagas, Vilnius: Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas, 2001, 273.
- Narbutas, Sigitas, 2001: „Knygų leidyba“, „Lietuviškoji raštija“, *Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštijos kultūra. Tyrinėjimai ir vaizdai*, [= Culture of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Researches and images, edited by], sudarė Vytautas Ališauskas, Liudas Jovaiša, Mindaugas Paknys, Rimvydas Petrauskas, Eligijus Raila, Vilnius: Aidai, 260–275, 276–292.
- Petrauskienė, I[rena], 1976: *Vilniaus akademijos spaustuė 1575–1773*, Vilnius: Mokslas.
- PSB 16 – Bronisław Natoński, „Lauksmin“, *Polski słownik biograficzny*, t. 16, Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Polskiej akademii nauk, 1971, 578–579.
- Sommervogel 4 – *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus. Bibliographie*, nouvelle édition par Carlos Sommervogel, S. J., t. 4, Bruxelles: Oscar Schepens; Paris: Alphonse Picard, 1893.
- SPTK 2 – *Słownik polskich teologów katolickich. Lexicon Theologorum Catholicorum Poloniae*, vol. 2hł, cura ed directione Hieronymi Eug. Wyczawski OFM editum, Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1982.
- Ulčinaité, Eugenija, 1979: „Retorika Vilniaus universitete XVI–XVII a.“, *Literatūra* 21(3), Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, 8–16.
- Ulčinaité, Eugenija, 1984: *Teoria retoryczna w Polsce i na Litwie w XVII wieku. Próba rekonstrukcji schematu retorycznego*, Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk, Łódź: Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.
- Ulčinatė, Eugenija, 1991: „Žygimantas Liauksminas: humanitarinio mokymo gilinimas“, *Lietuvos pedagoginės minties raida XVI–XVII a. kultūros veikėjų raštuose. Straipsnių rinkinys* [= Development of the pedagogical thought in Lithuania of the 16th–17th centuries, edited by], sudarė Ingė Lukšaitė, Kaunas: Šviesa, 50–58.
- Ulčinaité, Eugenija, 1992: „Koncepto teorija XVII a. retorikos moksle“, *Literatūra* 34(3), Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, 13–19.
- Ulčinaité, Eugenija, 1995<sup>a</sup>: „Tradycja i nowatorstwo w wykładach retoryki w kolegiach jezuickich w XVII–XVIII wieku“, *Jezuicka ars educandi. Prace ofiarowane Księdzu Profesorowi Ludwikowi Piechnikowi SJ*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, Księża Jezuci, 243–252.
- Ulčinaité, Eugenija, 1995<sup>b</sup>: „Pratarmė. Motiejus Kazimieras Sarbievijus – dviejų pasaulių poetas“, *Motiejus Kazimieras Sarbievijus. Lemties žaidimai. Poezijos rinktinė. Ludi Fortunae. Lyrica selecta*, parengė, įvadą ir komentarus parašė Eugenija Ulčinaité, Vilnius: Baltos lankos, xix–xxxvii.

- Ulčinaité, Eugenija, 1996: „Sarbievijus ir Seneka: stoikų filosofija ir mąstymo paradoksai“, *Literatūra* 38(3), Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, 40–51.
- Venclova, Tomas, 1981: „Four centuries of Enlightenment. A Historic View of the University of Vilnius, 1579–1979“, *Lituanus* 27(2), Chicago: Lituanus Foundation. Online version of this article in: [http://www.lituanus.org/1981\\_2/81\\_2\\_01.htm](http://www.lituanus.org/1981_2/81_2_01.htm)
- Vickers, Brian, 1988: *In Defence of Rhetoric*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Zedler, Johann Heinrich, 1737: *Grosses vollständiges Universal Lexicon Aller Wissenschaftten und Künste*, Bd. 16, Halle, Leipzig: Johann Heinrich Zedler (= 1982, Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt).
- Zedler, Johann Heinrich, 1744: *Grosses vollständiges Universal Lexicon Aller Wissenschaftten und Künste*, Bd. 41, Halle, Leipzig: Johann Heinrich Zedler (= 1962, Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt).
- Zinkevičius, Zigmas, 1996: *The History of the Lithuanian Language*, English by Ramutė Pliopys, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

*Sonderdruck aus:*

## Wolfenbütteler Barock-Nachrichten

In Zusammenarbeit mit dem Wolfenbütteler Arbeitskreis für  
Barockforschung herausgegeben von der Herzog August Bibliothek

Redaktion: Jill Bepler

Bibliographie: Ingrid Nutz

30 (2003) 1/2

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden