

Johannes Filiczki's 1614 book of poetry published in Basel

Dávid Molnár* 

Tokaj-Hegyalja Egyetem, Sárospatak, Hungary

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Received: June 17, 2024 • Accepted: July 5, 2024

© 2024 The Author(s)



ABSTRACT

The study summarizes the 1614 Basel volume of János Filiczki, who was referred to as the “Hungarian Ovid” or the “Hungarian Martial”. The volume is significant for Hungarian literary history because it is a collection of occasional poems – which were fashionable at the time – edited by the author himself. No other similar work is known from that era in Hungary. The summary thematically arranges the poems in the 1614 volume and, as much as the length allows, attempts to touch upon their content. The more interesting poems are analyzed in detail, providing references to both ancient and contemporary sources.

KEYWORDS

Neolatin poetry, Reformation, occasional poems, early modern literature, Humanism

I. “HUNGARIAN OVID” OR “HUNGARIAN MARTIAL”?

The almost completely forgotten János Filiczki of Filfalva is a typical figure of early modern Hungarian literature. His relative familiarity with the contemporary intellectual milieu and his surviving literary works are not at all indicative of the neglect that has surrounded him.¹ A few

* Corresponding author. E-mail: molnar.david@unithe.hu, dauid.molnar@gmail.com

¹Furthermore, his verses were quoted in album entries as late as the 18th century. See: *IAA (2003–2024)*, nos. 617, 15038, 10941, 14357.

years after Filiczki's death, in 1626, János Pataki Füsüs (?–1629) called him “the second Ovid of our time”.²

We first encounter the analogy of Filiczki with Ovid in a six-line epigram by Filiczki's former teacher in Marburg, the poet laureate Hermann Kirchner (1562–1620) (inc. *Haec aliquis veterum legat ortus in urbe Quiritum*; app. 5).³ Kirchner's poem clearly describes the “Naso Tomitanae” Ovid, who wrote his poems “de Getico litore mittit”. Kirchner's words – since he could read the poems – probably not accidentally refer to Janus Pannonius (1434–1472), adding another twist to the parallel of the Pannonian Ovid. Kirchner, too, emphasizes the return of the Roman poet: by using the verb “*redeo*” Filiczki leads Ovid himself back to Pannonia. The fifth line also reveals that Filiczki – by resurrecting Ovid – not only brought back the ashes, the poetic talent (*vena*) and the passion (*favilla*) of the Roman poet, but actually he was the one who finally brought (*tulisse*) them to this land. Kirchner, however, tries to subtly evoke the Janus-reminiscence in a way that does not require us to compare Filiczki with his great poetic predecessor. In such a contest, he would obviously be worsted. This is why Kirchner directs Filiczki as the second, resurrected Ovid not to the Danube but to the Sava. The ashes may be a reference to the poet's corporeality (*dixerit et cineres venamque tulisse favillas*), to the poet reborn in a new body. The term *favilla* (embers) thus refers to the embers glowing beneath the ashes from which, as “*Pannonii aura soli*”, Ovid's fire and talent were finally revived.

It cannot be argued that by the beginning of the 17th century the banks of the Pannonian rivers were so crowded that the thirsty muses of the barbarian poets had to squeeze their way through the swarm. However, the rhetorical compliments of primacy were beginning to fade. But why did Kirchner choose the Sava? The Danube was taken by Orpheus, Ovid and Janus Pannonius, leaving only its tributary, the Sava. The Tisza, for example, which Ortelius called “*Tibiscus fluvius piscosissimus*”, is a significant river, and will not be officially claimed by anyone for a long time. The Sava is worth considering for three reasons:

The first is that it evokes the parallel of Janus.

The second is that the Marburgian professor may have specifically had in mind the Roman province of Pannonia. Pliny (*Nat. hist.* 3.147–148) mentions only three rivers in the area: the Danube, the Drava and the Sava. Since both the Danube and the Drava were taken by Janus, only the Sava was available. From this point of view, however, Kirchner's analogy is particularly valuable, since while Janus is only the second-first poet after Ovid by the Danube, the “second Ovid” Filiczki is the first-first poet by the Sava.

And the third is perhaps a reference to the Slavic self-consciousness that can be found in Filiczki's poem *Ad Sphettium*. Perhaps it is a play on words, which thus recalls the word “*Slavus*”.

But the illustrious humanist, Georg Rem (1561–1625) compared Filiczki to Martial, or rather to the “British Martial”, that is, to John Owen of Wales (aka Audoenus, c. 1564–1622).⁴ Filiczki, as the Martial of Szepes, would thus modestly compete not with Martial, but only with the British Martial.

²Pataki Füsüs (1626), 31.

³Filiczki 1614):(5^v–):(6^f. Throughout this study, I will indicate the numbering of the poems and appendixes of Filiczki's critical edition, which can be found in Filiczki (2023).

⁴See: Molnár (2024), 309–310, 316–317, 419–421.



The laureated Johann Peter Lotichius (1598–1669) wrote the first, roughly five-page biography of Filiczki in his 1628 encyclopaedic *Bibliotheca poetica*.⁵ Lotichius did not mention the Ovid-parallel in his tetrastichon. But later Péter Bod quoted this epigram from the “German Ovid” Lotichius, when he wanted to laud Filiczki.⁶ The early modern Ovids praise the ancient Ovid in each other again and again.

At the beginning of the 18th century, Pál Debreceni Ember (1661–1710), in his monumental work, mentions our author in a single sentence when listing the professors of the College of Sárospatak.⁷

Dávid Czvittinger (1670s–1743) had already found Lotichius and included Filiczki in his *Specimen*, although he merely reprinted Lotichius’s writing word for word.⁸ Then Elek Horányi (1736–1809) quoted Czvittinger (“*Ex Zwitting.*”), that is Lotichius again, without adding a single word.⁹

Our next clue is a catalogue of the professors of Sárospatak written around 1720 by János Csécsi Jr. (1689–1769).¹⁰ It also contains new information, according to which Filiczki was killed by “contagious pest” in 1622.¹¹

This source is known from the manuscript by János Szombathi,¹² professor of Sárospatak. After Lotichius, a contemporary of Filiczki, it was Szombathi who wrote something new about Filiczki. He completed his manuscript entitled *Biographia Professorum* in 1789.

The next source worthy of mention is Jakob Melzer, who wrote the biographies of the famous people of Szepes County (Spiš, SK).¹³ He was the first to give Filiczki’s date of birth “circa 1580”, which then repeatedly appeared in the 20th century. Melzer had no direct evidence for this, he was probably inferring it from the date of Filiczki’s university attendance. Besides, he was the first to use the relatively up-to-date German genre and aesthetic definition of *Gelegenheitsgedicht* in connection with Filiczki.

The ensuing decades of silence were finally broken in 1932 by a Czech historian and archivist, Otakar Odložilík, who in a thorough study – based on Lotichius and the poems in Filiczki’s Basel edition – refined the biography of our poet and published a previously unknown letter.¹⁴

Then, in 1946, the first small monograph – as a doctoral dissertation – on Filiczki was written by József Bencédy.¹⁵ The only problem is that it has remained in manuscript form and has hardly been read by more than two or three people. Bencédy did a thorough job,

⁵Lotichius (1628), 142–147.

⁶Bod (1766), 85. Bod also quotes a poem by Filiczki in an album entry. *IAA* (2003–2024), no. 14357.

⁷Lampe (1728), 596.

⁸Czvittingerus (1711), 143–146.

⁹Horányi (1775), 668–676.

¹⁰Dienes, D. and Ugrai, J. (2013), 55–59.

¹¹Tsétsi, 12^r.

¹²Szombathi.

¹³Melzer (1833), 60–61.

¹⁴Odložilík (1932).

¹⁵Bencédy (1946).



knowing all the texts dealing with Filiczki from Lotichius onwards (except for Odložilík's article) and conscientiously reading through Filiczki's volumes of *Xenia* and *Carminum liber*. He summarized Filiczki's oeuvre and provided a very good starting point for further research. With quoted passages, he pointed out the mainly Horatian, Vergilian and Martial examples. Finally, it is not an exaggeration to say that if this undeservedly forgotten manuscript had been published, Hungarian and international attention would have been more easily drawn to Filiczki's oeuvre, which has remained completely unnoticed for the last seventy-five years.

In the 1966 s volume of Antonín Truhlář's Czech-Moravian humanist lexicon, Filiczki's name is also mentioned.¹⁶ The novelty of the entry, compared to the previous writings, is the systematic bibliographical data of Filiczki's then known works.

Although a few years later Ján Mišianik devoted only a few pages to Filiczki in his Slovak literary history, it is still an important text.¹⁷ Mišianik was the first to focus more on the literary aspects. He built on Odložilík's study, but he also knew Szombathi's biography. He provided no new information either, but suggested that the date of birth might have been around 1585.

A concise literary summary of Filiczki's oeuvre was also to be found a few years later in Jozef Minárik's book, which can be read as a more detailed continuation of Mišianik's work.¹⁸ He drew attention to the classical and contemporary models of our poet, for example to John Owen.

This literary interest will then be followed by Helena Májeková's article, which deals only with Filiczki and approaches the poems from the perspective of the humanist poetic self-representation. She summarizes the volume of *Carminum liber*, and also points out important details in Filiczki's texts, gives examples of his classical models and briefly analyzes a few of his poems. This study was followed by two more papers, the second of which presents an analysis of the poem *Ad Sphettium*.¹⁹

It is also important to mention the book on Janus Pannonius by Géza Szentmártoni Szabó's, who not only pointed out Filiczki's unknown, erotic sense of humour, but also proved that the direct model of his autocastration-epigram was a poem by Janus Pannonius.²⁰

In the next year, Gábor Kecskeméti published the Vatican manuscript of Filiczki's "(almost)" unknown greeting poem for Jan Gruter's 1618 Cicero's edition.²¹

In the same volume, Mihály Imre published and analyzed the manuscript of Filiczki's poem praising Albert Szenci Molnár's *Psalterium*, which shows significant differences from the printed version.²²

The most important new results in the Filiczki-research came in 2013 with two studies by Marta Vaculínová, who found previously unknown biographical data by examining the entries in Filiczki's album amicorum.²³

¹⁶Truhlář (1966), 144–145.

¹⁷Mišianik (1974), 153–157.

¹⁸Minárik (1985), 132–137.

¹⁹Májeková (1988), (1991), (2008).

²⁰Szentmártoni Szabó (2010).

²¹Kecskeméti (2011).

²²Imre (2011).

²³Vaculínová (2013a), (2013b).



Two recent pieces of scholarly literature are also worth mentioning: Eva Frimmová's lexicon article,²⁴ as well as Sebastian Krasnovský's MA thesis,²⁵ which seems to be a detailed elaboration of Helena Májeková's paper on Filiczki's literary self-representation.

The most recent developments are the publication of a critical edition of Filiczki's works and a monograph on him.²⁶

II. SUMMARY OF FILICZKI'S BIOGRAPHICAL DATA²⁷

1583–1585:	Born in Farkasfalva (Vlková, SK)
?1590s:	Studied in Lőcse (Levoča, SK)
01.09.1600:	Already studying in Késmárk (Kežmarok, SK).
02.03.1602:	Leaving Farkasfalva to embark on his European peregrination.
18.03.1602:	Enrolled in Görlitz.
08.09.1603:	He was already in Prague.
May 1605:	Left Prague.
05.06.1605:	Nuremberg.
14.06.1605:	Enrolled in Herborn.
12.09.1605:	Eichen.
June 1605:	Prague.
Early March 1607:	Siegen.
04.10.1608:	Marburg.
02.04.1611:	Enrolled in Heidelberg.
11.10.1612:	Speyer.
14.10.1612:	Strasbourg.
17.10–31.10.1612:	Enrolled in Basel.
February–April 1614: Awarded the title Poet Laureate by Grasser in Basel, then travels in Germany:	
	21.09.1614: Augsburg.
	29.03.1615: Prague.

(continued)

²⁴Frimmová (2020).

²⁵Krasnovský (2021).

²⁶Filiczki (2023); Molnár (2024).

²⁷For the detailed summary of his known biography: Molnár (2024), 23–98.



Continued

	02.07.1615: Marburg.
	07.07.1615: Magdeburg.
	05–06.07.1615: Wittenberg.
	09–10.07.1615: Leipzig.
	16.07.1615: Kassel.
	31.07–03[?].08.1615: Marburg.
	04[?]-07.08.1615: Frankfurt am Main.
	05.10.1615: Frankfurt am Main.
	?1616: Altdorf?
	05.06.1616: Prague?
1617?:	Already teaching in Sárospatak.
June 1618:	Already deputy rector in Sárospatak.
May 1622:	Already rector in Sárospatak.
18.08.1622:	Died in Sárospatak during the plague epidemic.

III. HIS MAIN WORK: THE BASEL EDITION OF HIS COLLECTED OCCASIONAL POEMS AND EPIGRAMS (1614)

In 1614, Filiczki published 315 of his selected poems – edited by himself – in Basel.²⁸ He divided his *silva*-collection into two books, the first containing 171 poems, the second 184. The first book of the volume includes mainly occasional poems, while the second book also contains improvisations according to the Quintilian definition. Filiczki's book also reflects the observation that each occasional poem is a *silva*, but not each *silva* is an occasional poem.

It is interesting that Pareus included in his 1619 edition only Filiczki's first book, which was divided by the poet into separate chapters according to the genres of his occasional poems:

- *Genethliacum, ubi et novus annus natalitium* (Birthday poem)
- *Gratulatorium* (Gratulatory poem)
- *Προπεμπτικόν* (Farewell poem)
- *Philothesia* (Poems written into alba amicorum)
- *Symbolum* (Motto-like poem as symbol of the addressee)
- *Προσώνησις* (Dedicatory poem)
- *Epithalamium* (Nuptial poem)
- *Παραμυθητικόν* (Consolatory poem)
- *Funebris* (Funeral poem)

²⁸Filiczki (1614).



The model of Filiczki's book was Georgius Carolides' *Farrago*.²⁹ He follows it so closely that he also begins his book with a picture of the Hodějova (Hoddiegova) family's coat of arms and a poem about it. In addition, the preface to the young Hodějova barons sometimes imitates Carolides' preface to Přeč Hodějovský the Elder word for word.³⁰ Carolides divided his first book into five centuria, which formed distichs from Vives' 500 sentences.

III.1. The first book of Filiczki's *Carminum liber*

Paratext. As an introduction, the first book contains eleven poems by nine authors: Rudolph Goclenius the Elder, Hermann Kirchner, Heinrich Gutberleth, Caspar Sturm, Johann Pincier, Simon Stein, Ludwig Lutz, Richard Hemmel and Georg Pasor.³¹

First chapter: Genethliaca, ubi et novus annus natalitium. The first chapter consists of 25 genethliaca, 18 of which are addressed to 26 people. The title of the chapter promises poems written for birthdays and poems for New Year (*strena*). To summarize the Genethliaca chapter, it is worth noting that, apart from the two hymns for New Year (1609, 1610) and the genethliacum to Miklós Thököly from Görlitz (1603), the poems were all composed during Filiczki's Herborn period between June 1605 and March 1607.

The chapter begins with two Latin and one Greek Christmas poems about the birth of Christ. The four-line Greek poem (inc. Ὡς Φοῖβοιο περὰ ὕαλου δίχα κλάσματος αὐγῇ; no. 47) is translated from the Latin (inc. *Ut vitreos Titan sine damno permeat orbes*; no. 46). Besides, there is a *strena* for the year 1606, and its Greek translation (inc. Δῆϊος, ὀχληροῖστε βαρύστονος ὥρος ἀπῆλθε; no. 49). In the poem, he complains about the "war-bringing and full of threatening destructions" year of 1605, and then asks Christ for a new year devoid of all this (inc. *Bellifer et praegnans infestis casibus annus*; no. 48).

Among these, the 10-distich poetic adaptation of the tenth chapter of St. Ambrose's work about virginity is worth mentioning (inc. *Mens mea, ne trepides! Christus tibi cuncta ministrat*; no. 45).³² The poem illustrates, on the one hand, that a humanistic paraphrase of a work can even be a free association, and, on the other hand, that the poem is a well-done example of the *carmen philomelicum*. In his Greek lexicon, Rudolph Goclenius the Elder uses this poem by Filiczki to demonstrate – albeit anonymously – philomelicum as a sub-genre of technopaegion.³³ According to István Kilián,³⁴ this is a stylistic rather than a genre concept. The last words of the lines of a philomelicum should be used to create the last line of the poem.

• Strenae (New Year wishes)

- 1) To his patron Přeč z Hodějová (Przechius ab Hoddiegova), Filiczki dedicates a New Year's poem for 1609 (no. 50). The first line bids farewell to the year 1608, a year of plague, famine

²⁹Carolides (1597).

³⁰For the detailed analysis, see Molnár (2024), 244–249.

³¹For the detailed analysis, see Molnár (2024), 249–254.

³²For a more detailed analysis, see Molnár (2024), 254–257.

³³Goclenius (1615), 259–260.

³⁴Kilián (1998), 20, 26, 315.



and wars. The second line, wishing to get rid of these, offers the year 1609 under the protection of Christ, and then, at the end of the poem, commends the baron and his family to the mercy of Jehovah. The first two lines are two chronograms. The letters of the first line give the number 1608, the letters of the second line give the number 1609: *Tabe, faMe, beLLIs Degrassans transIt annVs. / HisCe reCens CassVs faC, pIe ChrIste, MICet*. The Greek version of this is also published, but without chronograms (inc. *Κηρι, νόσω, λιμῶ πολέμωτ' ἐτὸς αἰνὸν ἀπῆλθε*; no. 51).

- 2) Without a specific addressee, there is also a New Year's poem for the year 1610 in ten distichs (inc. *Annus abit, quo avidus multos fluor abstulit alvi*; no. 52).
- 3) Filiczki greeted Johannes Paulus Hegranus and his disciples, two Czech noblemen – Johannes Dobrzensky a Dobrzenicz and Johannes Paczowsky – with a poem on the Feast Day of Saint John, the Apostle and Evangelist (inc. *Ornatissime Iane, vosque amici*; no. 58). The poem may have been written during Filiczki's Herborn period. It is rather a strena in which he wishes them bodily and spiritual goods and a carefree old age from Christ in the "great theatre of life". In line 11, the "great theatre(s) of life" is not only interesting because of the life-theatre metaphor, but perhaps also as a pun that adds further meaning: "e Poli theatris magnis." This may also refer to the famous Greek tragedian Polus (Πῶλος) of Aigina.³⁵ In this case, it refers not only to *polus* as the theatre of heaven, where the celestials stage their performances for humanity, but specifically tragic performances, where Poluses play their theatrical roles. From the New Year, however, the poet asks for more salutary "roles". Because of the mention of Christ and the use of the word "*nuper*", it is likely that Filiczki refers to his genethliacum written for them a few days earlier, on 27 December. That is, the poem might have been written at the very end of December 1605 or 1606, perhaps on 31 December.

• Birthday and name day poems

Genethliaca were used to celebrate not only birthdays but also name days. It is often difficult to ascertain for whom these birthday and name day poems were composed. A good starting point might be when the author mentions Genius, who is present at both procreation and birth. Such a poem was most probably written for a birthday. Some of his poems:

- 1) In 11 distichs, Filiczki celebrated the 16th birthday of Baron Miklós Thököly (1587–1617), son of Sebestyén Thököly (inc. *Annuus assuetum Tekeli natalis honorem*; no. 53). The poem was probably written between March 1602 and June 1603 in Görlitz. The first three lines are an evocation of Ovid's lines (*Trist.* 5.5.1–2, 5.5.5). Then, after sending down the grief inappropriate to the occasion to the Styx, he describes the sweet smells (*suaves odores*) wafting through the festive hall, the wreaths decorated with jewels in the hair, the sacrificed rabbits and fat capons on the tables, the delicious Falernian wine (*Massica vina*)³⁶ with cakes (*liba*), and the good wishes (lines 5–10). Line 9 is an almost word for word quotation from

³⁵It is known from Plutarch, *Parallel Lives: Demosthenes-Cicero* 28, and Lucian (e.g. *Juppiter tragoedus* 3.12–13).

³⁶The term "*Massicum vinum*" refers to several varieties of wine made from grapes harvested on Monte Massico in Campania, which are renowned as the most expensive, highest quality wines in Rome. This topos of good quality, expensive wine appears repeatedly from antiquity to the 17th century. In Filiczki's poem, this is perhaps a reference to Tokaj wine.



- Ovid (*Trist.* 3.13.17). The second half of the poem is a request for good wishes from God for young Thököly's birthday. Then lines 13–14 are an Ovidian allusion again (*Remedia amoris* 507–509). At the end of the poem (lines 21–22), Filiczki invites the muses by clearly quoting Ovid's words again (*Ars amatoria* 2.1): "Say, oh muses, say thrice: grow, flourish, shine in body, in mind and in faith!"
- 2) Filiczki celebrates the birthday (Decembris Idus) of the Czech nobleman Nicolaus Sekerczae a Sedczio (Mikuláš Sekerka ze Sedčic) on 16 December in 18 lines (inc. *Nobilissime Nicolae, pro re*; no. 55). He apologizes for the rude Phalaecian lines: *Crassa nunc celebros tuum Minerva natalem*. At the end of the poem, Filiczki wishes for Sekerka many, many more similar Ides of December, always in better and better fortune, which will then be celebrated with 600 Phalaecian lines. The poem was probably written in Herborn in 1605 or 1606.
 - 3) A genethliacum celebrates the birth of the son of Elias Rosinus the Younger (inc. *Ergone iam voto eventus respondit amicus*; no. 59). Filiczki asks whether Lucina, the goddess helping with the birth of children, made it easier for Elias's wife to give birth. In a not too subtle pun, he compares the youngest Rosinus to a fresh, weak rose, that will decorate the family's house. He hopes that the pious rose, rich in goodness of body and soul, will grow and produce new roses, and Elias can become a grandfather. Line 9 refers to a saying also found in Erasmus's *Adagia* (no. 487): *Lydius lapis sive Heraclius lapis*.
 - 4) Filiczki in six distichs celebrates the birthday of Johann Kraus the Younger (inc. *Sol vetat exhaustam versus deducere venam*; no. 60). In the title, he calls Kraus of Ólubló (Stará Ľubovňa, SK) his fellow countryman (*popularis*). It is true that publicity forbids our poet to write poems in an exhausted vein, but the law of friendship requires it [that he write poetry nonetheless]. He does not know which he should obey. Finally, he sends his best wishes: be stronger in body year by year, John, with a more lively genius! Drink more and more from the sacred fountain of the Aonides, prudently accumulate a solid wealth, and with the support of fortune enjoy the reward of studies.
 - 5) Filiczki greeted the birthday of the "Marcomann" (i.e. Moravian) Johannes Opsimathes with a poem rich in mythological allusions (inc. *Dicamus bona verba: redit Natalis in urbem*; no. 61). The first line is a paraphrase of a Tibullus' verse (*Eleg.* 2.2.1): "*Dicamus bona verba: venit Natalis ad aras*." The Graces, the nymph Chloris, the personified jest, Iocus and even Apollo himself return to the city to celebrate the great day. Invoking Propertius (*Eleg.* 3.10.5), the poet asks for the day to pass without gloomy clouds and winds, for sorrow and pain to retreat into the murk of the underworld. In line 5, the delicious smells lure the genius of Opsimathes to the smoking altars. This is again a "quotation" from Tibullus' same elegy (*Eleg.* 2.2.5). And then, as on the birthday of Miklós Thököly, they also offer a sweet *libum* to God to listen to their wishes interpreted by Hygieia (Υγιεία) herself, daughter of the god Asclepius. Filiczki asks the goddess of the hygiene to give Opsimathes strength of mind and body (and even the power to procreate a young girl in his nuptial bed). Line 10 is a quotation from Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* 28.25), which is also found in Erasmus's *Adagia* (no. 746): *Premere pollicem, convertere pollicem*. In the last few lines, our poet also refers to the subject of marriage, for which he asks God's blessing with a reminiscence of Virgil (*Georg.* 1.40). The poem might have been written in late December 1605.

Second chapter: Gratulatoria. The chapter contains 17 poems to five addressees from Filiczki's Herborn/Siegen and Heidelberg periods: to Antonius Matthaeus, rector of Herborn (1564–1637)



(no. 83), to Bohuchval Berka of Dubá (before 1590 and after 1628) (no. 82), Louis Henry of Nassau-Dillenburg (1594–1662) (nos. 69–71), Johannes Kumpsthoﬀ, nobleman of Westphalia (1585–1636) (no. 85), and to Philippus Adamus Misnicus, Filiczki’s fellow student in Heidelberg (no. 84). This is a typical academic, laudative genre in which students who have reached a certain level of university education salute each other and praise their academic achievements.

In addition, the chapter includes five two-verse epigrams and their Greek translations. The summary title of this block is *Sententiae παρανετικάι*, that is, sentences of exhortation, which are perfect examples of the humanist play with intertextuality. Filiczki translated into Greek his own Latin distichs which are paraphrases of Georgius Carolides’ distich paraphrases of Juan Luis Vives’ (1492–1540) prosaic sentences.³⁷ We can find other examples of this throughout the volume. Filiczki may have intended these poems to fill empty spaces in the print. Perhaps the most interesting example of these paraphrase-patterns is the distich entitled *Temporis minister*, which reworks a Seneca³⁸ excerpt through Vives and Carolides (no. 125).

*Temporis minister*³⁹

Allusio ad vetus oraculum. Tempori pare, de quo Plato, et Cicero, et Seneca. Accomodare se debet unusquisque tempori, nec speret coacturum se tempora, ut suis rebus serviant, ipse potius praesenti rerum statui subserviat.

*Temporis minister*⁴⁰

*Commoda ne tribuas vitiosis tempora rebus,
Quae fugiunt, nullo sunt reditura pede.*

Temporis minister (no. 125)

*Commoda ne tribuas damnosis tempora rebus.
Quae fugit a nobis, hora redire nequit.*

Χρόνου υπηρέτης (no. 126)

*Οὐκ ἀνάλισκε ἔδν χρόνου εἰς κακὰ ἔργματα. ἢ γὰρ
Ἄρτι ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρης, νίσσεται οὐδέποτε.*

In this case, the textual and motif sequence looks like a paraphrase of a paraphrase of a paraphrase of Seneca and its translations:

[Seneca]–[Vives]–[Carolides]–[Filiczki 1]–[Filiczki α]

[Seneca]–[Vives]–[Carolides]–[Filiczki 2]–[Filiczki β]

But it can also be drawn up as a paraphrase of a paraphrase of a paraphrase of a paraphrase of Seneca and their translations:

[Seneca]–[Vives]–[Carolides]–[Filiczki 1]–[Filiczki 2]–[Filiczki α]–[Filiczki β]

Third chapter: Προπεμπτικά. The chapter contains 21 propemptica, 19 of which were written by Filiczki, but seven of these 19 seem to be filling epigrams, because they do not fit in the genre

³⁷For the detailed analysis, see: Molnár (2024), 266–269, 274–275, 321–323.

³⁸See the expression “*temporis dominus*”: *De brevitae vitae* 10.12.9.

³⁹Vives (1599–1600), F4^f.

⁴⁰Carolides (1597), B3^f.



of the propempticon. In a reconstructed and estimated chronological order, Filiczki bid farewell to the following departed persons:

- 1) To his schoolmate in Görlitz, the Polish nobleman Petrus Biskupsky, probably in the spring or summer of 1603 (inc. *Petre polite, iuvat magis indulgere Camenis?*; no. 90).
- 2) To Miklós Thököly in Görlitz, sometime in late June 1603 with this quotation of Petrarch: “Verus nobilis non nascitur, sed fit”. The poem releases the young baron with the promise of nobility acquired through education during his studies in Heidelberg (inc. *Siccine propositum est alias invisere terras?*; no. 87).
- 3) A propempticon written to the young Thököly’s preceptor, István Miskolci Csulyak (inc. *Scis, erat in votis, ut vos comitarer euntes*; no. 88). (The first line is an allusion to Horace, *Serm.* 2.6.1.) Although Filiczki would like to follow Miskolci Csulyak and Thököly across the Alps, the Caucasus, the icy Scythia, or even the straits of Scylla and Charybdis, his brother’s illness forces him to delay and is unable to join them. In a pun, Filiczki writes that he will follow them to the Neckar with unequal, limping steps, that is, in distichs: “*Vos pede, quo possum, quamvis non passibus aequis, prosequor*”. (This is a Virgilian reminiscence: *Aen.* 2.724.) At the end of the poem, he wishes them a safe and tranquil journey. The sixth line, which quotes a verse from Ovid (*Ep. ex Ponto* 2.8.44): “*accipe non dura supplicis aure preces!*”; and the Virgilian allusions in lines 10 and 15 (*Aen.* 6.533–534; 2.724) is also worth mentioning.
- 4) Filiczki also bids farewell to the Czech nobleman Jaroslaus Smirziczky a Smirzicz (1588–1611) (inc. *Non pictus phaleris, auro, gemmisque superbus*; no. 86). The title quotes a passage from Seneca (*Epist. mor. ad Lucilium* 41.6.5): Golden bridles do not make a better horse (*Non faciunt equum meliorem aurei freni*). Line 4: Ovidius (*Epist. ex Ponto* 2.6.30): “*dignus es in tantis nomen habere viris*”; lines 5–6: Ovidius (*Met.* 13.140–141): “*Nam genus et proavos et quae non fecimus ipsi / vix ea nostra voco*”. The expression “*Naritiu ductor*” in line 6 refers to Odysseus, but as “*dux Neritius*” it is also found in Ovid (*Fasti* 4.69). It is also present in a medieval, pseudo-Ovidian heroida entitled *Odyssea. Responsio Ulixis ad Penelopen*, which was often used by the humanist education.⁴¹ The seventh line: Horatius (*Carm.* 1.2.27): “*nos numerus sumus et fruges consumere nati*”; line 9: Virgil (*Aen.* 4.176): “*mox sese attollit in auras*”; lines 27–28: Ovid (*Epist. ex Ponto* 2.9.17–18): “*Hoc nitor iste tui generis desiderat, hoc est / a superis ortae nobilitatis opus*”. A verse by Johann Stigel (1515–1562) is worth mentioning, which is quoted almost verbatim in line 16: “*Quos sine virtutis laude referre iuvat*”.⁴² In lines 17–18, the commonplace so often used by Filiczki can again be read: true nobility is acquired not by birth but by deeds.
- 5) Filiczki calls Johannes Minor Caismarcensis (Kežmarok, Sk) his fellow countryman (*popularis*), for whose departure from Görlitz he wrote a 14-distich propempticon (inc. *Ergone Parnassum linques, Nissique fluentia*; no. 93). It is worthy of note that in lines 7–8 of this poem – as in the farewell poem to Miskolci Csulyak – he alludes to some kind of obstacle, to the harpy Aellus, who blocks his way (“*Aellus precludit omnes, quae patuere, vias*”). Then, in line 17, he complains – somewhat enigmatically, but it also might be a reference to his brother’s illness at home and the delay in his studies – that the harpies destroy and devour his

⁴¹Meckelnborg and Schneider (2002).

⁴²Stigel (1545), A2^v.



household gods (*Penates*). Line 6 is an Ovidian verse (*Trist.* 3.4.34), line 19 is a Virgilian verse (*Aen.* 10.467), while the final lines (“*Sic tibi sint Pindi faciles ubicunque puellae, / Sic tibi sit semper dexter Apollo, vale*”) are an evocation of the lines of Petrus Lotichius Secundus: „*Sic tibi castae faciles ubicunque puellae, / Sic tibi sit semper dexter Apollo, veni*”.⁴³

- 6) Filiczki originally published two propemptic poems (no. 91, no. 92) addressed to his friend and compatriot Mátyás Török on a single sheet print (30.5 × 13.5 cm) around 1603 or 1604, when Török returned home from Prague. The only known copy (Miscellanea 18 přív. 38), dedicated to another compatriot of Filiczki, Johannes Minor from Késmárk (Kežmarok, SK), has since disappeared⁴⁴ from the library of the Premonstratensian Abbey of Jászó (Jasov, SK). According to the description in Truhlář’s lexicon, the title was as follows: “*In reditum e Pragensi urbe Bohemorum in Olssam oppidum Hungariae, patriam dulcissimam [...] Matthiae Terek, civis ac notarii reipub. Olssensis, domini et amici optatissimi etc., εὐχὴ προπεμπτική [...], scripta ab Ioanne Filickio Farkasfalvano Scep. [...] Pragae ex officina Ottmariana.*” The print most likely contained the same poems or at least a version of them similar to those later published by Filiczki in the Basel volume. According to the title of the print, Mátyás Török was a citizen and notary of a Hungarian town called “Olssa.” He might have served in a diplomatic mission in Prague and received this poem upon his return to Hungary. An inventory from around 1610 in the Hungarian National Archives mentions a village named Olsa, which was then in possession of the Diocese of Vác.⁴⁵ This might explain why Mátyás Török is referred to as the notary of Olssa. It is probable that Török did not reside and/or study in Prague, as indicated by the title of the second poem of the original print: *Ἀποστροφὴ ad Olssam*, meaning “Preparation for his return to Olssa.” Additionally, lines 11–14 of the poem’s variant known from the Basel volume (*Matthiae Török, Praga redeunti in patriam, etc.; inc. Huc rapidis pedibus, facilesque venite, Viales*) suggest that Török’s journey was not for leisure or profit, such as trading in gold and precious stones, but rather to deliver “sealed decrees” from the king granting exemption from service at home. In his farewell prayer, Filiczki invokes the *Lares viales* and implores them to accompany and protect Török from the weapons of robbers on his dangerous journey home: “*Huc ergo faciles faustique venite, Viales! / Ducite Matthiam Pragidos urbe domum.*” The *Lares* of roads, as their name suggests, were situated not within homes but along roads leading to homes, later becoming protectors of travellers on Roman roads. The *Lares* of roads pertain to the external world, whereas the *Penates* contrasted with them in the poem belong to the domestic realm, guarding over the household pantry and well-being. With the help of the *Lares*, Török can reach his household gods at home, whom he exempted from certain – unspecified – duties by decrees. Although Filiczki refers to the poem as a propempticon, it rather resembles a *votivum*, because it is primarily a request, a prayer, as the phrase “εὐχὴ προπεμπτική” suggests in the title. The other poem (no. 92) was dedicated to the town of “Olssa” and its title indicates that it belongs to one of the subgenres of exhortation (προτρεπτικόν): the noutheticon (*Νουθητικόν ad Olssam Hungariae oppidum; inc. Tu, pressa Olssa, diu deinceps obstaré memento*). Scaliger’s

⁴³Lotichius (1586), 283.

⁴⁴I am grateful to Veronika Timuláková, the librarian of the Premonstratensian Abbey, for the information.

⁴⁵MNL, Urbaria et Conscriptioes (E 156), Registrata: UC 62: 33(t). <https://adatbazisokonline.mnl.gov.hu/adatbazis/urbaria-et-conscriptioes/adatlap/4288> (12 June 2024)



definition of the subgenre appears apt. It aims to exhort the addressee towards a specific course of action based on a particular rule or principle. The direct or indirect generic model for Filiczki's poem might have been the gnomic poet Phocylides of Miletus (c. 560 BC), whose works were frequently published in the 16th century under the title *Ποίημα νομοθετικόν* and were incorporated into the so-called "Saxon curriculum" at the school in Lőcse (Levoča, SK), indicating Filiczki's probable familiarity with these writings.

- 7) Filiczki bids farewell to the Czech Baron Bohuchval Berka of Dubá with 43 hexameters (inc. *Ergone perpetui capita angunt nostra dolores?*; no. 89). The first part of the poem is more akin to an epicedium on the death of Count John VI of Nassau-Dillenburg, which Filiczki connects to the grief over Berka's departure. He repeatedly bids farewell to the young baron in three refrain-like verses: „*I pede felici flos, inclyte Berka, baronum!*” Lines 2–4 and 7–8 invoke Virgil (*Aen.* 4.462–463; *Aen.* 8.583–584).
- 8) A 28-distich propempticon to Jacobus-Laurentius Sialandus Danus as he prepared to leave Siegen for the “blonde waves” of the Neckar, i.e., Heidelberg (inc. *Ut me cum Paulo, miseranda sorte perempto!*; no. 94). This humanist poem offers a wealth of material for future detailed analysis. Besides the mythological references, the depiction of the Icelandic Hekla volcano (lines 21–24) is particularly intriguing, likely sourced from Caspar Peucer (1526–1602). Noteworthy as well is line 15, which adopts an Ovidian hexameter (*Epist. ex Ponto* 2.1.5) with the insertion of “*ubi*,” slightly disrupting the metre: “*Tandem aliquid pulsa curarum ubi nube serenum.*” In lines 49–52, he offers a captivating gastronomic-poetic metaphor to describe his schoolmate's poetic talent, preparing sweet *libum* for the Muses from Cicero's honeycomb, Horace's fine flour, and Virgil's milk.

Strictly speaking, only these eight poems in the chapter qualify as propempticons. According to Scaliger's classification, they are *προπεμπτικὸν ἐρωτικόν*, reflecting the relationship between two equal friends.

Following Jacobus-Laurentius' propempticon, we find one Greek and six Latin sentences that bear no relation to any travel. These distichs appear to serve merely as fillers.

There is a mysterious 15-distich poem addressed to a nobleman bearing the monogram N. N., who served as a counsellor at the imperial court but departed due to his study of the Holy Scriptures (inc. *Dum mihi culta genas pingebat flore iuventa*; no. 102). The poem functions as a propempticon that bids farewell to courtly life, which, according to Filiczki, is an occasion for rejoicing rather than sorrow. It is very probable that Filiczki composed this poem in Prague sometime between 1603 and the summer of 1605, when N. N. might have departed the city.

The chapter's unquestionably most important poem is Filiczki's *apobaterion*, characterized by its genre as a departing speech of one leaving to those left behind (inc. *Hinc ego discedo, quo numen et ardor honesti*; no. 103). From this, it can be inferred that he commenced his peregrination on March 2, 1602. As a *votivum*, the chapter's final poem, titled *Pro felici itinere votum*, prays for a successful continuation of his journey (inc. *O Pater omnipotens, caeli, terraeque Monarcha*; no. 104).

Fourth chapter: Philothesia. Filiczki might have drawn inspiration from the *Philothesia* chapter of Friedrich Taubmann's *Melodaesia*.⁴⁶ This chapter presents 26 poems from Filiczki's album

⁴⁶Taubmanus (1597), 511–527.



amicorum entries, including one in Greek, mostly concise sentences, often in multiple versions. Unfortunately, Filiczki did not consistently record the recipients' names, so only ten persons can be identified: Melchior a Seidlitz, Petrus Kosminsky, Johannes Opsimathes, Balthasar Zahn, the younger Elias Rosinus, Georgius Rosinus, Elias Acontius and his brother Nicolaus Acontius, Thomas Dubinus, and Sigefridus Lempius. These verses align with known biographical data, indicating that they were composed during Filiczki's Herborn/Siegen period from 1605 to 1608, but two entries might have been written in Marburg in 1609. This chapter also includes paraphrases of Vives–Carolides.

For a detailed analysis of the chapter's most intriguing verse, a pattern poem dedicated to a certain Petrus Kosminsky (Piotr Kościński) see [Molnár \(2024\)](#), 276–285.

Fifth chapter: Symbola. The chapter assigns brief motto-like symbols to each dedicatee, although the occasion for their composition remains unclear. These symbols may have been intended for album amicorum entries. The majority of these epigrams are succinct sentences. Filiczki composed 29 symbol-poems for ten recipients, concluding with his own symbol in the thirtieth epigram. Recipients include Maurice, Landgrave of Hesse-Kassel (1572–1632), Přech the Elder, and Přech the Younger, Smil, Bohuslav and Adam z Hodejova, along with Georgius Carolides, Philip-Johann Treutler de Krowitz, Paul Kutnaur of Sonnenstein – whose blason is also included – and Jacobus Laurentius Sialandus. Filiczki presents both his own motto and a variation thereof (nos. 149–150), which may serve as an important yet somewhat ambiguous example of his intellectual self-representation. The phrase “*Jesus Fiducia Firma*” in the title possibly refers to his name: Johannes Filiczki de Filefalva.

Sixth chapter: Προσφωνήσεις. The chapter contains eleven laudatory poems that Filiczki intended for the preliminaries of the addressed books. These fall into the subgenre of occasional poem known as *epigramma liminarium*.⁴⁷ They differ from dedications, which are also *liminaria*, in that the sender, rather than the recipient, is named. In a dedication, the sender offers the book as a cultural gift to the recipient. However, in a recommendation, the author seeks out the recipient for the book as a cultural commodity. The boundary between *laudatio* and *exhortatio* becomes blurred, as through the praise of the author and author's book, the reader is encouraged to purchase or at least read the book. Considering their rhetorical devices, because of their exhortative function they seem implicit advertisements. They are not aggressive or forceful but rather discreet advertisements, legitimized by the erudition and eloquent words of the recommender. An excellent example of this kind of poem is *Ad emptorem* by Rudolph Goclenius the Elder (app. 2).

Filiczki's *prosfoneseis* include some that are found in surviving prints, while others cannot be found at all. Some verses were intended for publications unknown to us, while others, though the publication exists, do not contain the poem (as best exemplified by the poem intended for Albert Szenci Molnár's *Psalterium*, no. 172). The latter cases are intriguing because if these poems were excluded despite the publication's release, they would lose their nature of *liminarium* entirely, even if the publisher or author of the forthcoming book did not find a poem suitable to fulfill the function of a threshold poem. Thus, although the poem slips through the cracks of the book-publishing institution, it remains a dedicatory verse. Excluded from the book, the *carmen liminarium* becomes mere praise and loses its “proclamator” role. The various genres

⁴⁷See: [Dam \(2015\)](#).



of occasional poetry demonstrate that its natural medium is orality. The printed version associated with the event merely serves as its stiff imprint or a snapshot of the event (similar to a concert and its recording). However, threshold poems invert this relationship, prioritizing the written word over the medium of orality, and confining the space of the event within the pages of the written or printed work.

Another significant difference from all other occasional genres is that the event associated with threshold poems is not a singular and unrepeatable occurrence, such as marriage, birth, or death – or in this case, the publication of a book – but rather it becomes a process through repeated turning of the pages, reading and browsing through the book. It is the idea of a published book and the gesture of opening individual copies of it that distinguish this subgenre from the other, more general forms of praise.

Another special feature of these threshold poems is that once they are extracted from their original context and published in an edited collection later, such as Filiczki's volume, they immediately lose their threshold and paratextual qualities. Their "threshold status" remains valid only as long as they retain their original position as guest texts around the main text. When a poem assumes a new position in a selected poetry collection, it acquires a new function: instead of serving as a recommendation, it becomes an exemplar of the genre of recommendation. This chapter of Filiczki's volume provides examples of this phenomenon.

The following works for which Filiczki wrote poems:

- 1) A poem for Jodocus Rhodius' 1605 dissertation (inc. *Culmina non tecti, verum fundamina ponit*; no. 159).⁴⁸
- 2) A poem for Georgius Rosinus' disputation (inc. *Extremos multi populos urbesque salutant*; no. 161).⁴⁹
- 3) In 1607, a poem for Albert Szenci Molnár's *Psalterium* (inc. *Felix ille animi, felix et corporis atque*; no. 172).⁵⁰
- 4) A poem for the Polish nobleman Hieronymus Zichlinsky's disputation (inc. *Ergone certa sedet cupidae sententia menti*; no. 162).⁵¹
- 5) A 32-hexameter poem titled *In συζήτησι philosopho-theologicam* for the 1611 theses of the respondent György Szepsi Korocs (inc. *Non tot vel Proteus facies, non Hydra figuras*; no. 168).⁵² Unfortunately, no copies of this booklet are known.
- 6) To Imre Pécseli Király's rhetoric in 1612 (inc. *Si tibi legitima methodo, planaue parare*; no. 160).⁵³
- 7) He greets Johann Georg Gross (1581–1630), a theology professor in Basel, for the 1613 Basel edition of Amandus Polanus' work titled *Collegium anti-Bellarminianum*, in four distichs (inc. *Gratia pro meritis rerum referenda Satori*; no. 173).⁵⁴

⁴⁸Rhodius (1605), [B4^v].

⁴⁹Rosinus (1607), [B4^{r-v}].

⁵⁰Szenci Molnár (1607):(8^v-):(9^r).

⁵¹Zichlinsky (1608), B4^v.

⁵²Szepsi Korocs (1611).

⁵³Pécseli Király (1612):(7^{r-v}).

⁵⁴Polanus (1613).



I could not identify the works of the following addressees:

- 8) Filiczki wrote an epigram in Greek to Johannes-Georgius Rosinus' *In theses oeconomicas* (inc. 'Ο σπουδαῖος ὅτε σπείρει δὲ σπέρμα γεωργός; no. 164), and its Latin translation (inc. *Dum vineta fimo saturat proba cura coloni*; no. 165). So far, I have not found any evidence of this publication.
- 9) Nicolaus Acontius' dispute was likely celebrated in Siegen between September 1607 and 1608 (inc. *Discite, mortales, legum parere magistris*; no. 169). The 27-hexameter poem contains numerous reminiscences of Virgil (*Geor.* 4.154, 4.158, 4.161, 4.178–179; *Aen.* 1.402–403, 1.434–435). The title of the poem suggests that Acontius' thesis collection dealt with ecclesiastical discipline ("*de disciplina ecclesiastica*"). However, his extant 1607 dispute from Siegen deals with a completely different topic: *Disputatio philosophica sexta de iudicio noetico sive axiomatice ut et de praecipuis partibus corporis humani*.
- 10) Filiczki celebrated Johannes Philemon's theses on free will, and the created and uncreated potentiality in 41 hexameters (inc. *Felix, qui potis est rerum cognoscere causas*; no. 163). However, of his two theses defended in Marburg in 1608, neither aligns thematically with Filiczki's verse. One bears the title *Pontificia de controversiarum iudice in religionis negotio*, while the other is titled *De persona Christi*. Related to Filiczki's poem, there might have been a third thesis, of which no copies are currently known.
- 11) I found no information regarding Abraham Geysel's dispute on the light of nature, grace, and glory ("*de lumine naturae, gratiae et gloriae*"), despite Filiczki's praise of it in ten distichs (inc. *Lumine naturae terraeque, polique, salique*; no. 167). It was possibly written between late 1608 and 1610 during his studies in Marburg.

In summary, it is evident from the above that Filiczki primarily composed his *prosphonestis* to his fellow students, indicating his confinement to the school. Excluding Jan Gruter's edition of Cicero⁵⁵ and Pécseli Király's rhetoric, there is currently no evidence of his works serving as paratextual endorsements for more significant literary endeavours.

Seventh chapter: Epithalamia. Perhaps the most common occasional genre is the wedding poem. The examples indicate that for such events, depending on the social status of the marrying parties, numerous separate occasional prints were issued. The verses for the five bridegrooms in chronological order:

1. For the wedding of Ionas Voit on April 24, 1604.⁵⁶
2. For the wedding of Friedrich Schütz in Herborn on September 24, 1605 (inc. *Sponse, dabis veniam nostrae sine syrmate Musae*; no. 179).⁵⁷
3. The wedding of the Livonian nobleman Ernst Nolde and Johann Piscator's daughter Johanna took place in Herborn on November 5, 1605. Filiczki celebrated the couple with a scholarly poem of 106+8 lines (inc. *Divae, progenies Dei, sorores*; no. 176). Filiczki's poem does not

⁵⁵Cicero (1618).

⁵⁶*Sacro nuptiali* (1604). See the chapter on patter poem and the other epithalamia addressed to him: Molnár (2024), 194–204.

⁵⁷*Carmina gratulatoria* (1605).



appear in the epithalamium collection for the wedding published in Herborn.⁵⁸ The poem clearly follows Petrus Lotichius Secundus' epithalamium, composed for his sister's wedding in 1544 (inc. *Sacrae progenies Iovis Camoenae*). Another noteworthy aspect of the poem is its appearance in an occasional print from 1642. It was stolen for the marriage of Adamus Mathias, Count of Trautmannsdorf, and Eva Johanna. The "author" is Venceslaus Sigismundus Falco Pisecenus, who was at that time a counsellor and syndic of Litomyšl. Filiczki's name is not mentioned, although he and Falco may have known each other in Prague from the early 1600s. Falco did not indicate the biblical references and altered lines 53–54 and 88, which originally contained the names of Filiczki's poem.

4. In 36 hexameters, Filiczki celebrated the second marriage of the legal counsel Konrad Rittershausen with Katharina Holtzschuh on June 19, 1609 (inc. *Nigrae ubi Rittershusiadem videre sorores*; no. 177). The poem mixes joy with some melancholy and consolation for the 1607 death of Rittershausen's previous wife.
5. An epithalamium was prepared for the wedding of John II, Count Palatine of Zweibrücken (1584–1635) and Princess Luise Juliane, daughter of the Elector Palatine Frederick IV (1594–1640) on May 14, 1612 (inc. *Iohanni duce nata duci Loysia nubit*; no. 175).

Finally, another poem addressed to Rittershausen in the chapter can be read, which has nothing to do with epithalamia. According to its title, it was sent along with Filiczki's book of poetry to the legal professor in 1605. This can only refer to the 1604 volume titled *Xenia Natalitia*, to which Filiczki wrote a dedicatory paratext endorsing and addressing his own book (inc. *Vis igitur nostrum, Cunrade, videre libellum?*; no. 178).

Eighth chapter: Παράμυθητικά. According to Scaliger, the *paramytheticon* (*consolatio*) is a subgenre of *adhortatio* (exhortation), in the sense that it stimulates the soul to be balanced and tranquil through consolation. This chapter contains five poems, based on their content none of which are consolations. Three of these form a coherent composition, while the remaining two, written in Latin and Greek, are laments of personified Hungary.

The first three poems are addressed to his teacher in Lőcse, Mihály Clementides (nos. 186–188). They belong more to the genre of *votivum*, because they invoke the heavens and direct their pleas to God. They can only be considered consolations insofar as the addressee finds solace in prayer directed to God. The exact dates of these poems are unknown, but they are presumed to have been written in response to the deaths of Clementides' children (probably to the deaths of his three daughters, as he alludes to it in the poem addressed to Clementides in Prague). This also explains the tripartite composition. Notably, the triptych comprises paraphrases/translations of three church hymns.⁵⁹

The other poems in this chapter are *Hungaria*, and its Greek translation (inc. *Quo mea Maiestas? Quo cessit gloria? Quo me*; nos. 189–190). This may be the most well-known or at least the most frequently published poem of Filiczki.⁶⁰ Here, as in the greeting poem to Szenci Molnár's *Psalterium*, we encounter the topos of the "lament of Hungary." It is worth noting

⁵⁸For the analysis of the verse, see: Molnár (2024), 294–296.

⁵⁹For more details, see: Molnár (2024), 298–299.

⁶⁰Schödel (1629), Q3^r; *Respublica* (1634), A2^r; Behamb (1676), 182–183. Expanded version: *Histoire* (1686a), a2^v; *Histoire* (1686b), a2^{r-v}; *Le Royaume de la Hongrie* (1686), a2^v.



that the nine-line poem was expanded with an additional ten lines almost a century later. The author of this propaganda-like extension remains unknown. However, since it does not mention the recapture of Buda in September 1686, it was likely composed just before that event.

Ninth chapter: Funebria. The chapter containing funeral poems features 21 compositions, of which only 11 can be considered genuine epicedia in the original sense. These eleven poems are dedicated to only six individuals. In chronological order:

1. The epicidium for Count John VI of Nassau-Dillenburg (Jan de Oude), written in 1606, was reissued with minor alterations (inc. *Ut vidit Satanas praelustrem heroa Iohannem*; no. 193).⁶¹
2. The poem for Martin Polycarpus, who died in 1607, was also republished (inc. *Dum quam caelipotens extollere destinat urbem*; no. 202).⁶²
3. A four-distich epitaph was written for Bartoloměj Havlík z Varvažova (1552–1609) sometime after his death on July 9, 1609 (inc. *Si vel natales, vel honos, probitasve, fidesve*; no. 203).
4. Two poems were dedicated to Bálint Homonnai Drugeth, who died on November 7, 1609: one in 20 distichs (inc. *Unge, quid assiduis lacrymis; quid tristibus, Ister*; no. 191) and another in three distichs (inc. *Viva Valens Drugeth iacet hic virtutis imago*; no. 192).
5. A collection of five epigrams for Přeč z Hodějova the Elder was reprinted with slight modifications from the 1610 edition (nos. 194–198).⁶³
6. Adam Huber's death on June 23, 1613 was lamented in six distichs (inc. *Optasti multis tibi, vir mitissime, votis*; no. 199).

III.2. Second book of the *Carminum liber*

Paratext. The second book is dedicated not to the offspring of the Hodějova family, but to Georg Rem and Adam Huber. In one of his poems, Filiczki addresses the reader (inc. *Haec prius observes, legis hunc quicumque libellum*; no. 212), while in another, he addresses his book, specifically the second part of his book (inc. *Uni gratus et alteri sodali*; no. 213). In his poem to the reader, Filiczki encourages a critical reading, not just of his own book but of all books. He advises separating evil deeds from morality, as one would separate vinegar from saturated salt. Those who support the good must restrain the evil, and those who praise everything also approve of the disgraceful. He cautions his book against overconfidence. What does it matter if friends praise you? Such glory is fleeting. A hundred bloodthirsty critics are waiting to pounce on every small mistake. It would be better to continue refining these verses.

Poems. The *Carminum liber* is clearly modelled after Georgius Carolides' *Farrago*.⁶⁴ The second book is a *silvarium*. No organizational principles can be discerned within it. It appears as if everything found around the house had been thrown into a basket. Upon closer inspection,

⁶¹*Luctus* (1607).

⁶²*Epicedia* (1607).

⁶³*In obitum* (1610).

⁶⁴Carolides (1597).



a noticeable amount of clutter remained in the collection, resembling typical school tasks. A significant portion of the poems could easily have been included in the first volume as well. The verses of the two volumes are not separated by chronology. Occasional poems addressed to specific individuals could also have found their place in the thematically appropriate chapters of the first volume. The remaining poems are school tasks and/or *sententiae*, following the pattern of the aforementioned Vives–Carolides poems. The question arises not only why Filiczki divided his volume into two books, but also why Pareus omitted this second book from the edition of *Delitiae*.⁶⁵ Did he consider the quality to be insufficient? It is possible that Filiczki himself regarded these 143 poems mere remnants and therefore he titled them *Miscella epigrammata*, a common designation in *silva* poetry. In the following sections, I will discuss the poems that I find particularly interesting. I divide the description of the second book of the volume into three subsections. In the first part, I summarize the poems whose addressees are known. In the second part, I focus on sentences and mottoes, while in the third part, I deal with the remaining school exercises.

1. Occasional poems omitted from the first book

The most tangible are the verses that Filiczki wrote for various individuals on different occasions, including persons whose names we have already encountered among the addressees of the verses in the first book, and there are also some whose identities are not yet known to us (in presumed chronological order):

- 1) His 11 distichs written to his fellow countryman, György Thúri (p. 104–105) are based on the following theme: similar attracts similar (inc. *Formicae formica placet, querulaeque cicadae est*; no. 251). The verse elaborates on a saying known from Erasmus (adagium no. 124): “*Cicada cicadae cara, formica formicae*”, meaning that cicadas are dear to cicadas, and ants to ants. Filiczki alters the text to emphasize that the hoarse, querulous song of the cicadas is dear to the other complaining cicadas. Hardly any creature in the world exists that does not desire a companion. Thus, it is not surprising that humans, possessing divine reason, also long for the intellectual companionship of one another. Can it be criticized if the learned favour the learned, and poets delight in poets? Indeed, he does not deserve the respect of Thúri, whether from the perspective of a scholar or a poet, because Filiczki is merely the bran and chaff (*furfur acusque*) of vesifying millstone (*versifica mola*). This poem is evidence of Filiczki’s affection for Thúri. The tiny seedling soars into the air, its branches stretching across the entire field. The expression *foedus amicitiae* in line 11 is found not only in Ovid (*Trist.* 3.6.1), in Catullus (109.6), but also in Statius (*Silvae* 4.6.9). Line 16 is a borrowing from Stigel’s verse: “*Quos tibi virtutis nomine iunxit amor.*” Line 19 alludes to Lucretius (*De rer. nat.* 6.819), and line 21 to Virgil (*Ecl.* 5.37). According to the title, Thúri was already a poet laureate, thus Filiczki might have written his poem after 1600.
- 2) The poem addressed to Tamás Szeli may be of particular importance, as it contains information previously unknown (inc. *En Thoma, rutilum Tarczalii decus*; no. 280). From the very first line, it becomes clear that Tamás Szeli, described as the “shining ornament of the pulpit of Tarcal,” was likely serving as a pastor in Tarcal at the time of the poem’s composition. We must also ask what Filiczki means when he refers to himself as Szeli’s

⁶⁵ *Delitiae* (1619), 465–530.



- disciple. It is probable that he refers to himself only as a young poet paying homage to the priest, who had already travelled abroad. He begs that Szeli accept the barren produce and weeds (*lolium*) of his poorly endowed student's talent.
- 3) The 14-distich laudation addressed to Elias K  chler was clearly written in G  rlitz between March and July 1603, because Filiczki calls himself K  chler's disciple (inc. *Accipe, culte Poeta, morae solamina nostrae*; no. 252).
 - 4) The poem addressed to the younger Johann Kraus consists of eight Sapphic stanzas (inc. *Quid bono dignum patre, quidve Musis*). Its final lines probably allude to the death of M  ty  s Bobrowicz's children: "*Dulcis, an Bobrovicius fruatur aetheris aura?*" If this is the case, Filiczki might have written the poem around the time of the publication of the book of mourning edited by Kraus, sometime between August 1603 and early 1604. Filiczki offers Kraus practical advice for life.
 - 5) The poem addressed to Thomas Literatus de Kisfalva was written in the imperial city during Filiczki's time in Prague, sometime between 1603 and the summer of 1605 (inc. *Carmine Caesarea te Ianus ab urbe saluto*; no. 215). I have not been able to ascertain the identity of the addressee. The poem suggests that Thomas Literatus was a compatriot, neighbour, or even relative (*affinia vincula*) of Filiczki. Filiczki writes home to console Thomas, possibly because his poverty prevented him from continuing his studies despite his talents. Just as a small ditch cannot restrain the sea, a small book cannot remind him of all the glories of the homeland. But the time will come when the heavens will provide assistance with their swelling sails.
 - 6) The poem titled *De Polycarpo* addressed to Adam Huber also appears to be a school exercise, a wine poem playing with the meanings of Greek words (inc. *Mirarerque phrenesim effrenem, aususque nefandos*; no. 319). It was likely written in Prague between 1603 and the summer of 1605.
 - 7) The poem addressed to Johannes Bocatius is a New Year's greeting, a *strena*, from 1604 (inc. *Si graviora sinunt strenis dare tempora nostris*; no. 217). It is unclear exactly when it was written. Although it does not appear in the 1604 volume of *Xenia*,⁶⁶ the contents of the poem suggest that Filiczki may have given *Xenia* to Bocatius as a gift together with the poem. If not at the end of 1604, then perhaps the poem was composed during their meeting in Prague in February–March when Bocatius inscribed Filiczki's album amicorum. Upon closer examination of the text of the poem, we can discern a somewhat apologetic *ars poetica* of the *Xenia* volume, which further supports the hypothesis that he sent or presented the collection together with the poem.
 - 8) The epigram addressed to Elias Acontius and its Greek translation resemble entries in an album amicorum. It elaborates on a saying known from Erasmus ("*Similes habent labra lactucas*," Adagium no. 971) in Greek and then in Latin within four distichs. The poem might have been written during Filiczki's time in Herborn/Siegen between June 1605 and August 1607.
 - 9) The poem addressed to Georg Rem can also be read as an appendix to the preface (inc. *Ah quid, amice, vigil potor Permessidos undae*; no. 216). Filiczki refers to Rem as his friend and the vigilant drinker of the Muse's nectar, immediately posing the question of why the

⁶⁶Filiczki (1604).



discordant strings of the raucous lyre do not disturb him. Filiczki admits that he lacks the poetic vein of inspired poets, and finds no favour with any of the Graces. He emerged from the perilous land of Pannonia, where Mars and the dreadful Eris embroiled everything. Whenever he strives to reach the sacred peak of poetry, the chorus of Phoebus casts him down from Helicon. Rem, however, still asks him for poems polished with much art. How is he able to compete with the wit and charm of John Owen? Perhaps Rem is the one who alone perceives a tiny drop as a mighty river. The poem concludes with the analogy that if the stomach – that is, the reader – values acorn flour more than finely ground wheat flour, then his millstones will grind it together with the rough bran.

- 10) Filiczki paraphrases the proverb “In wine, there is truth” for the younger Elias Rosinus in three distichs (inc. *Pocla meri mane et sero cur siccet ad imum*; no. 259).
- 11) He dedicates two wine poems to Johannes Minor of Késmárk (Kežmarok, SK), whom he calls his sweetest compatriot (*suavissimus popularis*). One is a single distich (inc. *Si virtus calicum medio consistit Achilles*; no. 285), while the other, a four-distich poem, jests about the truth of “*in vino veritas*” mentioning beer (inc. *Desine mirari, medias quod largiter urnas*; no. 286).
- 12) Among these, the panegyric for Maurice, Landgrave of Hesse-Kassel, is a little bit different because it is addressed not to the count himself but to a “friend” (inc. *Vis tibi describat Chattum mea Musa Dynastam?*; no. 214). Filiczki might have written it during his time in Marburg, between October 1608 and 1610.

2. Sentences

Most of the maxims collected here are paraphrases of Carolides’ paraphrases of Vives’s sentences. The best example of this is the poem entitled *Hemerobia vana gloria* and its two Greek translations (nos. 222–224). For some reason, Filiczki published these in the second book, while another version of the same paraphrase appears in the first book under a different title (nos. 208–209). The model for these was Carolides,⁶⁷ who versified Vives.⁶⁸ Including these, Filiczki elaborated on the same Vives’ *sententia* in five variations. The topos can be traced back to Aristotle. The concept of ephemeral creatures (ἐφήμερον ζῷον), i.e. day-flies, is discussed in several places (*De mundo* 392b35–393a8; *Historia animalium* 490a32–490b3). These “worms” (*vermes*) hatch and live their one-day lives near the Hypanis River, known today as the Southern Bug, which flows into the Black Sea in present-day Ukraine.

The theme of vain glory is also dealt with in the maxim entitled “*Gloria crocodilus*,” of which Filiczki provides a Greek translation as well (nos. 249–250). The crocodile is just like glory: if pursued, it runs away; if ignored, it will be found.

The theme of inexhaustible glory is explored in Filiczki’s epigram *Virtue Earns Glory* and its Greek translation (nos. 277–278), which corresponds to Erasmus’ adagium no. 3771. Filiczki emphasizes that virtue needs not praise itself; action speaks louder than words. Just as light needs to appear, so does stench too. Although living fame is born of deeds rather than words, only a combination of the two will bring eternal fame. This renown is reminiscent of Ovid’s

⁶⁷Carolides (1597), B3^v.

⁶⁸Vives (1599–1600), F4^v.



everlasting fame (*Amores* 1.10.62), as it frequently appears in Filiczki's poems: "*fama perennis erit.*"

Filiczki's Latin and Greek epigrams addressed to the glory-seeker (inc. *Omnis amat laudes, sed factis vix parat unus*; nos. 282–283) are also paraphrases of a Carolides' paraphrase. According to Filiczki, everyone loves praise, but instead of actions, this praise is often nourished by the jingling of small change. Midas, too, buys praise with gold. If fame does not shine from pure virtue, then virtue glittering with gold remains.

The motto "*Labor omnia vincit*" from Virgil's *Georgics* (1.145) is skillfully woven into three Sapphic stanzas (no. 225). The title of the poem is "*Labor omnia vincit improbus.*" The model was likely again Vives and Carolides.⁶⁹

Filiczki's adaptation of the saying "*Nos poma natamus*" about those who place themselves on a higher shelf without merit is one of the few vulgar ones (no. 238). The saying originates from medieval times, not antiquity. It can be found in Georg Henisch, Luther, and even Kant.⁷⁰ In his poem, Filiczki plays with the noun "*Scrapta*".⁷¹

His Latin and Greek epigram about the brevity of life and wasting time (no. 239) is also a Vives–Carolides paraphrase (inc. *Quod nusquam mercere, cave male perdere tempus*; no. 239).⁷² Filiczki writes about the precious nature of time, emphasizing the importance of exercising caution and restraint in its utilisation, because, once expended, it cannot be repurchased. Therefore, do good and enduring things to last you a long time.

The saying "Do not mock the afflicted!" is a paraphrase of Carolides' version from *Disticha Catonis* and its Greek translation (inc. *Sorte vides quoties pressos, illudere noli*; nos. 256–257).⁷³ Filiczki writes about people who are struck by fate. He advises not to mock them or exacerbate their troubles with laughter. We all navigate the ever-changing tides of Fortune; therefore, Filiczki urges us not to ridicule those whom fate afflicts, as what hurts one today may hurt the other tomorrow.

The next saying is a paraphrase of Carolides' adaptation⁷⁴ of a Seneca quote (inc. *Cur semper stultos manet ultrix poena; fluentis*; nos. 262–263): "*Inter cetera mala hoc quoque habet stultitia: semper incipit vivere*" (*Epistulae morales ad Lucilium* 13.16.3–4 [13.19]). Fools always plan but never act. Instead of living, they only plan their lives.

3. Miscellanea epigrams

This chapter is the most challenging to grasp in an exact manner because it is difficult to find a thematic, genre-specific, or any other solid anchor. Epigrams, just as the title promises in the second book, and nothing more. Below is my selection of verses more tangible for me and perhaps for today's reader as well. I categorize the poems into thematic sub-chapters:

⁶⁹Vives (1599–1600), [F7^r]; Carolides (1597), B5^r; cf. Pliny, *Nat. hist.* 11.108–110.

⁷⁰DWb, Bd. 15, Sp. 2643: <https://www.woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB?lemid=S22451> (14 June 2024).

⁷¹The forms "*scratta*" and "*scratia*" are also known. See: Molnár (2024), 321.

⁷²Vives (1599–1600), F4^r – v.

⁷³Carolides (1597), [F7^r].

⁷⁴Carolides (1597), F3^v.



3.1. Catholic Mockeries

Obscene, erotic satires

Among the Catholic and papal mockeries, I focus only on those that are thematically well-defined, which, with their playfulness and at times outspokenness, can be enjoyed by today's reader. The best introductory example is the epigram about a monk who castrates himself (inc. *Audierat nocturna salax post bella Lupercus*; no. 305). Géza Szentmártoni Szabó's study⁷⁵ proved that Filiczki not only knew but also utilized the epigram attributed to Janus Pannonius about the autocastrated abbot of Szekszárd (inc. *Testibus exectis duo grandia dona Tonanti*).⁷⁶ Thus, in this case too, we read a (pseudo-)Janus verse paraphrased in Martial's style, in which Filiczki invokes the fictitious character Lupercus, appearing in numerous verses of Martial, continuing the tradition of mockery.

Filiczki is greatly interested in the theme of castration, so he tackles it in another poem (inc. *Zelotypus rasum deprendens Haido sodalem*; no. 335). The poem in question bears resemblance to the aforementioned in a number of ways. The fictional character Gallus, who also appears in Martial, is present in Filiczki's poem too. This character subtly but clearly links the two poems. Moreover, in his poem on Lupercus, Filiczki even makes reference to the Janus poem. The poem carries on with the joke of Janus, which imitates one of Martial's epigrams (3.81). Martial mocks a gallus (γάλλος) named Baeticus, who castrated himself as a priest of the Cybele cult. The punchline of Martial's poem is that Baeticus should cut off his head as well, since he is just as busy with his mouth in women's laps. Janus' abbot of Szekszárd offers his severed testicles as a sacrifice, which the gods reject with loud laughter. Echoing from Jupiter's mouth is the Martial reminiscence, which suggests not the head but the mind (*mens*) of the abbot should be castrated. For such a fool has a sick mind that needs "surgery" (*"mentem castrare necesse est"*), just like the minds of mad *galli* drinking from the Gallus river (Ovid, *Fasti* 4.221–246, 361–366). Jupiter would rather give the offering of the severed testicle to the wolves (*lupis*). Filiczki strengthens the joke by having not Jupiter but the personified Pudor, or Pudicitia, the goddess of modesty, who screams at the sight of the offering suitable for the obscene dog (*obsceno cane*). In line 11, Filiczki uses the word "*eruo*" instead of "*castro*" when he writes about tearing out sins from the heart; instead of "*castrare mentem*," he uses "*eruere corde*," meaning to uproot them from his diseased soul. And here again, another parallel with Martial can be found (3.92):

Ut patiar moechum, rogat uxor, Galle, sed unum.
Huic ego non oculos eruo, Galle, duos?

In this epigram, we learn from a husband addressing a *gallus* named Gallus, that he was requested by his adulterous wife to tolerate a lover, who was evidently a priest of Cybele. The husband's sharp response is directed to Gallus, asking if he should then gouge out both his eyeballs. The question remains open, because if the husband truly means a priest of Cybele, then only his eyeball should be gouged; however, if he alludes to a lover named Gallus, who is not a priest, then the word "*oculus*" can also refer metaphorically to Gallus' testicles, and the speaking name Gallus suggests future mutilation.

⁷⁵Szentmártoni Szabó (2010), 162–165. For the 16th-century reception of the Janus verse, see also: Szentmártoni Szabó (2020).

⁷⁶Janus Pannonius (2006), 262 (no. 456).



But let us return to the verse. A jealous hajduk (Haido) caught a shaved friend (*sodalis*), who was secretly but very diligently plowing the neighbour's field, metaphorically referring to his sexual activity. The *sodalis* could also refer to a monk, as affirmed by the reference to his tonsure. The agronomic analogy bothers the hajduk because the image of the plow penetrating the earth alludes to the sexual act. This is a reference to Plautus (*Asinaria* 873–874), where one character complains that while the man plows another's land, he leaves his own family land fallow: „*Ille opere foris faciendo lassus noctu ad me advenit. Fundum alienum arat, incultum familiarem deserit.*” The friend's name in the poem is *Leno*, another speaking name: ‘pimp,’ likely inspired by Plautus' comedies, where this expression frequently appears.

In another poem about a monk and a peasant besieged by the Turks, we find no mention of testicles, only a lecherous monk, who is also named *Lupercus*, just like the self-castrating monk in the other poem (inc. *Cum netrice, coqua, sociis absentibus aedes*; no. 324).

Another verse about the licentious behaviour of ecclesiastical figures features a priest named Augustus (meaning august or venerable) and a nun (inc. *Augustus cupiens angustam tangere portam*; no. 270). The priest's name rhymes with *angustus*, immediately introducing a playful tone to the quite frivolous verse. Filiczki constructs his satire on Catholicism from the New Testament (Matthew 7:14), a well-known motto of Albert Szenci Molnár: “Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.” The Latin Vulgate version is essential due to its wordplay: “*Quam angusta porta, et arcta via est, quae ducit ad vitam, et pauci sunt qui inveniunt eam!*” The poem's punchline is that although our priest chose the strait gate and narrow way (of the nun), it did not lead him to life but rather to the broad path of death and decay.

But let us not stop here! Who would not think of Janus Pannonius' poems about the “spacious” Ursula⁷⁷ and their models, Martial's poems (11.21) about Lydia (inc. *Lydia tam laxa est, equitis quam culus aheni*)? Although these lack moral teaching, the broad path leads to the underworld, to death. As Janus – albeit without any eschatological undertones – states in his poem: “*Desine iam miseros Erebo deducere manes: amplius hic barathrum, Pliade nate, patet.*”⁷⁸ In Filiczki's poem, the phrase “*tangere portam*” recalls the expression “*tangere feminam*,” which signifies (among other things) the violation of a woman. The image of a warm bath and spring referring to the female groin needs no explanation. However, in the phrase “*in penitissimo*,” *penitus* can mean ‘penis,’ and although we must prefer the ‘inner’ or ‘deep within’ meaning due to the metre (*pēnītus* vs. *pēnītus*), we should not exclude the possibility that our poet deliberately played with the connotations of the word. The phrase “*nox atra caput*” in the fifth line recalls a line from Virgil (*Aen.* 6.866).

3.2. Ridicule of human characters

These short poems generally mock human weaknesses and characters with varying degrees of moralizing overtones: gluttony, drunkenness, lust, and corruption. The following subsections do not sharply distinguish between the examples, and the thematic classification of some is uncertain.

⁷⁷Janus Pannonius (2006), 144–147 (no. 195–198).

⁷⁸Janus Pannonius (2006), 146.



On the slaves of sensuality

This section aims to collate poems that criticize the excesses that arise from the unrestrained desires of the lower regions of the soul. This section could be designated as an examination of the deficiencies inherent to the inferior regions of the soul. Filiczki never mocks single lapses; he only holds a mirror to those character flaws that recur repeatedly. These poems mainly target gluttony and drunkenness, though lust also makes occasional appearances.

Prankish lambs

Two verses are dedicated to a butting lamb (p. 135–136). Without the erotic undertone the poem would be incomprehensible. The young man, driven by his youthful desires, follows a prostitute (*lupa*: she-wolf), which is just like entrusting a lamb to a wolf (inc. *Agne, lupam sequeris? Hosti te credere gestis?*; no. 338). The intended erotic ambiguity of the verse culminates in the second line. The poet warns the lamb that the wolf/prostitute will not guard the entrusted deposit (*depositum*) but will instead devour it. The verb “*depono*” reinforces the idea that the lamb, as a deposit, is laid down or placed under the wolf/prostitute.

The second poem about the lamb further reinforces this interpretation (inc. *Degener Agne, eheu quae te dementia cepit?*; no. 339). Here, the poet scolds the degenerate lamb, which has been seized by madness. Although Filiczki uses the word “*dementia*,” it clearly evokes the “*furor eroticus*.” The image of the mad lamb undoubtedly recalls one of Virgil’s eclogues (2.69): “*Corydon, Corydon, quae te dementia cepit?*”⁷⁹ With this, the lamb digs a grave for both itself and its father. While Christ’s death rescued us from the jaws of the wolf, this degenerate lamb now rushes into the arms of the she-wolf in her den. Filiczki’s use of the expression “*petis amplexus*” alludes to Ovid (*Epist.* 14.69). Since “*lustrum*” also means a brothel, it can be read as the lamb hastening into the prostitute’s embrace in the brothel. Thus, despite Christ’s act of dispelling the darkness with his saving light, the lamb flees from it and prefers the gloom of night.

On Melanthius

The name Melanthius, associated with a drunken and gluttonous character, does not refer to Melanthios from the *Odyssey* (see especially in Book 22). Filiczki’s persona appears in three poems as the Knight of Perbibesia and Peredia. Perbibesia (Drinkland) is a fictitious region – described by Filiczki as an island – known from Plautus’ *Curculio* (line 444). The title of the poem refers to a proverb: “*Hectorem imitaris, ab Ilio nunquam recedis*” (inc. *Iam satis est, capio, magnum te, credo, Melanthi!*; no. 219). In English: ‘To Melanthius, Knight of Drinkland: You imitate Hector, you never retreat from Troy.’ According to the poem, Melanthius is a valiant hero akin to Hector, at least in his extensive offerings of wine on the altars of the Trojan gods. Like Hector’s, his renown should also spread across the entire globe.

Another poem also focuses on the drunken Melanthius, consisting of five distichs (inc. *Scintillans auro, rides mea trita, Melanthi*; no. 255). In the third poem (inc. *Est quod nemo tibi obvius libenter*; no. 298), he is referred to not only as the Knight of Drinkland but also of Eatland (*Peredia*). It is found in the same line 444 of Plautus’ *Curculio*. This 22-line poem is more free-tongued than the others. The presumably inebriated Melanthius boasts to everyone

⁷⁹The expression appears frequently in Virgil: *Ecl.* 6.47, *Aen.* 5.465, *Georg.* 4.488.



he encounters about his titles and deeds. The Gaul is not struck as much by the plague (likely an allusion to syphilis), nor the bear by the deep wound of the sword, as much as these unfortunate ones are afflicted by Melanthius' drunken bragging. Melanthius spares no one with his titles, whether they are sitting, standing, rushing, drinking, urinating, or shitting (*meienti titulum et crepas cacanti*). In the baths, one cannot wash due to him; in the temples, one cannot pray because of him. If someone is heading to see the king, he delays him with his words; if someone is about to have lunch, his words interrupt him; if someone is asleep, he wakes him from his dream.

On Typhus

Filiczki wrote four poems about a fictional figure named Typhus; his name (*typhus*, *τύφος*) may refer to his self-importance and foolishness (nos. 226–228, 303). Typhus does not disdain alcohol or plentiful food. Filiczki again refers to Plautus with wordplays and creates fictional geographical place names from the Greek word *λεκάνη* and the Greek–Latin word *crapula* (from *κραίπαλη* as 'drinking-bout'): he names Typhus lord of Lecania and satrap of Crapulia (*In Typhum, dominum Lecaniae et satrapam Crapuliae*; no. 226). Filiczki took the fictional names from the satirical dystopia of Joseph Hall (1574–1656),⁸⁰ which had several editions published between 1605 and 1608 in Germany. Joseph Hall devotes an entire chapter to Crapulia. He writes the following about it: "Crapulia is an extended, splendid region. Its boundaries are formed from the north by the Ethiopian Ocean [the southern part of the Atlantic Ocean], from the east by Locania and Viraginia, from the south by Blessed Moronia, and from the west by the swamp of Tryphonia." (According to the map in the book, this area would be in Antarctica.) He also writes that he got his name from his vineyards, which also refers to headaches and dizziness due to drunkenness. He has two provinces: Pamphagonia (*Terra Gulonum*) and Yuronia (*Terra Ebriosa*); the former is named after gluttons, and the latter after drunkards.⁸¹

The verses therefore aim at Typhus' drunkenness, through which he loses his supposed grandeur. One cannot be both a great man (*magnus*) and a buffoon (*sannio*) at the same time. The third Typhus poem (inc. *Hesternas ructare dapes, ructare Lyaeum*; no. 228) is once again a paraphrase of a Martial epigram (1.28).

In the fourth verse about Typhus, he is referred to as a procurator of the gods (inc. *Si suo in effectu lucet praestantia causae*; no. 303). Filiczki develops his mocking epigram from the meanings of the word "*causa*" and the cosmogonic doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo*. If the greatness of the cause shines forth in its effect, then Typhus could not have been born of man, but only of God. Of the God which created the entire world out of nothing. In this, Typhus resembles God, as he also creates a thousand troublesome cases out of nothing.

On Ballio and other figures from Hall's dystopia

The figure Ballio in Filiczki's work refers to the main character, a pimp of Plautus' comedy, the *Pseudolus*. Our poet portrays him in two poems as a vain, boastful, and conceited character, albeit one that is comedic in nature. In one poem, Filiczki calls Ballio "*Cagastrius*" (inc. *Defendis*

⁸⁰See: Maczelka (2019), 161–195.

⁸¹Hall (1607), 19.



belle, tollis mala iurgia belle; no. 248). In Hall's work, Cagastrius is the ruler of Crapulia. In the margin, Hall connects this to Paracelsus' concept of "*cagastrium*", which contrasts with the "*iliastrum*." Paracelsus associates the latter with a spiritual lifestyle and the former with an animalistic one. Additionally, Hall derives "*cagastrium*" from the Greek κακή γάστρις, meaning 'evil glutton.' Therefore, Filiczki blends the pimp character of Plautus' comedy with the animalistic ruler in Hall's dystopia.

The title of the other poem is *Ad Ballionis Asoti, Cagastri, Glossaspida* (inc. *Audio, quid germane crepes Glossaspis Asoti*; no. 276). Here, "*cagastrium*" appears again, and the name "Ballio Asotius" also refers to Hall's dystopia, where the promontory named Azotium is located east of the city of Cubaea.⁸² Hall possibly derived the geographic name from the Greek ἄσωτος, which means 'abandoned,' 'profligate.' The term "*Glossaspis*" is not used by Hall, perhaps it is Filiczki's invention, derived from the Greek words γλῶσσα and ἄσπις, meaning 'snake-tongued.' The poem lists various attributes of Ballio and affirms what the protagonist claims about himself. For example: "*Nec gladios horret Ballio: fortis homo est!*" (Ballio does not shrink even from swords: he is a brave man!) And so on: "*cautus homo est,*" "*dulcis homo est,*" "*pulcer homo est.*" However, at the end of the poem, it contradicts these assertions with a Czech sentence: „*Z tiech je nic co pravý*", implying that nothing Ballio says is true (the Latin translation of the Czech sentence is provided in Filiczki's footnote).

There are five other poems that caricature gluttony, operating with personifications and puns. These also feature Joseph Hall's geographical names: the poem titled *Ad Phagonem de Sauffenberga et Cubea* concerns the gluttonous Phagus (Big Eater) (inc. *Da veniam, fateor, lapsa est mea lingua canendo*; no. 279). According to Hall, *Souffenberga* is a metropolis of *Yuronia* province, while *Cubaea* is the eight-cornered city of *Fatua Moronia*. Hall informs us that this is the land of wasteful fools.⁸³ In the four distichs of *Ad Philautum de Koczunga, haeredem Narragoniae et Devoraci*, we find not only Hall's two place names but also the Fool's Paradise from Sebastian Brant's *Stultifera navis* (inc. *Quod te diripiunt opibus, quod honore potentes*; no. 281). *Kotzunga* (*Kotzanga* on the map) is a village in *Yuronia* province, which, according to the author is the epitome of ugliness and smells. The name of the village derives from the German word "*kotzen*," meaning 'vomito', that is, vomit.⁸⁴ *Devoracum* is a settlement in *Lecanica*, a region of *Pamphagonia* province.⁸⁵ Similarly, the four-line *In Sauffellum de Gulonia* likely refers again to Hall's *Terra Gulonum*, or *Pamphagonia* (inc. *Inclita facta tace maiorum, stulte, tuorum!*; no. 310). Then, Filiczki wrote two versions under the title *Ad Chrysophum Glossogastora* (inc. *Iure tibi iurisconsulti affingis honores*; inc. *Ius scriptum sequitur iurisconsultus et aequum*; nos. 311–312).

On Postumus

Filiczki dedicated seven poems to the character Postumus, who is slanderous, deceitful, fickle, flattering, hypocritical, and greedy. One moment he preaches Christ's teachings and suddenly turns his back on Christ, following those who haggle with faith, and rob purses. He blows both

⁸²Hall (1607), 161–162. See the map: p. 18.

⁸³Hall (1607), 67–76, 161. See Cubaea on the map of Fatua Moronia: 18.

⁸⁴Hall (1607), 82, 217. See Kotzunga on the map: 112.

⁸⁵On map: Hall (1607), 112.



hot and cold from his mouth simultaneously (inc. *Qui delator es et calumniator*; no. 265). Two further verses are dedicated to Postumus (nos. 266–267), which use Erasmus' 594. adagium: "*In tuum ipsius sinum inspuere*" (Spit into your own bosom!). Postumus has disgusted so many people already; it is time for him to soil his own nest, already rendered ugly with a thousand disgraces. Postumus' home is like a nest of a hoopoe. The fourth poem uses a word creation from Aristophanes' comedy *The Frogs* (line 49): *Ad κομποφακελορρήμωνα* (For those who speak grandiose words in heaps). This poem was also prepared for scholarly and learned purposes; each line is assigned to different authors and provides the source from which it was taken (inc. *Quod causas tractat suadaque leporeque nullo*; no. 317). The remaining three verses, dealing with the Levitical tribe, operate with Greek and Latin wordplays, calling Postumus "*Oenotrian*" (nos. 220, 260–261).

On Halophanta

Filiczki dedicates three verses to a character with the speaking name "*Alabandaeus Halophanta*," who is a cunning flatterer seeking profit through mendacity. The name "*Alabandaeus*" refers to the city of Alabanda in Caria, known for extravagance and excess, as mentioned by Strabo (*Geographika* 14.2.26), who noted its abundance of harlots. The name *Halophanta* echoes again Plautus' *Curculio* (line 463), where the form "*halapanta*" appears. The comedy writer coined the Greek term ἀλοφάντης based on the model of συκοφάντης (slanderer, swindler), and then Latinized it. The first verse addresses Philautus (Lover of Himself), a character in Erasmus' *Colloquium puerpera* (inc. *Desine verba bonis dare, desine ludere puros*; no. 233). The remaining two poems use wordplay in Latin and Greek within four lines, based on the interchange of κόραξ (raven) and κόλαξ (flatterer) (inc. *Ῥῶ καὶ λάμβδα μόνον κόρακας, κόλακαςτε διίστᾱ*; inc. *Rho lambdaque uno κόρακες, κόλακεςque dirempti*). Filiczki implies that a single letter separates the raven from the sycophant, cautioning against following deceitful flatterers lest we end up nourishing the beaks of ravens on gallows.

In a 27-line dialogue (inc. *Graecule, ridebas, Graiis quod nuper Athenis*; no. 254), Filiczki criticizes a character named Graecula (the little Greek) possibly mocking those who imitate Athenians. He scolds a similar character in the poem titled *Ad Polypum* (inc. *Nobilis in patria, patria testante, fuisti*; no. 264), where the Polyp is a speaking name again and symbolizes voracity, licentiousness, and pretence simultaneously.

On human frailties beyond sensuality

In this subsection, I have gathered the poems where Filiczki targets the "higher-quality" human frailties: avarice, calculating flattery, or simply foolishness. Nine poems fall into the category of official corruption and stupidity, focusing on individuals who abuse their power in official positions (nos. 221, 231, 247, 258, 287, 288, 297, 299, 308). In these poems, Filiczki employs wordplay and speaking names.

The appellation of the character in the five-distich poem *In Dosonem numibasium* is derived from the epithet of Antigonus III, the Macedonian king known from Plutarch (*Coriolanus* 11.3.1–4.1): Δῶσων. The Greek word refers to someone who always makes promises to give but never fulfils them. The term *numibasium* (*nummibasium*) is defined as "miser," thus the title with the speaking name may be translated as "the ever-promising miser." Filiczki warns Doson in the poem to consider his promises carefully and account for their credibility. The thought in line 9, "*Mente prius versa*," according to Filiczki's footnote refers to Stobaeus: "Stob. I. de Mor."



Four of his epigrams criticize people – likely from the university environment where these poems might have been written – who do not wear their own nation's clothes but transform into Italians at dawn, Germans by morning, and French by evening, or put on Spanish military boots (*caliga*) (nos. 322–323, 337). Do they perhaps feel ashamed of their own country? Or is he targeting fashion enthusiasts and their trendy attire? Or those who have nothing and disguise this through their clothing choices?

IV. SUMMARY

Despite their appearance together in the 1619 volume of *Delitiae*, we have not discovered a new Janus Pannonius in Filiczki. Nevertheless, Filiczki is an important and, in many ways, typical intellectual figure of his era. Filiczki might be considered a second-tier poet who was at the forefront of the literary scene of his time. Among the early 17th-century intellectual elite, particularly in Central Europe, he was the most esteemed living poet from Hungary. Among the Hungarian authors published by Pareus in the *Delitiae* volume, Janus Pannonius was already a historical figure at that time; Johann Sommer, born in Pirna, was not actually Hungarian, and György Thüri's poetic oeuvre was much smaller than Filiczki's.

REFERENCES

- Behamb, J. F. (1676). *Notitia Hungariae Antiquo-Modernae Berneggeriana* [...]. Dolhopffius, Strasbourg.
- Bencédy, J. (1946). *Filiczky János élete és költészete*. Dissertation in manuscript. Library of the Institute for Literary Studies, Archive, 7–2. fond. [1946].
- Bod, P. (1766). *Magyar Athenas* [...]. S. n., Nagyszeben.
- Carmina gratulatoria amicorum in nuptias ornatissimi doctrina et virtute iuvenis, Friderici Schutzii Freybergensis* [...]. Ex officina Christophori Corvini, Herborn ([1605]).
- Carolides a Carlsperga, G. (1597). *Farrago symbolica sententiosa* [...]. Typis M. Danielis Adami, Pragae.
- Cicero, M. T. (1618). *Opera omnia quae exstant* [...], ed. J. Gulielmus and J. Gruter. Ex bibliopoli Frobeniano, Hamburg.
- Czittinger, D. (1711). *Specimen Hungariae literatae* [...]. J. G. Kohlesius, Francofurti.
- Dam, H.-J. van (2015). Poems on the Threshold: Neo-Latin carmina liminaria. In: *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Monasteriensis Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies (Münster 2012)*, ed. A. Steiner-Weber, K. A. E. Enenkel et al. Brill, Leiden–Boston: Brill, 50–81.
- Delitiae poetarum Hungaricorum. Nunc primum in hac Germania exhibitae a Ioh. Philippo Pareo*. Impensis Haeredum Iacobi Fischeri, Excudebat Nicolaus Hoffman, Francofurti, 1619.
- Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm*, digitalisierte Fassung im Wörterbuchnetz des Trier Center for Digital Humanities, Version 01/21 (<https://www.woerterbuchnetz.de/DWB>) (06.14.2024.).
- Dienes, D. and Ugrai, J. (2013). *A Sárospataki Református Kollégium története*. Hernád Kiadó, Sárospatak.
- Epicedia in praematurum obitum D. M. Martini Polycarpi Regino-Hradecensis Bohemi* [...] (1607). Apud Conradum Waldkirch, Basel.
- Filiczki, J. (1604). *Xenia Natalitia* [...]. Typis Schumanianis, Pragae.



- Filiczki de Filefalva, J. (1614). *Carminum liber primus; Carminum liber secundus, sive miscella epigrammata*. Typis Johannis Schroeteri, Basileae.
- Filiczki de Filefalva, J. (2023). *Carmina Quae Exstant Omnia*, ed., introduxit et commentariis instruxit D. Molnár. Reciti, Budapest.
- Frimmová, E. (2020). Filicki de Filefalva, Ioannes. In: *Companion to Central and Eastern European Humanism: The Czech Lands*, ed. L. Storchová. De Gruyter, Berlin, 423–426.
- Goclenius, R. (1615). *Lexicon philosophicum Graecum, opus sane omnibus philosophiae alumnis valde necessarium cum perspicentia Philosophysici sermonis plurimum etiam ad cognitionem rerum utile* [...]. Typis Rudolphi Hutwelckeri, Impensis Petri Musculi, Marchioburgi.
- Hall, J. (1607). [Mercurius Britannicus], *Mundus alter et idem sive terra Australis ante hac semper incognita longis itineribus peregrini Academici nuperrime lustrata*. Wilhelm Antonius, Hanau.
- Histoire de l'estat present du Royaume de la Hongrie* (1686a), ed. C. Vanel. Fricx, Bruxelles – Pierre Le Jeune, Köln.
- Histoire de l'état present du Royaume de la Hongrie* (1686b), ed. C. Vanel. Pierre Le Jeune, Köln.
- Horányi, A. (1775). *Memoria Hungarorum et provincialium scriptis editis notorum, Pars I*. Antonius Loewius, Viennae.
- IAA (2003–2024). *Inscriptiones Alborum Amicorum*, ed. L. Adamik, L. Zs. Bujtás, M. Latzkovits. <http://iaa.bibl.u-szeged.hu/index.php?page=home> (2024.06.06.)
- Imre M. (2011), A kulturális és az önreprezentáció feszültségei (Filiczky János verses ajánlái Szenci Molnár Albert zoltároskönyvéhez). In: *Bibliotheca et Universitas: Tanulmányok a hatvanéves Heltai János tiszteletére*, ed. G. Kecskeméti, R. Tasi Miskolci Egyetem BTK Magyar Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Intézet, Miskolc, 129–147.
- In obitu illustris ac generosissimi d[omi]n[i] domini Przechii B. ab Hoddieiova* [...] (1610). Typis Ionatae Bohutsky, Pragae.
- Janus Pannonius (2006). *Opera quae manserunt omnia I. Epigrammata. Fasc. 1*. Textus, edidit I. Mayer similia addidit L. Török. Balassi Kiadó, Budapest.
- Kecskeméti, G. (2011). Filiczky János (csaknem) ismeretlen köszöntőverse. In: *Bibliotheca et Universitas: Tanulmányok a hatvanéves Heltai János tiszteletére*, ed. G. Kecskeméti, R. Tasi. Miskolci Egyetem BTK Magyar Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Intézet, Miskolc, 149–156.
- Kilián, I. (1998). *A régi magyar képv. Felsőmagyarország Kiadó, Magyar Műhely Kiadó, Miskolc, Budapest*.
- Krasnovský, S. (2021). *Johannes Filiczki as a Renaissance Man: Identities and Self-fashioning*, MA thesis. Central European University, Vienna. http://www.etd.ceu.edu/2021/krasnovsky_sebastian.htm (2024.06.06.)
- Lampe, F. A. [Debreceni Ember Pál] (1728), *Historiae ecclesiae reformatae*. Apud Jacobum van Poolsum, Trajecti ad Rhenum.
- Le Royaume de la Hongrie ou description nouvelle, chronologique et géographique de ce royaume* [...] (1686), ed. C. Vanel. Pierre Le Jeune, Köln.
- Lotichius, P. S. (1586). *Petri Lotichii Secundi opera omnia*. Iohannes Steinmann, Leipzig.
- Lotichius, J. P. (1628). *Bibliothecae poeticae ars quarta et ultima* [...]. Sumptibus Lucae Jennisii, Francofurti.
- Luctus illustris Nassovicae scholae Sigenensis super obitu illustris et generosissimi domini, domini Johannis, senioris, Comitis Nassoviae* [...] (1607). [S. n.], Herborn.
- Maczelka, Cs. (2019). *A kora újkori angol utópiák magyar története*. Erdélyi Múzeum Egyesület. Kolozsvár.



- Májeková, H. (1988). K výskumu slovenskej humanistickej literatúry: básnik Ján Filický, *Zborník Filologickej fakulty Univerzity Komenského. Philologica*, 38: 139–151.
- Májeková, H. (1991). Ján Filický a jeho miesto v humanistickej literatúre. *Auriga: zprávy Jednoty klasických filológů*, 33: 19–29.
- Májeková, H. (2008). Preklad ako filologický a interpretačný problém (Na príklade Filického epigramu Ad Sphectium). In: *Sambucus III. Práce z klasickej filológie, latinskej medievalistiky a neolatinistiky*. Trnava, 142–152.
- Meckelnborg, C. and Schneider, B. (2002). *Odyssea. Responsio Ulixis ad Penelopen. Die humanistische Odyssea decurtata der Berliner Handschrift Diez. B Sant. 41*. K. G. Saur, München–Leipzig.
- Melzer, J. (1833). *Biographien berühmter Zipser*. Ellinger, Kaschau.
- Minárik, J. (1985). *Renesančná a humanistická literatúra. Svetová, česká, slovenská*. Slovenské pedagogické nakl., Bratislava.
- Mišianik, J. (1974). *Pohľady do staršej slovenskej literatúry*. Veda, Bratislava.
- Molnár, D. (2024). *Versörlő malomkönek korpája? Filefalvi Filiczki János költői életműve*. L'Harmattan, Budapest.
- Odložilík, O. (1932). Ján Filiczki z Filic a jeho čeští přátelé. In: *Sborník prací věnovaných Janu Bedřichu Novákovi*. Československá archivní společnost, Praha, 431–442.
- Pataki Füsüs, J. (1626). *Kiralyoknak tüköre [...]*. Jakab Klösz, Bartphae.
- Pécseli Király, I. (1612). *Isagoges rhetoricae libri duo [...]*. Ex Officina Typographica Hieronymi Galleri, Oppenheim.
- Polanus, A. (1613). *Collegium anti-Bellarminianum [...]*, ed. J. G. Grossius. Ludovicus König, Basileae.
- Respublica et status Regni Hungariae* (1634). Ex officina Elzeviriana, Leiden.
- Rhodium, J. (1605). *Disputatio philosophica de artibus sermocinatricibus [...]*. Corvinus, Herborn.
- Rosinus, G. (1607). *Disputatio de natura intellectus creati, quam divina affulgente gratia [...]*. Ex officina Christophori Corvini, Herborn.
- Sacro nuptiali iuvenis honestis, et integerrimi, dn. Ionae Voit Annaemontani, sponsi, et pudiciss. lectissimaeque foeminae, Marianae Prawdovae, amplissimi viri, Dn. Georgii Prawdae, civis quondam Lydomierzic. P. M. relictæ viduae, sponsæ, Lydomierzicii ad V. Calen. Maji Anni M. DC. IV. feliciter celebrando, amici pia mentis affectione optima quæque precantes, vota sua consecrabant*. E Typographæ Schumaniano, Pragae (1604).
- Schödel, M. (1629). *Disquisitio historico-politica de Regno Hungariae [...]*. Reppl, Strasbourg.
- Stigel, J. (1545). *Homeri Odiseae liber undecimus latino carmine redditus a Ioan. Stigelio*. Kreutzer, Veit, Wittenberg.
- Szenci Molnár, A. (1607). *Psalterium Ungaricum [...]*. Hollos [Corvin] Christof, Herborn.
- Szentmártoni Szabó, G. (2010). Janus Pannonius és a szekszárdi apátúr. In: *Parthenope veszedelme. Újdonságok a Janus Pannonius-filológia köréből*. Cédrus Művészeti Alapítvány–Napkút Kiadó, Budapest, 152–167.
- Szentmártoni Szabó, G. (2020). Egy kétes hitelű Janus Pannonius-epigramma 16. században nyomtatott variánsa. In: *Irodalomtörténet, tudománytörténet, eszmetörténet. Tanulmányok Tárnai Andor halálának 25. évfordulójára*, ed. Papp I. Reciti, Budapest, 191–206.
- Szepsi Korocs, Gy. (1611). *Disputatio philosophico-theologica de transubstantiatione et de ubiuitate carnis Christi*. S.t., Heidelberg.
- Szombathi, J. *Historia brevis Illustris Collegiis [...] Saros-Patakiensis*. Manuscript, Library of the Sárospatak Reformed College (Kt. 38), 106–114.
- Taubmanus, F. (1597). *Melodaesia sive epulum Musaeum [...]*. Thomas Schurer, Leipzig.



- Truhlář, A. (1966). *Rukověť humanistického básnictví v Čechách a na Moravě: Enchiridion renatae poesis Latinae in Bohemia et Moravia cultae*, 2, Č-J, eds., Opus ab A. Truhlář et C. Hrdina inchoatum, J. Hejnic et J. Martinek continuaverunt. Academia, Praha.
- Tsétsi, J. *Catalogus professorum illustris scholae S. Patakinæ* [...]. In: *Registrum Historicum* [...]. Manuscript, Library of the Sárospatak Reformed College (Kt. 40), 12^r–13^v.
- Vaculínová, M. (2013a). Jan Filický z Filic a jeho památník v rukopisné sbírce Knihovny Národního muzea v Praze. In: *Kniha 2013. Zborník o problémoch a dejinách knižnej kultúry. Dejiny knižnej kultúry Spiša*. Slovenská národná knižnica, Martin, 304–320.
- Vaculínová, M. (2013b). Památník Jana Filického v Knihovně Národního muzea a některé nově nalezené básně. *Sambucus*, 9: 96–103.
- Vives, J. L. (1599–1600). *Ioannis Ludovici Vivis Valentini, ad veram sapientiam introductio. Eiusdem satellitium animi, sive symbola, principum institutioni potissimum destinata* [...]. Impensis Voegelinianis, Leipzig.
- Zichlinsky, H. (1608). *Theses philosophicae de hominis intellectu et voluntate* [...]. Christophorus Corvinus, Herborn.

Open Access statement. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited, a link to the CC License is provided, and changes – if any – are indicated. (SID_1)

