

Simon Wirthensohn\*

## SEEKING AUCTORITAS PARATEXTUAL SELF-IMAGING IN JESUIT DRAMA COLLECTIONS

When reading prefaces of 18<sup>th</sup> century Jesuit drama collections we frequently come across phrases such as „multorum urgentibus votis [...] communico [...] dramata<sup>1</sup> or [latebant considerationes, i.e. dramata] in tenebris permansurae, nisi amica postulantium violentia invitas illas in lucem prodire coegisset”,<sup>2</sup> expressions which claim that the publication of the respective book took its motivation in the desires of people other than the author himself. We might consider them conventional topoi of modesty, intended to function as *captationes benevolentiae*. However, the forcefulness with which some 18<sup>th</sup> century Jesuit playwrights referred to such expressions, should encourage us to reflect more thoroughly about this practice. It is plausible that behind the literary convention there might be other, well calculated reasons. In the following paper I will give room to such considerations. However, what I present in this framework can be only a first overview of this research issue.

As in other parts of Europe, the Jesuit order was responsible for the major part of theatrical performances in the late 16<sup>th</sup>, in the 17<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century in the catholic lands of the German speaking area.<sup>3</sup> The teachers in

---

\* Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Neolatin Studies, Innsbruck, Austria, e-mail: [simon.wirthensohn@uibk.ac.at](mailto:simon.wirthensohn@uibk.ac.at).

<sup>1</sup> A. Claus, *Exercitationes theatrales*, Ingolstadt 1750, p. [3].

<sup>2</sup> F. Lang, *Theatrum solitudinis asceticae*, Munich 1717, p. [12].

<sup>3</sup> Secondary literature on the Jesuit theatre in the German speaking countries is numerous. Most recently: F. Rädle, *Jesuit Theatre in Germany, Austria and Switzerland*, [in:] J. Bloemendal, H. B. Norland (eds.), *Neo Latin Drama and Theatre in Early Modern Europe*, Brill, Leiden–Boston 2013, p. 185–292; F. Pohle, *Glaube und Beredsamkeit. Katholisches Schultheater in Jülich-Berg, Ravenstein und Aachen (1601–1817)*, Rhema, Münster 2010. Cfr. also J.-M. Valentin, *Theatrum catholicum. Les Jésuites et la scène en Allemagne au XVI<sup>e</sup> et au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Die Jesuiten und die Bühne in Deutschland des 16.–17. Jahrhunderts*, Presses universitaires, Nancy 1990; R. Wimmer, *Jesuitentheater. Didaktik und Fest. Das Exemplum des ägyptischen Joseph auf den deutschen Bühnen der Gesellschaft Jesu*, Klostermann, Frankfurt am Main 1982; J.-M. Valentin, *Le théâtre des Jésuites dans les pays de langue allemande (1554–1680)*, vol. 1–3, Lang, Bern 1978.

the order's schools were expected to stage Latin plays with their schoolboys several times a year. Most of these performances took place within the framework of the school class itself, where pupils performed plays for other pupils without a public audience. However, even when we take into account only the big, public events which every school organized once a year in occasion of the beginning or the ending of the schoolyear in autumn, dozens of performances are attested each year in the three German Jesuit provinces.<sup>4</sup>

Two specific characteristics of this school theatre practice should be highlighted as fundamental to my reasoning. First: the world of Jesuit theatre was extremely prolific. As is generally known, the teachers responsible for performances were not only the stage directors, but also the producers of the plays. In their capacity as *choragi* they could rely, admittedly, on a certain unofficial canon of plays and subject matter, which was established and continuously evolved on the basis of the quick diffusion of knowledge within the Jesuit network. Nevertheless, the teachers strove to write new plays as often as possible, in order to guarantee their stages' attractiveness and to meet the pedagogical, political and social circumstances of their specific location. Second: despite their productivity the Jesuit playwrights did not have the self-awareness of being literary *auctores*. They considered themselves educators, who used dramatic and dramaturgic activities as didactic tools. The texts they wrote were not perceived as literary texts, neither by the playwrights themselves nor by their contemporaries. As a consequence, for a long time Jesuit dramas were hardly ever published in written form. Until the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, in the German speaking lands only two autonomous collections of plays were printed.<sup>5</sup> The first was the *Ludi theatrales* by the famous Jacob Bidermann, which was only published in 1666, many years after Bidermann's death. The publication was probably motivated by Bidermann's popularity as a poet and novelist, as well as by the success of his morality play *Cenodoxus*, which had been disseminated in German translation from 1635 onwards.<sup>6</sup> The second was the *Poesis dramatica* by Nicolaus Avancini, an outstanding 17<sup>th</sup> century playwright at the Habsburg court who had earned for this reason a special position among the Jesuit playwrights.<sup>7</sup> No ordinary member of the Society of

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. J.-M. Valentin, *Le théâtre des Jésuites dans les pays de langue allemande. Répertoire chronologique des pièces représentées et des documents conservés*, vol. 1–2, Hiersemann, Stuttgart 1983–1984.

<sup>5</sup> In addition, some plays were published within the poetics of Jakob Pontanus and Jakob Masen. Very few plays were published as single prints.

<sup>6</sup> J. Bidermann, *Ludi theatrales sacri sive opera comica posthuma*, vol. 1–2, Munich 1666. The German translation was edited by Rolf Tarot under the title *Jakob Bidermann: Cenodoxus. Deutsche Übersetzung von Joachim Meichel* (1635), Reclam, Stuttgart 1965.

<sup>7</sup> N. Avancini, *Poesis dramatica*, vol. 1–5, Cologne–Rome 1675–1686.

Jesus, however, would have seriously considered distributing his plays in form of a book until the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century.

In the 18<sup>th</sup> century the situation changed only to a certain extent and the overwhelming majority of the plays still remained unpublished. However, now a few teachers decided to print and publish their collections of plays. These playwrights had, we can assume, a certain sense of literary self-esteem and had noticed a demand for their artistic and literary skills. In any case, they considered their plays worth being distributed to a larger public.<sup>8</sup>

The step from seeing oneself as a teacher to seeing oneself as a literary author was, however, not an easy one, especially since presenting oneself as an author might easily attract criticism. The members of the order had a clear instruction by the superiors of the Society, which was to teach Latin to the schoolboys, but not to write books. Moreover, within the Jesuit order any kind of individualism was scorned. A good Jesuit had to serve God and the Society, he should not seek literary glory.

Against this background it becomes clear that paratextual justification became indispensable for this new generation of 'literary' Jesuit playwrights. Whatever the respective Jesuit wanted to communicate to his readership in order not to appear a presumptuous and eccentric misfit had to be conveyed in paratexts. It is for this reason that in most 18<sup>th</sup> century Jesuit drama collection printed in the German provinces of the order we find substantial prefaces in which the playwright endeavours to propitiate his readers.

A representative case in this regard is that of Anton Claus (1691–1754). The Bavarian Jesuit, who ranks as one of the best playwrights of the Society in the 18<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>9</sup> published his *Tragoediae ludis autumnalibus datae* in 1741, a collection of four classicising plays, written for the end of term, which he had staged in the 1720s and 1730s in several colleges in Switzerland, Germany and Austria.<sup>10</sup> When Claus decided to publish his plays a few years after the end of his career as school teacher, he certainly felt the need to justify this step. In the previous years some Jesuits had started to publish their work, but most of these plays had been religious dramas, so-called *meditationes*, or at least tragedies

---

<sup>8</sup> The development was probably influenced by the situation in other European countries, especially in France, where the publication of Jesuit dramas was diffused since the early 17<sup>th</sup> century and particularly vivid in the first half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Cf. R. Rieks, *Drei lateinische Tragiker des Grand Siècle*, Verlag der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, München 1989.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. E. M. Szarota, *Das Jesuitendrama im deutschen Sprachgebiet. Eine Periochen-Edition*, Fink, München 1979–1987, vol. 2.2, p. 2266.

<sup>10</sup> A. Claus, *Tragoediae ludis autumnalibus datae*, Augsburg 1741. A second edition came out in 1753.

based on religious plots, whose publication could be defended relatively easily as a means to increase popular piety, a task in line with the order's edifying commitment. However, hardly any Jesuit before Anton Claus had produced in print classicising plays, in which pagan heroes such as Scipio Africanus or Themistocles were treated. Claus' tragedies had little in common with the order's theatre tradition of staging edifying Christian plots and conveying catholic virtues. Moreover, only five years before the *Tragoediae ludis autumnalibus datae* were published, an update of the Jesuit *Ratio studiorum* – the official curriculum for all Jesuit educators – had been released, in which emphasis was put on the rule that no teacher was allowed to carry out dramatic work unless he was explicitly asked to do so by his superiors.<sup>11</sup>

So how, then, did Claus justify the publication? First of all, by recurring to the topical denial of responsibility I introduced at the beginning of the paper: "Publico certe tam eruditi saeculi iudicio numquam eas [tragoedias] exposuissem, nisi repetita, & importuna etiam multorum vota, et eorum praecipue, quorum nutus veneror, Autoritas, diu reluctantem impulissent".

It should be clear to us that this statement must not necessarily be true; perhaps it is just a topic remark of protection. As I have already mentioned, we find analogous phrases in other publications of Jesuit plays. It seems that these kinds of phrases were necessary to meet the restrictive rules of the *Ratio studiorum* and similar writings.

A second argument that Claus uses in his preface is the usefulness of his publication. He argues that future generations of Jesuit school teachers will be glad to have access to his printed plays as models for their own dramatic productions. He thus insists that the plays were intended not for reading, but as didactic material. In fact, however, Claus could be sure that his plays would belong to a reading canon. He knew that the classicising subjects he had chosen met the literary taste of the time and were attractive for pupils as well as for the interested reader of neo-Latin drama. He could be sure that his plays were quickly distributed within the network of the order and might be read as closet plays by a bigger audience. The fact that he didn't merely intend to provide future choragi with models is also proven by the formal aspects of his publication. If the printed versions of the *Tragoediae* really had been intended as models for future performances, why then did the author eliminate the choir passages, which would be important for later staging, but not for readers? Why did he reduce in the printed versions of his plays the number of characters, although it was important for future playwrights to give roles to as many pupils as possible? If he really intended the publication

---

<sup>11</sup> F. X. Kropf, *Ratio et via recte et ordine procedendi in literis humanioribus*, Munich 1736, p. 212: "Neque scenicae actionis ullius, vel dialogi componendi negotium quisquam suscipiet, nisi Superior conscius rem totam approbaverit".

primarily as a collection of text templates for young colleagues, why, then, do we find scant indication of the *mise-en-scène* of the plays? It is evident that Claus' primary scope was not to submit didactic material, but to publish literary texts. Given that he did not want to tell this frankly, he concealed his literary ambitions behind pragmatic pretexts.

Let us come now to another aspect of Claus' paratextual self-expression: if the playwright wanted to make believe that he could provide his colleagues with good drama templates, he would have to come up with reasons why. He had to show why his plays specifically might claim authority as models. In this period it was not yet common to think of innovation as a criterion of literary quality. Claus, hence, could not base his argumentation on the fact that he had dealt with new, classicising subjects and that he had chosen a new, anti-Senecan approach to dialogue and language. On the contrary, he had to prove the quality of his plays by showing that they were in line with authoritative texts from the past, in the first place with Aristotle's poetics.

It is for this reason that the playwright equipped his *Tragoediae ludis autumnalibus datae* with a special type of paratexts. Each of the four tragedies is followed by so-called *Observationes*, a sort of self-commentary, up to seven pages long, on the respective play. In these *Observationes* Claus explains the literary principles he adopted for the play. He describes how he organized the action of the play, how he conceived the characters, he discusses the moral benefit of the play and he dedicates, of course, a section to the unities of place, time and action. Naturally, Claus stresses, whenever he can, the compatibility of his plays with the Aristotelian dogma. The purpose of the *Observationes* is evident: in these paratexts Claus introduces himself to the readership as an Aristotelian dramatist and advertises his plays by demonstrating that they meet the quality criteria which were generally acknowledged among his contemporaries.

The idea to equip his publication with poetological self-commentaries was, of course, not developed by Claus himself. The Jesuit imitated features he had encountered while reading his own primary literary model, namely the French dramatist Pierre Corneille. Corneille, who had been accused of failing to respect the Aristotelian guidelines,<sup>12</sup> had written poetological paratexts for all of his plays, the so-called *Examens*, short texts which have the same purpose as Claus's *Observationes*. Corneille also strove to make clear that his plays were in line with the common opinion of good Aristotelian drama. In addition, in order to make clear that he, as a playwright, had scrupulously followed the theory of drama, he wrote poetical treatises himself, the three *Discours sur la tragédie*, in which he

---

<sup>12</sup> M. Fuhrmann, *Einführung in die antike Dichtungstheorie*, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt 1973, p. 236; D. Clarke, *Pierre Corneille. Poetics and political drama under Louis XIII*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1992, p. 41–76.

presented associatively rather than systematically his interpretation of the text of the Aristotelian poetics and discussed what a modern play, based on this authoritative text, should look like. His perspective is apparently one of a practitioner of theatre, and not that of a philologist or a philosopher. At the beginning of his *Discours du poeme dramatique* he explicitly says so:

Il faut donc savoir quelles sont ces règles; mais notre malheur est qu'Aristote et Horace après lui en ont écrit assez obscurément pour avoir besoin d'interprètes, et que ceux qui leur en ont voulu servir jusques ici ne les ont souvent expliqués qu'en grammairiens ou en philosophes. Comme ils avaient plus d'étude et de spéculation que d'expérience du théâtre, leur lecture nous peut rendre plus doctes, mais non pas nous donner beaucoup de lumières fort sûres pour y réussir. Je hasarderai quelque chose sur cinquante ans de travail pour la scène, et en dirai mes pensées tout simplement [...].<sup>13</sup>

The result of this approach is that Corneille did not provide a faithful analysis of the text of the Aristotelian poetics, but an adjustment of the ancient text according to his own theatrical practice.<sup>14</sup> It is not uncommon that he completely abandons the Aristotelian path but nonetheless argues that if the philosopher had lived in his own time, he probably would have agreed with him.<sup>15</sup> By means of this distorted argumentation he tried to deny the frictions between the classicist theory and his own practice.

Corneille's theory caused huge difficulties for contemporary theorists.<sup>16</sup> For future playwrights, however, Corneille's pragmatic approach to the Aristotelian text was an advantage. Among the Jesuit playwrights of the 18<sup>th</sup> century the French dramatist was seen as an undisputed authority.<sup>17</sup> Now they could refer to Corneille's pragmatic, warped interpretation of Aristotle in order to justify their own un-Aristotelian dramatic approaches. By doing so, they did not have to solve the conflict between the theory and the reality of the stage themselves.

<sup>13</sup> P. Corneille, *Théâtre complet*, vol. 1, Gallimard, Paris 1950, p. 7–8.

<sup>14</sup> W. Söffing, *Deskriptive und normative Bestimmungen in der Poetik des Aristoteles*, Grüner, Amsterdam 1981, p. 177

<sup>15</sup> Cf. e.g. P. Corneille, *Théâtre complet*, p. 40: "En voici deux ou trois manières, que peut-être Aristote n'a su prévoir, parce qu'on n'en voyait pas d'exemples sur les théâtres de son temps".

<sup>16</sup> M. Lurje, *Die Suche nach der Schuld. Sophokles' Oedipus Rex, Aristoteles' Poetik und das Tragödienverständnis der Neuzeit*, Saur, München 2004, p. 126–127.

<sup>17</sup> J.-M. Valentin, *La diffusion de Pierre Corneille en Allemagne au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle à travers les poétique jésuites*, [in:] idem (ed.), *Pierre Corneille et l'Allemagne. L'œuvre dramatique de Pierre Corneille dans le monde germanique (XVII<sup>e</sup>–XIX<sup>e</sup> siècles)*, Desjonquères, Paris 2007, p. 295–329.

I will now demonstrate the utility of Corneille's solution by way of an example: for Jesuit school theatre it was necessary to stage strong, virtuous characters as moral examples for the schoolboys. Claus' Themistocles is such a hero. He is not an imperfect, fallible character, which Aristotle tells us is necessary in order to arouse pity and fear. Themistocles is not complex, not contradictory, he is not at all an Aristotelian hero. In the *Observationes in Themistoclem* Claus outlines this issue. However, in discussing the problem he comes to the conclusion that his Themistocles can indeed be seen as Aristotelean hero in spite of his perfection. His argumentation is, naturally, based on Corneille: "Videtur tamen Cornelio hoc Aristotelis dogma exceptionem pati."<sup>18</sup> Indeed, Corneille had argued, that morally perfect protagonists are acceptable under certain conditions, namely when the action of the antagonist is well motivated.<sup>19</sup> Corneille presents this idea as a complement to the Aristotelian text; as an aspect which is in line with what Aristotle wanted theatre to be. If we read the text of the poetics, however, we don't find any correspondence. It is clear, that Corneille invented the idea in order to justify his own virtuous protagonists. In general, Corneille's was a problematic interpretation; for Claus, however, it was advantageous. By referring to the well-established, classicising model of Corneille he could present his Themistocles as a solid Aristotelian hero.

I have so far shown how Anton Claus used his paratexts to justify the publication of his school plays and how he presented himself as writer of theoretically solid Aristotelian plays. In this he was not a singular case. The importance of emphasising the Aristotelian orientation of one's dramatic production during the 1740s can be elucidated by presenting a second collection of plays: in 1747, another German Jesuit, Ferdinand Hueber (1679–1762), decided to publish the plays he had written many years before, in the 1710s.<sup>20</sup> At this earlier stage of his career, certainly, he would not yet have thought about printing them. The trend of printing school plays had not yet reached its later levels of popularity. For this reason he had not felt the need to respect the Aristotelian rules. The plays were written for the school stage only, with no further ambitions. Only when Hueber decided to publish them, the non-Aristotelian character of these traditional catholic school plays turned out to be a shortcoming. So what did Hueber do? He wrote a preface in which he declared that ever since he had started writing plays, he had of course considered the Aristotelian rules. However, realizing that some modifications of the theory were necessary to satisfy the pedagogical need

---

<sup>18</sup> Claus, *Tragoediae ludis...*, p. 244.

<sup>19</sup> P. Corneille, *Théâtre complet*, p. 40–44.

<sup>20</sup> F. Hueber, *Flores poetico-rhetorici, tum sacri, tum scholastici*, vol. 1–2, Ingolstadt–Augsburg 1747–1748. Cfr. J.-M. Valentin, *Le théâtre des Jésuites dans les pays de langue allemande. Répertoire chronologique...*, p. 1065.

of the school stage, he had not respected all of the rules very strictly. We should not believe him. When Hueber wrote his plays for the stage, he did probably not consider Aristotle at all. His plays are anything but Aristotelian. In order to save them, though, he added many years later an Aristotelian paratext to his collection and hoped the reader would credit his fabrication. The case shows clearly the role that paratexts in late Jesuit drama might play. They were used to give literary prestige to a genre which had not been considered a literary genre for a long time – even by intentionally misunderstanding the theory.

Another form of paratextual authorisation was adopted by two of the most influential intellectuals of the upper German province in the middle of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Franz Neumayr (1697–1765) and Ignaz Weitenauer (1709–1783) prepared the way for their editions of end of term plays by publishing poetological works in advance. In his *Idea poeseos* (1751) Neumayr refers several times to his collection of tragedies, the *Theatrum politicum*, but the compilation was only published in 1760.<sup>21</sup> By then, of course, no doubt could be raised about Neumayr's dramatic expertise. When Weitenauer published his *Tragoediae autumnales* in 1758,<sup>22</sup> he had already proven his familiarity with the ancient theory of drama: only one year before he had published his commentary of Horace's *Epistula ad Pisones*. In this publication he had related the authoritative poetics with countless writers from the more recent past.<sup>23</sup> Weitenauer, however, did not settle for this epitextual demonstration of his knowledge about theatre and theory (maybe also for the reason, that the format of the commentary had not allowed him to develop a systematic theory of drama). Like his older colleague Claus, whom he knew personally, Weitenauer added explanatory paratexts to all of his tragedies. In these paratexts – Weitenauer called them *Animadversiones* – the author informs the reader about the consideration he made while conceiving his characters and about his intentions in the play. Here a direct link between Aristotle and Corneille is made, and Anton Claus functions as a mediator:

Singulare Tragoediae ornamentum est, si fundamentis historiae [...] nititur: quod jam olim ab Aristotele in Poetica, deinde a magno Petro Cornelio, & nuper a felicissimo poeta tragico Antonio Clausio est animadversum.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> F. Neumayr, *Idea poeseos sive methodica institutio de praeceptis, praxi et usu artis*, Ingolstadt 1751; idem, *Theatrum politicum sive tragoediae ad commendationem virtutis et vitiorum detestationem olim ludis autumnalibus nunc typo datae*, Augsburg–Ingolstadt 1760.

<sup>22</sup> I. Weitenauer, *Tragoediae autumnales cum animadversionibus*, Augsburg–Freiburg im Breisgau 1758.

<sup>23</sup> I. Weitenauer, Q. Horatii Flaccii „*Ars poetica ad omne genus eloquentiae, ligatae, solutae etiam sacrae, accomodata*“, Augsburg–Freiburg im Breisgau 1757. Cfr. E. Kellner, *Ars Poetica und Tragoediae Autumnales*, PhD thesis, Innsbruck 1958.

<sup>24</sup> I. Weitenauer, *Tragoediae autumnales*..., p. 7.

As Claus, Weitenauer highlights on several occasions the compliance of his plays with Aristotelian poetics, in particular when he comes to discussing the *mediocritas* of his heroes and to analysing how he tried to arouse pity and fear. The tone he uses, however, is different. Unlike Claus, Weitenauer renounces apologetic argumentation. In his *Tragoediae* we find nothing comparable to Claus' excuse that future Jesuit choragi would benefit from his publication. In the late 1750s, it seems, this was no longer indispensable. To print Jesuit plays was still a rare practice, but it had become more generally accepted. As a consequence, the Aristotelian orientation of a collection, arguably, did not have to be stressed anymore for apologetic reasons, but merely as a criterion of quality. In some parts of the *Animadversiones*, hence, Weitenauer does not refer to Aristotelian poetics as the theoretical fundamentals on which the playwright based his literary activities. In a more subtle way, Weitenauer discusses the qualities of his plays and subsequently shows that Aristotle had the same ideas about writing a good play as he himself had. Thus, Weitenauer's *Animadversiones*, although clearly inspired by Claus' *Observationes*, differ from them in terms of function and attitude: for Weitenauer the paratexts in the collection offer him the possibility to emphasise the outstanding qualities of his literary production. The playwright thus demonstrates his erudition and the intertextual complexity of the plays. The commentaries imply that the plays can only be understood properly with the author's own support.

I come to my conclusions. The examples discussed in this paper can be seen as an indication of how 18<sup>th</sup> century Jesuit drama collections reflect the development of a 'literary' Jesuit playwright in their paratexts. When Jesuit playwrights in the Upper German province started to publish collections of worldly plays in the 1740s, they introduced themselves cautiously as writers and pretended to feature didactic material. Their plays, however, were not only intended as templates for future Jesuit teachers, but rather to be read as closet plays, as literature in a narrow sense. The fragility of their literary self-esteem compelled them to claim a close observation of poetic authorities, even in cases where in substance this was difficult to argue. Ignaz Weitenauer, as a representative of the late 1750s, could already set other priorities. On account of the fact that the concept of the 'literary' Jesuit playwright was established in his time, he could claim validity as author of elaborated Jesuit closet drama without referring to pretexts or *topoi* of modesty.

## Bibliography

- Avancini N., *Poesis drammatica*, vol. 1–5, Cologne–Rome 1675–1686.  
 Bidermann J., *Ludi theatrales sacri sive opera comica posthuma*, vol. 1–2, Munich 1666.  
 Clarke D., *Pierre Corneille. Poetics and political drama under Louis XIII*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1992.  
 Claus A., *Exercitationes theatrales*, Ingolstadt 1750.  
 Claus A., *Tragoediae ludis autumnalibus datae*, Augsburg 1741.

- Corneille P., *Théâtre complet*, vol. 1–2, Gallimard, Paris 1950.
- Fuhrmann M., *Einführung in die antike Dichtungstheorie*, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt 1973.
- Hueber F., *Flores poetico-rhetorici, tum sacri, tum scholastici*, vol. 1–2, Ingolstadt–Augsburg 1747–1748.
- Kellner E., *Ars Poetica und Tragoediae Autumnales*, PhD thesis, Innsbruck 1958.
- Kropf F. X., *Ratio et via recte et ordine procedendi in literis humanioribus*, Munich 1736.
- Lang F., *Theatrum solitudinis asceticae*, Munich 1717.
- Lurje M., *Die Suche nach der Schuld. Sophokles' Oedipus Rex, Aristoteles' Poetik und das Tragödienverständnis der Neuzeit*, Saur, München 2004.
- Neumayr F., *Idea poeseos sive methodica institutio de praeceptis, praxi et usu artis*, Ingolstadt 1751.
- Neumayr F., *Theatrum politicum sive tragoediae ad commendationem virtutis et vitiorum detestationem olim ludis autumnalibus nunc typo datae*, Augsburg–Ingolstadt 1760.
- Pohle F., *Glaube und Beredsamkeit. Katholisches Schultheater in Jülich-Berg, Ravenstein und Aachen (1601–1817)*, Rhema, Münster 2010.
- Rädle F., *Jesuit Theatre in Germany, Austria and Switzerland*, [in:] J. Bloemendal, H. B. Norland (eds.), *Neo Latin Drama and Theatre in Early Modern Europe*, Brill, Leiden–Boston 2013, p. 185–292.
- Rieks R., *Drei lateinische Tragiker des Grand Siècle*, Verlag der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, München 1989.
- Söffing W., *Deskriptive und normative Bestimmungen in der Poetik des Aristoteles*, Grüner, Amsterdam 1981.
- Szarota E. M., *Das Jesuitendrama im deutschen Sprachgebiet. Eine Periochen-Edition*, vol. 1–4, Fink, München 1979–1987.
- Tarot R. (ed.), *Jakob Bidermann: Cenodoxus. Deutsche Übersetzung von Joachim Meichel (1635)*, Reclam, Stuttgart 1965.
- Valentin J.-M., *La diffusion de Pierre Corneille en Allemagne au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle à travers les poétique jésuites*, [in:] idem (ed.), *Pierre Corneille et l'Allemagne. L'œuvre dramatique de Pierre Corneille dans le monde germanique (XVII<sup>e</sup>–XIX<sup>e</sup> siècles)*, Desjonquères, Paris 2007, p. 295–329.
- Valentin J.-M., *Le théâtre des Jésuites dans les pays de langue allemande (1554–1680)*, vol. 1–3, Lang, Bern 1978.
- Valentin J.-M., *Le théâtre des Jésuites dans les pays de langue allemande. Répertoire chronologique des pièces représentées et des documents conservés*, vol. 1–2, Hiersemann, Stuttgart 1983–1984.
- Valentin J.-M., *Theatrum catholicum. Les Jésuites et la scène en Allemagne au XVI<sup>e</sup> et au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Die Jesuiten und die Bühne in Deutschland des 16.–17. Jahrhunderts*, Presses universitaires, Nancy 1990.
- Weitenauer I., *Q. Horatii Flaccii „Ars poetica ad omne genus eloquentiae, ligatae, solutae etiam sacrae, accomodata“*, Augsburg–Freiburg im Breisgau 1757.
- Weitenauer I., *Tragoediae autumnales cum animadversionibus*, Augsburg–Freiburg im Breisgau 1758.
- Wimmer R., *Jesuitentheater. Didaktik und Fest. Das Exemplum des ägyptischen Joseph auf den deutschen Bühnen der Gesellschaft Jesu*, Klostermann, Frankfurt am Main 1982.

Simon Wirthensohn

## **POSZUKUJĄC AUCTORITAS. PARATEKSTUALNA AUTOPREZENTACJA W ZBIORACH DRAMATÓW JEZUICKICH**

**Streszczenie.** W krajach niemieckojęzycznych aż do końca XVII wieku jezuicki teatr szkolny był postrzegany niemal wyłącznie jako zjawisko funkcjonujące jedynie w formie ustnej. Sztuki, które pojawiały się drukiem, należały do rzadkości. Ich autorzy byli traktowani nie jako pisarze, lecz wychowawcy. Kiedy w XVIII wieku utalentowani autorzy zaczęli ogłaszać drukiem swoje utwory, musieli oni starać się o ich paratekstualne uzasadnienie. Na przykładzie kilku reprezentatywnie dobranych tekstów autor opracowania przedstawia argumentację, jaką posługiwali się ci dramaturdzy oraz omawia stosowane przez nich strategie paratekstualnej autoekspresji od roku 1740 aż do drugiej połowy XIX wieku.

**Słowa klucze:** dramat jezuicki, teatr szkolny, dramat XVIII wieku, autokomentarz, literatura neolacińska.

**Key words:** Jesuit drama, school theatre, 18<sup>th</sup> century drama, self-commentary, Neo-Latin literature.