

THESIS FOR THE DOCTOR'S DEGREE

Szilvia Nagy

**THE CRITICAL EDITION AND TEXTUAL  
EXAMINATION OF TWO SCHOOL DRAMAS FROM  
CSÍKSOMLYÓ**

Miskolc  
2010

## **I. The aims set for the research**

The school dramas form a rather significant though not or scarcely known part of the Hungarian culture history. The literary values of these works do not meet the standards set by the literateurs. They are important not because of their possible literary values but because of their unique position in the cultural life in the 17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries. The style of school dramas appeared in the 16<sup>th</sup> century in the educational life and the interpretations of these plays are obviously connected to this aspect of life. The hegemony of these institutes is not represented purely by the frequency of performances but by the attendance and by their influence on the spectators. The school dramas are the direct forerunners of our dramatics and drama literature.

The literature research handled this style as a stepchild, they realised this important legacy only in 19<sup>th</sup> century. They started to reveal these plays at the end of the same century and this has been going on until today. Generations of scientists collected the texts of plays and information about the plays, circumstances, characteristics of the genre. The texts were issued just as monographs, studies, bibliographies which help the researchers in their work. These help us to examine the particular texts.

The aims of my study: preparation of the critical edition of two school dramas from Csíksomlyó, charting and analysing their potential for examination. Apart from publishing the text and the notes my aim was to put them into the right context in the age, religion, style and cultural background. I examined their relation with the audience other dramas from the same style, their characters and their dramaturgical, structural, poetic, stylistic, linguistic etc. features. I will check how these dramas fit into the custom of Passion plays, list their sources, the compilation techniques of their playwrights and the places of these works in the thematic order of school playing. My aim is their scenical expose too: the study of school drama has concluded that we need complex research methods, i.e. we need to explore the circumstances not only the texts. I am to use many methods of the literary theory searching for the best to analyse this style. I will answer the question: what did these dramas mean to the contemporary spectators and what might get the audience now from them.

I will not only examine the texts and the performances but I will touch some, in this case, less central topics. I will shortly introduce the history of the Franciscan order, the monastery and the school in Csíksomlyó, the act-playing of the Franciscans in Csíksomlyó comparing to bigger orders. I feel that sketching the history of school drama research is rather important too. Especially, as at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century/beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and in the 20<sup>th</sup> century they examined these plays in a positivist manner. However, in the 1990s a change of approach has arrived in the theory and practice of school drama research. Imre Varga and Hopp Lajos laid down the basics, which meant changes in the theory of the style, methodology of research and alternations in the stresses.

The most significant change was the move from focusing on the text/literature to a more complex research. I divided the history of the school drama research according to the changes in its place and in their quantitative and qualitative tendencies. I tried to identify the most important points and the intervals between them characterised by some kind of homogeneity.

My aim, apart from using the methodology of complex research, is to analyse the approach of different drama theory schools and their usefulness in examining the school dramas, specially these two plays. I start exploring from the 18<sup>th</sup> century, known as poetics until the theories focusing on the playwright, work and spectators in the 19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> century.

## II. The sources of the thesis

The two texts can be found in a manuscript from Csíksomlyó. Most of the texts survived in a 1348-page-long collection, called *Liber exhibens Actiones parascevicas Ab anno 1730 usque ad annum 1774 diem aprilis 27 (...) Confectus 1774*. The collection can be found in the holdings of the library of Csíksomlyó. The two texts are on p. 885-904 and p. 817-849.

I have used texts of other plays from Csíksomlyó. These are either in other publications (written by Árpád Fülöp, Zsolt Alszeghy, Ferenc Szilávik and in “*Nap, Hold és csillagok, velem zokogjatok!*”) or still in manuscripts (after finishing the text of my thesis the first volume of the critical edition of Franciscan school dramas was published). The other texts of dramas I took from *Régi Magyar Drámai Emlékek*, the data I used was from the book-form resource (writers: Géza Staud jesuit section, Imre Varga protestant section, István Kilián, Márta Zsuzsanna Pintér, Imre Varga catholic section, István Kilián collected and published the piarist section in 1994). Certainly, I read and used the collection of other types of texts.

I elaborated a considerable part of the bibliography dealing with school dramas during my work. I studied literary theory, dramatics, the literature about the contemporary poetics, scenery, music, folklore etc. I used the result of international researches (mostly based on conference materials).

I was helped by books of local history, school history, publications about the library, theological and communicational books.

I used many Internet databases, resources. They are partly texts, e.g. translations of the Bible, Vulgate and other Latin and Hungarian texts (Magyar Elektronikus Könyvtár, The Latin Library). Some of the online encyclopaedias, dictionaries were rather useful, and I used online maps, bibliographies, articles, facsimiles of books, etc. I searched the database of Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, the University of Mannheim, the California State University and other online databases.

The two texts I studied are not mentioned frequently. Both of them can be read in the summary of school plays written by Vazul Bándi. Árpád Fülöp published 4 plays from Csíksomlyó in 1897. The book starts with an overlook in which the author introduces the drama collection. In his thorough and multifold introduction he writes only few words about the topic of my thesis. He calls the first work a „dogmatic dispute” which has the same purpose as Passion plays. He gives a short summary about the topic and structure of the second play. Márta Zsuzsanna Pintér calls the first drama a religious dispute and states that its aim is to “foster religious enrichment” and he categorises the second as a mystery play, which is about the judgement day. Júlia Demeter says in a study that the first play is a religious dispute drama. Medgyesy-Schmikli Norbert

scrutinised the compilations in the second drama and its relation with the Lazar dramas. I examined the two plays in a few studies too.

### III. Summarising the result of the research

The beginning of the dramas did not survive, we do not know either their title or their first act. The copiers gave a name implying to their style and deficiency: *Actio sine initio* (1722) and *Actio antiqua satis sine initio* (1725). During the publishing I gave Hungarian names reflecting the plot: *Actio sine initio* – “Játék a zsidók megtéréséről” (Play about the Jews’ Conversion), *Actio antiqua satis sine initio* – “Játék az utolsó ítéletről” (Play about Doomsday).

Regarding their **topics** both works are exceptions, specialities as we do not have any data about religious disputes or judgement day plays from Csíksomlyó. The cause of this can be found in the date of the plays: we are talking about early 18<sup>th</sup> century works, which are strongly connected to the previous tradition of the previous century.

Though the thematic of the plays do not follow the mainstream of the Passion plays in Csíksomlyó still the signs which make the works an organic part of the dramacorpus are inevitable. One of these signs is the aim of the performance. The didactic element gets more or less play in the school performances, the proselytise aim can be transferred into different topics. The Passion plays targeting the emotions are just as appropriate enforcing faith as theological plays targeting logic. For awaking penitence showing the sinful youth is just as proper as showing the passion of Christ. One of the common relations is the religious attitude, which is all over the text. These two plays – similarly to Passion plays – draws a lot from the Bible. Nevertheless, the universality of the contemporary world perception contains revelative conjuration of the Apocalypse, apart from the Christ thematic, and pin picking religious disputes. The dramas and the Passion plays expose the same world but from other angles. The texts (as they are unique) can fit into the tradition of local Passion playing due to the contemporary apprehension. You can see in the play from 1725 morality acts, devils, the underworld and they appear in many Passion plays – exposing the Judgement Day is rather close to these. The play from 1722 and the Passion plays have similar approach to the world. Evoking the history of redemption is equal to build up the church of Christ, which is the same to the believers, so the play can enforce the spectators about their place in this group. The religious dispute contained the same conclusion (be the part of the group with its spiritual and psychical advantages) but not through showing the mystical act of redemption so not metaphorically but verbally, tangibly.

The basic feature of the school dramas was functionality, the aim targeted to achieve with the play. The structure of the plays can only be interpreted only by apprehending the aim. In the case of these two dramas functionality ruled the structure, which means mainly compilation. The dispute-like play was written to show the primacy of the catholic church, this is the main source of influence. The “Játék az utolsó ítéletről” wanted to picture the last day and the judgement waiting for the humanity to deflect the audience from the sins. These plays put their topics into the discussion about the salvation, which usually uses didactic tendency – influencing students and spectators.

The frame of the world (and so the plays) is salvation and no requirement of the dramas is that important.

The plays do not follow the contemporary act structure of 5 acts (3, 6, 7) drawn **by drama poetics**. They are not divided to acts, only for scenes. They hardly fit into Piscator's and Griff's structure, especially as they are only fragments. In the play "*Játék a zsidók megtéréséről*", for example, the first act contains the protasis, the epítasis and the catastrophe but it is impossible to point out the catastasis. We cannot find the climax in the play, it seems to repeat the same (fragmental) structure. The structure of the "*Játék az utolsó ítéletről*" has a different structure. Due to its holes we can only roughly find the boundaries of the inner parts of the structure. We can be rather sure about the catastasis in the 9<sup>th</sup> scene, in the Judex's judging but the event is part of the catastrophe together the two subsequent scenes. The 10<sup>th</sup> scene has some similarity to the catastasis too. The 2<sup>nd</sup> and the 7<sup>th</sup> scenes can be the part of protasis but the 4<sup>th</sup> is rather part of the catastrophe. So the two plays (just as many others) follow neither the structure of dividing to acts and scenes nor the „exposure-intrigue-delaying-climax-solution” structure. The plays cannot be interpreted as conflict dramas, the double-layered drama model of Tamás Bécsy is much more useful for use. According to him, the structure of mystery plays, the orders of the scenes are not accidental. The divine level defines the ordinary one, the work shows – in a ritual way – the appropriate behaviour to achieve eternity. The main frame for these works is to confront the afterlife and the ordinary parts of humanity. In the "*Játék a zsidók megtéréséről*" bears the order of conversion and this (at least in the known text) covert thesis means the frame of the play. The shown example of appropriate behaviour is strictly verbal proving the structural unity. In the "*Játék az utolsó ítéletről*" the divine level is presented in its whole together with its agents (angels, devils, Judex etc.) to display the fate of sinful or innocent people. Character of Anima and Corpus – the human figures of afterlife and the ordinary world – are there in the 4<sup>th</sup> scene. They represent the terrifying consequences of opposing the divine world. Though the work is fragmental we can reconstruct the relation altering. Aristippus, Epicurius, the Increduluses and the Discipuluses opposed the divine world and they get their punishment in the 9-10<sup>th</sup> scene. The 11<sup>th</sup> scene shows restoring order.

The contemporary poetics said that both plays were comoedia according to their outcome. However, they have almost nothing in common to this style of drama – then or even now. The plays are hardly joyful or funny, the social status of the characters are irrelevant, its vocabulary is sometimes high-minded sometimes (especially in case of devils) rude or foulmouthed, the emotions are the most powerful possible. Comparing these to Piscator's definition we can only conclude that even the playwright could not cover his work with one style. Besides, the medieval mystery plays (and school plays) are static, epic, they do not have a dramatic topic or the atmosphere of the stage, not to mention characters with personalities. So not only the different styles but also the genres are mixed. The two plays I studied are incline to the epic and lack the requirements of the drama.

The **structure** of the "*Játék a zsidók megtéréséről*" is rather simple, linear. The causes and the results, the topics follow each other in clear order. We can find scenes with the structure of consultation. The structure imitating consultation was popular because its clarity and simplicity – easy to follow for the author/teacher and easy to understand for the audience.

The structure of the “*Játék az utolsó ítéletről*” is concentric: the same message pictured by different stories. The whole work is characterised by contrapunctuality. The author tries to show both the good and the bad sides of almost everything: hell and heaven, the good and the bad, believers and infidels, Christ and the Antichrist, angels and devils, God and Lucifer, reward and punishment etc. This means that the author wanted to present the entire universe and the salvation, the behaviour and fate of the man in this antagonism-ruled world and the ways and possibilities of living.

Scrutinising the macroscheme of these two dramas we can recognise that neither of them is whole. Many (4-5) scenes were lost, presumably these parts were put into another play. Therefore we can conclude these parts formed a unit. We can deduce the content of some scenes but basically we can only make hypotheses. The structure of the scenes follows an inner logic and the scenes can be easily separated, making hypotheses even harder.

The medieval acting uses **types**: the martyr, the apostle, the demon does not have any personal character. Their personalities come from depicting the thesis or from the situation. It is true for Passion plays, mystery plays and the two school plays. We can find only models for behaviour – and not personalities – in these dramas. Especially true for the “*Játék a zsidók megtéréséről*”, in which all the characters are human only because they needed human people to personalise the ideas, themes etc. You cannot find the slightest trace for any personalities. The author paid attention only to show his dogmas but he did not show real, human relations. The characters are partly ordinary people partly famous figures of the Catholic Church (the prophets). The other characters are earthly people, from the Pope till heretic men we can find people from all levels of the society: servants, theologians, doctors, laymen, advisors, arians, Calvinists, Jews. The hierarchy of the society cannot be perceived in the text: the servants and the Pontifex are almost on the same level. Presumably, all the characters are continuously on the stage, the notes do not sign move and the plot does not inquire any. The scenes usually require a high number of people indicating that the characters move only very rarely. Two third of the characters are on the side of the Catholic Church. Their part of the text is even more. Naturally, the enemies of the Catholics have very limited text, their logic is rather ill, we can say that they are there only to have a partner for the disputes. The “*Játék az utolsó ítéletről*” is a little bit more colourful but its characters are still types. The Discipuluses, the Amicuses, the Ephebuses are perfect to show the possible types of human behaviour. The analyses is through verbal tools. The characters are ordinary men, famous christian personalities and allegoric figures. As the plot thickens there two types are left on the stage. This indicates that the text moves from the earthly thematic to the one about the afterlife, an allegoric story presented by divine characters.

Both plays require high numbers of performers but we cannot define the number of players due to the inconsistency about the character names and to the similarity in different characters.

Both of the dramas use Latin names. Only 15% of the characters have name in the play “*Játék a zsidók megtéréséről*”, the others appear in the play without names. In the other play even less characters have name. These names are mostly from the Greek or Latin mythology (or history). The characters without names got their identity through their most typical feature, their core meaning or their function in the drama. The players

were identified by (Latin) numbers. The numbers of the players were connected to Biblical numbers.

We can make only hypotheses about the **place** of the performance. As at that time there were no buildings for theatres we have to assume that it was in the hall of school building, on the ground floor. We do not know much about the set of the stage. Presumably, on the play “*Játék az utolsó ítéletről*” they tried to picture 3 levels of the world – mentioned in the notes: *ex inferno, infernus, de coelo*. The drama “*Játék a zsidók megtéréséről*” does not require such sets. It is possible that the place of the prophets or the Pontifex was stressed by their settings in place but we cannot prove that. As everybody is ordinary there and no divine characters (except the prophets) appear in this drama there is no need for such set. We do not have information about the **design**. The **stage properties** are mentioned either in the notes or in the texts.

The “*Játék a zsidók megtéréséről*” contains very few **stage directions** (only 10). These are about the actors presence on the stage, to whom they address their speech, what and when they do something. Most of these are either before or after the disputes. The dispute itself does not require any physical act. The “*Játék az utolsó ítéletről*” has regular notes from the director (40 lines or even more). These are about the actors’ presence, kinesical, proxemical, operative, indicating tools, place, verbal features, time and titling. The playwright made only the most necessary notes. The notes suggesting epics are rather interesting parts of the text. They are more helpful to the author than to the actors. The reason for this is that these dramas were written as material for a lecture not as individual pieces of art. In both plays the notes are in Latin. These seem to follow a pattern, as a routine.

The “*Játék az utolsó ítéletről*” contains **musical elements**. The text signs three songs, in one case it indicates the presence of musicians. The notes had only the beginning words, according to them the songs are: *Eheu! Quid homines sumus, Kérlek és intlek mostan tégedet* and *Te deum*. The songs fit into the text, illustrate the performance on the stage.

The **poems** in “*Játék a zsidók megtéréséről*” follows the Gyöngyösi pattern, they rarely deviate. The number of the syllables is always the same, the rhythm is more or less correct, the pauses are easy to recognise. However, the price to pay is the overcomplicated sentence structure. The rhymes are always on their places though they are rather simple ones, usually suffixes. The ends of the lines are usually the ends of sentences or sub-sentences though not always. The “*Játék az utolsó ítéletről*” uses the four-cornered poetic pattern, rather rigidly. The poems make text a little bit lengthy but this drama is still much more act-like than the former one. This indicates that only the style of the poems does not define the movement of a play. The rhythm is always on its place, the rhymes are almost every time correct (they are suffix rhymes too). The sentences/sub-sentences finish more often at the end of the lines and the enjambements are less sharp than in the former drama. The rhythms of the songs differ from the rhythm of the main text.

The “*Játék a zsidók megtéréséről*” is rather theological-converting than a piece with literary values. The most frequently used **poetic tools** are metaphor and addressing. This is true for the other drama too. The reason for the frequency of the metaphors and similes is that they were the most popular tools. The rhetorical question can have come from rhetorics, contraposition is just as effective rhetorical tool. Addressing was not only

aesthetical it had a practical function – helped identifying the players on the stage. There are no proverbs in the texts but they contain some dicta that are the signs of spontaneity. Both texts have **parts in foreign languages** (mostly Latin). They can be divided into 3 groups. The first group contains the coherent parts. There is only one full Latin sentence in the “*Játék a zsidók megtéréséről*”, presumably because its is rather well-known (and rhymes well). The second, bigger group is formed by the Latin words, which can have been used in the contemporary Hungarian language. Their written form is modified too, to make them similar to the Hungarian language because of pragmatic reasons. At the end, they did not build into the Hungarian language that is why they look awkward now. Possibly, the audience knew these words. We can find traces of other foreign languages (German, Italian and Greek). The third group is the Latin expressions, words not mentioned in the main text but in other parts of the dramas (names, notes, beginning and concluding parts). These were written fully in Latin, which is reasonable. These parts were not performed to the audience so only the director/teacher and the students knew these parts and certainly they understood them.

The most characteristic **stylistic feature** of the dramas from Csíksomlyó is ambivalence: they contain parallelly more than one layers of style. The dramas we examine are stylistically mixed too. The author did this deliberately, the different styles are excellent tools to depict: the devil is filthy with filthy tongue but Judex do not swear. The vocabulary of the “*Játék a zsidók megtéréséről*” is not that mixed, ambivalent. It is rather lack of emotions, exhaustive, repetitive. Now we would call this scientific documentary style. This quality of style is spotted by the high-minded, enlightened voice or by the speech of the common people, using sometimes rather filthy language. We can even meet sarcastic features but humour is totally missing.

The “*Játék az utolsó ítéletről*” is more mixed. The scenes show quite different themes so their styles are different too. The basic style of the second scene is the everyday language touching sometimes rhetoric sometimes the laymen’s pedantic religious discussion. The 4<sup>th</sup> scene is a good example for poetic vocabulary. Anima’s jeremiad follows the poetic traditions with its strong, emotional utterance – this scene is the linguistic peak of the whole drama. Despite the fact that technically it is part of the certamen tradition, stylistically this dialogue is close to poetry. The 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> scene is rather similar to religious disputes but its language is more common. The words of the Discipuluses are formally proving the dogmas but at the same time they prove their false and superficial nature. Using the language as a tool the writer unveil the petty world of the students too. The words of Enoch are close to speeches, emotional and snappy, Elyas presents the scholarly speech of the theologists. Antikristus speaks in a tyrannical way, without majesty, rather simply filled with inner passions. The angels use a mixture of majestic voices and theological expounding though sometimes only the elevated voice can be heard. Judex represents the everyday people with elevated and petty language too. Luciper’s most characteristic feature is to use emotional speeches. He is not afraid of using any tricks to achieve the wanted effects: pathetic, scholarly, filthy, common, comical all in the same time. The words of the devils depict hell in a naturalistic manner. They are the comical figures too. The humour is only present in this scene. This quality of style in the school plays is connected to tragedy and the language of everyday. The devils do not spare the swear words or hitting the back, tearing the beard. The damned souls try to evoke compassion in the style of the jeremiads but some of them try to mock



his/her sins. Their jeremiads do not evoke compassion, more likely they make the spectators laugh. The last scene is basically elevated again. Some erudite, theological overtone sneaks into the Pater's voice, with epic features. In the speech of Filius the rhetorical part is quite strong and the Seniors speak in the style of the hymns.

The school plays generally speaking use a lot of other **sources**. The dramas from Csíksomlyó are strongly related to the medieval traditions but it's not a continuous dramatic tradition: the medieval parts were built into the texts through a mediator material. It is almost impossible to trace back the sources.

The authors/teachers often used each other's texts, and it was even a practice between different orders and Christian religions. This method of writing widely spread in the school plays literature. There are different types of compilation: 1. The author rewrites a drama (maybe through translation), changes the names, erases some parts or inserts others but the work (the scene) itself (the theme, the conflict etc.) is intact. This method can move on a wide scale from simple rewriting to a more creative process. 2. The author puts together other school dramas. The writer chooses the parts that are necessary to his work and melts it into one with changing where it needs to be. 3. The author uses not a drama but another type of literature. For Passion plays they used usually the Bible or the "*Makula nélkül való tükrő*", but the folksongs and other songs are good examples too. Sometimes the whole text is built up from other sources, sometimes only some parts of the sources are used. Exploring these are rather difficult as the authors did not indicate the source of the used texts.

The texts, which are the subjects of this work, contain second and third type of compilation. The most important sources are the Bible, contemporary school dramas, jeremiads and religious folksongs. The examination of the prelude and the afterlife of the texts can highlight the working method of the contemporary intertextuality.

The primary source for these two works is the Bible. The topics of both plays are strongly connected to it. As the drama from 1722 is about a religious dispute between different branches of Christianity it is obvious that the primary source should be the Bible. The difference is only in its interpretation. They do not use any other texts. The group of references:

- referring to name (a book of the Bible) and place (passage, poem)
- referring to name
- without reference

You can find 81 references to the Bible in the drama, mostly to the New Testament. As the dispute is between Christian branches about interpreting it is not a surprise. The most popular part is John's Gospel but they refer to the others or to Paul's letters. From the Old Testament they mention the books of Moses and Daniel. There are more exact references from the New than from the Old Testament. This indicates that the speakers are educated in the New Testament. The Gospels and Paul are popular enough to be the basics in case of such dispute (and the author knew the quotation and the exact place by heart). The situation is different in case of the references without names: more Old Testament. They usually refer to some of the well-known parts of the Bible. As we might expect the positive characters have positive quotations. This is logical as the positive characters (usually Catholics) have more speeches in the drama. Besides they have real arguments while their opponents have nothing to prove they are right. All the exact references (except one) are connected to the positive side indicating that the

Catholics might know the Bible better than the others. The drama was written by a monk-teacher of a catholic school to the students of a catholic school, to the simple people living around the school. This is the explanation why the presence of the non-Catholics is so weak in the drama. Their role is purely dramaturgic, providing the opportunity to present the catholic dogmas and proving that they are indisputable. Though it was not the writer's deliberate aim (presumably), it also points out that the non-Catholics do not know the Bible. Besides the author could not have had real arguments against his own faith.

The primary source for "*Játék az utolsó ítéletről*" is the Bible, mainly the New Testament. Nevertheless, it is not based on the Bible that much as the former one. The quotations do not have that stress in this play and they are not punctual (no books or verse) as they do not function as arguments: their content is much more important. They use mostly the Book of Revelations, the Gospels (usually Mathew's), the Book of Moses and the Book of Daniel from the Old Testament. As you can see both of the plays refer generally to the most popular parts of the Bible. Though the catholic characters got almost all the references in the former drama from 1722, in this drama the situation is different. This work is much more like a real act or drama than its schematic predecessor where not only the catholic doctors but the author's dramaturgy defeated the characters too.

For the author of the latter work the negative side is just as vivid and part of the universe as the positive side so they use the Bible naturally.

It is rather general that they use other school plays as sources. This is especially true for the works from Csíksomlyó as they form a "textus-net" according to Márta Zsuzsanna Pintér. These two works are excellent examples for compilation. Certainly, they are close in time, in style but they even contain textual similarities. The 7<sup>th</sup> scene of the "*Játék az utolsó ítéletről*" contains a compilation from the beginning of the "*Játék a zsidók megtéréséről*". The text almost completely the same. The characters are different, less people have the same text (this part functionally one) which makes it more coherent, less school-like. The context is different just as the addressee (whole nation or individuals), the dramaturgy, its place in the text but the topic is similar. In the drama from 1725 the author inserted some notes making it more dialogical and dynamical. A shorter part with 5 verses was also used in the other drama. It is used as proving the Trinity in one and showing the kingdom of Christ in the other. The situation and the characters are different again, the author altered the text with stylistic and poetic changes. The alteration is rather small, it can be miswriting, required by the context or aesthetic. The writer of the "*Játék az utolsó ítéletről*" made rather apt decisions when choosing the compilations, he might have even seen the performances. However, the parts misfit too from the text as it is much more similar to a real act than the "*Játék a zsidók megtéréséről*". It contains more action and humour and it is snappy. This drama is much more to the common people than the other one with its theological, bookish style so the compiled part is rather out of the text with all the references and the prophetic voices. After the stanzas that the writer put in the 11<sup>th</sup> scene the Pater is not dealing with theological questions but invoke well-known Biblical stories. Though it is still diction (not action) it might be more interesting than listening to the incomprehensible tractate about the Trinity. The fact that two parts were compiled means that the author who write the latter drama chose deliberately the earlier one and they did not work from a common,

unknown resource. So it is an evidence for the intertextual relation between school dramas. It proves another fact: for the school dramas the content was secondary comparing to the aim of the performances. That is why we could find so similar texts in such a different works.

Another, long part from the "*Játék az utolsó ítéletről*" was put into a different work, a Passion play. The play, written in 1766, compiled the story of Epicurius and changed it to the feast of Arduinus. The borrowing is word-to-word but with a lot of small alterations (names, order etc.) The compiler integrated it deeper into the story than the other writer did in 1725. The work is much act-like because the writer set the scenes on the stage and not only have it told by somebody. This scene was a borrowed one even in 1725 but the source is still unknown. The same story appears in a Conventual Franciscan play ("*Jaj, én hűt régentén mint virágzom vala*") but without close textual similarities. This story is more or less similar to the morality plays performing the tale of the prodigal son (rather popular in Csíksomlyó) or to the Lazar story.

We can find similarities with Protestant texts too. In the play of István Eszéki ("*Rhytmusokkal való szent beszélgetések*") he writes about fulfilling the promises connected to the arrival of the Messiah.

There is no textual similarities with this work either but the content is resembling (e.g. same references). The Protestant play uses the frame of a dispute to another aim and there are only 3 characters in it. There is thematic connection between the drama from 1722 and the one from 1744 which mentions the dogma of Trinity too. The Franciscan "*Filius prodigus*" touches the importance of sanctimonies but this does not indicate intertextual connection rather the common cultural-ideological background.

The "*Játék a zsidók megtéréséről*" contains some stanzas which form a coherent unit. This means that the stanzas might have been used in other dramas too.

The compilers can have used a lot of plays in their own texts. This was enabled by the school dramas lengthy and loose structure and its changing requirements: religious and/or pedagogical aims. Fulfilling these aims was the most important so the tool (the drama) was secondary for them. As a result the texts are built up by smaller particles which were chosen by the writer according to the aim of the drama (consequently, we may not regard this as authorship). All of these set up a special intertextuality, the net of the different texts. These connections are stronger than the relations of the individual texts are but the works must be regarded as separate pieces. The main difference between the modern intertextuality and this type is that in school dramas it was not deliberate, it was the result of the special work-style.

The catholic folk songs and jeremiads can provide resources to the plays too. In the 4<sup>th</sup> scene of the "*Játék az utolsó ítéletről*" the moan of Anima can be connected to the apocryphal Judas tale, which was rather popular in mystery plays. Though textual copies are rare the scene is usually similar: the devils make Judas realise that some money can help to get rid of the hunger and poverty. The Bible does not contain any similar set. Nevertheless, we can read about Judas and the antecedent of this the Passion plays were extended with some Judas moan. The cores of these are the same: Judas is repenting his sinful act, greediness. He knows that there is no remission for this deed. We can read similar stories in several school plays (despite the intertextuality, they are from a common external source). We might find the deepest similarity with a play from the Conventual Franciscans. The drama called "*A dúsgazdag és a szegény Lázár*" (1778,

Kanta) written by Ferenc Jantso includes moans of a soul suffering in the hell (the motive of greediness might justify the placing of the text). 6 dramas from Csíksomlyó and a richman moan from Kájoni have similar texts (not word-by-word, rather rewriting). The 3 songs in the “*Játék az utolsó ítéletről*” are external sources too.

The **reception** cannot be defined exactly due to the lack of data. Possibly, the writers were attentive to the spectator’s interests: they chose events and thoughts that were familiar to the audience. The references of the disputes were only from the Bible. The other work contains the most well-known pictures of the judgement day and the theological parts could have been already said during the mass. Activating the audience might have happened during the songs of the “*Játék az utolsó ítéletről*”.

The different methods of the literary theories must be used in different ways too. The **methods focusing on the authors** have a disadvantage: the writer usually (as now too) is unknown so neither his life nor personality is possible to elicit. The psychic analysis required by the genetic analyses is impossible too, as the works do not seek analytic depicting. These schools of studies are only useful to generally describe the school dramas and its evolution. Positivist, genetic and zeitgeist schools help us to find out: 1. The origin of the texts (early 18<sup>th</sup> century), exact textus, linguistic distinctiveness and topic. 2. Their writers (unknown), aims (showing the victory of the catholic dogmas and the consequences of the sinful life), the process of writing (compilation). 3. Contrasting with other school dramas, contemporary texts – the influence of the disputes and the Bible. 4. Its place in the literary improvement (archaic), there is no new formal and contentious elements, they are among the early plays of Csíksomlyó. 5. Their esthetical values are not exceptional. 6. The baroque world put its mark on them (antagonism, deep religious feelings, fear etc.). This method can only provide superficial information about the dramas. Nevertheless, this methodology is necessary too, as its procedure to collect data might be the basic.

The different **structuralist methods** cannot be used to reach the same result as they only focus on the texts excluding the above mentioned method. Many principles of the New Criticism are not correct in case of the school dramas: e.g. the school dramas is not far from “the world of justice and moral”, cannot be examined without external points, it has depicting functions, its mediational function is especially strong. The New Criticism has rather attractive self-governing concept about recreating esthetical judgements but its result is rather dubious in this case. Its proving would be rather difficult too because of the length of the texts. There are other, feasible ideas: 1. Linguistic analyses, separating different layers, close reading. 2. Exploring compositional methods, the structure of the scenes comparing to each other, the role of the characters as dramaturgical elements, their distribution in the drama, the inner structure of the characters, the analyses of the mutuality, defining the functions etc. 3. Analysing the metaphors and metonyms: the dispute as enforcing the membership to the Holy Church and the last judgement as the proving to keep the dogmas. 4. Though the different structuralist schools did not accept the examination of the author or the audience still some of them has started to include the spectators. The Czech structuralist school mentions intention and non-intention that indicates the receiver. The intention of the school dramas can be examined but with the non-intention we have only theories. Empathy, understanding or non-understanding etc. According to the Polish integrational school the schematic views are filled with the fantasy of the receiver. So, describing these

schematic views are equal to mapping the place of the receiver's work. The drama from 1722 provides very few opportunities for such creative activity as the text shows almost everything. The first part of the play from 1725 the „filling” is unsaid but it might refer to the presented religious-moral lessons, in the second part the subjective affection. All in all, these methods might be good for examining the texts but in this case we would neglect and leave out a lot.

The **hermeneutics or receptional esthetics** can provide solution for problems due to the nature of the school dramas. The hermeneutics' concentric part-whole based model is excellent in this case. As the question, for which these dramas are the answer, is from the Bible and the religion or our relation to these, these concepts are still in the society so mapping the continuity of the traditions between past and present and resolving the tension between these two seems evident. The questions from the works are partly about the Catholicism partly about the ethical/theist life. But in the case of the school dramas it is much better to evolve questions about their functionality. The reception-esthetical statement (the work does not exist without the receiver) is especially true in case of the school dramas, as they have no internal but external ontological definition. Analysing the taste of the spectators, the reconstruction and comparison of the contemporary and present day requirement horizon are all well-known practices in examining the school dramas.

It seems to be the case that the methods focusing on the receivers might bring better results: their huge advantages are the studying of the continuity, the receiver, the change in the reception. Their disadvantage is that their target is primarily the text but the school dramas are not exactly literary works. The other problem is that they neglect the positivist tools, which are needed to the study of school dramas. So we need the mixture of the above mentioned methods to examine the school plays especially in the individual cases. The rather liberal statement of the school of Chicago says that a piece of work might have different equal approaches. However, in this situation the best result can be achieved by trying a lot of different methods.

Preparing the **textuary** I followed the principles and practice of the volumes of the *“Régi Magyar Drámai Emlékek”*. I tried to keep the original spellings and their meanings except punctuation, which I changed according to the present day rules so as making it easier to understand. I kept the capital letters in common nouns but I corrected the proper names starting with lower-case letters without any footnote. I put the stanzas into lines starting the lines with capital letters. Of course, I wrote the words broken by the lines together. The suffixes separated from the stem were put together. I corrected the text when the word was difficult to understand, easy to be mistaken or simply confusing. I replaced words, syllables only if its meaning and aim was clear. I wrote a playbill for the dramas with their names (given by me), its probable time and place of performance, the characters in the order of appearance (in square brackets). I used capital letters in case of the title, the characters and scenes. The text consists of standing types, the corrections and insertions are cursive letters. The notes for the director are with cursive letters too, I corrected them with standing types. The textological notes are at the bottom of the pages with Arabic numbers (similarly to the *“RMDE XVIII. 5./2. – Piarista iskoladrámák”*). In these I put the text deleted by the author between diamond brackets <...> and between square brackets [...] my own notes. I provided full apparel of notes: under the title *“A mű adatai”* (Datas) you can find the source of the text, afterlife. I write about the author in

the “*Szerző, színrevivő*” (Author), in the “*Forrás*” (Sources) about the possible sources. You can find notes about the time and place of the performance, directorial problems, intermediums in the part of “*Előadás*” (Performance). I dealt with data connected to the manuscripts (handwriting, abbreviations, grammatical mistakes, letter types, the general picture of the manuscript) in the “*Szövegkritikai megjegyzések*”. I gave the meaning of the hazy or old words in the “*Nyelvi és tárgyi magyarázatok*”.

In case of the “*Játék a zsidók megtéréséről*” the handwriting is clear and easy to read. It leans to the right, the copier uses small letters and writes uneven. The stanzas are easy to separate, starts with entering but they are not set to lines. The end of the stanzas are sometimes indicated by underlining the last words of the lines. This underlining can be found at the end of the scenes too. The characters and the notes for the director are in the out of the alignment, sometimes at the bottom of the pages under the text. They are all in Latin. The names of the characters are underlined with two lines just as the stage directions. Due to the bonding the words at the end of the lines sometimes cannot be read. The scenes are formatted in the centre starting with a bigger, curlicue letter or beginning letter underlined twice. At the bottom of the page we can find the catchword which is 4-6 syllable long (half of a line). The punctuation of the text is rather simple. The commas are rare, they are usually at the end of the lines or members of sub-ordinate structures separated by the word “és” and always after the conjunctive “s”. The full stop is usually on its place but there is hardly any other punctuation in the manuscript. There is apostrophe after pronoun “a” sometimes after the demonstrative “e”. The stanzas start with capital letters just as names and stage directions. He does not use hyphens. Sometimes he uses the sign “ß” instead of “sz” or “ss”. We might find the sign “j” in the place of the letter “s”. The letters “ö”, “ő”, “ü”, „ű” are indicated usually (besides the present day style) with putting an “e” over the “o” or “u”. Sometimes we can find the letter “ë” (*Izraël, Daniël, Samuël, Gabriël*) but the copier is not consistent with the use of the letter. The Latin letter “ae” he uses sometimes a special sign (æ). Sometimes he indicates the length of the vowels with a tilde, apostrophe-like knot or dash-line above the letter. The abbreviations are usually indicated with a tilde too. Sometimes we can meet abbreviations indicated by apostrophe but the most common method is not indicating at all or underlining. The copier uses underlining to sign the abbreviation of the suffixes “-nak”, “-nek”. The word “szent” is usually “sz” or “Sz”. The shortening “Xtus” is rather common too. The well-known acronyms come up in the text: NB and IHS. The deleting can be different in styles. Whole words, collocations or lines are indicated by single or double crossings or underlining. The correct texts are next to or above. The letters, parts of words are corrected by crossing or writing the correct one on them. The missing words or letters are written above. The incorrect ligatures are indicated by comma under the border.

The manuscript of the “*Játék az utolsó ítéletről*” is the work of two people. The first one wrote with bigger letters, leaning to the right. His handwriting is rather difficult to read, it is not clean at several places. The number of the mistakes shows us that the copier must have been young. The second hand is easier to read. He writes with smaller letters, slightly leaning to the right but his work is rather full of mistakes too. The stanzas are separated, starting with entering but the lines are not set. The ends of the stanzas are sometimes signed by underlining the last word(s). The name of the characters and the (Latin) stage directions are out of alignment. Some of them are fragmental as parts of

them were cut down during the bonding. On the other hand at the margin of the pages some words are rather difficult to read, due to the bonding too. At the end of the name of the characters and notes for the director sometimes we can find dots. These are underlined with one or two lines by copiers. The beginnings of the scenes are sometimes at the margin sometimes in the centre with the same letter size as the text, without any ornaments, underlined. The “Scena octava” and the “Scena ultima” are written with letters the others are numbered, e.g. “Scena 2da”. Both copiers use catchword but not regularly. Sometimes there are catchwords at the end of the roles or pages (usually only one word). The punctuation of the text is rather simple. The ends of the poem lines are marked with comma. After the stanzas both copier use dots though the first one uses commas here too. There are only two question marks in the text. After the conjunctive “s” we can find sometimes commas, apostrophe or dots. After the pronoun “a”, the demonstratives and demonstrative “e” and several times after the words ending “-e” the first copier writes apostrophes. The stanzas, stage directions, scene markings and the name of the characters begin with capital letters. The proper names start with lower case letters in case of the first copier. They use several times (but not always) hyphens: one or two commas at the end of the line. Hyphenations are according to the present day rules. Both of them use the sign „ß” to indicate letters like “ss”, “sz”, “ssz” but not consistently. The first copier marks sometimes the letter “s” with the sign “j”. The voice “cs” is sometimes “cs” or “ts”. The first copier uses the “ly” and “lj” as alternates. The “c” can be “c”, “cz” or “tz” in the manuscript. The first copier indicates the voices “ö”, “ő”, “ü”, “ű” in many different ways. Especially at the beginning of the text, he marks it with writing a small “e” above the letters “u” and “o”. This style is mixed with the accents sometimes even in one word. Using accents seems incidental sometimes there is none. The first copier uses the personal pronouns “eö” or “eő”. The second one indicates accents by overstriking of “o”, “u”. The Latin “ae” is marked by a distinctive sign (æ) in case of the first copier. He indicates the word-ending nasals with a knot. The long consonants are signed by tilde over the parts. Both of the copiers use the same sign to indicate the nasals just as abbreviations. Neither of them marks the obvious abbreviations, e.g. the word “szent” (sz., s.) or the expression “nota bene” (NB). The numbering is almost always shortened: usually the Latin endings are attached to the numbers (e.g. Ephebus 1mus). The corrections and deletions are indicated in many different ways. The first copier usually writes on the words, crosses out, maybe underlining the part. He uses underlining to mark missing or dele texts. The post-inserted letters are written under the words. The second copier sometimes corrects with writing on the words, above them or crossing the accents but usually he leaves the incorrect letter in the text without any notes. If he writes above the mistakes he still leaves the incorrect one.

#### **IV. The scientific studies in the topic of the dissertation**

1. A consultatio és a 18. századi iskolai színjátékok, in *A magyar színház születése*, ed. DEMETER Júlia, Miskolci Egyetemi Kiadó, 2000, 33-37.  
(Lecture on the conference ‘A magyar színház születése’ – Eger, 1997)

2. *Theological Teaching in a School Drama*, in *School and Theatre*, szerk. NAGY Júlia – KEDVES Csaba, Miskolc, 2002. (CD, ISBN 9632040147)  
(Lecture on the conference '*Iskola és színház – School and Theatre*' – /Miskolc, 2002)
  
3. *About the Structure of Comedies from the 18<sup>th</sup> Century*, in *MicroCad International Scientific Conference*, Miskolci Egyetem Innovációs és Technológia Transzfer Centruma, 2002, 55-59. (Lecture on '*MicroCad International Scientific Conference*' – Miskolc, 2002)
  
4. *Motívumátvételek néhány csíksomlyói drámában*, in *A magyar színjáték honi és európai gyökerei*, ed. DEMETER Júlia, Miskolci Egyetemi Kiadó, 2003, 43-50.  
(Lecture on the conference '*A magyar színjáték honi és európai gyökerei*' –/Eger, 2000)
  
5. *Két csíksomlyói dráma szerkesztési eljárásáról*  
(Lecture on the conference '*A világ színháza – a színház világa*' – Eger, 2003)
  
6. *Nagypénteki játék az emberi nem bűnbeeséséről és megjavulásáról*, in *Csíksomlyói passiójátékok a 18. századból*, ed. DEMETER Júlia, Bp., Argumentum, 2003, 543-607.  
(text edition)
  
7. *A csíksomlyói iskolai színjátszás és a korabeli iskoladráma* (Csíksomlyói múzeum évkönyve, under publishing)
  
8. *„Ha hitetlen voltál, jere már pokolra!” – Kísérlet egy ferences iskoladráma recepcióesztétikai értelmezésére* (Lecture on the conference *A (Dráma)szövegek metamorfózisa – Kontaktustörténetek* – Kolozsvár, 2009, under publishing)
  
9. *Funkcionalitás és szerkezet a ferences színjátszásban* (Lecture on the conference *800 éves a Ferences Rend* – Piliscsaba–Budapest, 2009, under publishing)