

Johann Clingerius, S.J., and his *Technopaegnon poeticum**

MARTA VACULÍNOVÁ

Abstract:

In Neo-Latin poetry, the literary life of a certain period is often shaped by notable figures whose work becomes an object of imitation, as exemplified by Johann Clingerius (ca. 1557–1610) from Thuringia, a member of the Jesuit Order and professor of poetry and Greek at several Jesuit colleges. His relatively short teaching career in Olomouc from 1597 until 1598 left distinct traces, which were observed earlier (but unrelated to him as a person) and have recently been better explored, thanks to new findings. Extant printed books and manuscripts now make it possible to determine the extent of his influence, which shaped not only Bohemian and Moravian students, but also to a large extent Polish students, as well as probably Hungarian students and which can be traced back to the early period of Clingerius's teaching career in Graz and Vienna. The prints from the Olomouc period contain abundant examples of *poesis artificiosa*, for which Clingerius had a special liking. It is also evidenced by the surviving manuscripts of his treatise *Technopaegnon poeticum*, which in some respects illuminate his poetic and teaching practices. Although the *Technopaegnon* was never published in print, it made its way into the printed scientific literature through the encyclopaedists Rudolph Goclenius the Elder and Johann Heinrich Alsted. Clingerius can thus rightly be placed among the theorists of the *poesis artificiosa*, namely chronologically between Julius Caesar Scaliger and J. H. Alsted.

Keywords:

Visual poetry, Jesuit poetics, Olomouc, Johannes Clingerius, cult of poetry, Neo-Latin manuscripts, text transmission.

Introduction

From their inception, visual poetry and various kinds of poetic artificia have had their advocates as well as opponents among poets and scholars. Certain poets used them sparingly like precious spices and criticised overly elaborate wordplay that favoured form over content.¹ Other poets, on the other hand,

* This study is an output of the project GA22-03419S 'Forms of humanism in the literature of the Czech lands II' supported by the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic and carried out at the Institute of Philosophy of the CAS, v. v. i., Prague.

¹ They included, for instance, the German Jesuit Jacob Balde and in Bohemia Bohuslav Balbín from the same order – see Wilhelm Kühlmann, *Kunst als Spiel: Das Technopaegnum in der Poetik des 17. Jahrhunderts. Mit Anmerkungen zu Baldassare Bonifacios Urania* (Venedig 1628), in: *Daphnis* 20 (1991), 505–529; Jan Martínek, *Drobné literární útvary za*

wrote defenses of *poesis artificiosa* to protect it from the attacks of critics. In Jesuit education, artificial poetry was part of schooling,² and it is no coincidence that it is the Jesuits who have often referred to it, whether in a negative or positive sense. In non-Catholic education, at least as far as the Czech lands are concerned, we do not encounter the teaching of *artificia*. Their cultivation by non-Catholic poets was a matter of personal predilection and we can find such personalities among Utraquists, Lutherans and also among members of the Unity of the Brethren.³ Despite of confession, *artificia* were also favoured for specific types of poetry, such as panegyrics.

The type of *poesis artificiosa* was popular in closed circles of intellectuals; in the Middle Ages and the early modern period, it was often written in the environment of monasteries and other scholarly communities, which provided ample time for the creation of elaborate poetic compositions.⁴ Beginning in late antiquity, visual poems were a suitable and impressive gift for rulers, and the same was true for the sovereigns of the early modern period, who were able to appreciate the subtle graphic and visual treatment of the text of a Latin poem, rather than its content. Moreover, these compositions, often panegyric, brought them closer to the glory of the emperors of late antiquity (such as Porphyry) and were to ensure the immortality of their names. In poetics, they occurred rather marginally, if at all. This was changed by Julius Caesar Scaliger, who incorporated figurative poems and *artificia*, albeit unsystematically, into his groundbreaking *Poetices libri septem*. Johann Heinrich Alsted is considered to be the theorist who discussed ‘*technopaegnia*’ comprehensively, summarizing under this term wordplay of all kinds, not only visual poetry.⁵ It is generally

humanismu [Short Literary Forms in the Period of Humanism], in: Zprávy Jednoty klasických filologů 7 (1965), 10–24. On Jesuit poetry in the Czech lands in general, see Martin Svatoš, Úvod do kapitoly: Literatura a rétorika jezuitů [An Introduction to the Chapter: The Literature and Rhetoric of the Jesuits], in: Petronilla Cemus (ed.), *Bohemia Jesuitica* 1556–2006, vol. 2. Praha 2010, 777–779.

² Examples of Jesuit student collections of artifice include the oft-quoted poems by students from Dole (Lília Diamantopoulou, *Griechische visuelle Poesie: Von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*. Frankfurt a.M. 2016, 110) or the slightly later poems by students of rhetoric at the Prague Jesuit Academy in honour of Archbishop Lamberg, which include figurative poems such as the altar, the axe, Pan’s flute, the egg and the wings (*Musa illustrissimi ... domini Caroli, archiepiscopi Pragensis*. Pragae: Daniel Sedesanus, [1607]).

³ E.g. Pavel Němčanský from the Unity of Brethren, Georg Handsch as Lutheran and Thomas Mitis or Petrus Codicillus as Utraquists.

⁴ Josef Hejnic, Zu den Anfängen der humanistischen Figuralpoesie in Böhmen, in: *Listy filologické* 111/2 (1988), 95–102.

⁵ From the abundant literature on the subject, it is worth mentioning at least: Dick Higgins, *Pattern Poetry: Guide to an Unknown Literature*. New York 1987; Miguel D’Ors, *Nuevos datos sobre caligramas*, in: *Rhythmica: revista española de métrica comparada* 3–4 (2006),

believed that it was during the Baroque period that *poesis artificiosa* was a frequent subject of printed treatises and was practically cultivated more than before. However, the roots of systematic interest in artificia are older. This paper discusses the manuscript treatise *Technopaegnon poeticum*, which is chronologically placed between Scaliger and Alsted, drawing on the former and indirectly influencing the work of the latter, as shown below. An attempt is also made to demonstrate that the Jesuit poet and scholar of the 16th century, whose name is not included in bibliographies or dictionaries of authors, may nevertheless have been of considerable importance for the history of Latin poetry, which has only recently been gradually revealed. Moreover, the research related to him indicates the major role of early modern manuscript sources in the transmission of texts and some aspects of the contemporary conception of authorship.

As early as the 18th century, literary historians and book scholars were already wondering about the peculiar period of Olomouc book printing, when local printing production rose sharply in the relatively short two-year period of 1597–1598.⁶ Most of these prints included Latin poetry, and their creators were associated with the Jesuit academy in Olomouc. Czech classical philologists have noted the common features of these poetic compositions, published under the names of Olomouc students or anonymously, and have characterized them (not without some dislike) as complicated and unnatural poetry that is sometimes difficult to understand.⁷ Art historians, on the other hand, consider this Olomouc period to be evidence of the beginnings of Jesuit emblem production in the Czech lands, as reflected in several extant copperplate engravings. When searching for the originator of this short-lived literary boom, we inevitably come

63–119; Seraina Plotke, *Gereimte Bilder: Visuelle Poesie im 17. Jahrhundert*. Paderborn 2009; Kühlmann 1991 (as in n. 1); Ulrich Ernst (ed.), *Visuelle Poesie. Historische Dokumentation theoretischer Zeugnisse*. Bd. 1: *Von der Antike bis zum Barock*. Berlin / Boston 2012, and other works by the same author; Agnieszka Borysowska / Barbara Milewska-Ważbińska, 'Poesis Artificiosa': Between Theory and Practice. Frankfurt a.M. 2013; Jan Kwapisz / David Petrain / Mikolaj Szymanski (ed.), *The Muse at Play: Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry*. Berlin / Boston 2013; Jan Kwapisz, *The Greek Figure Poems*. Leuven 2013; Beate Hintzen, *Beobachtungen zur Stellung der Poetik im System der artes in Johann Heinrich Alsteds Encyclopaedia (1630)*, in: Beate Hintzen / Roswitha Simons (ed.), *Norm und Poesie*. Berlin 2013, 45–80; Diamantopoulou (as in n. 2); Jan Kwapisz, *The Paradigm of Simias: Essays on Poetic Eccentricity*. Berlin / Boston 2019.

⁶ See Marta Vaculínová, *Literární tvorba na jezuitské akademii v Olomouci v letech 1597–1598 a její odraz v tiskařské produkci* [Literary Work at the Jesuit Academy in Olomouc in the Years 1597–1598 and its Reflection in Print Production], in: *Bibliotheca antiqua* 2021, 81–90 (including a list of relevant publications). Online: www.vkol.cz/uploads/page/253/doc/010-vaculinova2021.pdf.

⁷ Jan Martínek, *K pozdnímu latinskému humanismu na Moravě* [To the Late Latin Humanism in Moravia], in: *Zprávy Jednoty klasických filologů* 5 (1963), 69.

across two names – Johann Clingerius, professor of poetry at the Jesuit academy in Olomouc in 1597–1598; and the local bishop Stanislav Pavlovský, a patron and supporter of literary activities, who died on 2 June 1598. The arrival of Clingerius in Olomouc and the death of Pavlovský are milestones that mark the beginning and the end of this special period.

The name of Johann Clingerius (ca 1557–1610) does not appear in any bibliography; only *Rukověť humanistického básnictví* [*A Handbook of Humanist Poetry*] attributes to him a collection of epicedia on the death of the bishop Pavlovský, based on a handwritten note in a copy deposited in Olomouc archives.⁸ However, research by Polish scholars has shown that his poetry is, in fact, much more extensive. Already before that, Polish philologists identified Olomouc at that time as a source of inspiration for *poesis artificiosa* – studies at the local Jesuit academy influenced a number of Polish poets in this sense. The philologists have uncovered the fact that Clingerius, under the pseudonym Ianus Tyrigeta (he came from Thuringia), published in Kraków in 1598 the collection *Technopaegnon sacro poeticum*, edited by his Olomouc student Mikołaj Lubomirski. This great admirer of Clingerius tried to create his own poems following Clingerius's model. It was Lubomirski who preserved a manuscript convolute from the time of his studies, entitled *Musaeolum*, which sheds new light on Clingerius's teaching in Olomouc as well as his poetic activities. This has recently been discussed in detail and in a broader context by Jan Kwapisz,⁹ who has also shown that the Olomouc period was only the tip of the iceberg of Clingerius's poetic and teaching activities by referring to some Clingerian prints from the Viennese period preserved in a convolute from Lublin. Clingerius's poetic activities may have manifested themselves so strongly in Olomouc thanks to the favour of the bishop Pavlovský, who traditionally supported the poetry written by the students of the Olomouc Jesuit college.¹⁰

Lubomirski's manuscript and the sources and commentaries preserved in it clearly show Clingerius's established practice of publishing his own poems under the name of someone else and offering this service in return for a certain number of copies of the resulting print. Clingerius's poems were thus published

⁸ Antonín Truhlář / Karel Hrdina / Josef Hejnic / Jan Martínek, *Rukověť humanistického básnictví v Čechách a na Moravě* [*A Compendium of Humanist Poetry in Bohemia and Moravia*] 1. Praha 1966, 386.

⁹ Jan Kwapisz, 'Deciphering Ne Luscinia Segnior', in: *Prace Filologiczne. Literaturoznawstwo* 5(8) (2015), 167–182; Kwapisz 2019 (as in n. 5), chapter 'Appendix: A New Alexandria and its Little Museum', 135–165. Some additional information is provided by Patryk M. Ryczkowski, 'Paraphrasis historiae de Susanna by Adamus Placotomus Silesius and the "raptularius" (notebook) of Mikołaj Lubomirski', in: *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch* 23 (2021), 177–210.

¹⁰ This is also pointed out by Ryczkowski (as in n. 9), 181, note 15.

by a number of Olomouc students or clerics under their names. It is, however, difficult to determine the extent to which he was the sole author or had revised the original work of his students. This can be illustrated with a poem by Jan Sixti of Lerchenfels on the Star Summer Palace in Prague, where it is possible, using the second edition, to show which part was undoubtedly written by Clingerius.¹¹ On close inspection, one could find some encrypted signs of his authorship, such as an anagram of his name in the form “Ne lusciniá segnior”, as already pointed out by Jan Kwapisz.¹²

Another important finding of the Polish research is that Clingerius mastered the art of copperplate engraving and taught it to his students.¹³ The most famous examples are of Polish provenance, namely the copperplates of Stanisław Kochanowski, especially the emblem of the seven liberal arts in the Olomouc print of the Koryczyński brothers.¹⁴ Nevertheless, this influence might have also affected, for example, Clingerius’s students from the Kingdom of Hungary and the Czech lands, although it probably manifested itself later.¹⁵ The former students of the Olomouc college, Lőrinc Ferencffy and Mátyás Hajnal, cooperated in 1629 on the publication of Hajnal’s Hungarian book of emblems, for which Ferencffy wrote a foreword and which he accompanied by his copperplate emblem.¹⁶ In connection with the knowledge of the copperplate technique, one may also consider one of Clingerius’s students from Bohemia – in 1613, Jan Sixti of Lerchenfels wrote accompanying poems, including the *carmen Silonianum*, for a print of Felice Milensio, whose copperplate title page was clearly the work of a non-professional.¹⁷ Evidence of graphic art and figurative poetry is also available from Clingerius’s earlier Viennese period, with two hieroglyphic broadsides pointed out by Kwapisz. The author of the copperplate

¹¹ Marta Vaculínová, *Letohrádek Hvězda v latinské humanistické poezii* [The Star Summer Palace in Prague and Latin Humanist Poetry], in: *Listy filologické* 143 (2020), 467–507.

¹² Kwapisz 2019 (as in n. 5), 141.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 141 and 143.

¹⁴ Lubomír Konečný / Jaromír Olšovský, *Emblematické tisky olomouckých jezuitů* [Emblematic Prints of the Olomouc Jesuits], in: Petr Elbel / Ondřej Jakubec (ed.), *Olomoucké baroko 1. Proměny ambicí jednoho města, Úvodní svazek*. Olomouc 2010, 41–44.

¹⁵ The prints of Hungarian students from 1597–1598 are mostly dedicated to the archbishop Kutásky – for their overview, see Vaculínová (as in n. 6), 86. The Clingerian anagram of Kutásky’s name “O spes, o cunctis vinea chara piis” (= Ioannes Cutasi archiepiscopus), used in the print of Imre Nagy and Mátyás Hajnal *Anagramma eponymicum* (1597), can be found in Lubomírski’s *Musaeolum* on fol. 560v.

¹⁶ Ferenc Zemplényi, *Egy magyar jezsuita emblematikus: Hajnal Mátyás*, in: *A reneszánsz szimbolizmus. Ikonológia és műértelmezés* 2 (1998), 145–152.

¹⁷ *Alphabetum Felicis Milensii de monachis et monasteriis Germaniae*. Pragae: Kargesius, 1614.

engravings referred to in this context, namely *Poema hieroglyphicum* from 1593, was the student of poetry at the Jesuit college in Vienna, Jacob Krasiczki. Krasiczki, however, was probably not the author of the engraving; Clingerius's authorship can almost certainly be proved in the case of another hieroglyphic from the Lublin collection *Typogramma epithalamion*,¹⁸ which was published under the name of Ludwig Pernecker, a Viennese student of poetry, but is signed IC (Ioannes Clingerius) in the bottom left corner. Previously unknown evidence of the graphic activity of the Viennese Jesuits is the figural acrostic composition with the Habsburg eagle on a broadside bound into the manuscript of the Jesuit lectures in Graz.¹⁹

The printed poetry of the Olomouc period, created with the participation of Johann Clingerius, form a relatively homogeneous group of works with related features. In addition to their penchant for artificia, they share a number of frequently recurring motifs, especially nature, songbirds, an ideal landscape populated by nymphs, and springtime, which is associated with the awakening of nature and the great Christian feast of Easter.²⁰ In their day, these poetic prints were popular in intellectual circles across denominations, as evidenced by their presence in many libraries with historical collections.²¹ The discovery and study of Clingerius's manual of artificia provide enough material to explain some of the formal practices and motivic elements in the Clingerian prints that are already known.

The Preservation of the Treatise *Technopaegnon poeticum* and Its Contents

From 1584, Johannes Clingerius worked intermittently as professor of poetics (humanitatis) and Greek for the classes of poetics and rhetoric, first at the Jesuit college in Graz, then in Vienna, and finally in Olomouc. For the instruction of the basics of poetry, he wrote a *Tractatus poeticus*, dated 1587, which has come

¹⁸ Both Kwapisz 2019 (as in n. 5), 157.

¹⁹ The broadside *Sereniss. Rodolpho II.*, Universitätsbibliothek Graz (hereinafter only as Graz), shelf mark Ms. 1278, fol. 252r.

²⁰ On the common features of Viennese and Olomouc Clingerian prints, see Kwapisz 2019 (as in n. 5), 161.

²¹ Besides the convolute from Lublin, described by J. Kwapisz, and the convolute in Olomouc archives, see Jan Martínek, *Humanistické tisky městského archivu v Olomouci* [Humanist Prints in the Archives of the City of Olomouc], in: *Listy filologické* 84 (1961), 51–53. It is worth noting the convolute of printed poetry of Viennese and Olomouc provenance in the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Munich (LMU), whose earlier but not first owner was the physician and poet Johann Christoph Daisigner from Most – see Vaculínová (as in n. 6), passim. Six Clingerian prints are also bound into the convolute of the Olomouc Research Library, shelf marks 35.920–35.957, coming from the library of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine there.

to us in one manuscript.²² In it, he conventionally introduces students to the fundamentals of prosody and metre. However, he incorporated his special interest in poetic artificia and figurative poetry into his manual *Technopaegnon poeticum*. We currently know of three manuscripts of the *Technopaegnon*, all of which were written by Clingerius's students, probably in the first half of the 1590s, when Clingerius was teaching in Vienna.²³ The teaching text of the *Technopaegnon* is older – it is dated to 1585, as evidenced by the chronostich preserved in two of the known manuscripts.²⁴ The quality of the individual manuscripts varies. For some of them, we know the names of their first owners: the manuscript in Graz was written by Christoph Andreas Fischer from Glatz, who later lived in Seiz Charterhouse, from whose library the manuscript comes.²⁵ The manuscript in Gotha was written by Jacob Arlenus from Wroclaw.²⁶ The

²² Graz, fols. 242r–255v. The title contains the names of the authors on whom it is based, including those of late antiquity, namely Priscianus, Diomedes, Marius Victorinus, Servius, and his *Centimete*, the early modern authors J. C. Scaliger and two Dutch authors, namely Johannes Despauteerius and his successor Simon Verepaeus.

²³ Manuscript Graz, see Johann Loserth, *Aus Grazer Handschriften*, in: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Vereines für die Geschichte Mährens und Schlesiens* 25 (1923), 104–105; Anton Kern, *Die Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Graz*, Bd. 2. Wien 1956, 279; Maria Mairold, *Die datierten Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Graz bis zum Jahre 1600*. 1. Teil: Text. 2. Teil: Tafeln. Wien 1979, 127. Forschungsbibliothek Gotha, shelf mark Chart. B 1945 (hereinafter only as Gotha). See Annette Gerlach / Cornelia Hopf / Susanne Werner, *Magister Andreas Reyher (1601–1673). Handschriften und Drucke. Bestandsverzeichnis*. Gotha 1992, 39. An edition of the introductory part of the manuscript: *Technopaegnon Poeticum ex Codice MS. edidit Hugo Slevogt*. Teil 1, in: *Programm des Gräfllich-Gleichen-schen Gymnasiums Ohrdruf*. Ohrdruf 1887. Teil 2, in: *Programm des Gräfllich-Gleichen-schen Gymnasiums Ohrdruf*. Ohrdruf 1888. UB Augsburg, shelf mark Cod.II.2.4.37 (hereinafter only as Augsburg). See Georg Grupp, *Öttingen-Wallersteinische Sammlungen in Maihingen, Handschriften-Verzeichnis 1. Nördlingen 1897*, 2, N. 40, adl. 1: Roma – *Epitome antiquitatum*, XVI p.; 24, adl. 2 *Poetik*.

²⁴ Slevogt 1887 (as in n. 23), 1; Gotha, fol. 90v; Augsburg, fol. 294v.

²⁵ Loserth (as in n. 23), 105 mentions Clingerius as Fischer's teacher in Vienna in 1578. This is a mistake; in fact it must have been 1587, as evidenced by the dating of Fischer's manuscript at fol. 265r. He continued his studies at a German college in Rome, see Andreas Steinhuber, *Geschichte des Collegium Germanicum-Hungaricum in Rom* 1. Freiburg i.Br. 1895, 311.

²⁶ Arlenus enrolled at the Jesuit college in Olomouc in October or November 1594, see Libuše Spáčilová / Vladimír Spáčil (ed.), *Nejstarší matrika olomoucké univerzity z let (1576) 1590–1651* [The oldest register of the University of Olomouc from the years (1576) 1590–1651]. Olomouc 2016, 85; and studied rhetoric under Cosmas Nicolai (the transcript of his lecture on ancient antiquities forms the second part of the manuscript). It may therefore be assumed that he had previously studied poetics in Vienna under Clingerius. He completed his studies at the University of Würzburg in July 1597 as an alumnus of the Prince-Bishop of Würzburg.

Augsburg manuscript is anonymous; its later owner was Cornelius Gobelius (1611–1654), who may have obtained it from the estate of his uncle of the same name, who studied at the collegium Germanicum in Rome in 1589–1596.²⁷ Similarities to the *Technopaegnion* can, of course, be found in the *Musaeolum* of Mikolaj Lubomirski as well. Its index explains some terms following Clingerius. An inspection of Lubomirski's entry for "monosyllabi",²⁸ for example, reveals that the introductory section is considerably abbreviated compared with the manuscripts of the *Technopaegnion*, but it is supplemented by another, expanding passage, which is absent from the manuscripts. This leads to speculations that Lubomirski was either given private lessons on artificia by Clingerius or he took notes in a different way, not literally copying Clingerius's teaching text.

As far as figurative poetry is concerned, most material can be found in the manuscript from Graz, which, however, unlike the manuscripts from Gotha and Augsburg, is unfinished. In addition, another manuscript by Clingerius, the above-mentioned *Tractatus poeticus*, is bound into it. The manuscripts from Gotha and Augsburg are both bound in a convolute, together with the notes from the Olomouc lectures on Roman antiquities by the professor of rhetoric Cosmas Nicolai (ca. 1558–1602), one of which is dated to 1594 in Olomouc (Gotha) while the other is undated (Augsburg). This could mean that the teaching of poetic artificia was also intended for students of rhetoric who had already taken poetry and had the necessary foundations required by the subsequent studies of poetic artificia. Whereas Nicolai's lectures were based quite faithfully on the popular work of Johann Rosinus of Eisenach *Romanarum antiquitatum libri decem*, Clingerius's *Technopaegnion* is far from being a simple excerpt from someone else's work.

It is a systematically organised compendium of poetic artificia, collected from various sources and supported by specific examples. The author himself writes in the afterword that the *Technopaegnion* is a result of eight years of work. In its complete form, it begins with a preface listing the artificia discussed in the volume and with prolegomena without a heading of their own, and it ends with an afterword enumerating recommended authors. In this work, Clingerius made good use of his knowledge of Greek and Latin poets, both secular and sacred,

²⁷ However, the ownership inscription was definitely added by Gobelius the Younger – cf. his signature in the album amicorum of Philipp de Maliverné, Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nuremberg, shelf mark Hs. 97.791, fols. 157v–158r.

²⁸ *Musaeolum*, fols. 570v–571v; Gotha, fols. 33v–34r; Graz, fols. 59v–61r. The index of Lubomirski's manuscript, fols. 269–279, says: "Technopaegnion, sive lusus artificiosus poeticus variis usque tum sacris, tum profanis concinnus materiis, authore rev. P. Johanne Clingerio e Soc. Jes.", see Ryczkowski (as in n. 9), 199. Considering the small number of ten folios, it may have been an introduction and prolegomena to *Technopaegnion poeticum*.

from antiquity to his own time. A separate chapter is devoted to Rabanus Maurus and his figurative poetry. The *Technopaegnon* further includes compositions by a number of early modern poets from many lands, regardless of denomination (some non-Catholics, such as Nicolaus Borbonius, on whose work Clingerius drew extensively, are, however, absent from the final list of recommended authors, which we present in Appendix 4), and some excerpts from Clingerius's own work (chronostics marked with his name as well as anonymous poems, which can be attributed to him). In his theoretical considerations, Clingerius draws mainly on Scaliger, but he undoubtedly also used other sources, which he does not always acknowledge. We do not know who inspired Clingerius's interest in poetic artificia because the lists of persons at the Jesuit college in Graz are only partially preserved for the time of his studies in poetry, before 1583, when he is documented there as a student of rhetoric. It could have been the professor of Greek and poetry, Aegidius Martini from Liège, or his compatriot Ludovicus Hailanus/Haillaus of Namur.²⁹ Their influence is evidenced by the knowledge of French poetry, clearly evident in the *Technopaegnon*.

In the preface to the *Technopaegnon*,³⁰ Clingerius compares poetry to visual arts. In his opinion, art, both verbal and visual, is perfected through training and the passage of time. Every artist tries to match his or her model. In their creative works, people thus imitate God the Creator, and if they cannot compete with him, they can at least try to approach divine things.³¹ Painters, sculptors and engravers use various techniques to make their works beautiful and pleasing (*venustas et gratia*) as well as liked by people. They depict substances, light and shadow with such mastery that they seem not to have learnt from nature but to compete with it, even to give it their own rules. And since 'Sacra Poesis' is art, it involves the effort to rival the Muses. No poet who desires to excel can avoid crossing the boundaries defined. According to Scaliger, poetry is an imitation of nature, and nature rarely includes simple things. That is why poets in the past invented various *technopaegnia* and artificia that we can imitate. According to Clingerius, there is nothing that cannot be achieved through art and intellectual diligence. Therefore, he selected some artificia and poetic techniques, by means of which he will try to bring his students to the gate of the Muses. He dismisses all the opponents of this endeavour who would belittle his work as dumb asses

²⁹ Ladislaus Lukács, SI (ed.), *Catalogi personarum et officiorum provinciae Austriae S.I. I.* (1551–1600). Romae 1978, 405–406 (Aegidius Martini), 392 (Ludovicus Hailanus) – both are documented in Graz for 1583.

³⁰ See Appendix 1.

³¹ This passage is reminiscent of a quote from Ausonius, *Technopaegnon* 5, 1: "Aemula dis, naturae imitatrix, omniparens ars." (Auson., XXV, 5, 1 [Green 1991, 177]).

(quoting here the adagium “A donkey prefers hay to gold” of Erasmus of Rotterdam, without mentioning the author). People have the unfortunate trait of disparaging whatever they are unable to achieve because of their own stupidity. If poetry were not arduous, it could not be called art and would not enjoy such fame. Its magnificence shines so powerfully precisely because it is not an easy art that even children could master without effort. A comparison between poetry and visual arts resembling that provided by Clingerius is known from the later texts of Antonio Possevino and Jodocus de Weerdt.³²

At the end of the preface, Clingerius lists artificia, foreshadowing the entrance to an antechamber (“vestibulum”), which the students will explore and try to master. The lists of artificia are not identical in any of the manuscripts. It may thus be assumed that, despite some partial matches, each manuscript was written in a different term. The longest list, unlike the others alphabetically arranged and numbered, is the one in the Augsburg manuscript, which records 76 artificia in the introduction. The manuscript from Gotha does not have numbers in the list, but the artificia are numbered in the text itself in the chapter headings. There are 35 artificia numbered in this way there. A reconstruction of the list of artificia according to the extant manuscripts is given in Appendix 3 of this article, but we would like to draw special attention to some of them.

The first in the list is “artificium Vergilianum”.³³ This extensive section deals with the artistic use (“artificioso usu”) of units of text, in this case individual letters of the alphabet, in Virgil’s work, particularly with respect to their visual and sound qualities. Clingerius considers this artificium to be the basis of the others and the key to their understanding. The unreliability of the earlier edition of Hugo Slevogt is evidenced by his omission of the following sentence, in which Clingerius refers to the work of *Lucullianarum quaestionum libri quinque* of Bartolomeo Maranta as his source of inspiration.³⁴ The second artificium, entitled *Lucullianum*, is derived from Maranta’s work as well.

³² Antonio Possevino, *De Poesi et pictura ethnica, humana et fabulosa, collata cum vera, honesta et sacra*, in: *Bibliotheca Selecta*, Romae: ex typographia apostolica Vaticana, 1593, 469–555. The connection between poetry, visual arts and music, as well as the defence of poesis artificiosa in a preface by Jodocus de Weerdt from 1626 are discussed by Walther Ludwig, *Wortkunststücke in der frühneuzeitlichen lateinischen Poesie oder über die Parnassi bicipitis de pace vaticinia* des Jodocus de Weerdt, in: ders., *Florilegium Neolatinum*. Ausgewählte Aufsätze 2014–2018, edendum curavit Astrid Steiner-Weber. Hildesheim / Zürich / New York 2019, 373–397.

³³ The whole of it, including the epilogue, was published by Slevogt 1887 (as in n. 23), 5–8; Slevogt 1888 (as in n. 23), 1–9.

³⁴ Slevogt 1887 (as in n. 23), 5; the text is quoted according to Gotha, fol. 6r: “Huic ego artificio Virgiliano iustas ob causas primum locum tribui, ut sit tanquam fundamentum et

Clingerus pays great attention to the artificium entitled *echo*, which is “artificium laboriosum sed vere iucundum, quia rarum et ingeniosum”.³⁵ ‘Iucunditas’, as one of the main qualities, is nothing new; we should recall Antonio Possevino, mentioned above, who sees the common goals of painting and poetry in “utilitas et iucunditas”.³⁶ The interpretation includes a handy glossary of several pages entitled *Sylvula Austriaca dictionum Echicarum*, which always lists the pair “word – echo”. Among the many kinds of echo-poems, the Latin-Greek echo, documented by Clingerius’s autobiographical verses from 1588, is highlighted as a witty, learned, and melodious variant:

Potes ne artificia poëtica scribere, Echo? ἔχω.
Qualis tibi videtur esse prosodia? δῖα.
Nonne discipulos negligentia reddit invisos? ἴσος. [sic]
Decem iam annos teris in Cicerone? ὄνε ...³⁷

According to Clingerius, the melodiousness of the ‘echo artificium’ invites us to sing; when reciting echo-verses, he thus recommends intoning and imitating the echo by singing.³⁸ In the echo chapter, Clingerius includes various kinds of repeated words and syllables, for example solmisation syllables (ut re mi fa sol la):

Cantor vult vino sua guttura saepe lavare,
Fare Thalia melos et modulare, la re.³⁹

Another kind of repetition in the echo type concerns the repetition of onomatopoeic words, such as birdcalls. This is a manifestation of Clingerius’s penchant for onomatopoeic expressions, pervading all the prints of the Clingerian circle.

clavis caeterorum. Collectae vero sunt hae lucubrationes e Bartholomaei Marandae Venusini Luculliaris quaestionibus, quas ille in divinitate Maroniana observavit.”

³⁵ Graz, fol. 71v: “Artificium laboriosum sed vere iucundum, quia rarum et ingeniosum ordine praescripto sequitur ...”

³⁶ Possevino (as in n. 32), 469–555.

³⁷ Graz, fol. 79v; Gotha, 44v; Augsburg, 239r. The dating of the poem is determined by the verse: “Mirabilia futura dicunt hoc anno 88 astrologi? Λόγοι.” Latin-Greek and Greek-Latin echoes were also included in the collection of poetry *Sylvae* written by students of the Jesuit academy in Dôle in 1592 – see Higgins (as in n. 5), 24 and Diamantopoulou (as in n. 2), 110.

³⁸ Gotha, fol. 48r: “Decorum in recitatione servetur. In sylvis enim liberiores sumus, modo enim loquimur, modo cantamus, quid si Echo ibidem fuerit, hanc vocem quam cantum imitatur. Non igitur absurdum erit in Echus recitatione nonnunquam in cantionem prorumpere ...”

³⁹ The author of this ditty may be Clingerius; it was later reproduced by Rodolphus Goclenius, *Lexicon philosophicum graecum*. Marburg: Rudolph Hutwelcker, Petrus Musculus, 1615, 100, and according to Goclenius – e.g., by Johann Philipp Ebel, *Epigrammata palindroma*. Ulm: Mederianis, 1623, Section V. Echo.

Ausonius had already established the tradition of voces animantium, which reached its perfection in the medieval *Carmen de Philomela*, originally attributed to Ovid.⁴⁰ In the early modern period, mention should be made of Guillaume de Salluste Du Bartas's epic poems on the creation of the world, translated from French into Latin and containing long passages devoted to animals and birds.⁴¹ Clingerius illustrates this type with a preface to his echo-poem:

Est natura loci quaedam mirabilis huius,
 Quam nuper Nymphae quaedam coluisse putantur,
 Haec repetit mea verba sono postrema loquaci:
 Si clamo, clamat, fleo flet, si rideo, ridet,
 Si canto cantat, si iubilo iubilat illa ...
 ... si cuculo, cuculat, si rugio rugit et illa.⁴²

A similar passage with sounds of animals and birds was included in the poem *Stella Bohaemica* (1597). Jan Sixti omitted it in the second edition, making it clear that he was not its author.⁴³ Wordplay, including bird sounds, can also be found in the Olomouc print of the Clingerian circle *Cuculus Noč*, published in 1598 under the name of Clingerius's compatriot from Greussen, Pancratius Taper.⁴⁴ This print illustrates well Clingerius's creative processes and the cultural context of his work. The title page contains a paraphrase of the words of a motet of Iacobus Handl Gallus, beginning with the verse: "Quamvis per multos cuculus cantaverit annos, / At cuculat guggug praeterea quae nihil ..." ⁴⁵ The poem, about the contest between a cuckoo and a nightingale judged by a donkey, elaborates on a theme taken from Achille Bocchi's symbolum *Index ineptus peste peior pessima*.⁴⁶ At the end of the print, the author allowed himself a little joke by parodying the end of the Latin speech, finishing it with "cuculavi" instead of "dixi". The wordplay was duly appreciated in its time, as attested by the commentary of Mikolaj Lubomirski in the index of the *Musaeolum*. "Magis

⁴⁰ Paul Klopsch, *Carmen de Philomela*, in: Alf Önnersfors / Johannes Rathofer / Fritz Wagner (ed.), *Literatur und Sprache im europäischen Mittelalter: Festschrift für Karl Langosch zum 70. Geburtstag*, Darmstadt 1973, 81.

⁴¹ Guillelmi Sallustii Bartasii Hebdomas: opus gallicum a Gabriele Lermeo latinitate donatum. Paris: Michel Gadouleau, 1583.

⁴² Gotha, fol. 48r.

⁴³ Vaculínová (as in n. 11), 485–486 and 490.

⁴⁴ Antonín Truhlář / Karel Hrdina / Josef Hejnic / Jan Martínek, *Rukověť humanistického básnictví v Čechách a na Moravě* [A Handbook of Humanist Poetry in Bohemia and Moravia] 5. Praha 1982, 332–333.

⁴⁵ *Moralia Iacobi Handl Carnioli*. Nuremberg: Alexander Dietrich, 1596, Nr. XXVII. *Permultos liceat cuculus*.

⁴⁶ Achille Bocchi, *Symbolicarum quaestionum ... libri quinque*. Bononiae: Societas Typographiae Bononiensis, 1574 (1st ed. 1555), lib. III., XC.

cuculinum carmen, quam hic cuculatum est, si quis forte cuculaverit, omnes totius orbis cuculos suo cuculatu superbit.”⁴⁷

In several places in the *Technopaegnon*, Clingerius emphasises the affinity between poetry and music. During his time in Vienna, he composed *Alleluia* for one voice⁴⁸ and he undeniably had a background in music theory. His greatest opportunity to develop his passion for music came in Olomouc. Most of his poetry published there was printed by Georgius Handl, brother of Jacobus Handl Gallus and also the publisher of the collection of his motets *Moralia* (1596). In addition, Clingerius’s students included members of the court chapel of Rudolf II, Jan Sixti of Lerchenfels and Johann Mollerus.⁴⁹ The prints dedicated to Sixti in particular are full of music-related themes; they contain texts of musical compositions performed at the college (unfortunately without musical notation) as well as the various kinds of musical artificia that Clingerius described in the chapter “Artificium musicum” in the *Technopaegnon*.⁵⁰ He introduces them with the words: “Ut et Musici in hoc technopaegnon poeticum aliquod ex illorum arte translatum videant, animi gratia et communi Musarum amore novi quid proponetur, ut Cantores, quidnam poetae scripserint, mirentur et imitentur.”⁵¹ These are various types of musical rebuses, ranging from simple ones, where the solmisation syllables are represented by notes (this type is known, for example, from a symbolum of Kryštof Harant of Polžice and Bezručice), to more complex ones, where the notes are replaced by a syllable, a letter, or a word, according to their quantity. Based on the disorganised and crossed-out notes of this artificium in the extant manuscripts, it seems that students had difficulty to understand them. After all, some of them are difficult to decipher even now. Clingerius, in fact, described them as new, and indeed we do not often encounter musical rebuses in 16th-century prints. A likely source for this artificium may be sought in the riddles in the collection *Biggarnes* by the poet and musician Étienne Tabourot, first published in Paris in 1572.⁵² Clin-

⁴⁷ *Musaeolum*, fol. 563v.

⁴⁸ Graz, fols. 282r–284v. The poem is dated March 1587.

⁴⁹ For Sixti and the Olomouc prints, see Marta Vaculínová / Petr Daněk, „Caesaris olim Musicus ille“. Jan Sixti z Lerchenfelsu (ca. 1565–1629), zpěvák Rudolfa II. a litoměřický probošt [Jan Sixti of Lerchenfels (ca. 1565–1629), Singer of Rudolf II and Provost of Litoměřice], in: Muzikologické fórum 10/2 (2021), 161–182.

⁵⁰ Gotha, fol. 52rv; Graz, fol. 95r–96v; Augsburg, 248r–249r.

⁵¹ Graz, fol. 95r.

⁵² Katelijne Schiltz, *Music and Riddle Culture in the Renaissance*. Cambridge 2015, 342–343; Ulrich Ernst, *Carmen figuratum: Geschichte des Figurengedichts von den antiken Ursprüngen bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters*. Köln / Weimar / Wien 1991, 585.

gerius, however, does not cite Tabourot or any other source and gives his own examples and some original types of rebuses.

Clingerus's own invention is probably 'artificium Japonicum'. This wordplay is inspired by the Japanese writing system as described in the letters of the Jesuit missionaries in Japan (published in Leuven in 1569), to which Clingerius also refers in the recommended literature.⁵³

A large space in the *Technopaegnon* is occupied by chapters devoted to the combination of poetry and image – i.e., poems of the 'carmina figurata' type, symbola, emblems, and hieroglyphs (artificium hieroglyphicum). However, the treatment of this topic would be worthy of a separate specialised study. Moreover, emblems and symbola were not absent from contemporary Jesuit poetics – they could be found, for instance, in the works of Jacobus Pontanus Spanmüller and later of Alessandro Donati.

Clingerus's favourite artificia included the so-called *Philomelicum*.⁵⁴ He introduces it by these words:

Hoc Philomelicum appellare placuit artificium, non quidem quod de Philomelis ibi sint carmina (quanquam etiam haec celebrari artificio queat), sed mutato saltem nomine a Philomelis. Non enim frustra dictam fuisse arbitror lusciniā a poetis philomelam. Quid enim aliud est φιλῶς [sic], quam amicus charus sive pulcher? Et quid μελῶς [sic] est, nisi cantus, modulatio vel carmen lyricum, unde et poetae melici nomen sortiuntur? Hoc igitur genus artificii cum sit gratum et suave non immerito pulchrum et omnibus charum carmine iocari potest.

Clingerus then explains the principle of artificium, which lies in the fact that certain words that appear in individual verses of a poem are then arranged in order at its conclusion. This method was known before – it was used, for example, by Nicolaus Borbonius,⁵⁵ but the term 'philomelicum' is not known from earlier times and it is likely that Clingerius himself invented it. The pieces given as examples have no authors and presumably are also Clingerius's own

⁵³ Epistolae Iapanicae. Leuven: Rutger Velpius, 1569.

⁵⁴ Gotha, fols. 29v–29r (bis); Graz, fols. 51r–53v; Augsburg, fols. 217v–220r. Simias of Rhodes referred to his 'figuratum' in the form of an egg 'the cloth of Pandion's daughter' – i.e., Philomela (see Ernst [as in n. 52], 49 and 65), but Clingerius did not use the comparison of poetic artificium to a carpet with a woven message.

⁵⁵ Clingerius undoubtedly knew Borbonius's poetry – he quotes his poem *Composui versus, quos nunc sibi vindicat alter* from the collection Nugarum libri. Leiden: Gryphius, 1538, 249: carm., 76, in the section *Thiopoema*, Gotha, fol. 35rv.

creations, such as *Epigramma de philomela* (Inc.: “Suavis drosta canat” ...) ⁵⁶ etc. The only exception is the poem entitled *Convivii tenuitas accusatur*, which he refers to as “Elegia patris nostri Venegae, insignis poetae”. Nevertheless, the author has not been identified – his name was apparently garbled by the students’ records. Clingerius also applied the ‘philomelicum’ to longer compositions – for example, the Olomouc *Philomelicus dialogismus* of 1598. ⁵⁷

The nightingale (“philomela” or “lusciniā”) plays an important role in the Clingerian prints. Lubomirski in *Musaeolum* comments on the *Viridarium lusciniarum*, which Kwapisz considers to be Clingerius’s programmatic print, as follows:

Convenientissima inscriptione et dedicatione, Poetica hilaritate suavique verae amoenitatis odore, mirum in modum alliciens, iucundissima ... Unde quam Homeri simulachrum voluit esse antiquitas, eandem natura plane iubente, Clingerio deberi, et nominis ratio postulat cum ne Lusciniā segnior sit hortatur, et suavissimi Poëticae Musicae ingenii perfectio, cuius ea est ἱερογλύφικον [sic], suo iure omnino exigit. Clingerius itaque Lusciniāe foetus, ego Clingerii. ⁵⁸

This symbolic cult of the nightingale, whose pupil Clingerius claimed to be and whose skills he passed on to his students, resonates in poems surviving in manuscript form. ⁵⁹ The most important of them is the extensive *Encomium lusciniarum*, copied in the manuscript from Graz. ⁶⁰ In one passage, the author vividly describes the beautiful and variable song of the nightingale, before moving on to describe how the nightingale teaches its young to sing:

Inde suos pullos informat, corrigit, audit
Discipulos, modulos recitantes adjuvat, auget
Materiam, verum quod displicet auribus omne
Reiicit, indignum censens, perfecta requirit
Carmina ... ⁶¹

He calls the nightingale his Muse and expresses his admiration and love for it:

⁵⁶ Clingerius’s authorship of this poem can be considered virtually indisputable, because it was printed in *Viridarium lusciniarum*. Olomouc: Milichthaler, 1598, fol. A4b, marked with an anagram of Clingerius’s name “Ne lusciniā segnior”.

⁵⁷ *Philomelicus dialogismus sacris primitiis* ... d. Simonis Michaelis Silesii. Olomouc: Wüst, 1598.

⁵⁸ *Musaeolum*, fol. 570r.

⁵⁹ See e.g. Kwapisz 2019 (as in n. 5), 143.

⁶⁰ Graz, fols. 287r–290r.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, fol. 288v.

Te semper mea Musa sequar, tibi luce canenti
 Has aures tendam te quaeram nocte dieque
 Qui non audierit nec amarit corde lubenti.⁶²

Finally, he concludes the encomium with the verses:

Te Deus a cuculo clementer protegat hoste,
 A laribusque tuis frondosis arceat omnes
 Accipitres corvos noctu bubonis et iras
 Confundat, statione tua ut serveris honesta.
 Hos Luscinisonos versus Philomelica Musa
 Dictavit sanctae Paschae vernantibus horis.

The bird that is superior to the nightingale in Clingerius's allegorical world is, of course, the phoenix (i.e., Christ), whose deeds the nightingale praises.⁶³ This motif is also repeated in the print *Alleluia paschale* in the separate poem *Luscin-eologa allegorica – Phoenix redivivus*. In Clingerius's poems, the nightingale is accompanied by other birds, such as the swan, which appears as 'Musica' in Kochanowski's emblem of the seven liberal arts, or the cuckoo in the above-mentioned fable about the contest between the cuckoo and the nightingale. Clingerius's ideas of poetry, the cult of the nightingale and the Sacra Poesis are rather reminiscent of the Alexandrian school, as noted by Jan Kwapisz.⁶⁴ They have little in common with the ideas of poetry in contemporary, slightly later Jesuit poetics – those of Pontanus Spannmüller, Sarbiewski, or Donati.⁶⁵

The *Technopaegnon poeticum* concludes with a relatively short afterword,⁶⁶ in which Clingerius addresses the lovers of the Sacra Poesis and his students. He mentions that he worked eight years to complete it and regrets that many of the relevant sources were not yet at his disposal. After five years of teaching poetry, he can finally make this work available to his Viennese students. He was not concerned with Ciceronian eloquence but with showing the art of poetry. It will still be quite challenging to study and understand the novelty and variety of artificia. If the work were as perfect as he wishes it to be, it would arouse great interest among poets, who would then be like birds flocking around a wise owl or singers rushing to hear the song of a nightingale.

Updates to the *Technopaegnon* and its Further Fates

⁶² Ibid., fol. 290r.

⁶³ Ibid., fol. 287r: "... soligenae extollat Phoenicis gesta stupenda."

⁶⁴ Kwapisz 2019 (as in n. 5), 163.

⁶⁵ For the Jesuit poetics, see Volkhard Wels, Jesuitische Poetiken um 1600, in: Der Begriff der Dichtung in der frühen Neuzeit. Berlin / Boston 2009, 82–97.

⁶⁶ See Appendix 2.

The *Technopaegnon* originated in 1585. Over time, however, Clingerius updated some of the examples and lengthened the list of artificia, although he did not significantly alter the core of the work. There are noticeable updates, for example, in the chronostics and datable occasional poems (in the Augsburg copy, fol. 294v, there is a chronostic dated 1591). Other influences that Clingerius drew from literature over the years but that are not reflected in the known manuscripts of the *Technopaegnon* are evident in the poetic prints of the second half of the 1590s. Evidence of this is provided by the depiction called *Sacra Poesis*. This personification of poetry appears in the form of a woodcut in the congratulatory collections for the graduation of individual Olomouc students from 1597–1598, but we know of one copy that might be slightly older and is preserved as a bound-in sheet in a convolute of prints of mostly Viennese and Olomouc provenance with the following accompanying poem:

Maiestatis amans assurgo SACRA POESIS,

Cultori nostro laureaserta fero:

Omnia describo (vario hinc exornor amictu)

Sive sacrata petas, sive Prophana velis.⁶⁷

For Clingerius, *Sacra Poesis* thus does not mean exclusively religious poetry, as the term is sometimes understood, but poetry that is a gift from God, ‘divina’, no matter if it deals with secular or religious themes. Clingerius, by the accompanying poem, as well as the depiction itself (whether he himself is the author of the woodcut or whether he had it made to his own design), adopts the idea of the form of poetry as expressed in the *Carmen sub effigiae Poesis dedicatae* by Georgius Bartholdus Pontanus of Breitenberg in 1593.⁶⁸ If we compare Pontanus’s verses with the Clingerian woodcut, we can see how closely the author of the subject followed Pontanus’s model and also that Clingerius’s accompanying poem is clearly inspired by this poem written by Pontanus:

Dia triumphalis consurgit honore Poësis

Maiestate potens, fertur sublimis in aulas

His evecta bonis: Viden’, ut rapit una Phalangem

⁶⁷ In the convolute from the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Munich, the sheet is bound in before the print *Vertumnianum artificium*. Viennae: Kolbe, 1597. The Kraków copy of this print contains Clingerius’s handwritten dedication to Lubomirski – see Kwapisz 2019 (as in n. 5), 148. For more on the woodcut, see Vaculínová (as in n. 6), 85.

⁶⁸ Pontanus already treated the topic of ‘Poesis effigies’ in the 1570s, but these are manuscript versions produced in the community of poets in the Premonstratensian monastery in Louka near Znojmo – see Jana Kolářová, *Básnické dílo Jiřího Bartholda Pontana* [The Poetic Work of Georgius Bartholdus Pontanus]. Olomouc 2020, 43. The first extant printed version was published in the collection *Panegyrica ... Rudolpho Secundo*. Frankfurt a.M.: Basse, 1593, 21–23.

Innumeram, ut plaudant omnes victricibus armis?
 Cur bifidum diadema? Sacrata prophanaque pangit.
 Quid crux? Quidve manus monstrans? Notat esse Poësin
 Christiadam: quod tot vestis depicta figuris?
 Res omnes memorat, rerumque ornatur amictu.
 Astra quid et coeli decor? Hunc conscribit Aratus.
 Martia signa ferens cur stringit halitheus alvum?
 Arma virumque Maro canit, ausus Martis Homerus.
 Cur res naturae? Cur picta elementa? Sophiam
 Concinit Empedocles: Volucres, regioque, quid arbor?
 Quid prope diversis intexta animalia formis?
 Intexti flores, quos dat circumfluis humor?
 Ista Macer scribit, multi dant caetera vates.
 Ad talos humeris cur pendet laena superne
 Et Phoebum et Phoebe gerit, astrologoque per ima
 Est distincta gradu: sevant et carmina certos
 Quaque gradus, astrumque gradusque Poëta recenset.
 Laureaserta levat dextra, vatesque coronat.
 Solsequium laeva: ac veluti se hoc vertice flectit,
 Ad Phoebi radios, sic res imitatur et actus
 Et proprium quod rebus inest, moresve, habitusve,
 Personas rerumque vices et tempora vates,
 Illustratque viros et quod capit orbis et aether,
 Immortale facit, summo induit ornamento.

Clingerius was studying theology in Prague in 1589 when Pontanus was awarded the title Count Palatine. The influence of Pontanus's poetry on Clingerius's students is known from Lubomirski's collection, which in its complete form (for it has been preserved only in part) contained "*meditationes ad G. Bart. Pontani Carmina*".⁶⁹ Allow us to return to the term 'Sacra Poesis', to which Jan Kwapisz refers the adjective "sacropoeticus" in the title of the Kraków collection *Technopaegnon sacropoeticum*.⁷⁰ It may be a designation linked to religious poetry, not to the cult of poetry as such. The *Technopaegnon sacropoeticum* announces already in its title that it was published on the occasion of the Feast of Corpus Christi and contains religious poetry, albeit in the form of artificia and carmina figurata. The same adjective appears in the print *Strenae natalitiae sacropoeticae*, dedicated in the name of Jan Cautus as a New Year's gift to the bishop

⁶⁹ Kwapisz 2019 (as in n. 5), 155; Ryczkowski (as in n. 9), 198.

⁷⁰ Kwapisz 2019 (as in n. 5), 162.

Stanislav Pavlovský. Here, too, the content is religious – it is a traditional poetic composition with the subject of the Nativity.

In the early modern period, manuscripts could not compete with printed books in terms of their influence on readers and literary and scientific production. In the case of Clingerius and his *Technopaegnon*, however, it is possible to prove the further influence of the manuscript. Several years after Clingerius's death, it was used by the Marburg professor Rudolph Goclenius the Elder when he worked on his encyclopaedic work *Lexicon philosophicum Graecum*, published in Marburg in 1615.⁷¹ Goclenius included many artificia there, and wherever he lacked material from contemporary poetics, especially from Scaliger, he drew information from Clingerius's *Technopaegnon*. The entry φιλομέλισμα begins with the words "In Technopaegnio poetico est carmen ...", and the author goes on to explain the origin of its title with a text taken from Clingerius and abridged: "Appellatur hoc artificio a quodam Philomelicum et Philomelinum, non quod de Philomela illud sit (quanquam etiam Philomela eo celebrari possit), sed translato tantum nomine a Philomela ..."⁷² The examples of the poems beginning with the *Epigramma de philomela* are also taken from the *Technopaegnon*. In the entry "de parallelismo versuum", Goclenius includes the epitaph of Vilém Prusinovský by an unknown author and the epitaph of Maximilian II by David Crinitus,⁷³ the only two examples of Bohemical poetry from the *Technopaegnon*.⁷⁴ The section devoted to acrostics contains again the reference "haec ex TechnoPaegnio Poëtico",⁷⁵ and the inspiration by the manuscript is evident in a number of other places in the *Lexicon* as well. A comparison of the manuscripts known today shows that Goclenius utilised a variant close to the Gotha manuscript, which has more examples of the artificia used, but his reading is more correct than in the manuscript – he either had a better version or he emended the manuscript text himself. It is almost a rule that those who discussed the artificia also wrote them themselves. This is true, apart from Scaliger, of Goclenius, whose artificia are known from the collection *Liber selectiorum carminum* (Marburg 1606).

⁷¹ Goclenius (as in n. 39). The same work was already published in 1613 under the title *Lexicon philosophicum* with the identical typesetting.

⁷² Goclenius (as in n. 39), 259. Cf. the note with the quotation after note 50.

⁷³ David Crinitus wrote poesis artificiosa – e.g., figurative acrostics: see Mirjam Bohatcová, Farbige Figuralakrostichen aus der Offizin des Prager Druckers Georgius Nigrinus (1574/1581), in: Gutenberg-Jahrbuch 57 (1982), 246–262. On his printed poem, see Hejnic (as in n. 4), 97.

⁷⁴ Goclenius (as in n. 39), 165. David Crinitus, In obitu divi Maximiliani. Prague: Nigrinus, 1577, No. XIII. The source of the epitaph of Vilém Prusinovský is unknown.

⁷⁵ Goclenius (as in n. 39), 8.

Goclenius's student Johann Heinrich Alsted is known as a proponent of 'technopaegnia'.⁷⁶ For his *Encyclopaedia*,⁷⁷ Alsted drew heavily on Goclenius's *Lexicon* and thus also transferred the term 'technopaegnon poeticum' into it without referring it to a specific manuscript. Alsted took many of the entries from Goclenius and hence indirectly from Clingerius's *Technopaegnon*, as is evident from the examples of 'philomelicum' and parallelism above.⁷⁸ These excerpts can be traced to later writings by Catholic and Protestant intellectuals, for instance Juan Caramuel y Lobkowitz and Christian Stegman.⁷⁹ It is also possible to infer the reception of the *Technopaegnon* in a religious school environment, an example of which might be Paschasius and his *Poesis artificiosa*,⁸⁰ whose personification in the colophon in the form of a female figure in a starry robe holding a laurel wreath and a book of poetry is reminiscent of the depiction of the Sacra Poesis from the Olomouc prints.

That Alsted drew indirectly on Clingerius is also evident from the development of the definitions of the term 'technopaegnon'.⁸¹ In Clingerius, we read: "Sed ut quid velit Technopaegnon, inscriptio nempe huius operis, declaremus. Notandum est compositam esse dictionem 'ἀπὸ τῆς τέχνης', id est arte et 'παίγνιου' quasi lusu, ut sit veluti ludicrum artis vel artificium ludicrum aut lusus artificiosus, quod ab Ausonio originem trahere videtur, qui quosdam versus, ut suo loco videbimus (quos Monosyllabos vocat), Technopaegnon inscribit."⁸² The source of Clingerius's definition was most likely the Greek dictionary of Henri Estienne, which gives this interpretation:

Technopaignion, Ludicrum artis: vel Artificium ludicrum, aut Ludus artificiosus. Sic inscripsit Ausonius versus quosdam suos qui monosyllaba voce clauduntur.⁸³

Goclenius shortens it to:

⁷⁶ Kühlmann (as in n. 1), 432.

⁷⁷ Johannis Henrici Alstedii *Encyclopaedia cursus philosophici*. Herborn: Corvinus, 1630. The encyclopaedia was published in a smaller version already earlier – e.g., *Cursus philosophici encyclopaedia*, Herborn: Corvinus, 1620.

⁷⁸ Alsted (as in n. 77), 562–563 ('parallellon'), 564 ('philomelisma').

⁷⁹ Bohemical epitaphs are presented by Juan Caramuel y Lobkowitz, *Primus calamus ob oculos ponens metametricam*. Romae: Falconius, 1663, 50. Christian Stegman was inspired by Alsted, even for the title of his work *Technopaegnum poeticum*. Wismar: Martini, 1682, 79 ("parallellon") and 83 ("philomelisma").

⁸⁰ *Poesis artificiosa* ... R. P. F. Paschasii. Herbipoli: Zinck, 1668.

⁸¹ On the development of this term, see Kwapisz 2013 (as in n. 5), 9–11.

⁸² Gotha, fol. 5rv; Graz, 10v; Augsburg, 195v–196r.

⁸³ Henricus Stephanus, *Thesaurus Graecae linguae*, Tom. III. [Genf]: [Henri Estienne II], [1572], 1431.

Technopaegnion est artificiosus ludus ut Erotopaegnion est amoris lusus.
Tale est Acromonosyllabicum carmen.⁸⁴

His definition is then specified and expanded by Alsted:

Technopaegnion poëticum est artificiosus in re metrica lusus. Lusus ille respicit vel accidentia grammatica et rhetorica, vel affectionem logicam, vel figuram mathematicam.⁸⁵

We have attempted to provide the basic information on the manuscript sources discovered, but there is still much more to be added to create a complete picture of Clingerius's *Technopaegnion*. However, the questions that remain cannot be answered with the existing knowledge of the sources documenting monastic humanism in the 16th century.⁸⁶ It is not entirely impossible that Clingerius, in the study of artificia, also had a predecessor, a 'nightingale' from whom he learned poetry and theory. Except for some minor remarks, we have left aside his poetry and discussed him more as a theorist and teacher. His own poetic activities, which should be critically evaluated in future studies, are remarkable not only for their form. In the context of his poetic contemporaries, who cultivated given poetic conventions without much thought, Clingerius can be described as a poet with a distinctive artistic expression.

Transcription of Latin texts

The text of the preface is based on the three extant manuscripts of *Technopaegnion*: Forschungsbibliothek Gotha, Chart. B 1945 (hereinafter only as **Go**); Universitätsbibliothek Graz, Ms. 1278 (hereinafter only as **Gr**); UB Augsburg, Cod.II.2.4.37 (hereinafter only as **Aug**).⁸⁷ The Hugo Slevogt edition, based on the manuscript in Gotha, is also taken into account: *Technopaegnion Poeticum ex Codice MS. edidit Hugo Slevogt*. Teil 1, in: Programm des Gräfllich-Gleichenschen Gymnasiums Ohrdruf. Ohrdruf 1887, 3–5 (hereinafter only as **Sl**). The basic text for transcription of the preface (Appendix 1) is the **Go** manuscript, which has the best reading. In the textual critical notes we note divergences from the main text in other manuscript versions and in the Slevogt edition. In Appendix 2 we transliterate the afterword⁸⁸ that is missing in the **Go** manuscript. The **Gr**

⁸⁴ Goclenius (as in n. 39), 239.

⁸⁵ Alsted (as in n. 77), Cap. V. *De technopaegnio poetico Latino*, 549.

⁸⁶ On monastic humanism in the Czech lands, see Lucie Storchová, *Paupertate styloque connecti. Utváření humanistické učenecké komunity v českých zemích* [The Shaping of the Humanist Scholarly Community in the Czech Lands]. Praha 2011, 308–314.

⁸⁷ **Go**, fol. 9rv; **Gr**, fol. 8r; **Aug**, fol. 192rv.

⁸⁸ **Gr**, fols. 263v–264r; **Aug**, fols. 317r–318r.

and **Aug** manuscripts both contain errors to a comparable degree and it was not possible to give preference to one.

Our aim was to reproduce the original text according to the most probable wording, not to classicize or interfere with the orthography. We have also retained the original capitalization, which is a testimony to the contemporary practice. In a similar way, other Latin texts cited in the article are transcribed. The textual critical notes are written according to the principles of the Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina.

Appendix 1

In Technopaegnion poeticum praefatio.

Cognitum est⁸⁹ omnes artes rudiores primum tractatas⁹⁰ et deinde tempore⁹¹ politiores effectas fuisse, quemadmodum in omnibus artibus cum liberalibus quam⁹² mechanicis comperimus.⁹³ Nec mirum. Nullus enim artifex aemulo caruit;⁹⁴ quippe eo usque pervenitur, ut homines rei universae opificem Deum in suis quibusdam operibus effingendis imitando⁹⁵ omnem industriam collocent, et, si⁹⁶ non aemulari possunt,⁹⁷ propius⁹⁸ tamen ad res divinas accedere conantur.⁹⁹ Quid enim non pictores, sculptores et¹⁰⁰ caelatores suae arti addiderunt, ut populo placerent? Quasi nihil venustatis¹⁰¹ et gratiae habiturum sit illud,¹⁰² quod Apellaeum et Daedaleum¹⁰³ quid prae se ferat, quo fit, ut lineamenta, lucem, umbrarum recessus exprimant tanto artificio ita, ut¹⁰⁴ non a natura didicisse, sed cum ea certasse, aut potius illi leges dare posse¹⁰⁵ videantur. Sic cum sacra Poësis¹⁰⁶ sit ars, non defuerunt in illa Musarum aemuli. Unusquisque enim poetarum se de Iovis cerebro aut lacte mellisve medulla aliquid

⁸⁹ Cognitum est **Go, Aug**: Cunctis est cognitum **Gr**

⁹⁰ tractatas **Gr**: tractata **Go**, tractu **Aug**, tractatu *corr.* **Sl**

⁹¹ tempore **Go, Aug**: temporis successu **Gr**

⁹² quam **Go, Gr, Aug**; tum *corr.* **Sl**

⁹³ comperimus **Go, Gr**: comperientur **Aug**

⁹⁴ caruit **Go, Gr**: caret **Aug**

⁹⁵ imitando **Go, Gr**: *om.* **Aug**, imitentur in eoque imitando *corr.* **Sl**

⁹⁶ et si **Go**: etsi **Gr, Aug**, atque si *corr.* **Sl**

⁹⁷ possunt **Go, Aug**: possint **Gr**

⁹⁸ propius **Gr, Aug**; *corr.* **Sl**: proprius **Go**

⁹⁹ propius tamen ... conantur **Go**: *om.* **Gr**; propius tamen ... accedunt **Aug**

¹⁰⁰ sculptores et **Go, Gr, Aug**: sculptores *corr.* **Sl**

¹⁰¹ venustatis **Go, Gr**: vetustatis **Aug**

¹⁰² illud **Go, Gr**: *om.* **Aug**

¹⁰³ Apellaeum et Daedaleum **Go, Gr**: non Apellem prout Daedalum **Aug**

¹⁰⁴ ita, ut **Go, Gr, Aug**: ut: *corr.* **Sl**

¹⁰⁵ leges dare posse **Go**: dare leges posse **Gr, Aug**

¹⁰⁶ sacra Poësis **Go, Aug**: poësis **Gr**

libasse demonstrare voluit, unde se quemadmodum pavo¹⁰⁷ aliis avibus¹⁰⁸ ostentaret, quo factum est, ut poetae limitibus suis se¹⁰⁹ non continuerint. Poësis enim (ut loquitur Iulius Caesar Scaliger¹¹⁰) est imitatio naturae, natura vero¹¹¹ ipsa raro simplicia commentatur. Hinc factum est, ut vates diversa Technopaegnia et diversa¹¹² artificiorum genera excogitaverint¹¹³ nobisque¹¹⁴ imitanda reliquerint. Idcirco liceat mihi cum Aristophane exclamare: Quid est, quod non manibus effici¹¹⁵ queat? Nihil enim est rerum omnium, quod arte necnon ingenii industria non perficiatur. Nos igitur ex¹¹⁶ multiplici artificiorum genere¹¹⁷ quasdam artes poeticas proponemus,¹¹⁸ ut intelligenter et sapienter¹¹⁹ Castalidum¹²⁰ ianuus percurramus,¹²¹ quamvis fortassis a quibusdam ille labor vili pendi possit,¹²² sed non nisi ab¹²³ huius artis ignaris vel aemulis severisque¹²⁴ Aristarchis. Asinus enim stramenta mavult quam aurum.¹²⁵ Sed condolendum est communi hominum vitio, quicquid enim ipsi vel stupiditate¹²⁶ vel¹²⁷ negligentia consequi nequeunt, temnere citius¹²⁸ quam laudare malunt, sed nihili facienda sunt huiusmodi verborum vana iacula. Maior enim hinc divinae Poëseos clarescit gloria, quae nisi difficilem se praeberet,¹²⁹ artis nomine indigna esset. Rem enim facilem, quae a pueris effici potest, non artem statim appellamus,¹³⁰ proinde perpetuum splendeat Poëseos maiestas. Haec autem sunt artificiorum nomina,

¹⁰⁷ pavo **Gr:** pavi **Go;** pavus **Aug**

¹⁰⁸ aliis avibus **Go, Gr, Aug:** inter alias aves *corr.* **Sl**

¹⁰⁹ poetae limitibus suis se **Go, Aug:** limitibus poetae suis sese **Gr**

¹¹⁰ Scaliger **Go, Gr:** Schaliger **Aug**

¹¹¹ vero **Go, Gr:** enim **Aug**

¹¹² diversa **Go, Aug:** *om.* **Gr**

¹¹³ excogitaverint **Go, Gr:** excogitarint **Aug**

¹¹⁴ nobisque **Go, Gr:** novisque **Aug**

¹¹⁵ non manibus effici **Go, Aug:** manibus effici non **Gr**

¹¹⁶ nos igitur ex: *corr.* **Sl:** nos igitur et **Go, Gr;** hos itaque pro **Aug**

¹¹⁷ genere **Go, Gr, Aug:** arte: *corr.* **Sl**

¹¹⁸ proponemus, ut **Go, Gr, Aug:** proponemus et operam dabimus: *add.* **Sl**

¹¹⁹ intelligenter et sapienter **Go:** intelligantur et capiantur **Gr, Aug;** intelligenter ac sapienter: *corr.* **Sl**

¹²⁰ Castalidum **Go, Aug:** Castaliceas **Gr**

¹²¹ percurramus **Go:** aperimus **Gr;** aperiemus **Aug**

¹²² possit **Gr;** *corr.* **Sl:** posset **Go, Aug**

¹²³ ab **Go:** *om.* **Gr, Aug**

¹²⁴ severisque **Go, Aug:** vel **Gr**

¹²⁵ Erasmus, *Adagia* 3738 (4, 8, 38)

¹²⁶ stupiditate **Go, Aug:** suppeditat **Gr**

¹²⁷ vel **Go:** vel potius **Gr, Aug**

¹²⁸ temnere citius **Go, Gr, Aug:** contemnere *corr.* **Sl**

¹²⁹ praeberet **Go, Aug:** praebeat **Gr**

¹³⁰ appellamus **Go, Aug:** appelabimus **Gr**

quae in primo vestibuli ingressu omnium¹³¹ obtutibus¹³² perlustranda, deinde¹³³ vero tractanda praefigere volumus.¹³⁴

Appendix 2

Conclusio Technopaegnii

Haec sunt, sacrae Poeseos¹³⁵ amatores et discipuli mei clarissimi, quae octo annorum spatio nocturnis et diurnis lucubrationibus collegi, et me plura non audisse,¹³⁶ vidisse et legisse doleo. Opus enim non¹³⁷ omnibus numeris perfectum esse censeo, quicquid tamen in secretiori mea Poesi multis hoc quinquennio spatio, quibus artem hanc professus fui, in tribus collegiis occultavi, vobis¹³⁸ vieniensibus hisce artificiiis manifestavi. Quamvis autem non tantam gratiam et venustatem redoleant, quod¹³⁹ ad consuetam dicendi rationem formata et ornata non sint nec verborum elegantium in aliis¹⁴⁰ admixtum sit, nulla praeterea sententia adeo argute dicta, nulla industria, nulla Atticae linguae Venere proposita, aut compositionis harmonia aut arte ad amussim elaborata,¹⁴¹ sed ab his omnibus longe lateque discrepant, sciant lectores operis mei me¹⁴² artem poeticam potius quam Ciceronianam facundiam ostendere voluisse, hanc igitur curam aliis commendo, qui vel ornabunt, augebunt vel amplificabunt. Satis sit novitate et varietate saltem artificiorum insudasse et studuisse. Si ita perfectum esset, ut optarem, atque¹⁴³ in publico si appareret, certatim ab omnibus Poetis curaretur,¹⁴⁴ non aliter veluti ad noctuam reliquae aviculae sturnatim et gratulatum convolare aut tanquam ad lusciniam audiendam Philomelici vates appropere solent.¹⁴⁵ Hoc fuit nectar illud poeticum, quod proliferare volui, vos rosas Musarum decerpere, spinas vero relinquire. Ex quibus vero auctorum floribus apum more quaedam sumptum¹⁴⁶ Coronidis et Colophonis loco

¹³¹ omnium: omnibus **Aug**

¹³² obtutibus **Go, Gr: om. Aug**, obtutu: *corr.* **Sl**

¹³³ deinde **Gr, Aug: deinceps Go**

¹³⁴ volumus **Go, Gr: volumus Aug**

¹³⁵ sacrae Poeseos **Gr: Sacrae poeseos Aug**

¹³⁶ non audisse **Gr: om. Aug**

¹³⁷ non **Gr: om. Aug**

¹³⁸ nobis **Aug: Nobis Gr**

¹³⁹ quod **Gr: quo Aug**

¹⁴⁰ elegantium nihil in illis admixtum sit *corr.:* elegantium in aliis admixtum est **Gr**, elegantiam nihil in illis admixtum est **Aug**

¹⁴¹ aut ... elaborata **Gr: om. Aug**

¹⁴² me **Aug: om. Gr**

¹⁴³ atque **Aug: certe Gr**

¹⁴⁴ curaretur **Aug: curveretur Gr**

¹⁴⁵ sturnatim ... solent **Gr: om. Aug**

¹⁴⁶ sumptum **Gr: superum Aug**

Catalogum authorum tam sacrorum quam prophanorum adiungere placuit, hi autem sunt qui sequuntur.¹⁴⁷

Appendix 3

A reconstruction of the content of the original manuscript of the *Technopaegnon poeticum*. Graz / Augsburg / Gotha / Goclenius + Alsted (GA)

In Technopaegnon poeticum praefatio (Graz: Inc.: “Cunctis est cognitum”, Gotha + Augsburg: “Cognitum est ...” Expl.: “... tractanda praefigere voluimus”.) complemented by a list of artificia.

Graz and Augsburg then have prolegomena without a heading: Inc.: “Pluria¹⁴⁸ quidem artificiorum genera sese nisi ...” (which is incomplete in Gotha, with one or more folios missing; it thus begins: “... satis vel novitatis id omne tenuerit”), Expl. in Graz and Augsburg: “Haec in Prolegomenis, iam ad artificia”.

The artificia in Graz are not numbered, Gotha has numbered artificia in the actual text up to number 35, and Augsburg has 76 numbers in the alphabetical list after the preface; when the lists from all manuscripts are combined, there are about 78 artificia in total.

1. Virgilianum / Vergilianum
2. Lucullianum / Luculianum
3. Gryphus / Griphus (GA)
4. Sotadeum / Sothadaeum
5. Diaulonianum (GA)
6. Stichodilecticum / Stychodilecticum
7. Metatheticum / Metatheticon (GA)
8. Philomelicum (GA)
9. Pyrrhichicum / Pyrricum
10. Parallelon (GA)
11. Commatium / Commaticum / Commathium
12. Monosyllabum / Monosyllabicum / Monosyllabi
13. Thiopoema / Tiopoema / Tiopoëma
14. Euryphalicum / Euryphallicum
15. Epomoneon / Eponomion / Epomoneon / Epomonion
16. Paromoeon / Paromaeon (GA)
17. Syncriticum
18. Apologeticum
19. Symplecticum
20. Echo + vocabula echica (GA)

¹⁴⁷ hi autem ... sequuntur **Aug:** *om.* **Gr**

¹⁴⁸ Pluria **Gr:** Pura **Aug**

21. Musicum
22. Leoninum (GA)
23. Centones (GA)
24. Harmoniacum
25. Parodia (GA)
26. Centaurinum (GA)
27. Metamorphosianum (GA)
28. Proteus / Protheus (GA)
29. Isogrammadistichon / Isogrammastichon seu Rhabanianum / Isogrammatistichon seu Rhabanianum (GA)
30. Acrostichon (GA)
31. Cephalonomaticum / Cephalonomaticon (GA)
32. Silonianum
33. Iaponicum / Japonicum
34. Pangrammata / Pangrammaton
35. Hieroglyphicum / H. imitatum seu figuratum
36. Epizographianum
37. Emblema (GA)
38. Symbolum
39. Elogium / Elogia
40. Epigramma (GA)
41. Anagramma (GA)
42. Distichon
43. Apophoreta
44. Eteostichon (GA)
45. Monostichon
46. Senecianum / Senetianum
47. Aenigma (GA)
48. Logogryphi / Logographi (GA)
49. Paroemiacum
50. Cascum
51. Germanicum
52. Macharonicum / Macaronicum
53. Eponymicum / Epomonicum
54. Heroinum
55. Pantomiphonon / Pantomiphonon
56. Macrocolon (GA)
57. Brachycolon / Brachicolon
58. Anaphoricum / Ephanaphoricum
59. Epanadoticum
60. Epanastrophicum

61. Gomphonianum sive coagmentatum
62. Perileptianum / Perilepsis / Perilepsianum
63. Erotematicum
64. Diameiodia
65. Stichoplagiasmon / Stichoplagiasmus
66. Alleponalium / Allonexalium
67. Palinodia
68. Iconium
69. Politianaeum
70. Climaticum
71. Antitheticum (GA)
72. Paronomasiacum (GA)
73. Anadiplosianum
74. Polypoticum
75. Periphrasticum
76. Histurgicum
77. Bucolicum
78. Progymnasmaticum

Conclusio Technopaegnii. Inc.: Haec sunt sacrae poeseos amatores et discipuli mei charissimi quae 8 annorum spatio nocturnis et diurnis lucubrationibus collegi ... Expl.: Colophonis loco Catalogum auctorum tam Sacrorum quam prophanorum affingere placuit.

Appendix 4

A reconstruction of the list of recommended authors and works.

(**Gr**, fol. 264rv; **Aug**, fols. 317v–318r. **Gr** is used as default manuscript because of its better reading. Alternatives from **Aug** are given after the slash. The name order in both manuscripts is not the same.)

S. Augustinus¹⁴⁹

S. Ambrosius¹⁵⁰

Venerabilis Beda¹⁵¹

Rhabanus Episcopus Moguntinus¹⁵²

Eustatius¹⁵³

¹⁴⁹ Saint Augustine (354–430).

¹⁵⁰ Saint Ambrose (Aurelius Ambrosius, c. 339–c. 397).

¹⁵¹ Bede the Venerable (c. 672–735), English bishop and writer.

¹⁵² Rabanus Maurus (c. 780–856), Frankish archbishop, theologian and poet.

¹⁵³ Eustathius of Thessalonice, a 12th-century bishop, commentator on Homer and Dionysius Periegetes.

Nicephorus / Nicephalus¹⁵⁴
 S. Nazianzenus¹⁵⁵
 S. Hyeronimus¹⁵⁶
 Plato¹⁵⁷
 Aristoteles¹⁵⁸
 Vegetius¹⁵⁹
 Plinius¹⁶⁰
 Bocatius¹⁶¹
 Higinius¹⁶²
 Palephatus¹⁶³
 Boetius / Boëtius¹⁶⁴
 Athenaeus¹⁶⁵
 Petrus Crinitus / Crinitus¹⁶⁶
 Sanetes / Santes¹⁶⁷
 Non: Marcellus¹⁶⁸
 Suidas¹⁶⁹
 Naugerius¹⁷⁰

¹⁵⁴ Nicephorus Gregoras, a 13th–14th-century Byzantine historian, commentator on Porphyry, Proclus, and Homer; his work was published by Melanchthon.

¹⁵⁵ Saint Gregory the Great (c. 540–604).

¹⁵⁶ Saint Jerome (c. 342–420).

¹⁵⁷ Plato (c. 424–c. 347 BC).

¹⁵⁸ Aristotle (384–322 BC).

¹⁵⁹ Adam of Fulda or Vegetius († 1505), a composer and theorist, author of a treatise on music, originally a Benedictine monk, later professor at the newly founded University of Wittenberg.

¹⁶⁰ Probably Pliny the Elder (Gaius Plinius Secundus, c. 23–79).

¹⁶¹ Giovanni Boccaccio (1313–1375), Italian humanist and poet.

¹⁶² Gaius Iulius Hyginus († before 17 AD), a Roman author of writings on mythology and astronomy, poet.

¹⁶³ Palaephatus, the fourth-century Greek mythographer.

¹⁶⁴ Anicius Manlius Severinus Boëthius (c. 480–524).

¹⁶⁵ Athenaeus of Naucratis, a Greek grammarian and rhetorician of the turn of the 2nd and 3rd centuries, author of the fragmentarily preserved work *Deipnosophistae* or *The Banquet of the Learned*.

¹⁶⁶ Pietro Crinito (1474–1507), a Florentine humanist and poet, author of the work *De honesta disciplina* (1504).

¹⁶⁷ Probably Santes Pagnino (1470–1541), an Italian Dominican, philologist, and Biblical scholar.

¹⁶⁸ Nonius Marcellus, a late-Roman grammarian and lexicographer of the 4th or 5th century.

¹⁶⁹ The alleged author of the Byzantine lexicon Suda, which was written around 970.

¹⁷⁰ Andrea Navagero (1483–1529), an Italian humanist and poet, editor of Ovid.

Diomedes¹⁷¹
 Natalis comes¹⁷²
 Lilius Gyraldus / prialdus¹⁷³
 Nicolaus Perotus / perottus¹⁷⁴
 Hortensius¹⁷⁵
 Petrus Damianus¹⁷⁶
 Servius¹⁷⁷
 Despauterius¹⁷⁸
 Bartolomaeus Riccius¹⁷⁹
 Julius Caesar Scaliger¹⁸⁰
 Claudius Minois¹⁸¹
 Publius Festus / Vestus¹⁸²
 Rubertus Turnerus¹⁸³
 Gilbertus Genebrardus / Gelebrandus¹⁸⁴
 Riochus / Triochus¹⁸⁵
 Joannes Rosinus¹⁸⁶
 Ennius¹⁸⁷

¹⁷¹ Diomedes Grammaticus, a Latin grammarian of the late 4th century.

¹⁷² Natale Conti (1520–1582), an Italian mythographer and historian.

¹⁷³ Giglio Gregorio Giraldi (1479–1552), an Italian mythographer, predecessor of Conti, and a poet.

¹⁷⁴ Niccolò Perotti (1429–1480), an Italian humanist and the author of the first early modern Latin grammar.

¹⁷⁵ Probably Lambertus Hortensius (1500–1574), a Dutch humanist and Catholic clergyman, poet, and historian, commentator on Roman poets.

¹⁷⁶ Peter Damian († 1072), an Italian medieval theologian and philosopher.

¹⁷⁷ Maurus Servius Honoratus, a late 4th-century and early 5th-century grammarian, commentator on Virgil.

¹⁷⁸ Johannes Despauterius (1480–1520), a Flemish Humanist and educator, author of a Latin grammar.

¹⁷⁹ Bartolomeo Ricci (1542–1613), an Italian Jesuit.

¹⁸⁰ Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484–1558), Italian scholar, author of influential work on poetics.

¹⁸¹ Claude Mignault (Claudius Minos, 1536–1606), a French lawyer and philologist, author of emblem books.

¹⁸² Probably Sextus Pompeius Festus, a Roman grammarian of the 2nd century, author of the work *De verborum significatu*.

¹⁸³ Robert Turner († 1599), originally from Scotland, professor of philosophy and rhetoric at Ingolstadt, later secretary of Archduke Ferdinand II Tyrol, commentator and theologian.

¹⁸⁴ Gilbert Générard († 1597), Benedictine exegete, and Orientalist-Hebraist.

¹⁸⁵ Unidentified, probably ‘de Rioja’.

¹⁸⁶ Johann Rosinus (1551–1626), a German Protestant theologian and antiquarian.

¹⁸⁷ Quintus Ennius (c. 239–c. 169 BC).

Virgilius¹⁸⁸

Seneca¹⁸⁹

Juvenalis¹⁹⁰

Ausonius¹⁹¹

Alciatus¹⁹²

Bartholo: Annulus / Anulius¹⁹³

Horatius¹⁹⁴

Achilles Boschius / Poclesius¹⁹⁵

Andreas Brusius / Prusius¹⁹⁶

Joannes Engerdus¹⁹⁷

Sambucus¹⁹⁸

Pontanus¹⁹⁹

Wida / Bida²⁰⁰

Bartholo: Maranta Venusinus²⁰¹

Paradinus²⁰²

¹⁸⁸ Virgil (Publius Vergilius Maro, 70–19 BC).

¹⁸⁹ Probably Seneca the Younger (Lucius Annaeus Seneca, c. 4 BC–65 AD).

¹⁹⁰ Juvenal (Decimus Junius Juvenalis, turn of the 1st and 2nd century).

¹⁹¹ Decimus Magnus Ausonius (c. 310–c. 395).

¹⁹² Andrea Alciato (1492–1550), an Italian jurist and humanist, founder of the genre of emblems.

¹⁹³ Barthélemy Aneau (1510–1561), a classmate of Beza and Calvin, professor of rhetoric in Lyon, creator of emblems and translator of Alciato.

¹⁹⁴ Horace (Quintus Horatius Flaccus, 65–8 BC).

¹⁹⁵ Achille Bocchi († 1562), an Italian humanist, author of the emblem book *Symbolicarum quaestionum libri V*. Bologna: Academia Bochiana, 1555.

¹⁹⁶ Correctly Andreas Frusius (André des Freux, † 1566), a French Jesuit, scholar, and poet. The first Jesuit whose works were published in print.

¹⁹⁷ Johann Engerd († 1587), professor of poetry at Ingolstadt, poet and creator of artificia; Clingerius often quotes him in the *Technopaegnon*.

¹⁹⁸ Johannes Sambucus (1531–1584), a court historian of Ferdinand I and professor in Vienna, poet and polyhistor, author of emblems.

¹⁹⁹ Only in the manuscript from Graz. It may be Jacobus Pontanus Spanmüller (1546–1626), a Jesuit from Most, author of Jesuit poetics and other textbooks, or the Italian humanist and poet Giovanni Gioviano Pontano (1426–1503) or Czech Catholic poet and historian Georgius Bartholdus Pontanus (c. 1550–1614).

²⁰⁰ Marco Girolamo Vida († 1566), an Italian Humanist, author of poetics in verse and a number of religious and didactic epics.

²⁰¹ Bartolomeo Maranta (1500–1571), an Italian physician, botanist, and literary theorist. Clingerius's first two artificia are based on his work *Lucullianae quaestiones*. Basel: Oporinus, 1564.

²⁰² Claude Paradin († 1573), a French canon, genealogist, and publisher of emblem books.

Merlinus²⁰³

Homerus²⁰⁴

Picta Poesis²⁰⁵

Livius²⁰⁶

Epistolae Japonicae²⁰⁷

Laurentius Albertus / Alb. Laurent.²⁰⁸

Joannes Susambrotus / Jo. Susenbrod.²⁰⁹

Castellio²¹⁰

Claius / Chlasius²¹¹

Martialis²¹²

Sanazarius / saccasorius²¹³

Ovidius²¹⁴

Sixtus Senensis²¹⁵

²⁰³ Jacques Merlin (c. 1480–1541), a French theologian and editor, commentator on Origen.

²⁰⁴ Homer (born c. 8th century BC).

²⁰⁵ The book of emblems under this title was written by Barthelémy Aneau, who is already listed above. It is also worth considering *Picta poesis Ovidiana* by N. Reusner and F. Sabaeus (Frankfurt: Feyerabend, 1580) and *Emblematum Tyrocinia sive Picta poesis latinogermanica* by M. Holtzwardt (Straßburg: Jobin, 1581).

²⁰⁶ Livy (Titus Livius, 59 BC–AD 17).

²⁰⁷ *Epistolae Iapanicae, de multorum gentilium in variis insulis ... per Societatis Iesu theologos conversione*. Leuven: Velpius, 1569.

²⁰⁸ Only in the manuscript from Augsburg. Laurentius Albertus († after 1583) was linguist and author of a German grammar.

²⁰⁹ Johannes Susenbrotus († 1542), a German humanist, who wrote the foundations of Latin grammar, a collection of Christian poems and the book on tropes.

²¹⁰ The identification is unclear; theoretically, it could be Sébastien Châteillon (1515–1563), a Protestant theologian, opponent of Calvin, and translator.

²¹¹ Johannes Clajus (1535–1592), a German educator, Protestant theologian and grammarian, author of Latin religious poetry, author of *Prosodiae libri tres*. Wittenberg: Krafft, 1570.

²¹² Martial (Gaius Valerius Martialis, between 38 and 41–between 102 and 104).

²¹³ Jacopo Sannazaro (1458–1530), an Italian humanist and poet.

²¹⁴ Ovid (Publius Ovidius Naso, 43 BC–17/18 AD).

²¹⁵ Sixtus of Siena (1520–1569), a Jewish convert, Catholic theologian, and biblical scholar; editor of the collection *Bibliotheca sancta ex praecipuis Catholicae Ecclesiae auctoribus collecta*. Venice: Franciscis, 1566.



Image 1: *Sacra poesis*, detail of the woodcut used by Clingerius. *Artificiosae Musarum gratulationes*. Olomouc: Handl, 1597, reverse of title page. National Library of the Czech Republic, 52 C 11/adl.33.



Image 2: Paschasius a Sancto Johanne Evangelista, Poësis artificiosa. Würzburg: Zinck, 1668, detail from the frontispiece. National Library of the Czech Republic, 9 K 62.

Marta Vaculínová
vaculinova@ics.cas.cz

Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague/Czech Republic

