

## PETRUS HELIAS ON RHETORIC

Karin Margareta Fredborg

Petrus Helias is in our time nearly only known as a celebrated grammarian of the Twelfth century, but was in his own days well known as a master in rhetoric<sup>1)</sup>. John of Salisbury profited from his rhetorical teaching<sup>2)</sup> and rhetorical glosses on the *Ad Herennium* by Alanus de Insulis and later commentators quoted from his treatises<sup>3)</sup>. His commentary on Cicero's *De Inventione* has been handed down to us, anonymously, in three manuscripts:

MS Cambridge, Pembroke College 85, sect. III, fol. 84 r-99 r, s. XIII in.<sup>4)</sup>

MS Brescia, Bibl. Civ. Queriniana, A.V.4, no.4, fol. 69 r-113 v, s. XV<sup>5)</sup>

MS Napoli, Bibl. Naz. Fondo Princ. V.D.25<sup>6)</sup>

- 1) cf. M. Manitius, *Geschichte d. lat. Lit. d. Mittelalters* III, 184-187, München 1931. For the details of P. Helias' life, cf. K.M. Fredborg, *The dependence of Petrus Helias' Summa super Priscianum on William of Conches' Glose super Priscianum*, *Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Âge grec et latin* 11, Copenhagen 1973, p. 3 sqq.
- 2) *Metalogicon* II, 10. ed. Webb, p. 80, Oxford 1929: "...rethoricam quam prius cum quibusdam aliis a magistro Theodorico tenuiter auditis paululum intelligebam. Sed eam postea a Petro Helia plenius accepi".
- 3) Alanus de Insulis, MS Brit. Mus. Harl. 6324 fol. 61 ra: (ad Her. IV, 22, 30) "QUID VENIAM, QUIS SIM etc. Dicunt quidam et magis<ter> Theodorus quod hi[n]c consideratur ornatus in hoc (hec MS) quod hic non ponuntur nisi verba subiunctiva, quod non videtur secundum Petrum Eliam. In hiis enim est ornatus /fol. 61 rb/ similis quid, quis, quare et cur et si qua similia". cf. H. Caplan, *A mediaeval commentary on the Rhetorica ad Herennium*, in "Of Eloquence", ed. A. King & H. North, London 1970, p. 266 and K.M. Fredborg, *The commentary of Thierry of Chartres on Cicero's De Inventione*, *Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Âge grec et latin* 7, Copenhagen 1971, p. 9, n. 47.
- 4) M.R. James, *Descriptive catalogue of the manuscripts of Pembroke College, Cambridge* 1905, p. 77.
- 5) P.O. Kristeller, *Iter Italicum* I, p. 31. London 1965.
- 6) P.O. Kristeller, *Iter Italicum* I, p. 400. London 1965.

and, with the ascription ( by the scribe ) to Petrus Helias, in MS Vatican, Fondo Ottobon. lat. 2993, anno 1357<sup>7)</sup>.

The incipit of the commentary is:

"Sicut ordo nostre doctrine exigit, ita quoque circa artem rethoricam consideranda sunt hec: Primo quid sit rethorica, deinde quod genus rethorice, que materia, quod officium..."

This commentary has been discussed in John O. Ward's doctoral thesis, *Artificiosa Eloquentia in the Middle Ages*, Toronto 1972<sup>8)</sup>, but as the Vatican manuscript was not known to him at the time, it is treated there as an anonymous commentary, "Sicut ordo...", written by a master of the generation immediately following Thierry of Chartres. In 1973 Ward identified the commentary ascribed to Petrus Helias in the Vatican manuscript with his "Sicut ordo...", but neither he nor anybody else has to my knowledge given it any further discussion and the full attention, which it deserves.

Petrus Helias' commentary on the *De Inventione* is interesting for two reasons, 1<sup>o</sup> because it forms an important link in the development of doctrine in the rhetorical commentaries from the middle of the Twelfth century, being immediately dependent on the rhetorical commentaries written by P. Helias' master, Thierry of Chartres, and other unnamed masters of that generation. Later, the other great and influential rhetorician of the Twelfth century, Alanus de Insulis, made use of P. Helias' *De Inventione* commentary, as can be seen from a comparison of especially the introductions, *Accessus*, to the two commentaries, which follow an identical scheme, treating the heads

*Extrinsecus / intrinsecus artem docere,*

*Circa artem:*

quid	que species
quod genus	quod instrumentum
que materia	quis artifex
quod officium	quare rethorica vocetur
quis finis	quo ordine docenda sit
que partes	et discenda

*Circa librum:*

que auctoris intentio
utilitas operis
(causa operis)
titulus
utrum ad philosophiam pertineat

7) P.O. Kristeller, *Iter Italicum II*, p. 422. London 1967, cf. G. Mercati, *Codici Latini Pico...*, *Studi e Testi* 75, Vatican City 1938, p. 248: "...l'Ottobon. lat. 2993 ...in esso ci sono, secondo la sottoscrizione fol. 58 r le "Rationes Petri Elie super libro rethoricorum veterum Tullii" principianti: "(S)icut ordo nostre doctrine exigit ita quoque..."

8) vol. II p. 264-272. Not in print. J.O. Ward has kindly informed me of his identification of the commentary in a letter in 1973 and has generously put to my disposal a copy of his doctoral thesis.

This Accessus scheme is at least as old as Thierry of Chartres' commentaries on the *De Inventione* and the *Ad Herennium*, what the first ten heads "circa artem" are concerned, while Thierry omits "ordo docendi" and only has the two first heads "circa librum" and Petrus Helias in his *SUMMA SUPER PRISCIANUM* omits the distinction "artem extrinsecus / intrinsecus docere" and all the heads "circa librum" and in this commentary to the *De Inventione* omits "causa operis". The verbal similarity of Alanus' Accessus is however closer to Petrus Helias' Accessus, but occasionally dependent on Thierry's Accessus too<sup>9)</sup>.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to go into a detailed analysis of how Alanus utilized Petrus Helias' *De Inventione* commentary, as I am here primarily concerned with an analysis of parts of Petrus Helias' rhetorical doctrine and his sources. Also, such a comparison between Alanus' commentary on the *Ad Herennium* and Petrus Helias' commentary on the *De Inventione* entails the question, yet not solved: Did P. Helias write a commentary on the *Ad Herennium* too? The above-mentioned quotation in the Alanus commentary in a gloss on a particular rhetorical figure in *Ad Herennium* IV certainly suggests a detailed knowledge of P. Helias' rhetoric, not drawn from the *De Inventione* commentary, which does not discuss figures of speech, and most reasonably derived from a written commentary on the *Ad Herennium*. But it could stem from reminiscences of lectures too. No commentary on the *Ad Herennium* by P. Helias has been identified yet, but a passage in his *De Inventione* commentary makes it clear that he intended to lecture on and maybe write on the *Ad Herennium*<sup>10)</sup>.

- 
- 9) Alanus, MS Brit. Mus. Harl. 6324 fol. 1 ra - 3 ra.  
 P. Helias, MS Cambr. Pembroke Coll. 85, sect. III, fol. 84 ra - 84 vb.  
 Excerpts in Ward, l.c. in note 8.  
 P. Helias *SUMMA SUPER PRISCIANUM*, MS Paris, Bibl. de l'Arsenal 711, fol. 1 ra - 1 va. Excerpts in R. Hunt, *The introductions to the "Artes"...*, *Studia in hon. R.J. Martin*, Brügge 1958, p. 87-93.  
 Thierry of Chartres, best text in N.M. Haring, *Thierry of Chartres and Dominicus Gundissalinus*, *Med. Stud.* 26, Toronto 1964, p. 281 sqq., cf. Suringar, *Hist. Crit. Scholiast. Lat.*, Leyden 1834, p. 213 sqq.  
 For the early history of the Accessus see Ward, *The date of the comment. on Cic. De Inv. by Thierry of Chartres...*, *Viator* 3, Berkeley 1972, p. 247 sqq.
- 10) MS Cambr. Pembroke Coll. 85, sect. III, fol. 84 vb: "Hoc ordine docenda et discenda est. Primo enim agendum est de inventione, secundo de dispositione, tertio loco de pronuntiatione, quarto de memoria, ad ultimum de (<e>)locutione. Ratio autem huius ordinis in rethorica ad Herennium ... assignabitur".

2<sup>o</sup> Secondly P. Helias' commentary, apart from its intrinsic merits, is important because it sheds light on P. Helias' early production and is dateable to 1130-1139. This rhetorical commentary is earlier than his wellknown SUMMA SUPER PRISCIANUM, which refers back to it<sup>11)</sup>, but it has the same form, i.e. having an Accessus of the above-mentioned type and giving a continuous paraphrase and commentary on the classical textbook, avoiding lemmata from that, but beginning each section with a short notice on the disposition of the section to be glossed. It is predominantly occupied with definitions of termini technici, quoting here ancient and mediaeval authorities, but only naming the ancient<sup>12)</sup>.

The date of the commentary, 1130-1139, is inferred from the mention of the schism of 1130 and the antipope Anacletus II, Petrus Pierleoni (1130-1138). Here the case of ordination and further promotion of the ecclesiastical authorities, ordained by Pierleoni, is used as an example of the rhetorical "issue", constitutio negotialis, in which one must form new laws as none so far exists dealing with that particular matter. This case could no longer be an issue for debate after the second Lateran Concilium in 1139, when pope Innocent II (1130-1143) deprived the men ordained by Pierleoni of their position and took measures that ecclesiastical authorities put in office by Pierleoni's papal legate in Aquitaine, Gerard of Angoulême († 1136), could obtain no further promotion<sup>13)</sup>.

"Ut si veniret nunc in controversiam an ordinati a Petro Leonis essent ad ordines promovendi, negotialis esset constitutio, quoniam de novo iure formando. De huiusmodi enim re nullum ius constitutum fuit adhuc, quoniam ante ipsum non est auditum scisma huius in ecclesia Dei. Per maius tamen vel minus vel simile posset fortasse conici quod ius super hoc esset constituendum ex illo beati Britii facto, quia de diocesi<sup>14)</sup> sua violenter expulsus, licet duo vel tres archiepiscopi interim sedi sue succes(erint, revocatus tamen postea omnibus misericorditer indulget et quos illi ordinauerant<sup>15)</sup> ad ordines promovit<sup>16)</sup>."

11) Fredborg, o. c. in note 1, p. 4 sq.

12) e. g. on the "issues", constitutiones, MS Cambr.... fol. 85 ra - rb, he quotes the definitions of De Inv., Ad Her., Victorinus, Mart. Cap., Quintilianus, Boethius, Vulpianus.

13) Chronicon Mauriniacense, P.L. 180, 169 B. For the widespread double ordinations in France during the schism cf. Ordericus Vitalis, P.L. 188, 932 C, D.

14) de diocesi] dāiociesi MS.

15) illi ordinauerant] ille ordinauerat MS.

16) MS Cambr.... fol. 85 va.

P. Helias' commentary on *De Inventione* belongs to the group of mediaeval commentaries, strongly influenced by Boethius and Victorinus and preoccupied with the rhetorical theory of argumentation and its affinities to dialectic<sup>17)</sup>. Yet, pressed by the authority of Cicero, P. Helias emphatically denies that rhetoric has anything to do with philosophy or parts of philosophy (presumably dialectic or ethics), as it does not concern itself with truth<sup>18)</sup>.

Rhetoric is considered, with Cicero, to be the most important part of civil science, the other part being knowledge of law and custom (interpretation of Cicero's *sapientia*)<sup>19)</sup>. P. Helias displays little knowledge of law himself and is mostly content to explain and paraphrase Cicero's examples of ancient customs and laws, but he has occasional interesting comparisons of mediaeval and ancient custom, as for instance the still existing custom in the Middle Ages of covering up the face of brigands and robbers when condemned<sup>20)</sup> or accusing a man "nomine extra ordinem accepto" i.e. without regard of social position, time and place, when he is charged with treason, *proditio*<sup>21)</sup>.

Most important is the mention of the mediaeval custom of deferring the defense till after the prosecution has stated and defined his case, thus letting the counsel of prosecution and not the defense, as the ancients did, determine the scope and type of case, the "issue" or *constitutio*. This would threaten to break down the whole ancient system of "issues", which is the backbone of Cicero's and his own theory of rhetoric.<sup>22)</sup>

---

17) cf. the excellent historical outline in R. McKeon, *Mediaeval rhetoric*, *Speculum* 17, Cambr. Mass. 1942, p. 1-32.

18) MS Cambr.... fol. 84 vb.

19) *De Inv.* I, 1, 1 - I, 5, 6. MS Cambr.... fol. 84 ra: "Civilis itaque scientie due sunt partes integrales, eloquentia scil. et sapientia, que a rethoribus dicitur consuetudinum vel legum peritia".

20) MS Cambr.... fol. 98 vb, ad *De Inv.* II, 50, 149.

21) MS Cambr.... fol. 97 ra, ad *De Inv.* II, 19, 58. From Thierry, *Com. De Inv.* MS Brit. Mus. Arund. 348 fol. 165 v. Other customs mentioned are MS Cambr.... fol. 97 rb, *clarigatio*, *palmatio*.

22) MS Cambr.... fol. 85 ra: "In formanda vero constitutione dolo fere omnes apud nos hodie tenentur. Cum enim reus a pretore vel a principe devocatur in ius, audito quid intendatur in eum, differt depulsionem plerumque dicens se non ideo venisse ut causaretur, sed ut audiret quid ei adversarius imponere vellet et die prestituta a iudice responsurum super hoc promittens... Nescio quid doli subest in huiuscemodi depulsionis dilatione cum intentione audita ut cause constitutio formaretur deberet statim depellere".

In dealing with the section of *De Inventione* handling the political speech, *genus deliberativum*, and the speech of praise or censure, *genus demonstrativum*, which both are concerned mainly with ethical categories, debating the cause of justice versus the cause of utility, dealing with the cardinal virtues and the corresponding vices etc., P. Helias does not contribute much to a deeper instruction in ethics, but aims at a purely rhetorical goal, assigning topics, loci, for argumentation to the various ethical categories enumerated by Cicero<sup>23)</sup>.

While P. Helias thus to a lesser extent informs his readers about the applicability of rhetoric to the social and political needs of Twelfth century France and so to say omits to try to take rhetoric out of the classroom, his handling of the major points of rhetoric, the theory of "issues" and of argumentation, is thorough and at times even critical of Cicero.

In the theory of rhetorical argument Cicero held that an argument had 5 or 4 parts, a major and a minor premise, both or at least one of which had its approbation as a part of the same syllogism, and a conclusion. This was emphatically denied by P. Helias' master, Thierry of Chartres<sup>24)</sup> and is criticized too by P. Helias in almost the same words, but adding the historical interpretation that this misunderstanding was current in Cicero's time. The 5 and 4 part syllogism is pardonable if not brought into dialectic but kept to rhetoric where the orators "in causando" in fact usually introduce the proof of the premises in their arguments<sup>25)</sup>.

Likewise P. Helias gives a historical interpretation of the difference between the theory of the number of "issues" in Cicero's *De Inventione* and the treatise, *Ad Herennium*, which in the Middle Ages was considered a work of Cicero's.

The *Ad Herennium*'s system of 3 "issues"<sup>26)</sup>, *coniecturalis constitutio* (= an sit?), *legitima constitutio* (= quid sit?), *iuridicialis constitutio* (= iurene sit?), he thinks, is dependent on Roman sources and legal custom.

23) *De Inv.* II, 51, 155 sqq. P. Helias, MS Cambr.... fol. 99 ra - rb.

24) cf. text and discussion in Fredborg, o. c. in note 3, p. 31-33.

25) *ad De Inv.* I, 34, 57 sqq. MS Cambr.... fol. 94 ra: "Est autem utraque harum sententiarum (scil. de numero part. syllogismi) falsa sed quoniam hee due tantum tempore Tullii tenebantur, iccirco falsificata una alteram stare putavit..." cf. fol. 86 va, where P. Helias quotes Boethius, *De Hyp. Syll.* II, 1, 3-4, ed. Obertello, Brescia 1969, p. 256, P.L. 64, 844 B - C, for rejecting Cicero's view on the number of parts of a syllogism.

26) *Ad Her.* I, 11, 18 - I, 15, 25.

The number of "issues" in the *De Inventione* is 4, *coniecturalis*, *diffinitiva*, *translativa*, and *generalis constitutio*, which is subdivided into *iuridicialis* and *negotialis*, the last being reserved for cases, where equity rather than existing law determines the "issue". Apart from these 4 proper "issues" Cicero enumerates 5 types of cases springing from written law, in *scripto*, i.e. *de scripto et sententia*, *contrariae leges*, *ambiguum*, *ratiocinativum*, *diffinitivum*<sup>27)</sup>.

This complex system, with its uncomfortable similarity or doubling of *constitutio diffinitiva* = *diffinitivum*, *constitutio negotialis* = *ratiocinativum*, P. Helias interprets as dependent on Greek sources, because he argues that there were no law schools in Greece and the legal "issues" therefore only had a secondary importance.

"Sed mirum est cur controversias *de scripto* separaverit auctor iste a constitutionibus cum et causas constituent[ur] et in rethorica que inscribitur *Ad Herennium* sub constitutionibus includantur. Quod ideo factum putamus quoniam in hac rethorica, quam primam vocant, secutus est Grecos, qui cum nec legum habeant magistros nec iuris scolam, nullam *de scripto* principaliter tractant controversiam. Ideoque controversias *de scripto* inter constitutiones non connumerant. In rethorica vero *Ad Herennium*, quam secundam nominant, Latinos secutus est qui in scola iuris ante legum magistros controversias *de scripto* principaliter tractav(erunt). Ideoque constitutiones esse merito confirmant<sup>28)</sup>. ...Greci tamen quorum doctrinam in hoc opere Tullius sequitur hanc inter eas assignabant differentiam quod *negotialis constitutio* est cum queritur que res ex qua re sine scripti respectu possit perpendi. Status vero *ratiocinativus* est cum queritur quid sit scriptum... Si quis tamen altius inspiciat eadem prorsus est *constitutio* nec in aliquo differt nisi quoniam cum principaliter tractatur *constitutio negotialis* dicitur, cum secundario status *ratiocinativus* [dicitur] nominatur<sup>29)</sup>.

---

27) *Constitutiones*, *De Inv.* I, 8, 10 - 11, 16; in *scripto*: I, 13, 17, which are called "quasi constitutiones" in *Topica* 25, 95. cf. the thorough study on the "issues" in J.O. Ward, *The Constitutio Negotialis...*, *Prudentia*, I, 2, p. 29-48, New Zealand 1969.

28) MS Cambr.... fol. 87 rb.

29) MS Cambr.... fol. 87 va.

... Greci tamen ... istam assignant differentiam quod status dif<f>initivus est cum queritur quid scriptum dicat esse aliquid, diffinitiva vero constitutio cum sine scripti respectu quid aliquid sit queritur. Sed nulla est hec differentia...nec in aliquo differunt nisi quod cum principaliter tractatur constitutio dicitur diffinitiva, cum secundo status dicitur diffin<i>tivus<sup>30)</sup>.

This coordination of the two systems of "issues" is at least as old as Thierry of Chartres' commentaries on the *De Inventione* and the *Ad Herennium*. Thierry preferred the system of the *De Inventione* and upheld the view that the "issues" in scripto were secondary to the proper "issues"<sup>31)</sup>. Later Alanus De Insulis took over the coordination from Thierry and P. Helias but preferred the simpler system of the *Ad Herennium* in his commentary to that treatise<sup>32)</sup>.

Much of the rhetorical doctrine in P. Helias' commentary can be shown to be immediately dependent on Thierry's views and terminology. P. Helias' main contribution appears to me to be clarity and a more orthodox dependence on the authorities, Boethius and Victorinus, omitting or avoiding many of the interesting but at times unhomogeneous and rambling discussions found in the earlier commentators' work.

---

30) ibidem.

31) Thierry, com. *De Inv.* MS Brit. Mus. Arund. 348 fol. 125 v: "Quinque controversie sunt de genere scriptionis...quas esse separatas i.e. diversas a constitutionibus manifestum est..(fol. 126 r) Non enim hic controversatur de aliquo an ipsum sit aut quid sit etc... Amplius constitutiones principales controversie sunt i.e. causam constituunt, iste autem non constituunt[ur], sed, causa constituta, incidunt, aliquo scripto in causam ad auctoritatem inducto... In negotiali principaliter de re etsi secundum certam legem aut consuetudinem intenditur... In ratiocinativa vero quamvis ipsa non sit principalis controversia sed incidens tamen in ea de verbis scripti propositi principaliter intenditur... In constitutione diffinitiva queritur de re quid ipsa sit, in controversia vero scripti queritur de re quid ipsam esse[t] lex dicat". Com. *Ad Her.* MS Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, lat. oct. 161, (Philips 9672) fol. 42 rb: "Nota in hac divisione trimembri contineri tantum (tamen MS) quantum in quadrimembri que facta est in prima retorica et eo amplius scil. quinque legales status. Considera enim coniecturalem constitutionem per se et iuridicalem iterum que est quedam pars generalis constitutionis; et sub legitima considera dif<f>initiv[um] et negotialem que est altera pars generalis constitutionis nec non et translative et cum omnibus istis etiam quinque legales status..." The term, incidens status, for the "issues" in scripto is from Mart. Cap., *De Nupt.* V, ed. Dick, Stuttgart 1969<sup>2</sup>, p. 227-228.

32) MS Brit. Mus. Harl. 6324, fol. 19 rb - 19 va: "... hic emendatius quam in priori rethorica constitutionis species distinxit..."



In the theory of the rhetorical topics, especially dealing with the difficult group, *adiuncta negotio*, i.e. *loci e maiori, a minori, a contrariis* etc., he mostly paraphrases Boethius' theory in the fourth book of *De Differentiis Topicis*, leaving aside the more intricate problems of the validity of these rhetorical topics, compared with the similar dialectical ones, problems which Thierry had tried hard to elucidate and solve<sup>33)</sup>.

In the discussion of the three necessary rhetorical arguments, *complexio* = the dilemma, the *enumeratio* and the *simplex conclusio*, P. Helias quotes Thierry and other mediaeval rhetoricians but rejects their views and prefers that of Victorinus, whom he quotes at length<sup>34)</sup>.

"Et videntur quibusdam hec esse genera sillogismorum quibus argumenta necessaria tractantur. Est autem complexio quidem secundum eos sillogismus<sup>35)</sup> qui ab antiquis cornutus dicitur propter duplicem quam habet conclusionem... Dicitur autem a dialecticis indirecta ratiocinatio.

Sunt etiam qui dicant quod complexio est species divisionis disiuncta scil. cuius utraque pars reprehenditur secundum quos nil aliud est complexio quam <dis>iunctio qua undique quicquid ex duobus vel pluribus concessum sit cogitur ad id quod non vult ut in supraposito exemplo. Nam si concesserit probum esse cogetur ad hoc ut <non accuset, si vero improbum cogetur ad hoc ut><sup>36)</sup> eius societatem non habeat cum tamen neutrum velit.

Quidam enim ausi sunt etiam complexionem, enumerationem<sup>37)</sup> et simplicem conclusionem locos argumentorum secundum quod sunt necessaria dicere ut sub his attributa omnia persone et negotio vellent includere.

33) MS Cambr.... fol. 91 vb - 92 vb, ad De Inv. I, 28, 41 sq., Boethius, P.L. 64, 1212 - 1216. For Thierry cf. Fredborg o. c. in note 3, p. 17-25. The question of validity is solved in Alanus, MS Brit. Mus. Harl. 6324 fol. 27 rb: "Sunt autem adiuncta circumstantie extrinseci negotii et extrinsece persone, relate ad presentem personam et ad presens negotium et ex relatione vim probandi recipientes..."

34) MS Cambr.... fol. 92 vb ad De Inv. I, 29, 44 - 45, cf. Thierry in Fredborg, o. c. in note 3, p. 26-29, to which should be added the correction, that Thierry's term "divisio" probably is from Ad Her. IV, 40, 52, this type of disiunctive argument being a figure of style too.

35) sillogismos MS.

36) Lacuna in MS. The missing words are added from Thierry's com. De Inv., which he is quoting here, cf. Fredborg o. c. in note 3, p. 27.

37) enunciationem MS.

Dicebant enim quod complexio continet contraria et disparata in adiunctis negotio quoniam inter hec omnis complexio fiat. Et <e>numer<ati>o quoque secundum eosdem continet genus et speciem in adiunctis <negotio> quia contentorum soleat f<i>eri enumeratio ut aliquid de continenti probetur<sup>38)</sup>. Simplex autem conclusio secundum eosdem cetera attributa continet. Illud quoque a quibusdam dictum est quod complexio, enumeratio et simplex conclusio loci<sup>39)</sup> sunt <non> argumentorum sed necessitatis eorum ut dicerent argumenta ex attributis persone et negotio su<m>i, sed ex eo necessitatem contrahere quod vel complexione[m] tractare<n>tur vel enumeratione vel simplici conclusione. Sed nos Victorini sententiam preponentes quomodo hunc exposuerit locum explanabimus...<sup>40)</sup>.

But mostly P. Helias is content to follow Thierry, occasionally even pil-laging illustrative examples from him, as in the gloss on the necessary clarity to be sought for in the exposition of facts in a speech (narratio)<sup>41)</sup>.

He even credits Quintilianus with a subsummation of the four "issues" under the ten categories, while he actually quotes Thierry, who had a different system from that of Quintilianus. For Quintilianus used the four categories, quid, quale, quantum, ad aliquid, for the "issues", the rest being reserved for the topics<sup>42)</sup>, while Thierry referred quid to coniecturalis and diffinitiva, quantum, quale, ad aliquid to generalis, the rest to translative constitutio<sup>43)</sup>. There is nothing in Thierry's commentary which could warrant this false attribution to Quintilianus, the ultimate

---

38) continenti probetur] continente probatur MS.

39) loca MS.

40) Victorinus in Halm, Rhet. Lat. Min. Leipzig 1863, p. 231 sqq.

41) MS Cambr.... fol. 89 vb ad De Inv. I, 2o, 29: "Videndum enim est ne quid dicatur contorte i.e. ut non fiat difficilis transitus sicut facit Aristotiles qui cum loqueretur de divisivis differentiis quasi ex abrupto intulit de constitutivis dicens: Quare quecumque erunt predicati eodem erunt (erint MS) etiam subiecti; unde tota li<t>tera obscura est. (Arist., in Boet., In Cat., P.L. 64, 177 A). cf. Thierry, text in M. Dickey, Some commentaries on the De Inv...., Med. & Ren. Stud. 6, London 1968, p. 25.

42) Quint. Inst. Orat. III, 6, 23-24.

43) Thierry, Com. De Inv. MS Brit. Mus. Arund. 348, fol. 118 v: "Notandum vero quod he quattuor constitutiones ad predicamenta referuntur hoc modo: Coniecturalis et diffinitiva ad substantiam i.e. de substantia rei fiunt, generalis vero fit aut de quantitate aut de qualitate aut de <ad> aliquid, translatio vero de reliquis..."

P. Helias, MS Cambr.... fol. 86 rb: "Quoniam vero rethorica quodam

source for which must be someone else or the generally inaccurate knowledge of Quintilianus, of which P. Helias is guilty.

To sum up: P. Helias' commentary on the *De Inventione* is orthodox and scholarly work, coherent and aiming at greater clarity than most commentaries of the time. It owes a lot to Thierry of Chartres both in doctrine and clear disposition with an *Accessus*, and the division of Cicero's textbook into two parts, the first dealing with the main categories of the art, the second treating the different parts of a wellordered speech<sup>44</sup>). As so little is known still about the earlier tradition in mediaeval rhetoric and the sources for Thierry's commentaries, it is difficult to judge exactly how much is original and how much is part of tradition in these commentaries but P. Helias' commentary on the *De Inventione* certainly deserves attention for the light which it throws on P. Helias' work in the thirties and because of its clear and fixed position in the tradition of mediaeval rhetoric and the influence it had on the later tradition.

---

modo quasi defluit ex arte (alte MS) logica nititur Quintil 1 ianus constitutiones quatuor ad decem predicamenta redigere hoc modo: Dicit enim: constitutio coniecturalis et diffinitiva ad predicamentum substantie quodam modo pertinent... Generalis vero constitutio sub tribus predicamentis includitur... ad predicamentum /fol. 86 va/ qualitatis pertinet... ad predicamentum quantitatis refertur. In hoc rursus[us] quod in ea queritur de comparatione <sub> predicamento [sub] ad aliquid includitur. Translativa autem constitutio ad cetera sex... redigitur".

44) Fredborg, o. c. in note 3, p. 11 sq., P. Helias, MS Cambr. fol. 85 ra.