The Triad in Dispute: Johannes Lippius, His Audiences, and the Disputatio *Genre*

CALEB MUTCH

The reception of Johannes Lippius's path-breaking conception of the triad chiefly relies upon his treatise *Synopsis musicae novae*. Yet Lippius first published most of his ideas in texts called "disputations," whose genre-specific peculiarities have been overlooked. By situating Lippius's writings within the early-modern university system, this essay reveals an important instance of how demands of audience and genre have shaped music theory and offers tantalizing glimpses of how the oral disputation may have encouraged Lippius to clarify his ideas, particularly in his recasting of the analogy between the triad and the Trinity.

Keywords: Johannes Lippius, disputation, education, triad, Strasbourg, theology, history of music.

Johannes Lippius occupies a curious place within the history of music theory. He is widely acclaimed as the first author to articulate fully the modern concept of the musical triad,[1] and thus he must be considered one of the most consequential theorists of the seventeenth century. Yet his writings have received relatively scant attention in the past three decades, even as the contributions of many other theorists have been illuminated through careful contextualization of their writings. This study extends the benefits of such attention to Lippius by situating him within the Lutheran university system of his day and demonstrating how that context affected his musical writings. By focusing on one genre Lippius frequently employed—the disputation (*disputatio*)—this article reveals an important instance of how demands of audience and genre have shaped music theory.

THE DISPUTATION GENRE

Like Lippius himself, his *Disputatio musica tertia* (1610) has been cited in passing much more often than it has been studied in depth.[2] Even though Lippius first articulated his concept of the triad in this work, there are many good reasons why scholars have directed their attention instead to his *Synopsis musicae novae* (1612). That compact volume consists of a "true summing up of all his musical ideas,"[3] ideas that are otherwise spread across six shorter works of limited circulation which have never been reprinted. Furthermore, Lippius's musical theory was primarily disseminated through the *Synopsis*, and since the publication of an English translation of that treatise,[4] it has solidified its place as Lippius's most widely read work. Yet despite the content that these shorter texts share with the *Synopsis*, there are important implications to their difference in form: Lippius composed his shorter musical writings in the genre of the "disputation," which occupies a prominent place within the history of European university education.

Teaching via debate was already practiced in eleventh-century monastic schools, and formalized academic disputations were well established in French and English universities from their inceptions.[5] The origins of this teaching method appear to lie in the oral explication of problematic texts: professors would identify a perplexing passage, elucidate opposing explanations, and then offer a solution that reconciled the conflicts and resolved the problem.[6] By Lippius's day, however, the disputation had undergone two particularly significant developments.

First, it had gained a position of great importance in universities' educational programs. Disputations were an integral part of the weekly schedule in German universities, and students even organized clubs to sponsor disputations outside of school hours. The use of disputations also expanded beyond mere pedagogical exercises: they were the means by which students sought to demonstrate their readiness for graduation and by which prospective new professors displayed their academic competence. Students also participated in disputations to demonstrate their progress to their patrons and staged valedictory disputations when it was time for them to leave school.[7] These

1 Although Lippius was the first author to set forth a robust theory of fully invertible major and minor triads, many elements of his triadic theory had already been articulated in descriptions of three-note sonorities made by earlier authors. The most notable of these are Johannes Avianius (who treated simple five-three and six-three sonorities as models for complex sonorities involving upper-voice permutations and note doublings, including sonorities with only two pitch classes) and Otto Siegfried Harnisch (who proposed an idea of chordal inversion). For detailed treatments of the development of triadic thinking, see Rivera (1980, 127–45) and Lester (1989, 14–20, 28–36).

2 Indeed, even when modern scholars have discussed specific details from this text, it is often merely to help explicate parallel passages in the *Synopsis musice novae* [such as Lester (1989, 40) and Rivera (1980, 50–51)].

3 Rivera (1980, 15).

4 Lippius (1977).

5 Novikoff (2013, 42–52, 133–46).

6 Weijers (2013, 84–88).

7 Horn (1893, 9–32); Weijers (2013, 199).

disputation events had three main actors: the presider (*praeses*), the respondent (*respondens*), and the opponent (*opponens*). The disputation would normally be based on a series of theses, prepared by either the presider or the respondent, and the respondent would be responsible for expatiating upon those theses orally, in Latin.[8] The opponent (or more than one opponent) would challenge the respondent by advancing a contradictory argument via syllogisms or leading questions.[9] The presider was responsible for moderating the debate and could also assist the respondent, should the need arise.[10] The respondent's objective was not merely to defend the theses, but also to demonstrate oral eloquence in the Latin language.[11] This feature of the disputation genre helps to explain its popularity in Renaissance-era education, which cultivated persuasive, fluent speech.[12]

The second significant development which the disputation underwent is responsible for the genre's pertinence to music theory: the oral event began to be supplemented with a printed overview of the theses.[13] An early and famous example of such a list of theses intended for disputation is Martin Luther's *Ninety-five Theses*, also known as the *Disputatio pro declaratione virtutis indulgentiarum* (1517).[14] Whereas Luther's disputation was initially printed on a single broadsheet[15] (and the oral disputation it invited never occurred), by the following century the disputational document was usually printed in quarto format on one or two sheets. Because the process of printing was still expensive, brief, condensed publications were preferable for the respondents, who were responsible for bearing the printing costs.[16] The disputational documents' title pages routinely name both the presider and the respondent, but these do not constitute claims of authorship. Rather, scholars have concluded that the roles assigned to each merely indicate what functions they served in the oral disputation; the theses could have been written by the presider, the respondent, or by both together.[17] The role of the opponent, in contrast, is scarcely ever acknowledged in the printed document.[18]

8 Chang (2004, 137–38).
9 Felipe (2010, 36–39).
10 Marti (1994, 867).
11 Ibid., 868.
12 This emphasis on rhetoric and oratory is particularly evident in the curricula of the Strasbourg Academy, where Lippius received his foundational education (Schindling 1977, 166–74).
13 Weijers (2013, 200–201). According to Freedman (2010, 111–12), academic disputations began to be published in the late 1540s, but only in small quantities until the end of the sixteenth century.
14 For more on the disputational nature of the *Ninety-five Theses*, see Chang (2004, 145–49).
15 Of the three 1517 printings, the Nürnberg and Leipzig editions were on broadsheet, while the Basel one was in quarto format (Honselmann 1966, 11–16).
16 Chang (2004, 157).
17 Marti (2007, 260).
18 Freedman (2010, 95–96).

LIPPIUS'S NONMUSICAL DISPUTATIONS

Since the genre of the disputation underwent significant changes over the centuries, it is important to ascertain what Lippius's audience would have expected of a *disputatio*. Fortunately, over a dozen disputations at which Lippius presided are extant (see Example 1), though not all of these works contain the word *disputatio* in their titles.[19] There is instead a diversity of terminology, including *quaestio* (examination), *thematia* (subjects), and even the untranslated Greek word *διάσκεψις* (inspection). Nonetheless, the title pages still name presiders and respondents, and the documents exhibit practically identical organization and formatting to works labeled *disputationes*, so evidently the titles' terminological diversity is merely for the sake of variety. Only about a third of Lippius's scholarly output was concerned with music: the range of subjects upon which he disputed—ethics, political science, physics, and philosophy—reveals the breadth of his education. Curiously, although Lippius earned a doctorate in theology and was on his way to assume a theology professorship when he fell ill and died at the age of twenty-seven,[20] he never presided over a disputation dedicated to that subject.[21]

Several characteristics of Lippius's nonmusical disputations illuminate his musical ones. First, these disputations exhibit an active engagement with past scholarship. Lippius's frequent citation of Aristotle is unsurprising, considering the sway which Aristotelianism still held in Lutheran universities.[22] (These citations are often simple chapter references or Latin paraphrases, but sometimes extend to lengthy untranslated Greek quotations, such as in his *Decas quaestionum*.[23]) Lippius's references to the Bible and classical authorities like Cicero, Porphyry, and Vitruvius are also predictable. What is less

19 Disputations also survive at which Lippius was the respondent, including Hawenreuter (1603), Hutter (1607a, 1607b, 1610a), and Balduin (1608). Since Lippius mostly served as a respondent earlier in his studies, when he was less likely to have written the theses, this study restricts its attention to disputations at which he presided.
20 Although Lippius was to have taken the place of the Strasbourg Academy's most prominent theologian, Philipp Marbach, who had died in 1611, this fact is not necessarily indicative of Lippius's stature: many of the theology professors there were pastors at local churches, and by 1619 all were Strasbourg-born and only one held a doctoral degree (Engel 1900, 291).
21 Lippius's disputation-formatted doctoral dissertation, over which Johann Winckelmann presided, is dedicated to theology. Its four sections concern baptism, the Eucharist, the nature of Christ, and salvation. The third section delves into Christology in some detail, but considerations of the Trinity as whole are limited to reciting standard creedal matters (Lippius 1612b, A3v–4v).
22 The common narrative of a Renaissance rejection of scholastic Aristotelianism in favor of a Ciceronian *latinitas* poorly serves the Strasbourg Academy. While there certainly was an increased emphasis on eloquence, no significant rejection of Aristotelianism occurred in Lippius's environs (Schindling 1977, 202).
23 Lippius (1607d, A2v). While disputations were only rarely conducted in Greek, demonstrating competence in Greek was evidently an integral part of one's self-presentation as a scholar in Lippius's circles.

Non-musical:	Musical:
Nobiliorum problematum philosophicorum διάσκεψις prima (March 28, 1607)	Disputatio musica prima (June 30, 1609)
Nobiliorum problematum philosophicorum διάσκεψις secunda (July 25, 1607)	Disputatio musica secunda (September 16, 1609)
Nobiliorum problematum philosophicorum διάσκεψις tertia (November 7, 1607)	Disputatio musica tertia (October 27, 1610)
Decas quaestionum philosophicarum controversarum (November 14, 1607)	Thematia musica (December 22, 1610)
Disputatio ethica (July 7, 1610)	Breviculum errorum musicorum (April 1611)
Διάσκεψις politica de civitate (July 14, 1610)	Themata fontem omnium errantium musicorum (June 1, 1611)
Thematia de homine (September 1, 1610)	

EXAMPLE 1. Disputations listing Lippius as presider

expected, however, is his engagement with recent, international scholarship. One of his most frequently cited authors is Julius Caesar Scaliger, a celebrated humanist scholar based in France who died in 1558.[24] Other sources are yet more recent, including books by the Aristotelian philosopher Jacopo Zabarella, who lived in Padua from 1533 to 1589,[25] and the Spanish Jesuit Benedict Pereira, who predeceased Lippius by only two years.[26] Incidentally, it is curious that Lippius rarely if ever cites Protestant authors in his disputations; instead, his scholarship evidences an importation of philosophy texts from the Catholic South to the educational system of the Protestant North.[27]

The second characteristic of Lippius's nonmusical disputations is their unoriginality. As has been widely noted of Renaissance-era higher education, scholars rarely strove to make discoveries or propose new positions; rather, their purpose was to explain received knowledge clearly and to reconcile conflicting viewpoints.[28] In the field of theology, for instance, the stakes were high: coming up with original insights risked straying into the realm of heresy. For this reason theological disputations were routinely penned by professors, not students.[29] Even in less perilous fields, where students might be trusted with preparing theses, their primary tasks were still demonstrating their knowledge of authoritative sources and important commentators and adjudicating among disagreements in those texts. Lippius's nonmusical disputations are true to form: he does not make any strikingly original claims, and he identifies conflicting assertions which his respondents would have reconciled in the oral disputation event.

The third characteristic of Lippius's nonmusical disputations is their formatting. The publications were printed in quarto format and are around twelve pages long.[30] In each case the disputation's theses are numbered, which furnishes the text's most salient structure. Lippius has two very different approaches to the theses.[31] In the first, he presents a large number of short theses (from 44 to 127) as a simple list—sometimes referred to as "bare theses" (*theses nudae*).[32] A representative thesis, from Lippius's *Disputatio ethica*, is "An excess of endurance is obstinacy; a deficiency is effeminacy."[33] In such cases the theses are usually not independent propositions. Instead, they build on preceding material, and their divisions seem to mark off a convenient amount of material for the oral debate, rather than a completed contention.[34] In Lippius's

24 Lippius refers to Scaliger (1540) and Scaliger (1552) particularly often.
25 Zabarella (1578).
26 Pererius (1576).
27 Maclean (2002, 177–81, 191–94) describes the market forces and scholarly culture that supported the dissemination of Italian authors in Northern Germany at the turn of the seventeenth century, with particular attention paid to Zabarella.
28 Chrisman (1982, 49); Schindling (1977, 210).
29 Becker (1907, 150).
30 13.8 pages is the average length of the *Nobiliorum problematum* 1–3 (1607a, 1607b, 1607c), *Decas quaestionum* (1607d), *Disputatio ethica* (1610a), *Διάσκεψις politica* (1610b), *Thematia de homine* (1610c), and *Thesium theologicarum* (1612b).
31 Curiously, the *Nobiliorum problematum philosophicorum διάσκεψις tertia* (1607c) diverges from this pattern: the main body of its text consists of three and a half pages of running text.
32 Marti (1994, 870).
33 "Excessus Tolerantiae est pertinacia: Defectus, mollicies" [Lippius (1610a, A4r)]. All translations are my own.
34 For instance, the previously quoted thesis occurs in the midst of a characterization of various virtues (such as self-restraint and fortitude) with respect to the vices that result from excesses or deficiencies of those qualities. The *Disputatio ethica* as a whole largely consists of a synopsis of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, of which Book VI, Chapters 7–9 form the

second approach to theses, he provides a smaller number of theses (from 10 to 16), each of which is followed by a paragraph or more of explanation in the printed document. In contrast to the "bare theses," these were called "clothed theses" (*theses vestitae*).[35] Lippius's *Decas quaestionum* provides a fine example of this second type: the paragraphs which Lippius adds to explain the theses present a mixture of supporting arguments and pertinent quotations, presumably functioning as resources for the respondent during the oral disputation event.

Just as Lippius explored using both "clothed" and "bare" theses in his disputations, he also implemented a variety of strategies for organizing those theses. The earliest disputations over which Lippius presided feature a small number of "clothed" theses, which all concern physics or metaphysics but are arbitrarily ordered.[36] Consider the *Nobiliorum problematum philosophicorum διάσκεψις secunda*, whose three theses are largely unrelated, except for their general subject matter. Specifically, all three address issues of change and motion: "[1] Is the subject of physics a moving body? It is. . . . [2] Can artifice impart substantial form to natural things? It is impossible. . . . [3] What moves the [element] earth downward?"[37] The lengthy explanatory texts which clothe the theses develop arguments that resist conforming to clear overarching structures, even while relying heavily on Aristotelian concepts and categories to elucidate their points.[38]

Nearly three years later, when Lippius next presided over nonmusical disputations, many of these features had changed. The later disputations turned from physics to considerations of ethics and politics. They also rejected the "clothed" theses format in favor of a larger number of "bare" theses that are thoughtfully ordered. The *Thematia de homine* shares elements of both types: it contains only ten theses (the same number as the *Decas quaestionum*, which has clothed theses), yet they are very prolix and have no explanatory paragraphs to "clothe" them. Moreover, Lippius structures the ten theses far more rationally than was his practice earlier. In order to explain his subject matter (the nature of humanity), Lippius relies on the four Aristotelian causes, to which he dedicates the disputation's third through sixth theses.[39] The *Διάσκεψις politica de civitate* also invokes the four causes, but this disputation uses them as an overarching structuring principle for twenty-eight of its sixty-six theses.[40]

The *Disputatio ethica* exhibits an organizational scheme that encompasses even more of the text, and, in an uncharacteristic move, Lippius explicitly discusses his methodology in his second thesis, noting that "we, who are about to commence this disputation, will come to the definition and division of practical philosophy in general."[41] In the third and fourth theses Lippius duly goes on to provide a definition of that discipline and then enumerate its parts:

> III. [The discipline in question] is defined as that part of human knowledge which directs [one's] consideration of matters toward an action in which one may peacefully rest.
>
> IV. It is divided into two parts: absolute, which is called "ethics," and relational, which does not consider a human absolutely (as does ethics), but with respect to a household or a city.[42]

Thereafter Lippius dedicates the next 115 theses to repeating this process of defining each constituent part and dividing it yet further.[43] This procedure is significant, both because it undergirds two of Lippius's musical disputations and the later *Synopsis musicae novae*, and also because it has been a source of confusion in the secondary literature on Lippius. In an article on the *Synopsis musicae novae*, John Howard contends that Lippius organized the *Synopsis* according to the pedagogical method pioneered by Johann Sturm, the founder of the Strasbourg Academy, where Lippius received his foundational education. And since, as Benito Rivera has noted, "the *Synopsis* derives its material and organization from the three Wittenberg disputations,"[44] Howard's contentions would seem to apply equally to those *disputationes*. After paraphrasing a passage in which Sturm recounts Galen's three methods of teaching (synthesis, analysis, and *diairesis* [i.e., definition and division]), Howard asserts that Sturm's famous pedagogical

basis for the quotation. For more on the role of Aristotle's ethical teachings in Renaissance universities, see Lines (2002, 65–110).

35 Marti (1994, 870).

36 Lippius (1607a, 1607b, 1607c, 1607d).

37 "Vtrum Physicæ subjectum sit Corpus mobile? Est . . . Ars ne Naturalibus substantialem queat communicare Formam? *Impossibile* . . . Quid Terram moveat *κάτω*?" [Lippius (1607b, A2r, B1r, B2v)]. The first thesis concerns the contentious issue of what the proper subject of Aristotelian physics is (see Ariew and Gabbey 1998, 432–34). The second thesis addresses whether change (viewed in Aristotelian terms as a given substance's assumption of a new form) can be externally imposed onto a natural substance. The final thesis seeks to explain the internally motivated change of place that is seen in falling objects. Casalini (2017, 121–75) provides an overview of the state of sixteenth-century natural philosophy, which constitutes the intellectual background for this disputation.

38 For instance, Lippius's commentary on the final thesis, concerning the downward motion of earth, invokes the oppositions between substance and accidence; matter and form; composite and simple; and acting and being-acted-upon (Lippius 1607b, B2v–3r).

39 Lippius (1610c, A2v–3v).

40 Lippius (1610b, A2v–4r)

41 ". . . disquisitionem instituturi generaliter practicæ philosophiæ definitionem & divisionem adducemus" [Lippius (1610a, A2r)].

42 "III. Definitur autem ea sapientiæ humanæ pars rerum contemplationem ad actionem, in qua beatè quiescat, dirigens. IV. Quæ in duas dispescitur partes: in absolutam, quæ Ethica dicitur: & respectivam, quæ hominem non absolutè, ut prior, sed respectu vel domus, vel civitatis considerat" (ibid.).

43 (Ibid., A2r–6r). The *Διάσκεψις politica de civitate* (1610b) and *Thematia de homine* (1610c) also begin by defining their subject matters, but do not proceed to divide and define further. This procedure of opening with nominal definition occurs frequently in seventeenth-century disputations and gained in popularity over the course of the century, though with shifting emphases as authors engage with Cartesian thought in later years (Friedenthal 2016, 68–82).

44 Rivera (1982, 15).

system, the *methodus Sturmiana*, consists of a successive application of those three approaches:

> In its practical applications in discourse, Sturm's method yields a predictable structure of argument. Discourse begins by the presentation of a definition that comprehends the subject's essential attributes. It then continues by the repeated division and subdivision of the definition into its evermore specialized elements [i.e. *diairesis*] … This first stage of Sturm's threefold method, in moving from the general to the particular, eventually leads one to the second, *analysis*, insofar as examples of an art represent its most specific aspects. [Third,] *synthesis* follows, guided by the principle of imitation.[45]

Yet there is a problem with this account: both Lippius and Sturm certainly employ the procedure of *diairesis* in their writings, but there is no evidence of Howard's putative three-stage structure.[46] Indeed, the vagueness of Howard's description of the analytic and synthetic stages hints that he had noticed the lack of corroboration for his hypothesized methodology.

In an ironic twist, when the term *methodus Sturmiana* appeared in the 1604 statutes of the Strasbourg Academy, it was most likely understood to represent a pedagogical ideal standing in opposition to the precise explicatory methodology which Howard describes.[47] While Sturm certainly employed the method of definition and division in his writings,[48] its systematic application in the late-sixteenth-century German sphere was most commonly associated with Sturm's quondam student Petrus Ramus (1515–72) and the hybrid pedagogical movement known as Philippo-Ramism.[49] One of the chief attractions of Ramus's approach was its emphasis on pedagogical efficiency. He and his followers dramatically condensed traditional curricula by replacing the painstaking study of ancient texts with new textbooks which systematically applied the definition-and-division procedure.[50] Johann Sturm, in contrast, championed an unusually rigorous curriculum (also referred to as the *methodus Sturmiana*) which aimed to instill oratorical fluency in Latin and Greek through extensive exposure to Classical sources.[51] In the 1580s and early 1590s the Strasbourg Academy and Wittenberg University (the schools where Lippius studied longest) had flirted with Ramism. By the time of Lippius's education, however, Wittenberg had officially banned Ramism, and in Strasbourg Johann Hawenreuter (Lippius's teacher in Aristotelian matters) had rejected his own Aristotelian *Compendium physicae* in favor of teaching via line-by-line commentary on Aristotle's *Physics*.[52] Consequently, Lippius's choice in the *Synopsis* to emphasize how quickly his method allows people to learn[53] and to employ the definition-and-division method may well have been seen as hallmarks of Ramus's movement, not Sturm's.

LIPPIUS'S MUSICAL DISPUTATIONS

Lippius presided over six disputations on music. Three of them (Lippius 1610e, 1611a, 1611b), which are labeled *Themat(i)a* and *Breviculum* rather than *disputationes*, were argued at the University of Jena between December 1610 and June 1611.[54] These include standard elements of the nonmusical disputations, some of which are *pro forma*, such as engagement with scholarship: Lippius cites Aristotle and Scaliger and more pertinently refers to musical authorities (like Boethius, Euclid, and Ptolemy) and recent theorists (such as Zarlino, Francesco Maurolico, and Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples). Additionally, Lippius includes Greek words and even sentences. Lippius's Jena works are also distinctly unoriginal, like his nonmusical disputations, since in each he works with others' ideas, rather than proposing his own. Across the three documents Lippius first identifies a conflict between the old Pythagorean tuning system and the syntonic diatonic scale championed by Zarlino, and then he adjudicates in favor of just intonation. The disputation documents' formatting is also characteristic: each is eight pages long and has ten relatively prolix theses, or *thematia*, as they are labeled. Lippius adds no commentary to "clothe" the theses, and I agree with Rivera that "the texts reveal no definite organization of material."[55]

In contrast to these generically regular disputations, Lippius's other three musical disputations gradually stray away

45 Howard (1985, 536).

46 For more on this subject, see Véronique Montagne's substantial account of method in the writings of Sturm and Erythraeus, a pupil with whom he collaborated (2001). Notably, she holds that Sturm effectively collapses Galen's three methods into two: proceeding from simple to composite (synthesis) and from composite to simple (analysis and *diairesis*) (486-87). At no point does Montagne corroborate Howard's contention that Sturm's approach involves progressing through the three Galenian methods.

47 Howard (1985, 536).

48 Montagne (2001, 481–83).

49 Hotson (2007, 102–14).

50 Ibid., 43–45.

51 Schindling (2016, 67–70). Indeed, Sturm evidently preferred writing in genres that easily accommodated stylish prose, such as epistles and dialogues. (For examples, see Spitz and Tinsley 1995, 257–339). Even in passages where he employed the *diairesis* method, it still takes some effort to extract the dialectical structure from his prose, which is doubtless why his student Erythraeus repackaged Sturm's works in Ramist-style tables (Montagne 2001, 478–81). In contrast, Ramist authors prioritized the clear communication of the text's underlying divisional organization over matters of literary style.

52 Hotson (2007, 112, 66). Hotson (66) provides several other telling examples of Strasbourg professors who spent years teaching their way through Aristotelian texts. Schindling (1977, 204) corroborates that Ramism had no discernable influence in Strasbourg by 1600.

53 Lippius (1612a, sig.):(4r). The typesetter of *Synopsis* signed quires instead of numbering pages. For the preface he chose the peculiar signature):(; beginning with the main text he returned to the usual alphabetic signatures.

54 The specific dating of the *Breviculum* is problematic. Its listed date on the title page is "April. 4." This is likely a typographical error, since April 4, 1611 was a Thursday in the Julian calendar. By contrast, Lippius's other disputations occurred on Saturdays and Sundays, as was normal for academic disputations (Horn 1893, 9–10).

55 Rivera (1980, 15).

from the disputational characteristics we have seen. These three disputations, which are entitled *Disputationes musicae*, contain Lippius's articulation of the triad and are consequently better known; they were argued in Wittenberg between June 1609 and October 1610, earlier than the more conventional Jena disputations. These documents depart from disputational norms even in their formatting: the first disputation, the *Disputatio musica prima*, is the usual eight pages long, but the second one is twenty pages in length, and the *Disputatio musica tertia* runs to thirty-two pages. The disputations' theses are unnumbered and "clothed,"[56] though the proportion of thesis to explication is dramatically different from Lippius's practice in his nonmusical disputations. For instance, his *Thematia de homine*, which is contemporaneous with the second and third *Disputatio musica*, was heavy on commentary, but still had ten theses over the course of eight pages. The thirty-two-page long *Disputatio musica tertia*, in contrast, has a mere eight theses.

Lippius's organization of the theses in his earlier three musical disputations is also notable. The first Wittenberg disputation is the most unusual, as it is the only disputation I have seen to employ an additive scheme for its theses. After beginning with the uncontroversial proposition "Music exists" (literally, "Music is"), Lippius gradually adds Greek-language modifiers to the thesis ("Music is a science"; "Music is a mathematical science") until he reaches his final two theses: "Music is a subordinate and composite mathematical science" and "Music is a [subordinate and] composite mathematical science concerning melody."[57] The second and third Wittenberg disputations employ the *diairesis* method, but in a curious hybrid with disputational form: the definitions and divisions which clearly undergird the *Synopsis* are largely present, but some of them comprise the disputations' theses, whereas others are consigned to paragraphs which explain the theses.[58]

The most significant departure of all from generic norms would seem to be found in these texts' originality. Despite the scholarly consensus that a *disputatio* is not intended to convey novel ideas, Lippius was evidently happy to put new wine into the old wineskins of the *disputatio* genre. Recall that the later musical disputations given in Jena, which more closely resemble disputational norms, concern tuning systems and focus on the conflict between the old Pythagorean tuning and Zarlinian just intonation. Yet, even in these disputations, Lippius unabashedly holds that the recently proposed syntonic diatonic tuning system is "(by God's favor) far more perfect and marvelous" than the music of old.[59] As he similarly waxes rhapsodic about the harmonic triad and its resemblances to the three-letter word roots in Hebrew, the three terms of a syllogism, the three dimensions, and the Holy Trinity, his enthusiasm for this new way of understanding music springs off the page. Even more tellingly, in the Wittenberg disputations, Lippius departs yet further from traditional music theory: he not only proposes his concept of the musical triad, but also offers what is, to the best of my knowledge, the first published conceptualization of the scale as a circle.[60] Clearly these works diverge significantly from normal disputational practice.

How might this conflict between Lippius's *disputationes musicae* and the disputation's generic norms be resolved?[61] The best explanation is that Lippius exploited academic conventions in order to publish texts that were only nominally disputations. To do so he relied upon the other named participant in the disputations: the respondent. In all six of Lippius's musical disputations (but none of his nonmusical ones), the respondent was Sebastian Carolus, a native of Regensburg, Bavaria.[62] One of the aforementioned characteristics of the disputation genre is that the positions of the presider and the respondent indicate functioning in the oral disputation event, not authorship of the printed document. Nonetheless, as Rivera has rightly pointed out, there is little question that Lippius is the author of the works: while no other works are known to be authored by Carolus, the content of the six disputations was reworked and published in the *Synopsis musicae novae*, a treatise attributed solely to Lippius.[63] Carolus's contribution to the project appears instead to have been primarily financial. Even simple eight-page disputations were not inexpensive to print, and the second and third *Disputationes*

56 The theses are set off from the following explication only by line breaks and a change of typeface: the theses are in roman script, while the explications are italicized.

57 "Musica est … Musica est ἐπιστήμη … Musica est ἐπιστήμη μαθηματική … Musica est ἐπιστήμη μαθηματικὴ ὑπάλληλος και συμπεπλεγμένη … Musica est ἐπιστήμη μαθηματικὴ ὑπάλληλος περὶ τὸ μέλος οὖσα" (Lippius 1609a, A2r–4v). The final thesis lacks the "subordinate and" qualifier of the fourth, an omission which was surely made merely to keep the thesis on one line of text and thus prevent the need for an additional leaf.

58 Furthermore, the assignment of content to thesis vs. commentary reflects no clear hierarchy: for instance, the three characteristics of the monad (longitude, latitude, and crassitude) are presented in theses, but the superordinate division of monad vs. composite sound occurs in commentary (Lippius 1609b, A4r–B2r).

59 "Longe perfectior & mirabilior (DEI favore) …" Lippius (1610e, A2v).

60 Although a diagram depicting the scale as a circle does not appear until the *Synopsis musicae* (Lippius 1612a, F3r), Lippius uses the same term (*scala circularis*) in the *Disputatio musica tertia* (1610d, B3r).

61 A compelling explanation is unlikely to be found in differing institutional contexts. We know little about Lippius's time in Jena, since he delivered only his last three, generically normal musical disputations there. The three irregular musical disputations, on the other hand, occurred in the Wittenberg University, the same institution where Lippius had earlier presided over all the comparatively normal nonmusical disputations shown in Example 1.

62 Carolus went on to teach the third class at the Regensberg Gymnasium from 1613 until his death in 1628, and he was also the cantor at St. Oswald's church (Kleinstäuber 1882, 56).

63 Rivera (1980, 17). An additional supporting argument, unmentioned by Rivera, is the title page of *Thematia musica*, which clearly indicates that Lippius is proposing its contents, whereas Carolus is merely responding (Lippius 1610e, A1r). Such authorial explicitness is doubtless due to the disputation being *pro loco*, which granted eligibility to teach in universities (Marti 2001, 16).

musicae were much longer and contained complex diagrams and musical notation as well. Lippius, the son of a minister,[64] would likely have been hard-pressed to afford such a print run, particularly since he was then the rough equivalent of a modern postdoctoral scholar. Fortunately for him, respondents were responsible for the costs of printing disputation documents, and Carolus, who apparently had a strong network of patrons, could afford to cover the significant expenses of printing Lippius's first three disputations.[65] Two months after the *Disputatio musica tertia*, Lippius and Carolus arrived in Jena for more disputing—and more printing of disputational documents. (Lippius may have had to assure Carolus that the next set of disputations would be much cheaper, since the Jena texts are simple eight-page, text-only publications.)

Carolus's responsibility for the costs of printing the musical disputations has been acknowledged by Rivera,[66] but the participation of the three Wittenberg *disputationes* in a broader academic trend has not. As Horn has noted, since academic journals did not yet exist in the early seventeenth century and printing costs were unlikely to be recouped by sales, professors at times published original research under the auspices of a disputation so that their students would cover the publication costs. Such an occurrence would still lead to a formal debate in which the student, in this case Carolus, would dispute upon the theses written by the presider, Lippius. Yet it would also result in a fleshed-out academic document, labeled a *disputatio* or the like, which the professors could use to circulate their ideas to an audience far greater than the scholars in attendance at the oral disputation.[67] This scenario explains the unusual details of Lippius's musical works well, such as their innovative content, their abundant printed explanations of the theses, and their identification of the well-connected Carolus as the respondent. It thus reconciles the discrepancies between the *disputatio* genre and Lippius's peculiar works.

LIPPIUS'S AUDIENCES

This dual functioning of Lippius's disputational texts—as material required for a particular academic event but ultimately destined for a broader readership—and their later revision as the *Synopsis musicae novae* raise two important questions: who were Lippius's intended audiences, and how did he adapt his theory to appeal to those audiences? Attending to these questions illuminates discrepancies between the *Disputationes* and the *Synopsis* and further reveals how concerns of audience and genre affected Lippius's music theory. We will see how he revised the disputations to create a *Synopsis* that appeals to a less educated audience, and we will also investigate how Lippius's reworking of his famous triad/Trinity analogy may have been motivated by objections raised in the oral disputation event.

Lippius's intended audience is clearest in the oral disputations held by Lippius and Carolus at the universities of Wittenberg and Jena. These were public events, and the audience would not have been music specialists, but students and professors drawn primarily from the philosophy and theology faculties. Music theory was not a standard element in university instruction at the time, as is reflected in the fact that Lippius's works appear to be the first documented cases of university disputations on that subject. Furthermore, pre-university music education was largely limited to singing instruction and the rudiments of theory.[68] As a result, Lippius and Carolus could not assume that their listeners would be well equipped to follow detailed music-theoretical argumentation. Lippius's use of Aristotle and his frequent references to Scaliger would thus have been an important way to establish intellectual rapport with his audience and to support his assertions by appealing to familiar authorities.

Those characteristics which aligned Lippius's Wittenberg texts with the genre of the university disputations—eloquent elucidation and defense of theses, frequent citation of authorities, learned quotations of Greek-language texts, and publication as a series of short documents—also limited their attractiveness for less educated readers. Consequently, Lippius would have expected the readership of his printed disputations to resemble the audience of his oral disputations: university professors and advanced students.[69] Indeed, the texts do not contain the detailed compositional doctrine found in the German *musica poetica* treatises of the preceding generations, so it seems unlikely that Lippius was aiming his words at pedagogues or aspiring composers.

Comparing Lippius's disputations with their revision as the *Synopsis* casts yet more light on the matter of his audience. Lippius drew extensively on the second and third Wittenberg disputations to create the *Synopsis*, but the resulting text departs from its antecedents with respect to both genre and intended audience. All of the aforementioned characteristics of the disputation genre (defense of theses, citations, extensive Greek quotations, short length) are either absent or highly attenuated in the *Synopsis*. By making these alterations Lippius simultaneously transformed the genre within which he was presenting his ideas and made his argumentation easier to

64 Bicczanius (1612, B4v).

65 Carolus dedicated five of the six musical disputations to various patrons (*Mæcenatibus & Fautoribus*), both named and unnamed, in his home city, and also to the Marshall of Pappenheim. (Michael Philipp [2010, 252–59] has found that dedications to local rulers were common in mid-seventeenth-century political disputations, so it is possible that Carolus's dedications were attempts to curry favor rather than indications of close relationships.) Intriguingly, the *Disputatio musica tertia* is Carolus's sole disputation to contain no dedicatory preface.

66 Rivera (1980, 16).

67 Horn (1893, 52). Ku-ming Chang (2004, 143–44) argues that the oral disputation was also an effective means by which academics could publicize their ideas, though in Lippius's case, his use of diagrams and musical notation was better served by the written document.

68 Carpenter (1958, 317–19); Chrisman (1982, 255–56).

69 It is even possible that Lippius presented copies of his disputational texts to potential employers at universities while searching for work as a professor.

follow for less educated readers. For instance, Lippius incorporates the disputations' typographically isolated theses into a continuous text which more clearly presents the definition-and-division organization found in the second and third Wittenberg disputations. He also routinely abbreviates or entirely eliminates his lengthy disputational explanations of the theses, relegates his appeals to authoritative writers to the *Synopsis's* foreword,[70] and removes all Greek-language quotations, restricting his usage of Greek to individual terms.

Lippius surely made these sort of alterations in order to appeal to students, and in the foreword to the *Synopsis* he calls attention to how efficient his teaching method is.[71] Even after these modifications, however, he still assumed that his readers would have many years of education behind them, as his frequent recourse to Aristotelian concepts and Greek terminology demonstrate.[72] It is thus probable that the initial market for the *Synopsis* would have been advanced students at the Strasbourg Academy, since the treatise was published in Strasbourg and by the time of its publication Lippius had already been designated as a professor at the Academy. The *Synopsis* would thus have joined a long line of music textbooks written or reprinted for the Strasbourg Academy: the first text, Greiter's *Elementale musicum* of 1544, was written shortly after the school's founding for its students,[73] and the last to be published before the *Synopsis* (Walliser's *Musicae figuralis praecepta brevia* of 1611) was issued just the year before it.[74] (Walliser's textbook overlapped minimally with Lippius's, since it was largely dedicated to mensural notation.)

Yet as the later dissemination of Lippius's *trias harmonica* proves, the *Synopsis* also found a readership beyond the walls of the Academy. Lippius hoped for this outcome, since the treatise's lengthy title describes it as being "proposed for all lovers of music (*philomusi*)."[75] This title might suggest that the *Synopsis* is intended for a more musically sophisticated audience than the university-geared *Disputationes*, but Lippius's revisions do not support this hypothesis. The *Synopsis* preserves rudimentary content found in the disputations, such as an account of rhythmic notation, and adds significantly more, including explanation of note names, clefs, and solmization with both Guidonian and bocedization syllables.[76] Furthermore, the *Synopsis*'s instructions in how to compose using triads add little of substance to the parallel passage in the third *Disputatio*.[77] Consequently, Lippius's addressing of the treatise to "lovers of music" is better understood as a reference to musical amateurs (emphasizing that term's etymological derivation from "lovers") than to those learned in music theory.

Attending to questions of audience and genre also sheds new light on Lippius's famous analogy between the concept of the harmonic triad and the Trinity, especially when we compare how he articulated that analogy in the *Disputatio musica tertia* and the *Synopsis musicae novae*. Since the audience at the oral disputation event would have known that Lippius was trained in theology, he likely anticipated that this section of his writing would attract particular interest from the theologians in attendance. Consequently, the *Disputatio musica tertia* includes a lengthy description of the Trinity:

> The 'harmonic root' is a unitrisonic trichord: behold the simulacrum of that great mystery of the divine Trinity, which alone is to be adored! God is the root, fount, foundation, origin, means, and end of all things, in whom all things are, from whom all things proceed, through whom all things came into being, to whom all things return. He is one in essence, but nonetheless three in persons: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The Son, the second person, is born from the Father, who is the first, and from each proceeds the Spirit, the third person, who remains in both for eternity.[78]

Even though Lippius is introducing his audience to a new use for the concept of the Trinity, he does so in orthodox terms. He borrows his description of the Trinity as being one in essence, but three in persons (*unus est essentia: nihilominus etiam trinus personis*) directly from the Augsburg Confession ("*sit una essentia . . tamen tres sint personae*"[79]), which was a foundational creed of the Lutheran Church. Additionally, the language of the Son being born of the Father (*ex patre natus filius*), and the Spirit proceeding from each (*ab utroque procedit spiritus*), comes from the Nicene Creed.

Yet I suspect the inclusion of this detailed bit of theology may have tripped Lippius and Carolus up. It is easy to imagine this reference to the Trinity attracting the attention of the audience's theologians, who would then prod at the analogy. And rightly they could inquire: how does it make sense to say that the C of a C major triad births the G above, but that the E proceeds in some way from both the C and G? And what of the fact that from the same C and G either E or E♭ can proceed? Certainly the Trinity was understood as one in essence

70 Lippius (1612a, sig.):(3r).
71 Ibid. (sig.):(4r).
72 Indeed, even the *Synopsis* (not to mention the *Disputationes*) was still far more intricate and philosophical than is the case in musical primers of the day, such as David Wolkenstein's textbook for the Strasbourg Academy (1585) or the slightly modified Strasbourg reprint of Faber's popular *Compendiolum musicae* (1596).
73 Young (1962, 130).
74 For more on the sixteenth-century tradition of German theory textbooks, including a consideration of how Lippius's *Synopsis* both partakes in and departs from that tradition, see Mutch (forthcoming).
75 Lippius (1612a, sig.):(1r).
76 Lippius (1612a, D2r–4r, D6v–E1r).
77 Lippius (1612a, G7v–H1r; 1610d, C3v–4r).
78 "Radix Harmonica est τρίφωνος Vnitrisona. En Vmbram magni illius Mysterij Divinæ & solùm adorandæ *TRINVNITATIS. DEVS* Radix est, Fons, Fundamentum, Principium, Medium & Finis omnium, in quo sunt omnia, à quo omnia profluunt, per quem fiunt omnia, ad quem omnia redeunt. Vnus est essentiâ: nihilominus etiam *TRINVS* personis, Pater, Filius, & Spiritus sanctus. Ex Patre personâ primâ, natus Filius altera, ab utroque procedit in utroque tamen manens æternùm Spiritus, Tertia" (Lippius 1610d, B3v).
79 Melanchthon *et al.* (1530, A3v).

and three in persons, but there is no orthodox way to describe it as being two in forms.

There is unfortunately no record of the oral debate that occurred at the three disputations. Yet by examining the significant ways in which Lippius reworked his exposition of the triad for publication in the *Synopsis musicae novae*, it is possible to hypothesize what may have occurred. Specifically, it is likely that Lippius's triad/Trinity analogy met with resistance, perhaps of the sort just laid out, and that Lippius was unable to rebut successfully the objections raised against it. Although from a theological perspective the analogy was irreparably flawed, Lippius remained committed to it. And indeed, it appears that the triad held personal significance for him: in the *Synopsis* Lippius claimed to have taken notice of the triad while a child, with the leading of only God and nature.[80] Furthermore, music and theology, the two domains which his analogy linked, are also the two pursuits for which Lippius's brief life is remembered. Lippius was even something of an evangelist for the greater integration of music and academic study. His idiosyncratic use of the disputation event for music theorizing is the most prominent exhibit of this, but it is not the sole one. In Lippius's circles major academic milestones were sometimes marked with brief pamphlets filled with poems extolling the praises of the graduate, such as Bartholomaeus Nasser's *Carmina συνχαριστικα in laudem . . . Iohannis Lippii* (1603), which celebrated Lippius's completion of his bachelor's studies. Lippius himself contributed songs to two such pamphlets, and in each pamphlet his was the only musical composition.[81] Furthermore, in the *Synopsis* Lippius exhorted theologians to study the triad, claimed that God is the efficient cause of harmonic song, and also included an unusual appendix listing twenty-three references to music found in the Bible.[82]

Thus, when it came time to prepare the text of the *Synopsis*, it should be no surprise that Lippius did not abandon his linking of the triad and the Trinity, as would have been easy to do (and, indeed, as nearly all theorists of the triad since have done). He also could have retained the analogy, but then acknowledged its limitations and simply moved on. Instead, Lippius made significant alterations to the *Synopsis*'s account of the triad in an apparent attempt to distract attention from the analogy's deficiencies and paper over the holes in his argument. In the *Disputatio musica tertia* Lippius begins his section on triads by ensuring that his audience properly understands the musical constitution of the triad. He dedicates nearly 500 words to describing consonant versus dissonant triads, the intervals which comprise the triad, the names of the notes, and so on.[83] Only after his audience has absorbed the details of his triadic doctrine does he launch into the triad/Trinity analogy using his creed-suffused description of the Trinity, which is quoted above.[84] In the *Synopsis*, by contrast, Lippius only briefly introduces the topic of the triad (succinctly accomplishing the *diairesis* method's requisite definition and divisions in fewer than seventy words), before describing the triad as "the image and simulacrum of that great mystery of the divine Unitrinity, which alone is to be worshiped."[85] He has not yet provided his readers enough information to take issue with the analogy; indeed, he may also have hoped that frontloading the comparison would provide a familiar point of reference for his readers, helping them to assimilate his new triadic ideas more easily.

This is not, however, the only revision found in the *Synopsis* which serves to minimize the shortcomings of the triad/Trinity analogy. After briefly planting the analogy early in the *Synopsis's* section on the triad, Lippius omits much of the characteristically disputational elaboration found in the *Disputatio musica tertia*'s parallel passage, in keeping with his practice of streamlining the *Disputationes musicae* for the *Synopsis's* less learned audience. Notably, he cuts the third *Disputatio*'s extended, creedal description of the Trinity, along with its aforementioned dilative comparison of the harmonic triad to the three dimensions, three-letter word roots in Hebrew, three terms of a syllogism, and the Trinity. Yet in compensation for these omissions he fuses Trinitarian terminology into his main account of the musical triad's constitution. In the *Disputatio* he had first described the chord as a strictly musical phenomenon, writing:

> The sounds or notes are: two bounding notes, one [being] first or lowest and the foundation, the other [being] last or highest, [with both] being distant from the other by a fifth, and a middle one, which by its gentle sweetness joins together those two bounding notes (the lowest and highest), which harmonize (*conspirantes*)[86] with a perfect ringing.

80 Lippius (1612a, F4v).

81 Nasser (1605a, A1v; 1605b, A3v). The compositions are transcribed in Rivera (1980, 236–39).

82 Lippius (1612a, F4v, B2r–v, I6r–7r).

83 Lippius (1610d, B2–3r).

84 To be sure, Lippius (1610d, B2v) had foreshadowed the analogy earlier in the section by employing the adjectives "triune" (*triunus*) and "unitrine" (*unitrinus*) to refer to the concept of the triad, but he defers any explanation of implications of these terms until much later.

85 ". . . magni istius Mysterii DIVINÆ solùm adorandæ UNITRINITATIS Imago & Umbra . . ." (Lippius 1612a, F4r–v).

86 In Benito Rivera's translation of the *Synopsis*, he distorts Lippius's meaning by rendering this term using the scare-quoted neologism "'co-spirate'" (Lippius 1977, 41). While Lippius likely intended a punning reference to *spiritus* in this passage, he also uses the verb "conspiro" when discussing dyads, where no Trinitarian allusions are plausible (1610d, A2v). In Classical Latin the term *conspiro* was frequently used by widely read authors like Cicero, Quintilian, and Caesar to mean "act in harmony" or "agree" (*Oxford Latin Dictionary*, s.v. "conspiro"), which must be how Lippius uses the term in the passage on dyads. As for the theological implications of the term "conspiro," the Church Fathers used it to mean "agree" in a doctrinal sense (Albert Blaise, *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens*, s.v. "conspiro"). The earliest use I have been able to find of the verb "conspiro" in a Trinitarian context occurred only in 1620 (Walaeus 2015, 212). (Furthermore, that usage occurred in Leiden, a Calvinist university at a time of tension between Calvinism and Lippius's Lutheranism, which diminishes the likelihood of intellectual contact between the intellectual circles of Lippius and Walaeus.) Consider, for

> [The middle note does this] by lying between them and being distant from one of them by a major third, [and] from the other by a minor third.[87]

Only much later does Lippius suggest its similarity to the Godhead. In the *Synopsis*, by contrast, he alters his description of the triad so that it newly describes the top note as "begotten by" the lowest, the middle note as "proceeding from" the other two, and those two as harmonizing with a ringing that is only now described as "masculine."[88] (As an aside, Johann Alsted, who was an important disseminator of Lippius's ideas, cut all hints of Trinitarian theology from Lippius's account of the triad, yet retained the curious description of the outer voices' perfect fifth as being masculine.[89]) The text also capitalizes the terms for "First note" (*Prima*), "Last note" (*Ultima*), "Middle note" (*Media*), and "Bounding Notes" (*Extremae*), which is likely a typographical nod to the usual capitalization of the persons of the Trinity.

When Lippius reworked the *Disputationes musicae* to create the *Synopsis*, he condensed and reordered much of their material to suit the *Synopsis*'s different genre and audience, and the revisions to his account of the triad detailed above could be adequately explained on the basis of genre concerns alone. Those revisions, however, also remove points of potential resistance to the triad/Trinity analogy while emphasizing its strengths, which suggests that Lippius was aiming to minimize the theological shortcomings of his analogy as well. The three-in-oneness of the triad is the strongest part of the analogy, and he emphasizes that similarity by introducing it early in his account of the triad. Later, when he explains the musical triad's structure in depth, he inserts enough creedal terminology to sustain the impression of a close mapping between the triad and Trinity.[90] Yet as soon as he comes to describing the two forms of the triad, at which point his analogy encounters serious difficulties, he simply abandons the comparison. Rather than approaching the matter as a rigorously trained theologian, employing his extensive dialectical training to defend his proposition and rebut objections, Lippius seems to hope that his readers will simply accept the relationship between the triad and Trinity as an article of faith.

If, as Rivera has claimed, the term *trias* has theological overtones and should be understood as referencing the Trinity,[91] then Lippius's audience would have been primed to accept the triad/Trinity analogy as soon as the term appeared. Rivera has rightly noted that the term τριάς (*trias*) was used for the Trinity already by the second-century CE,[92] but this usage appears to be restricted to theological literature in Greek. Latin theologians, in contrast, generally used the term *trinitas*, starting with Tertullian about the turn of the third-century CE.[93] By Lippius's day the Greek term τριάς, and related numerical words, had been adopted into academic writing in the generic sense of a group of things defined by their number. For instance, Lippius's fourth disputation is titled "*Decas quaestionum philosophicarum controversarum*" (Group-of-ten investigations about philosophical controversies); this usage is familiar in English, since *decas* (*decades* in the plural) is the source of the word "decade."[94] Rivera also provides examples of Lippius using the term *trias* in logical and rhetorical contexts.[95] When an adjective denoting holiness was applied to *trias*, the compound expression clearly indicated the Trinity, as in the lengthy subtitles to Lippius's *Nobiliorum problematum philosophicorum διάσκεψις tertia* and *Disputatio musica prima*, both of which reference the Holy Triad (*sancta triade*).[96] In the absence of such an adjective, however, it is highly questionable that Lippius's audience would have agreed with Rivera that "*trias* is no less theological a word than *trinitas*,"[97] particularly since the term is decidedly absent from discussions of Trinitarian theology in Lippius's circle. For instance, across the eighty-nine pages which Leonhard Hutter dedicates to discussing the Trinity,[98] the word *trias*/τριάς never appears,

instance, the writings of Leonhard Hutter (1607a, 1607b, 1610a), who was one of Lippius's teachers at Wittenberg and presided over at least three disputations at which Lippius was the respondent. Hutter, who has been described as "the prototype of orthodox Lutheran dogmatics and polemics" (Jackson 1909, 422), wrote an extensive commentary on the *Augsburg Confession* that includes lengthy exposition of the Trinitarian theology to which Lippius would have been exposed. While he makes use of the verb *spirare* and the nouns *spiraculum* and *spiratio*, he never employs any form of the word *conspirare* in this context (Hutter 1602, 91–104). This is the case even when he is emphasizing the Holy Spirit's procession from both the Father and the Son, in refutation of the Eastern Orthodox belief that the Holy Spirit proceeds only from the Father. In such a context employing the term *conspiro* could have made his point even more strongly, so his avoidance of it demonstrates that the term was not understood to have pneumatological connotations. Consequently, Rivera's awkward neologism is unjustified and should be replaced with the term's standard meaning.

87 "Soni seu voces sunt, duæ Extremæ una prima seu Infima & basis, altera ultima seu summa, distantes à se invicem per Quintam: & media una duas illas extremas imam & summam perfecto tinnitu conspirantes leniori suâ dulcedine conjugens interveniendo & distando ab illarum unâ per Ditonum, ab alterâ per Semiditonum . . ." (Lippius 1610d, B2r).

88 Lippius (1612a, F5r–v).

89 Alsted (1630, 1202).

90 While one could argue that Lippius trimmed the *Disputatio musica tertia*'s theological material simply to appeal to a more music-focused readership, Lippius's deliberate reordering of the third *Disputation*'s Trinitarian ideas, as well as his evident personal investment in the triad/Trinity analogy, strongly suggest that Lippius strove to communicate the analogy more effectively in the *Synopsis*, not just to compress it.

91 Rivera (1980, 120–22).

92 Rivera (1980, 121); Toom (2007, 62).

93 Toom (2007, 71).

94 When this term is used in its chronological sense, it is merely an abbreviation of the older expression "decade of years" (*Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "decade").

95 Rivera (1980, 126–27).

96 In a similar vein, in Schlick's and Schneegass's discussions of the Trinity and music, which Rivera cites as precedents to Lippius, the authors consistently modify the term *trias* (with "holy and venerable" and "divine") so that it clearly refers to the Trinity (Rivera 1980, 138–41).

97 Rivera (1980, 121).

98 Hutter (1602, 55–135; 1610c, 11–19). For more on Hutter, see n. 86.

even in his numerous Greek-language quotations. An analogy to the word "lamb" seems apt: when encountered in a nonreligious context, one would reasonably assume that it indicates the animal. Yet if the modifier "of God" is added, it would have been clearly understood to refer to Jesus. Likewise, though "holy triad" doubtless indicated the Trinity, the term "trias" is per se theologically neutral. Indeed, the effort which Lippius expends in the *Disputatio* to persuade his audiences of the pertinence of the triad/Trinity analogy makes little sense if one were to accept Rivera's implication that the mere presence of the word *trias* accomplished that work.

EPILOGUE

We have seen that Lippius exploited the genre of the disputation as a means to circulate his music-theoretical ideas to a broader audience. I propose that part of Lippius's intention in his musical disputations was to make a case for the reinvigoration of musical studies in the universities of his day. Indeed, Lippius ably demonstrated that music theory can draw upon and engage with both respected authorities and recent scholarship; that it can easily fit within the standard pedagogical procedures of the day, such as the academic disputation; that it has religious significance; and even that it can create new knowledge. Lippius by no means incited a groundswell of university-based music theory—indeed, only a handful of other seventeenth-century music theorists appear to have graced us with disputations, and even those occurred only in the closing years of the Thirty Years' War and thereafter.[99] Yet Lippius's music theory made it to the masses nonetheless. His unusual balance of intellectual rigor and attempts to appeal to a broader audience caught the eye of the great encyclopedist Johann Alsted, who adapted Lippius's theory to form the section on music in his widely read *Encyclopedia*.[100] Thus, even though music theorists would have to wait several centuries more to secure their place in academia, one early theorist's attempt to argue his way in led to the articulation and dissemination of one of the major conceptual achievements of Western music theory: the harmonic triad.

WORKS CITED

Alsted, Johann Heinrich. 1630. *Encyclopaedia septem tomis distincta*, vol. 3. Herborn: G. Corvini.

Ariew, Roger, and Alan Gabbey. 1998. "The Scholastic Background." In *The Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy*, vol. 1. Ed. Daniel Garber and Michael Ayers. 425–53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Balduin, Frideric. 1608. "Disputatio vi. in epistolam ad Hebræos." In *Analysis epistolæ Hebræos, complectens dispositionem textus*. Wittenberg: Gorman.

Becker, Wilhelm Martin. 1907. "Das erste halbe Jahrhundert der hessen-darmstädtischen Landesuniversität." In *Die Universität Gießen von 1607 bis 1907*, vol. 1. Ed. Universität Gießen. 1–364. Gießen: Alfred Töpelmann.

Bicczanius, Jacobus. 1612. *Ein christliche Leichpredigt bey der Trawrigen Begräbnuß. Johannis Lippii*. Strasbourg: Johann Carolus.

Carpenter, Nan Cooke. 1958. *Music in the Medieval and Renaissance Universities*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Casalini, Cristiano. 2017. *Aristotle in Coimbra: The* Cursus Conimbricensis *and the Education at the College of Arts*. Trans. Luana Salvarani. London: Routledge.

Chang, Ku-ming. 2004. "From Oral Disputation to Written Text: The Transformation of the Dissertation in Early Modern Europe." *History of Universities* 19 (2): 129–87.

Chrisman, Miriam Usher. 1982. *Lay Culture, Learned Culture: Books and Social Change in Strasbourg, 1480–1599*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Engel, Charles. 1900. *L'école Latine et l'ancienne académie de Strasbourg (1538–1621)*. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher.

Faber, Heinrich. 1596. *Compendium musicae, cum compendiolo recognito*. Strasbourg: Antonio Bertram.

Felipe, Donald. 2010. "Ways of Disputing and *Principia* in 17th Century German Disputation Handbooks." In *Disputatio 1200–1800: Form, Funktion und Wirkung eines Leitmediums universitärer Wissenskultur*. Ed. Marion Gindhart and Ursula Kundert. 33–61. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Freedman, Joseph S. 2010. "Published Academic Disputations in the Context of Other Information Formats utilized primarily in Central Europe (c. 1550–c.1700)." In *Disputatio 1200–1800: Form, Funktion und Wirkung eines Leitmediums universitärer Wissenskultur*. Ed. Marion Gindhart and Ursula Kundert. 89–128. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Friedenthal, Meelis. 2016. "Nominal Definition in the Seventeenth-Century University Disputations of the German Cultural Space." *History of Universities* 29 (1): 65–87.

Hawenreuter, Johann. 1603. *Disputatio ethica de temperantia*. Strasbourg: Jodocus Martin.

Honselmann, Klemens. 1966. *Urfassung und Drucke der Ablassthesen Martin Luthers und ihre Veröffentlichung*. Paderborn: Schnöningh.

Horn, Ewald. 1893. *Die Disputationen und Promotionen an den Deutschen Universitäten vornehmlich seit dem 16. Jahrhundert*. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.

Hotson, Howard. 2007. *Commonplace Learning: Ramism and its German Ramifications, 1543–1630*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Howard, John Brooks. 1985. "Form and Method in Johannes Lippius's 'Synopsis musicae novae.'" *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 38 (3): 524–50.

99 Trew (1645, 1648, 1662); Vallerius (1674, 1686, 1698).

100 Alsted (1630, 1195–211). Alsted was, of course, not the only seventeenth-century writer to adopt Lippius's ideas: Rivera (1980, 146–51) points out borrowings by Crüger, Baryphonus, Kircher, and others; and Joanna Carter Hunt (2012, 253–58) has explored further borrowings by Grimm. The theory treatises by these authors secured the triad's place in German theory discourse, but Alsted's widely read encyclopedia spread Lippius's ideas to a wider audience yet.

Hunt, Joanna Carter. 2012. "Appropriating the Music Theoretical Concepts of Johannes Lippius: Heinrich Grimm's 'Instrumentum Instrumentorum, hoc est, Monochordum vel potius Decachordum' (1634), Michael Praetorius, and Textual Borrowing." In *"Hands-on" Musicology: Essays in Honor of Jeffery Kite-Powell*. Ed. Allen Scott. 247–63. Ann Arbor: Steglein.

Hutter, Leonhard. 1602. *Augustanae confessionis, symboli ecclesiarum . . . analysis methodica*. Wittenberg: Cratonianis.

———. 1607a. *Disputatio 5 De vera ac reali communicatione omnipotentiae, ac omni scientiae divinae facta assumptae humanitati Christi.* Wittenberg. Reprinted in Hutter 1610b. 262–83.

———. 1607b. *Disputatio 7 De Christi hominis omnipraesentia*. Wittenberg. Reprinted in Hutter 1610b. 299–325.

———. 1610a. *Thematia theologica de peccato mortali, veniali et irremissibili*. Wittenberg: Gormann.

———. 1610b. *Controversiae duae theologicae*. Wittenberg: Gormann.

———. 1610c. *De articulis confessionis Augustanae & libri christianae concordiae*, 3rd ed. Wittenberg: Paul Helwig.

Jackson, Samuel Macauley, ed. 1909. *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, vol. 5. New York: Funk and Wagnalls.

Kleinstäuber, Christian Heinrich. 1882. "Ausführliche Geschichte der Studien-Austalten in Regensburg 1538–1880." In *Verhandlungen des historischen Vereines von Oberpfalz und Regensburg*. 1–142. Stadtamhof: Joseph Mayr.

Lester, Joel. 1989. *Between Modes and Keys: German Theory 1592–1802*. Stuyvesant, NY: Pendragon Press.

Lines, David A. 2002. *Aristotle's Ethics in the Italian Renaissance (1300–1650): The Universities and the Problem of Moral Education*. Leiden: Brill.

Lippius, Johannes. 1607a. *Nobiliorum problematum philosophicorum διάσκεψις prima*. Wittenberg: Johann Schmidt.

———. 1607b. *Nobiliorum problematum philosophicorum διάσκεψις secunda*. Wittenberg: Johann Gorman.

Lippius, Johann.. 1607c. *Nobiliorum problematum philosophicorum διάσκεφις* [sic] *tertia*. Wittenberg: Johann Gorman.

———. 1607d. *Decas quaestionum philosophicarum controversarum*. Wittenberg: Johann Gorman.

———. 1609a. *Disputatio musica prima*. Wittenberg: Johann Gorman.

———. 1609b. *Disputatio musica secunda*. Wittenberg: Johann Gorman.

———. 1610a. *Disputatio ethica*. Wittenberg: Martin Henckel.

———. 1610b. *Διάσκεψις politica de civitate.* Wittenberg: Martin Henckel.

———. 1610c. *Thematia de homine.* Wittenberg: Johann Gorman.

———. 1610d. *Disputatio musica tertia.* Wittenberg: Johann Gorman.

———. 1610e. *Thematia musica ut multis forte paradoxa.* Jena: Johann Weidner.

———. 1611a. *Breviculum errorum musicorum.* Jena: Johann Weidner.

———. 1611b. *Themata fontem omnium errantium musicorum.* Jena: Johann Weidner.

———. 1612a. *Synopsis musicae novae.* Strasbourg: Carol Kieffer. Translated as Lippius 1977.

———. 1612b. *Thesium theologicarum*. Strasbourg: Carol Kieffer.

———. [1612] 1977. *Synopsis of New Music*. Trans. Benito V. Rivera. Colorado Springs: Colorado College Music Press.

Luther, Martin. 1517. *Disputatio pro declaratione virtutis indulgentiarum*. Basel: n.p.

Maclean, Ian. 2002. "Mediations of Zabarella in Northern Germany, 1586–1623." In *La presenza dell'aristotelismo padovano nella filosofia della prima modernità*. Ed. Gregorio Piaia. 173–98. Rome and Padua: Editrice Antenore.

Marti, Hanspeter. 1994. "Disputation." In *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, vol. 2. Ed. Gert Ueding. 866–80. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

———. 2001. "Dissertation und Promotion an frühneuzeitlichen Universitäten des deutschen Sprachraums." In *Promotionen und Promotionswesen an deutschen Hochschulen der Frühmoderne*. Ed. Rainer A. Müller. 1–20. Cologne: SH Verlag.

———. 2007. "Von der Präses- zur Respondenten dissertation. Die Autorschaftsfrage am Beispiel einer frühneuzeitlichen Literaturgattung." In *Bilder—Daten—Promotionen. Studien zum Promotionswesen an deutschen Universitäten der frühen Neuzeit*. Ed. Rainer A. Müller. 250–74. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

Melanchthon, Philipp, et al. 1530. *Confessio exhibita caesari in comitiis Augustae*. N.p.

Montagne, Véronique. 2001. "Jean Sturm & Valentin Erythraeus ou l'élaboration méthodique d'une topique dialectique." *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et renaissance* 63 (3): 477–509.

Mutch, Caleb. Forthcoming. "Pedagogy and Authority in Sixteenth-Century German Music Theory Textbooks." *Theoria*.

Nasser, Bartholomaeus.. 1605a. *Των φιλων συγχαριστικας in honorem . . . Michaelis Schnellii*. Strasbourg: Antonius Bertram.

———. 1605b. *Μελη συνχαρηστικα in honorem . . . Iohannis Guilielmi Kressii*. Strasbourg: Antonius Bertram.

Novikoff, Alex. 2013. *The Medieval Culture of Disputation: Pedagogy, Practice, and Performance*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Pererius, Benedictus. 1576. *De communibus omnium rerum naturalium principiis & affectionibus*. Rome: Venturinus Tramezinus.

Philipp, Michael. 2010. "Politica und Patronage. Zur Funktion von Widmungsadressen bei politischen Dissertationen des 17. Jahrhunderts." In *Disputatio 1200–1800: Form, Funktion und Wirkung eines Leitmediums*

universitärer Wissenskultur. Ed. Marion Gindhart and Ursula Kundert. 231–68. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Rivera, Benito V. 1980. *German Music Theory in the Early 17th Century: The Treatises of Johannes Lippius*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press.

Scaliger, Julius Caesar. 1540. *De causis linguae latinae*. Lyon: Seb. Gryphius.

———. 1552. *Exotericarum exercitationum liber quintus decimus*. Paris: Michael Vascosanus.

Schindling, Anton. 1977. *Humanistische Hochschule und Freie Reichstadt, Gymnasium und Akademie in Strassburg 1538–1621*. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte in Mainz, 77. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

———. 2016. "Jean Calvin and the School of Jean Sturm." In *John Calvin: The Strasbourg Years (1538–1541)*. Ed. Matthieu Arnold. Trans. Felicity McNab. 61–74. Eugene: Wipf & Stock.

Sjökvist, Peter. 2012. *The Music Theory of Harald Vallerius: Three Dissertations from 17th-century Sweden*. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet.

Spitz, Lewis W., and Barbara Sher Tinsley. 1995. *Johann Sturm on Education: The Reformation and Humanist Learning*. Saint Louis: Concordia.

Toom, Tarmo. 2007. *Classical Trinitarian Theology: A Textbook*. New York: T&T Clark.

Trew, Abdias. 1645. *Disputatio musica prima de natura musicae, tri-unitate divine triadis harmonicae*. Altdorf: Scherffianus.

———. 1648. *Disputatio musicae tertia de causis consonantiae et dissonantiae*. Altdorf: Scherffianus.

———. 1662. *Disputatio musica de divisione monochordi*. Altdorf: George Hagen.

Vallerius, Harald. 1674. *Disputatio physico-musica de sono*. Stockholm: Nicolaus Wankijff. Ed. and trans. in Sjökvist 2012.

———. 1686. *Disputatio physico-musica secunda de modis*. Uppsala: Curio. Ed. and trans. in Sjökvist 2012.

———. 1698. *Disputatio musica de tactu*. N.p.: Olaus Retzel. Ed. and trans. in Sjökvist 2012.

Walaeus, Antonius. 2015. "Disputatio VIII: De persona Patris et Filii." In *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, vol. 1. Ed. Dolf te Velde, 202–27. Leiden: Brill.

Walliser, Christopher. 1611. *Musicae figuralis praecepta brevia*. Strasbourg: Carol Kieffer.

Weijers, Olga. 2013. *In Search of the Truth: A History of Disputation Techniques from Antiquity to Early Modern Times*. Turnhout: Brepols.

Wolkenstein, David. 1585. *Primum musicum volumen scholarum Argentoratensium*, 4th ed. Strasbourg: Antonius Bertram.

Young, Clyde William. 1962. "School Music in Sixteenth-Century Strasbourg." *Journal of Research in Music Education* 10 (2): 129–36.

Zabarella, Jacobus. 1578. *Opera logica*. Venice: Paul Meietus.

Music Theory Spectrum, Vol. 0, Issue 0, pp. 1–13, ISSN 0195-6167, electronic ISSN 1533-8339.
DOI: 10.1093/mts/mtaa008