

DOI 10.24425/asmdn.2025.157084

Paulina Pludra-Żuk

ORCID: 0000-0002-3955-8672

Instytut Historii Nauki im. L. i A. Birkenmajerów Polskiej Akademii Nauk

**MEDIEVAL PRELIMINARIES AS EVIDENCE OF READERSHIP:
THE CASE OF *AURORA* BY PETRUS RIGA
AND THE 'CRACOW GROUP' OF ITS COPIES¹**

**Średniowieczne preliminaria jako parateksty ukazujące czytelników
— przykład *Aurory* Piotra Rigi i jej kopii należących
do „grupy krakowskiej”**

Summary: The article discusses medieval preliminary texts as evidence of the function of the main work, and its reception with respect to *Aurora*, composed during the last years of the 12th century by Petrus Riga, and reworked by Aegidius of Paris in the beginning of the 13th century. The inquiry is based on a selected group of 15th-century manuscript copies associated with the milieu of the University of Cracow, and several smaller provincial centers in Poland. The appendix presents editions of three preliminary texts that can be found in the manuscript group in question, which the modern edition of *Aurora* has not encompassed.

Keywords: medieval preliminaries, medieval text transmission, University of Cracow, Petrus Riga, Aegidius of Paris, *Aurora*

Słowa kluczowe: preliminaria średniowieczne, transmisja tekstu w wiekach średnich, Uniwersytet Krakowski, Piotr Riga, Idzi z Paryża, *Aurora*

The works that achieved particular attention during the Middle Ages often present a challenge to the editors. Such works are usually preserved in numerous manuscripts and frequently, they provide material which reveals several authorial

¹ My sincere thanks go to the anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions, as well as to Sławomir Szyller and Jacek Soszyński for their kind assistance in preparing the text.

versions and later redactions, while their editions tend to be based on a limited number of copies.

Consequently, the edited text can be perceived in isolation from the original context in which it functioned. Preliminary texts belonged to that original context, whereas in the editions often only the authorial additions (prefaces, introductions, dedicatory letters etc.) are incorporated, leaving out—partially or completely—later add-ons from manuscript versions.² In this study, I will analyse the question of preliminaries to *Aurora*, a metrical version of the Bible (or more precisely, a metrical equivalent of the *Biblia glossata*). It was composed by Petrus Riga towards the end of the 12th century, and is preserved in approximately 500 copies—one of many proofs of its exceptional popularity during the later Middle Ages.³ Given the number of copies preserved and the complexity of the paratextual material, the inquiry has been narrowed to one specific group of manuscripts from the Polish territories, namely the so-called ‘Cracow group’.⁴ The selection is not accidental. The copies in question constitute a specific case illustrating the popularity of the text in the second half of the 15th century.⁵ In general, the group stems from the environment of the University of Cracow,⁶ but it also reaches out to minor provincial centers in Greater⁷ and Lesser Poland.⁸ It demonstrates particularly close internal connections between individual copies. Moreover, the manuscripts transmit an expanded set of preliminaries that illustrate subsequent stages of the work’s reception with only minor deviation from the fixed arrangement (the stability of the paratexts can be confirmed against copies not belonging to the group). This prefatory material reveals certain aspects of the manifold functions that *Aurora* fulfilled in medieval literacy, such as the study of the Bible, literary instruction or moral formation.⁹

² Cf. e.g. I. Galynina, ‘Accessus ad Lactantium?’ *Zur Handschriftlichen Überlieferung der Werke des Lactanz und zur Exzerptmethode im Mittelalter* (I), “Revue d’Histoire des Textes”, 2017, vol. 12, pp. 161–196, DOI 10.1484/J.RHT.5.112811.

³ Edition: *Aurora: Petri Rigae Biblia versificata*, ed. P.E. Beichner, Notre Dame 1965, see also G. Dinkova-Bruun, *On the Problem of Editing Versions: Peter Riga’s Euangelium*, [in:] *The Arts of Editing Medieval Greek and Latin: A Casebook*, ed. E. Göransson, G. Iversen, B. Crostini, B. M. Jensen, E. Kihlman, E. Odelman and D. Searby, Toronto 2016, pp. 96–120.

⁴ The starting point for the article is the material brought together during preparation of my PhD thesis. Its first version has been published as an Annex to P. Pludra-Żuk, ‘*Aurora*’ *Piotra Rigi. Średniowieczna transmisja i funkcje tekstu na przykładzie rękopisów polskich, pruskich i śląskich*, Warszawa 2021.

⁵ It was thoroughly analysed in P. Pludra-Żuk, ‘*Aurora*’ *Piotra Rigi*.

⁶ Kraków, Jagiellonian Library, 320, 322, 323, 324, Wrocław, University Library, R 355, Wrocław, Ossolineum Library, 693/I (thereafter cited as Ossol. 693/I).

⁷ Poznań, Raczynski Library, 142; Wrocław, University Library, Akc. 1948/829.

⁸ Wrocław, Ossolineum Library, 819/I (thereafter cited as Ossol. 819/I).

⁹ P. Pludra-Żuk, ‘*Aurora*’ *Piotra Rigi*, pp. 215–226.

In a broader sense, preliminaries can be divided into two categories: the first consists of introductory texts written by the author himself; the second encompasses preliminaries added by readers, displaying their insight into the text and contextualizing the audience. Although the vast medieval material of prefatory character often remains unedited and consequently unstudied or understudied, some patterns have been revealed. In the first instance, they allow us to separate conventional formulas from the elements that are distinctive and specific to the author and the circumstances in which he writes.¹⁰ In the second instance, by distinguishing specific arrangements of introductory material, they enable us to link an introduction of a certain type to a specific time and environment.¹¹ Below, I will propose the reading of preliminaries to *Aurora*, focusing on the readers and the purpose of the text as can be seen explicitly in the texts of the preliminary material and through the conventional shape of the preliminaries. By these means I will try to bring together the evidence on original authorial intention concerning the role of the text, pay attention to the evidence on the paths of the transmission of the text connected to the environment in which it was read and illustrate the copying method which resulted in the production of the manuscripts in question.

In the case of *Aurora*, the first category—authorial prefaces—includes also preliminary texts written by its ‘corrector,’ Aegidius of Paris, who started to rework the text already during Petrus Riga’s lifetime. Regarding this category of introductory texts, one can consider their correspondence both to previous texts of similar scope and to contemporary texts written with a complementary purpose. I will discuss specific authorial preliminaries in accordance with the chronological order in which they were added to the core text, although this order does not reflect the actual succession of texts present in the manuscripts under consideration.

First, let us focus on the preface edited by Beichner as Preface III, the only one written by the author of *Aurora*, which begins with the words *Frequens sodalium meorum*. It can be considered as the main introduction to the text, since it appears virtually in all complete copies, irrespective of the version, provenance, or form of the text. It presents a variation of a classical rhetorical scheme. The author modestly claims that his work is a response to his friends’ request, stating he undertook the task unwillingly, torn between his awareness of the limitations of his talent and the obligations stemming from his close relationship with his

¹⁰ E.g. T. Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions*, Stockholm 1964.

¹¹ Esp. E.A. Quain, *The Medieval Accessus ad auctores*, “Traditio” 1945, vol. 3, pp. 215–264. R.W. Hunt, *The Introduction to the ‘Artes’ in the Twelfth Century*, [in:] *The History of Grammar in the Middle Ages*, ed. G.L. Bursill-Hall, Amsterdam 1980, p. 117–144, A. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*, London 1984, G. Dahan, *Les prologues des commentaires bibliques (XIIe–XIVe siècle)*, [in:] *Les prologues médiévaux: actes du colloque international; (Rome, 26–28 mars 1998)*, ed. par J. Hamesse, Turnhout 2000, pp. 427–470.

friends (*sodales*), who were his companions in studying Cicero and Aristotle (“*animus meus in dubio pependit, incertus an scriberet an obmutesceret. Vires [...] ingenii mei tanto operi minime sufficere considerabam, sed alia de parte petitioni sodalium obuiare formidabam*”). Next, he explains the title chosen for the work, and on this occasion, he again emphasizes the struggle this task imposed upon him (“*post luctam et laborem quem in hoc opere exercui*”). The author omits the issue of the metrical form of the text and focuses only on its role in conveying allegorical meanings of the Bible—he employs comparisons already present in patristic texts (such as a honey pressed from the honeycomb, or a nut being shelled).

This scheme of the preface can be traced back to Cicero’s *Orator*—quite likely it originated even earlier in Greek rhetorical works, and was widely used thereafter in Latin literature.¹² If we consider the most widely known texts that can be classified as *full-scale biblical versifications*,¹³ such as Juvencus’ *Evangeliorum libri IV*, Sedulius’ *Carmen Paschale* or Arator’s *Historia Apostolica*, we will observe conventional rhetorical elements of *recusatio* that are common to all these works. However, there is no visible direct correspondence between the texts, all of which were produced in highly divergent circumstances.

At the same time, some analogies can be found with respect to contemporaneous literary production. The justification of taking up the task of depicting the Pentateuch in metrical style and uncovering allegorical meanings seems to correspond with the introduction to *Historia scholastica* by Petrus Comestor, who explains that “*Causa suscepti laboris fuit instans petitio sociorum, qui cum historiam sacre scripture in serie et glosis diffusam lecitarent breuem nimis et inexpositam, opus aggredi me compulerunt ad quod pro ueritate historie consequenda recurrerent [...]. Porro a cosmographia Moysi inchoans riuulum historicum deduxi usque ad ascensionem saluatoris, pelagus mysteriorum peritioribus relinquens*”.¹⁴ It seems that Riga with his preface echoes what had already been said by Comestor and takes up the task which can be seen as the following step in biblical studies. The fact that the two texts were seen and used as complementary is attested by their frequent copying together in multiple-text codices dedicated to biblical studies.¹⁵

¹² Cf. T. Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces*, pp. 40–49.

¹³ G. Dinkova-Bruun, *Biblical Versifications from Late Antiquity to the Middle of the Thirteenth Century: History or Allegory?*, [in:] *Poetry and Exegesis in Premodern Latin Christianity. The Encounter between Classical and Christian Strategies of Interpretation*, ed. W. Otten, K. Pollmann, Leiden–Boston 2007, pp. 315–342; P. Pludra-Żuk, ‘*Aurora*’ *Piotra Rigi*, pp. 37–74.

¹⁴ *Petri Comestoris Scholastica Historia. Genesis*, ed. A. Sylvan, Turnhout 2005, p. 3.

¹⁵ In respect to manuscripts that were the subject of my study, as examples of this kind of practice can be mentioned: Toruń, University Library, 75 and Cambridge, Parker Library, Corpus Christi College 520.

The second layer of authorial preliminaries is the one added by the ‘corrector’ of *Aurora*, Aegidius of Paris. These texts have already been extensively discussed by G. Dinkova-Bruun.¹⁶ Here, I will recapitulate the arrangement and the content of Aegidius’ prefaces, which display a noticeable change in his attitude towards the undertaken task with an unusual focus on himself.

The prose preface appended by Aegidius to his first redaction (Beichner, no. IV, inc. *Fraterne caritatis*) stresses the role of the author elevated by the work’s purpose (“ea emulari ex quibus et profectus morum et salus proueniat animarum. De quo utique laudabili uoto penset quicumque est eiusdem caritatis comparticeps quantum gratulandum est presentis operis editori”). In the discussed manuscripts this is the opening preface called *prologus magistri Egidii*. Already the title refers to the *obeli*, used to indicate verses added by Aegidius.¹⁷

Aegidius inserts several verses on the importance of the task into the metrical preface to the same edition (inc. *Initium mundi quales*, no. VIII in the edition) (“Nec uero, quasi nil operer, magis ocia secter, / Ridiculo debent seria nostra geri. / Credo superuacuo non indulgere labori”) and in the invocation to God, he calls himself a divine poet (“Da tua facta, Deus, ut prosequar ore fideli / Et sit sermo tuus uatis in ore tui”). The prologue stresses the allegorical meaning of the text and underlines the work’s importance, even though at first sight it can be disregarded (“etsi primum discredet, postea nemo neget”). In his opinion, the author who combines grammatical subtleties with Sacred Scripture should hold the first place among poets taught at schools (“Minthologi cedant et apud gymnasia uatum / Hec habeant primum precipuumque locum. / Hic etenim figens oculum simul ire uidebit / Gramaticos apices eloquiumque sacrum”). Indeed, for this reason, *Aurora*—which combines literary and moral values—was included into the scholarly curriculum already in the 13th century.¹⁸ In the ‘Cracow manuscripts’, this piece is entitled *Hic proponit auctor de quo velit agere*, and it is explicitly ascribed to Aegidius in the ms. Ossol. 693/I.

The first redaction of Aegidius also encompasses his metrical prayer (Beichner, no. IX, inc. *His te, Petre...*). Generally, in the majority of manuscripts, it follows

¹⁶ G. Dinkova-Bruun, *Aegidius of Paris and his Two Letters to Bishop Odo*, [in:] *Medieval Letters – Between Fiction and Document*, ed. Ch. Høgel and E. Bartoli, with a preface by F. Stella and L.B. Mortensen, Turnhout 2015, pp. 153–166.

¹⁷ Parts added to the text by Aegidius were marked by himself with an *acus*, see G. Dinkova-Bruun, *Marking One’s Own: Aegidius of Paris’s Revisions of Peter Riga’s ‘Aurora’*, “*Filologia Mediolatina*” 2019, 26, pp. 132–142. These markings are also preserved in many later manuscripts (in the ‘Cracow’ manuscripts called *obelus*, represented with a short horizontal line with one dot above and one below). Dinkova-Bruun states that the *acus* can be found in manuscripts containing the second redaction by Aegidius, yet the ‘Cracow’ manuscripts contain only some additions ascribed by Beichner to this version.

¹⁸ *Aurora: Petri Rigae Biblia versificata*, pp. XXX–XXXV.

Recapitulationes, but in the manuscripts under consideration, it is placed at the end of the set of preliminaries. In the prayer, Aegidius praises Riga's merit of facilitating the reading of the Bible for his brothers ("Fratribus hac facta pro commoditate legendi"); however, with respect to himself not only does he stay anonymous, but even stresses his anonymity ("Me simul, in seriem qui libri abrupta redegī, / Nec comes, immo cliens, hic tibi, Petre, fui. / Sed quis sim taceo, uolo namque latere minus que / Mundi, plus oculis cognitus esse Dei"). Yet, he still claims some merit by employing classical diminutive form ("Me quoque munificet propter suppleta libelli / Portio perpetui quantulacumque boni").

There is also one more preface by Aegidius, which Beichner associated with Aegidius' second redaction (Beichner, no. VII, inc. *Scire cupis...*). But it appears in the 'Cracow' manuscripts, which generally belong to the first redaction.¹⁹ The poem once again primarily focuses on the merits of Aegidius in correcting the original version of the text.²⁰

Additionally, the second redaction of Aegidius is supplemented with more material, which is missing from the copies under discussion. In the preface written in elegiac couplets addressed to Odo of Sully, the bishop of Paris (Beichner, no. X, inc. *Vtile cum dulci...*), Aegidius changes his attitude and underscores his amendments to the work very carefully. He refers to the requests from his friends ("Quocirca, a sociis crebro multumque rogatus / Istum defectum tollere uelle, tuli") and justifies his work by the imperfections of the original. Surprisingly, one of his objections towards Riga's poem was the lack of a proper introduction ("Vulnificabat eum defectio magna libellum, / Cui neque que decuit ianua prima fuit"). At the same time, he justifies his own imperfections with the law of meter. Aegidius indicates that every verse he authored is marked by an *acus* (needle), yet he demands that initially his work should be read in private, and made known to others only if it proves worthy.

Moreover, three manuscripts transmit one more letter written by Aegidius to Odo in prose (inc. *Vrgebat me priusquam*, omitted in Beichner's edition, edited by G. Dinkova-Bruun²¹). In this letter Aegidius justifies his decision to take up the task of improving the original. Most likely this is a response to criticism voiced by readers of his re-elaboration of *Aurora*.²² He uses a quotation from Seneca's *De beneficiis* as the motto for his undertaking, depicting his gift as necessary,

¹⁹ As mentioned above, n. 17, the 'Cracow' manuscripts contain some additions that Beichner attributes to Aegidius' 2nd redaction, such as the extensive *Mysterium de agno paschali* inserted into the book of Exodus. At the same time, many of the additions are missing. It is possible that the group testifies to an intermediary version of the text.

²⁰ See G. Dinkova-Bruun, *Corrector Ultimus: Aegidius of Paris and Peter Riga's 'Aurora'*, [in:] *Modes of Authorship in the Middle Ages*, ed. S. Rancović, Toronto 2012, pp. 174–175.

²¹ G. Dinkova-Bruun, *Aegidius of Paris and his Two Letters*, pp. 163–166.

²² *Ibidem*, p. 160.

useful, and pleasant (“cum danda sunt aliqua, primo debent esse necessaria, deinde utilia, deinde iocunda”). Simultaneously, he presents himself as the author of the addressee’s eternal glory. As Dinkova-Bruun states, it is likely that the letter was actually sent to Odo.²³

There is one more category of authorial prefaces preceding particular biblical books, which will be omitted in this overview. What can be noted here, is that both the author and the editor were adding texts of this kind. A notable difference in approach between Petrus and Aegidius is that the former provides a more comprehensive overview of the biblical book in question, focusing on prefigurations, while the latter presents a summary of the book and highlights the significance of the title. Furthermore, some manuscripts of Aegidius’ second edition contain an introduction to the Gospel, known from several manuscripts and edited by G. Dinkova-Bruun,²⁴ which is also missing from the manuscripts under discussion.

The second category of the preliminaries in manuscripts of the ‘Cracow group’ is represented by several texts of diverse origin. The first of this type of preliminaries is an eulogy of *Aurora*, beginning with the words *Stringere pauca libet* (Beichner, no. V). In some manuscripts, it has been ascribed to a premonstratensian canon of Auxerre.²⁵ It refers to *Aurora* using figures typically standing for the Bible itself, such as *triticea farina*, *manna*, *epulum*, *sol*, *fons*, *pascua celestis*, *cellaria regia*, *celum*, *poma*, *calamum*, *arcus*, *rota*, *liber in dextra regnantis scriptus intus et foris*, or *mel*. Additionally, when it comes to discerning the manifold meaning of the text, the author of the preface refers rather to the Bible than to *Aurora* specifically. All the copies belonging to the ‘Cracow group’ ascribe the text mistakenly to Aegidius (with the title: *Prologus magistri Egidii de commendatione huius libris*) and transmit it in two parts, the second beginning with the words *Nil homini melius...*, which stresses the moral aspect of the text, called *pascua vite*, on which one should build his life (“Sapientem non puto quando / Nil sibi quod didicit codice corde sapit” and further: “Qui colit hanc, audi que metat inde bona: / Purior affectus, sensus fit clarior, et mens / Liberior, mundo carneque pressa minus. / Lectio iugis alit uirtutes, lucida reddit / Intima, declinat noxia, uana fugat”). This second part in the ‘Cracow manuscripts’ is usually preceded by the title: *Ostendit quod divini libri sunt libenter legendi* (in ms. Ossol. 693/I it is also ascribed to Aegidius).

²³ Ibidem, pp. 159–160.

²⁴ G. Dinkova-Bruun, *Aegidius of Paris and the Seven Seals: a Prose Prologue to the Gospels in Peter Riga’s Aurora*, “Mediaeval Studies” 2012, 73, pp. 119–145.

²⁵ Beichner considered this preface characteristic of Aegidius’s second redaction (*Aurora: Petri Rigae Biblia versificata*, p. 9). However, based on manuscripts from the ‘Cracow group’, it can be asserted that it also appears in manuscripts containing its intermediary redaction, at least in a version that was expanded with later anonymous versifications.

Moreover, this preface is divided into two by another text, inc. *Omnis scriptura divinitus inspirata* (Beichner, no. II). As Beichner indicates, in the manuscripts he used, this piece is called *prologus magistralis* or *prologus Alberti Remensis*. In the discussed manuscripts it is entitled: *Nota quod ad omnes bonos usus utilis est sacra pagina* (ms Ossol. 693/I adds: *seu theologia*). It is based on Tim II, 3:16: “omnis scriptura divinitus inspirata est utilis ad docendum, ad arguendum, ad corrigendum, ad erudiendum in iustitia”. The introduction is very dialectical in form. First, it presents a defence against potential accusers which evokes associations with *disputatio*, but also with traditional conventions that can be observed, for example, in the introduction to the *Carmen Paschale* of Sedulius. It is characterised by systematic division, typical of distinctions and by rhetorical form (e.g. use of paradoxes, such as *ampla brevitate* and *brevi amplitudine*). It underscores the manifold usefulness of *Aurora*, which: “utilis est [...] ad docendum nescientes, ad arguendum de malo negligentes, ad increpandum in malo persistentes, ad erudiendum rudes et discendum insipites”, and her worth for the readers on diverse levels of advancement: the *parvulus* will find in it “lac paruulorum, perfectus — solidum cibum, ingeniosus et studiosus — reperiet unde possit et debeat exercere ingenium suum”. Even the *fastidiosus* can be attracted by its novelty and pleasant sound (“nouitas fauorabilis et mulcens aures exsufflabit fastidium et amena diuersitas audiendi quasi prouocabit appetitum”). The preface stresses the conciseness of *Aurora* with respect to the Bible, stating that *Aurora* renders *ampla brevitate et breui amplitudine* what has been depicted by Moses *diffuse et confuse*. It presents the history *plane et plene*, revealing literal truth and subtleties of allegory *ad morum informationem* and *moralitatis suauitatem*. The text then explains the four senses of the Bible.

Further, among the introductions in the ‘Cracow’ manuscripts a short commentary entitled *Quomodo sit intellegendum In principio creavit Deus, etc.*, can also be found, beginning with the words: *In principio creavit etc. magister librum suum inchoat....* To date, it has not been published (assigned with ** in the appendix below). The commentary to the first verses of Genesis was probably based on the opening chapter of *Historia scholastica* by Petrus Comestor. Due to theological difficulties, the fragment frequently became the subject of commentary works, such as those by Langton and Hugh of St. Cher. Its reappearance in the introduction to *Aurora* can suggest that both *Aurora* and *Historia scholastica* were used by the same circle of readers as two complementary companions to the Bible.²⁶ It is probable that the fragment of the commentary was originally inserted

²⁶ M.J. Clark, *The Commentaries on Peter Comestor’s ‘Historia scholastica’ of Stephen Langton, Pseudo-Langton, and Hugh of St. Cher*, “Sacris erudiri” 2005, 44, pp. 301–466; Idem, *Stephen Langton and Hugh of St. Cher on Peter Comestor’s ‘Historia Scholastica’: The Lombard’s Sentences and the Problem of Sources Used by Comestor and his Commentators*, “Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie Médiévales” 2007, 74, No. 1, pp. 63–117.

in the manuscript as a marginal gloss. Only here one finds the standard Proemium by Riga (inc. *Frequens sodalium meorum...*, no. III) and the poem of Aegidius on the authors of *Aurora* (inc. *Scire cupis...*, no. VII).

The following introductory piece with the incipit *Sequitur prohemium aut narratio. Hiis itaque dictis...* also remains unedited (assigned with * in the appendix below). To some extent the text of this prohemium is parallel to the prohemium No. I (Beichner: “A Thirteenth-century Foreword”), the edition of which is based on a single manuscript copy from the collection of the British Library, MS Sloane 1726. It is a typical *accessus ad auctorem* compiled from the information contained in other introductions. Both the version in the printed edition and the one that can be found in the ‘Cracow’ copies use analogous headings. The first part of the introduction, which lacks a heading, concerns the authorship of the text. In the edited version, it pertains only to Riga, whereas in the ‘Cracow’ version, it encompasses both Riga and Aegidius, with a rather detailed description of the latter’s role. Moreover, the ‘Cracow’ proemium does not contain information on the education of Petrus Riga and the circumstances in which he entered the order. Instead, it describes Aegidius’s contribution quite precisely and gives the reason for writing the introduction. Furthermore, it presents *materia* (where only the Pentateuch is taken into account, which means that also in the case of this part, the source of the information was the authorial proemium and not the work itself), *intentio*, *causa* (with the distinction for *causa privata* and *communis*), *utilitas* and *titulus*. The set of headings constitutes a variation of an introduction described by Hunt as type C.²⁷ Missing from this scheme are: *modus scribendi*, which has been indicated under *intentio*, and *cui parti philosophie supponitur*.²⁸ A deviation from the scheme is the use of the term *causa*, typical of the scheme popularised in the 13th century, along with the introduction of Aristotle’s *Physica* and *Metaphysica* to the curriculum. The context implies, however, that what is meant by the heading is in fact the *causa finalis*,²⁹ which in this case overlaps with the category of *intentio*. A similar use of this category can be found as early as the 12th century.³⁰ *Causa* has been divided into two subcategories: *causa privata* and *communis*. The difference, in this case, lies in the differentiation between fellow brothers of Riga and the broader audience. Here, one can observe reminiscences of the distinction

²⁷ R.W. Hunt, *The Introduction to the ‘Artes’*, pp. 126–129. The arrangement of the preface is close i.a. to the anonymous preface to Priscian, inc. *Tria sunt*, specifically to the part *intrinsicus* (with the difference that *materia* is classified as belonging to the *extrinsicus* part).

²⁸ Regarding diverse approaches in defining relations between the Bible and philosophy see A. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, p. 27.

²⁹ A. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, p. 29: “In the context of commentary on secular *auctores*, this meant the philosophical import or moral significance of a given work; in the context of Scriptural exegesis, it meant the efficacy of a work in leading the reader to salvation”.

³⁰ As Hunt (*The Introduction to the ‘Artes’*, p. 127) and Minnis (*Medieval Theory of Authorship*, p. 29) state, *causa finalis* was implemented alongside or instead of *utilitas*.

between elements belonging to the category *ante opus* (the author and the reason underlying the work) and *in ipso opere* (the rest of the headings). As has already been said, the set of prefaces is concluded by the prayer of Aegidius.

The arrangement of the prefaces is stable for almost all manuscripts of the ‘Cracow group’, with only minor differences between individual copies. However, there is one distinct addition introduced at the beginning of the manuscript Ossol. 819/I, a poem beginning with the words: *Panem celestem sine fomite mandere gliscens* (assigned with *** in the appendix below). This poem was copied in 1474 by Michael de Budziwój in Radymno (a small village halfway between Jarosław and Przemyśl, in modern southeastern Poland). Michael de Budziwój was immatriculated at the University of Cracow in the autumn of 1474, as attested by a list of lectures and exercises noted on the front flyleaf of the aforementioned manuscript.³¹ The text is inserted immediately after the title: *Biblia metrica Petri de Riga* on f. 1r (f. 1v is left blank). It addresses the conditions that a Christian must meet to receive Holy Communion and refers to Franciscan authors, including Bonaventure and Richard of Middleton. The piece does not seem to be strictly related to the content of *Aurora*. Eucharistic spirituality which was specifically important for the 13th-century mendicant orders, was not addressed in a polemical way by Riga, who, after introducing the scene of the establishment of Eucharistia, explains its allegorical meanings. Moreover, besides several additional lines inserted into the main text as headings, the passus in Ossol. 819/I does not bear any traces of reading. Simultaneously, the added text describes the fervent reading of Sacred Scripture as one of the ways of preparing for the Eucharist.

In the literature, one can find important reservations regarding the stability of prefaces in the transmission of medieval texts in general, and in the transmission of *Aurora* in particular. Minnis (following Lacombe and Smalley) notices the *disconnecting facility* of paratextual elements of this type.³² Dinkova-Bruun observes that the instability of the arrangement of prefaces in *Aurora* impedes the establishment of relations between copies of the text.³³ However, with respect to the ‘Cracow’ copies the introductions appear to be transmitted stably, with a slight tendency for further accretions. Therefore, while the instability of the arrangement cannot be used as evidence in establishing relations between copies, its stability can be significant. The stability may testify to the position of authority ascribed to the text in the second half of the 15th century and constitutes one more trace of the editorial practice of the copyist of the exemplar from which the ‘Cracow group’ took its origin. The aggregation of introductions suggests that the ‘Cracow edition’ contains a set of introductions considered

³¹ P. Pludra-Żuk, *Nieznany spis zajęć na wydziale artium Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego z lat 1474–1477*, “Analecta. Studia i Materiały z Dziejów Nauki” 2021, t. 30, z. 2, pp. 99–116.

³² A. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, p. 42.

³³ G. Dinkova-Bruun, *Aegidius of Paris and the Seven Seals*, p. 126, n. 25.

complete, and in which Aegidius plays the crucial role he planned for himself. The character of the prefaces is divergent. They can be assigned to the following types discerned by Gilbert Dahan regarding biblical commentaries composed in the timeframe from the 12th to the 14th century:

- Introductions of free form, namely the prohemium by the author and editor (III and IV);
- *Accessus ad auctores*, namely the anonymous prohemium bringing together information derived from earlier introductory pieces (*);
- Introduction constructed around a biblical citation (it falls under the subcategory of informal introductions as discerned from the strict rules of the ‘sermon type’³⁴), namely “The Teacher’s preface”.³⁵

In the codices under consideration, the arrangement of prefaces and preservation of the *acus* designating the parts supposedly written by Aegidius exhibits noticeable stability which can easily be noticed vis-à-vis other manuscripts from this territory. Differences between copies are visible in their titles, with the most developed headings found in ms. Ossol. 693/I. This manuscript systematizes the *prohemia* with a clear distinction between the texts by Petrus and Aegidius. Thus, building up paratexts, the scribe constructs a coherent introduction to Riga’s work.³⁶

The analogy for *Aurora* can be provided by *Graecismus* by Eberhard of Béthune, which reveals several patterns. First, the set of introductions depends on the text’s redaction. Second, in the group of manuscripts which contains a developed set of prefatory texts, they can be divided into three categories: 1) prologues written or reused by the author of the commentary; 2) authorial introductions, and 3) marginal explanations referring to the authorial introduction³⁷. Two observations are particularly noteworthy when considering *Aurora*. First, codices that were not supplemented with later introductions did not burden the text with additional

³⁴ A. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship*, p. 64: “They begin with a text from Scripture, which is then applied to the contents of the book under discussion, just as preachers cited a text at the beginning of their sermons”. As Minnis states, this form was used by Comestor in his commentaries to Evangile, but he did not invent it. G. Dahan, *Les prologues des commentaires bibliques*, p. 432 differentiates informal introductions with an initial scriptural citation and introductions built on the rule of *divisio*, a form that gained popularity from the second half of the 13th century. The preface under discussion shows an analogy with the Prologue to the commentary to Ecclesiastes by Stephen Langton (edited by G. Dahan, pp. 461).

³⁵ G. Dahan, *Les prologues des commentaires bibliques*, especially pp. 429–443.

³⁶ V. De Angelis in *Lo Stazio di Dante: poesia e scuola*, “Schede Umanistiche” 2002, 2, pp. 32 states that medieval readers regarded paratexts as constituting a whole with the main text. In ‘Cracovian’ prefaces one can observe a similar approach in constructing and transmitting a coherent set of introductions.

³⁷ A. Grondeux, *Prologues, ‘Prohemium’, glose du ‘Prohemium’ dans les manuscrits du ‘Graecismus’ d’Évrard de Béthune*, [in:] *Les prologues médiévaux*, pp. 323–344.

material, making them particularly useful for school use.³⁸ Second, in the case of ‘editions’ of *Graecismus*, the practice of copying text from more than one exemplar was related to the awareness of the gloss’s instability. Copyists referred to diverse versions of the text due to the differences in their content.³⁹

The case of *Aurora* can be analogously interpreted to some extent. The manuscripts containing only the authorial introduction were generally used in more conservative learning in which propedeutic introductions held less significance, such as monastic or cathedral schools or in a group of copies likely intended for reading aloud in refectories. Although a comprehensive study of all *Aurora* copies exceeds the scope of this study, a preliminary overview of the copies described in catalogues which indicate their provenance corroborates the existence of this tendency. In the case of *Aurora* the prose preface by Riga constitutes primary introductory material, similar in kind to the prefaces preceding earlier texts of comparable character, whereas the later scholastic prefaces attest the authoritativeness of the text. The difference between these two groups would therefore lie in the type of schooling in which they were created and functioned. The tendency for accretions of prefatory material can be connected to the practice of critical copying of the text, likely based on more than one copy, with the awareness of existing multiple versions of the work and with the objective to prepare its most complete version. Moreover, it can be observed that *Aurora* is not preceded by a prologue based on Aristotle’s four *causae*, a characteristic of the university environment in the 13th century, which suggests that the development of scholastic prefaces to this text probably began to decline quite early. Similarly, the anonymous books that complement the original text (such as *Ecclesiastes*, *Lamentationes Ieremie* and *Proverbia Salomonis*) are already known from 13th-century manuscripts.

³⁸ Ibidem, p. 326: *Le conservatisme parallèle à cette tendance à l’accrétion permet aux enseignants de conserver à leur disposition des introductions plus succinctes, qui ne nécessitent pas un trop grand nombre de leçons avant de passer à l’étude du texte lui-même, en particulier si l’on suppose que les auditeurs avaient pu déjà bénéficier d’une introduction de ce genre...*, p. 326.

³⁹ Ibidem, pp. 327–328.

Appendix⁴⁰

*

Based on ms. Kraków, Jagiellonian Library, 320, p. 8.⁴¹

Hiis ita dictis ad sequentia transeamus; a vetera scientibus in texendo veterum scriptis veteribus nos nova novorum legentes opera novis nos leccionibus innovemus. Prosequar igitur ea, que faciunt ad elucidacionem sequencium, breviter exponendo. Supervacuum enim est, si plura sint, extrinsecus ad hec plura pluribus superaddere, qui propter numerositatem possum vel ipsorum legencium vel ipsorum audiencium animos onerare. Cum itaque, sicut in sequencibus apparebit, alius fuerit, qui hunc librum edidit, alius qui quasdam suppleciones de suo apposuit, videndum est, que sint, persone eorundem. In primis dicimus, quod quidam canonicus regularis sancti Dionisii de Carcere Remensis Petrus nomine, Riga cognomine, licet de mediocri parentela oriundus, tamen morum honestate preditus, clarus ingenio, doctus eloquio, liberalium artium feliciter eruditus, fuit autem tante sapientie, ut de eo illud vere dici possit: “Curritur ad vocem iocundam et carmen amice / historie letam confecit versibus urbem” [*add.* scilicet Parisius]⁴². Tantus ergo vir hunc librum edidit, scilicet in quibusdam ordinem pretermisit, aut quidem brevitatis amator, aut tedium vitans, aut ad finem sui laboris accelerans. Quod diligencius intuens magister quidam Egidius nomine libro isti illud, quod de facili potuit apponi, adiecit, et in quibusdam versibus et rubricis hoc opus emendavit. Et si aliqui loquentur, quod hoc auctori debuit reservari, ut qui fuerat editor, idem esset et corrector, sciant illi, quod hoc factum fuisset, si is, qui hunc librum edidit, hoc facere voluisset, cui labori se subtraxit et statim post edicionem librum istum promulgavit. Ceterum, ut ita sit attentius, utamur exemplis. Simile olim factum videmus, quoniam Esdras psalmos David aliter, quam ordinati fuerunt, ordinavit et titulos de suo apposuit. Hiis itaque visis videamus, que sit materia, que auctoris intentio, que causa suscepti operis, que utilitas, quis titulus. Materia auctoris est historie executio in hoc opere a prima mundi origine tractans

⁴⁰ In this edition, I have retained original spelling features of the manuscript version, such as spelling of words ending in *-cio* and monophthongization. The spelling of the letters *v* and *u* reflects their pronunciation. Abbreviations are expanded, without indicating the expansions. The spelling of the letters *i* and *j*, punctuation and capitalization of proper nouns have been standardised.

⁴¹ The edition is aimed at making the texts available to the broader audience of scholars. Due to the fact that it is likely that the texts are still to be found in other copies of *Aurora*, that are not directly linked to the Polish territories and which are outside the scope of my research, I have decided to base the edition on a single copy. This particular manuscript is one of the oldest copies belonging to the ‘Cracow’ group and was written ca. 1450.

⁴² Decimus Iunius Iuvenalis, *Saturae sedecim*, ed. J. Willis, Stuttgart–Leipzig 1997, VII, p. 98, v. 82. Cf. also *accessus* to *Thebaid* by Statius (see S. Resconi “*Novam monstrare futuris*”. *Alcune osservazioni sul Roman de Thebes*, [in:] *Il medioevo degli antichi. I romanzi francesi della “Triade classica”*, ed. A. D’Agostino, Milano–Udine 2013, p. 113).

res veteris testamenti, quas Moyses et alii sequentes Moysen tantum prosaice descripserunt. Intentio auctoris est in hoc opere historiam versibus texere, demum ex ipsa littera quasdam allegorias elicere, tanquam nucleum de testa, granum de palea, mel de cera, etc. Causa suscepti operis duplex est: communis et privata: privata, ut fratres suos minus peritos in sacra pagina instruat, ita, quod ex eius doctrina morum veniat disciplina et insuper salus animarum; communis, ut legentes hunc librum verborum exornet floribus, mellito pascat eloquio et scintillis illuminet scienciarum, ethnicorum deliramentis penitus obscuratos. Utilitas est virtutum plantatio, misteriorum revelatio, novi veterisque testamenti cognitio. Titulus talis est: *Incipit Aurora. Libri compositor, quis sim me percipe, lector. / Petrus Riga vocor, cui Christus petra rigat cor. / Dulcius ut saperem modulamina condita metri, / incipit hic Rige biblioteca Petri.*

**

Based on ms. Kraków, Jagiellonian Library, 320, p. 6.

Quomodo sit intelligendum *In principio creavit Deus celum et terram.*

In principio creavit etc. Magister librum suum inchoat ab illo, qui est principium et fundamentum tocius boni, dicens: In principio creavit deus etc. Notate in structura mundialis machine, quia fecit deus: primum creavit, secundo disposuit, tercio ordinavit, videlicet solum celum angelis, aerem volucris, aquam piscibus, terram hominibus et bestiis. Et proprie ornatus dicuntur mobilia. Arbores enim et herbe non sunt ornatus, quia sunt immobilia. Fecit etiam dominus mentaliter, quia omnia ab eterno previderit in mente, unde illud: Quod factum est in illo vita erat, id est vivebat. Et alibi: ipse erat omnia in omnibus. Materialiter, quoniam ipse materiam omnium rerum fecit, ut celum et terram. Actualiter, quoniam res in actum prodiit. Hiis visis procedamus ad litteram. In principio creavit Deus celum et terram, continens pro contento, celum scilicet empireum et angelicam naturam; terram, id est materiam omnium corporum, id est quattuor elementorum. Cum autem: primo ponatur celum in hoc loco, et alibi: inveniatur terra, ut ibi: inicio tu Domine terram fundasti. Dicendum est, quod ea, que simul facta sunt, simul dici non possunt. Creavit, id est de nichilo fecit. Et hic elidit errores Platonis et Aristotelis. Plato dicit tria esse principia: deum, hile et ydeam; hile est primordialis materia, ydea — forma. Deus autem hile tribuit et quamlibet formam, et sic operando omnia fecit. Aristoteles dicit duo esse: inane et athomos. Epicurus duo: mundum et opificem. Hos errores elidit Moyses solo verbo dicens: In principio, id est in filio et per filium, id est per sapienciam. Filius enim est patris sapiencia et pater omnia operatur per filium, videlicet in principio temporis, coequena enim sunt mundus et tempus, videlicet in principio omnium rerum fecit deus celum et terram.

Based on ms. Wrocław, Ossolineum, 819/I, f. 2r.

Panem⁴³ celestem sine fomite mandere gliscens,
 Quatuor hec videat interno lumine mentis:
 Ritum ecclesie studeat servare sumendo;
 Non aliquis morsus mortalis rodeat illum;
 Voluntas sit ei culpas vitare pro posse;
 Devotus extra sit semper sive veritus.
 Hec Bonaventura sumenti dat valitura.
 Sed cum sumenti incumbit devocio semper,
 Questio si fuerit tibi, quis modus apcior illi,
 Cum modus et qualitas distincta convenit omni,
 Regula sub certa non sistit questio sumpta.
 Est aliquis, quem oracio perficit apte,
 Et meditacio consimilem pia efficiet quem,
 Et dulcemque purum faciunt ieiunia crebra.
 Verbo divino saciatus comperit illam,
 Divinis scriptis incumbens parturit ipsam,
 Subveniens inopi idipsum senciatur in se.
 Et quemcumque modum aptum sibi invenerit quis,
 Illi pro posse vigilet insistere semper.
 Digne sumenti hec dantur comoda bissex:
 Inflamat, memorat, sustentat, roborat, auget,
 Hostia spem purgat, reficit, vitam dat et unit,
 Confirmatque, fidem munit, fomitemque remittit [!].
 Inflamat caritate Dei sumentem hostia sancta,
 In cruce susceptam tristi mortem memoratur.
 Purgatum culpa labentem non sinit esse,
 A vicio revocans fortem facit ad bona semper,
 Anchoramque spei firmam gerit illa cibatus.
 Quod dignum venia purgat sumentem modificando
 Et mentem reficit prestans solacia cordi,
 Vivificat animam per culpam mortificatam,
 Unit item domino vicia dans spernere queque
 Strenuum inque fide disponit sumptio digna,
 Demonis impulsum abicit munimenta ministrans,
 Ardorem carnis introfrigit [? *infrigit?*] fomitemque remittit [!].
 Digne sumenti hec dantur comoda bissex,
 De Media Villa ut continet ipse Richardus.

⁴³ In P. Pludra-Żuk, *'Aurora' Piotra Rigi*, 239, 243, 246, mistakenly "Aurem".

Bibliography

Primary literature:

Cambridge, Parker Library, Corpus Christi College

520

Kraków, Jagiellonian Library

320

321

322

323

324

Poznań, Biblioteka Raczyńskich

142

Toruń, University Library

75/III

Wrocław, Ossolineum

693/I, 819/I

Wrocław, University Library

Akc. 1948/829

Secondary literature:

De Angelis V., *Lo Stazio di Dante: poesia e scuola*, “Schede Umanistiche” 2002, 2, pp. 29–69.

Clark M.J., *The Commentaries on Peter Comestor’s ‘Historia scholastica’ of Stephen Langton, Pseudo-Langton, and Hugh of St. Cher*, “Sacris erudiri” 2005, 44, pp. 301–466.

Clark M.J., *Stephen Langton and Hugh of St. Cher on Peter Comestor’s ‘Historia Scholastica’: The Lombard’s Sentences and the Problem of Sources Used by Comestor and his Commentators*, “Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie Médiévales” 2007, 74, no. 1, pp. 63–117.

Dahan G., *Les prologues des commentaires bibliques (XIIe–XIVe siècle)*, [in:] *Les prologues médiévaux: actes du colloque international; (Rome, 26–28 mars 1998)*, ed. J. Hamesse, Turnhout 2000, pp. 427–470.

Dinkova-Bruun G., *Aegidius of Paris and the Seven Seals: a Prose Prologue to the Gospels in Peter Riga’s Aurora*, “Mediaeval Studies” 2012, 73, pp. 119–145.

Dinkova-Bruun G., *Aegidius of Paris and his Two Letters to Bishop Odo*, [in:] *Medieval Letters — Between Fiction and Document*, ed. C. Høgel and E. Bartoli, with a preface by F. Stella and L. B. Mortensen, Turnhout 2015, pp. 153–166.

Dinkova-Bruun G., *Biblical Versifications from Late Antiquity to the Middle of the Thirteenth Century: History or Allegory?* [in:] *Poetry and Exegesis in Premodern Latin Christianity. The Encounter between Classical and Christian Strategies of Interpretation*, ed. W. Otten, K. Pollmann, Leiden–Boston 2007, pp. 315–342.

Dinkova-Bruun G., “*Corrector Ultimus*”: *Aegidius of Paris and Peter Riga’s ‘Aurora’*, [in:] *Modes of Authorship in the Middle Ages*, ed. S. Rancović, Toronto 2012, pp. 172–189.

- Dinkova-Bruun G., *Marking One's Own: Aegidius of Paris's Revisions of Peter Riga's 'Aurora'*, "Filologia Mediolatina" 2019, 26, pp. 127–142.
- Dinkova-Bruun G., *On the Problem of Editing Versions: Peter Riga's Euangelium*, [in:] *The Arts of Editing Medieval Greek and Latin: A Casebook*, ed. E. Göransson, G. Iversen, B. Crostini, B. M. Jensen, E. Kihlman, E. Odelman and D. Searby, Toronto 2016, pp. 96–120.
- Galynina I., *Accessus ad Lactantium? Zur Handschriftlichen Überlieferung der Werke des Lactanz und zur Exzerptmethode im Mittelalter* (I), "Revue d'Histoire des Textes", 2017, vol. 12, pp. 161–196, DOI 10.1484/J.RHT.5.112811.
- Grondeux A., *Prologues, 'Prohemium', glose du 'Prohemium' dans les manuscrits du 'Graecismus' d'Evrard de Béthune*, [in:] *Les prologues médiévaux: actes du colloque international; (Rome, 26–28 mars 1998)*, ed. J. Hamesse, Turnhout 2000, pp. 323–344.
- Hunt R.W., *The Introduction to the 'Artes' in the Twelfth Century*, [in:] *The History of Grammar in the Middle Ages*, ed. G.L. Bursill-Hall, Amsterdam 1980, pp. 126–129.
- Decimus Iunius Iuvenalis, *Saturae sedecim*, ed. J. Willis, Stuttgart–Leipzig 1997.
- Janson T., *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions*, Stockholm 1964.
- Minnis A., *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*, London 1984.
- Petri Comestoris Scolastica Historia. Genesis*, ed. A. Sylvan, Turnhout 2005.
- Pludra-Żuk P., *'Aurora' Piotra Rigi. Średniowieczna transmisja i funkcje tekstu na przykładzie rękopisów polskich, pruskich i śląskich*, Warszawa 2021.
- Pludra-Żuk P., *Nieznany spis zajęć na wydziale artium Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego z lat 1474–1477*, "Analecta. Studia i Materiały z Dziejów Nauki" 2021, vol. 30, 2, pp. 99–116.
- Quain, E.A., *The Medieval Accessus ad auctores*, "Traditio" 1945, vol. 3, pp. 215–264.
- Resconi S., *"Novam monstrare futuris". Alcune osservazioni sul Roman de Thebes*, [in:] *Il medioevo degli antichi. I romanzi francesi della "Triade classica"*, ed. A. D'Agostino, Milano–Udine 2013, pp. 105–136.

Paulina Pludra-Żuk — PhD, a medievalist and graduate of classical philology at the University of Warsaw, she is an Assistant Professor at the Old and Rare Book Studies Research Unit at the Institute for the History of Science, Polish Academy of Sciences. Her research interests include the circulation of texts in the Middle Ages and fragmentology.

e-mail: ppludzuk@ihnpn.pl