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. John of Salisbury profited from his rhetorical teaching and rhetorical glosses on the Ad Herennium by Alanus de Insulis and later commentators quoted from his treatises. 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.
MS Brescia, Bibl. Civ. Queriniana, A.V.4, no. 4, fol. 69 r-113 v, s. XV
MS Napoli, Bibl. Naz. Fondo Princ. V.D. 25


4) M.R. James, Descriptive catalogue of the manuscripts of Pembroke College, Cambridge 1905, p. 77.


and, with the ascription (by the scribe) to Petrus Helias, in
MS Vatican, Fondo Ottobon. lat. 2993, anno 1357. 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, Ar-
tificiosa Eloquentia in the Middle Ages, Toronto 1972, but as the Vati-
can 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 genera-
tion 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, because it forms an important link in the development of doc-
trine in the rhetorical commentaries from the middle of the Twelfth cen-
tury, 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 Inventi-
tione commentary, as can be seen from a comparison of especially the in-
tructions, Accessus, to the two commentaries, which follow an identical
scheme, treating the heads
Extrinsicus / intrinsicus artem docere,

Circa artem:

Circa librum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>quid</th>
<th>que species</th>
<th>que auctoris intentio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quod genus</td>
<td>quod instrumentum</td>
<td>utilitas operis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>que materia</td>
<td>quis artifex</td>
<td>(causa operis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quod officium</td>
<td>quare rethorica vocetur</td>
<td>titulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quis finis</td>
<td>quo ordine docenda sit</td>
<td>utrum ad philosophiam pertineat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>que partes</td>
<td>et discenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ti, 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
Tulii" principianti: "(S)icut ordo nostre doctrine exigunt ita quo-
que...".

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 Acessus 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' Acessus is however closer to Petrus Helias' Accessus, but occasionally dependent on Thierry's Acessus too.)

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 too.


10) MS Camb. 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".
20 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 well-known SUMMA SUPER PRISCIANUM, which refers back to it11), 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 ancient12).

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 promotion13).

"Ut si veniret nunc in controversiam an ordinati a Petro Leonis esset ad ordines promovendi, negotialis esset constitutio, quoniam de novo iure formando. De huiusmodi enim re nullum ius constitutum fuit ad-hu[n]c, 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 diocesi14) sua violenter expulsus, licet duo vel tres archiepiscopi interim sedi sue successerint, revocatus tamen postea omnibus misericorditer indulsit et quos illi ordinaverant15) ad ordines promovit16)."

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. 160, 169 B. For the widespread double ordinations in France during the schism cf. Ordericus Vitalis, P.L. 188, 932 C. D.
14) de diocesi] dāiocesi MS.
15) illi ordinaverant] ille ordinaverat MS.
16) MS Cambr.... fol. 85 va.
P. Helias' commentary on De Inventione belongs to the group of medi-
æval commentaries, strongly influenced by Boethius and Victorinus and
preoccupied with the rhetorical theory of argumentation and its affinities
to dialectic 17). Yet, pressed by the authority of Cicero, P. Helias em-
phatically denies that rhetoric has anything to do with philosophy or
parts of philosophy (presumably dialectic or ethics), as it does not con-
cern itself with truth 18).

Rhetoric is considered, with Cicero, to be the most important part of
civil science, the other part being knowledge of law and custom (inter-
pretation of Cicero's sapientia) 19). 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 20) or accusing a man "nomine extra ordinem
accepio" i.e. without regard of social position, time and place, when he is
charged with treason, proditio 21).

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 an-
cients did, determine the scope and type of case, the "issue" or consti-
tutio. This would threaten to break down the whole ancient system of "is-
sues", which is the backbone of Cicero's and his own theory of rhetoric 22).

17) cf. the excellent historical outline in R. McKeon, Mediaeval rhetoric,
18) MS Cambry..., fol. 84 vb.
19) De Inv. I, 1, 1 - I, 5, 6. MS Cambry..., fol. 84 ra: "Civilis itaque
scientie due sunt partes integrales, eloquentia scil. et sapientia,
que a rethoribus dicitur consuetudinum vel legum peritia".
20) MS Cambry..., fol. 98 vb, ad De Inv. II, 5o, 149.
21) MS Cambry..., fol. 97 ra, ad De Inv. II, 19, 58. From Thierry, Com.
De Inv. MS Brit. Mus. Arund. 348 fol. 165 v. Other customs men-
tioned are MS Cambry..., fol. 97 rb, clarigatio, palmatio.
22) MS Cambry..., fol. 85 ra: "In formanda vero constitutione dolo fere
omnes apud nos hodie tenentur. Cum enim reus a pretore vel a prin-
cipe devocatur in ius, audito quid intendatur in eum, differt depul-
sionem plerumque dicens se non ideo venisse ut causaretur, sed ut
audiret quid ei adversarius imponere vellet et die praestituta a ju-
dice responsurum super hoc promittens... Nescio quid dolii subest in
huiuscemodi depulsionis dilatione cum intentione audita ut cause con-
stitutio 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 23).

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 24) 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 25).

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" 26), coniecturalis constitutio (= an sit?), legitima constitutio (= quid sit?), iuridicialis constitutio (= iurene sit?), he thinks, is dependent on Roman sources and legal custom.

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.
The number of "issues" in the De Inventione is 4, coniecturalis, diffinitiva, translativa, and generalis constitutio, which is subdivided into iuridicalis 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.27)

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 script[i]o separaverit auctor iste a constitutionibus cum et causas constituant[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, nul-lam 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.28)

...Greci tamen quorum doctrinam in hoc opere Tullius sequitur hanc inter eas assignabat 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 ali-quo differt nisi quoniam cum principaliter tractatur constitutio nego-
tialis dicitur, cum secundario status ratiocinativus [dicitur] nominat-
tur.29)

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 Negoti-
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 secundario status dicitur diffin\{t\}itivus\textsuperscript{30}.

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"\textsuperscript{31}. 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\textsuperscript{32}.

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.

\textsuperscript{30} ibidem.

\textsuperscript{31} Thierry, com. De Inv. MS Brit. Mus. Arund. 348 fol. 125 v: "Quinque controversiae sunt de genere scriptiosis...quas esse separatiae i.e. diversas a constitutionibus manifestum est...(fol. 126 r) Non enim hic controversiatur de aliquo an ipsum sit aut quid sit etc... Amplius constitutiones principales controversiae sunt i.e. causam constituunt, iste autem non constituuntur, sed, causa constituta, incidunt, aliquo scripto in causam ad auctoritatem inducunt... In negotiali principaliter de re etsi secundum certam legem aut consuetudinem intenditur... In ratiocinativa vero quasvis 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, (Phillips 9672) fol. 42 rb: "Nota in hac divisione trimembri contineri tantum (tamen MS) quantum in quadrinembri que facta est in prima retorica et eo amplius scil. quinque legales status. Considera enim conicercalem constitutionem per se et iuridicalem iterum que est quedam pars generalis constitutionis; et sub legitima considera dif\{f\}initivam et negotiale que est altera pars generalis constitutionis nec non et translativam 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\textsuperscript{2}, p. 227-228.

\textsuperscript{32} MS Brit. Mus. Harl. 6324, fol. 19 rb - 19 va: "... hic emendatius quam in priori rethorica constitutionis species distinxerit..."
In the theory of the rhetorical topics, especially dealing with the difficult group, adiuncta negotio, i.e. loci e maiori, a minori, a contra-
riis 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.\(^{33}\)

In the discussion of the three necessary rhetorical arguments, complexio = the dilemma, the enumeratio and the simplex conclusio, P. Helias quotes Thierry and other medieval rhetoricians but rejects their views and prefers that of Victorinus, whom he quotes at length.\(^{34}\)

"Et videntur quibusdam hec esse genera sillogismorum quibus argumenta necessaria tractantur. Est autem complexio quidem secundum eos sil-
logismus\(^{35}\) qui ab antiquis cornutus dicitur propter duplicem quam habet conclusionem... Dicitur autem a dialecticis indirecta ratiocini-
natio.

Sunt etiam qui dicant: quod complexio est species divisionis dis-
ijuncta scil. cuius utraque pars reprehenditur secundum quos nil aliid est complexio quam <dis>iunctio qua undique quicquid ex duobus vel pluribus concessum sit cogitum ad id quod non vult ut in supraposito exemplo. Nam si concesserit probum esse cogetur ad hoc ut (non accu-
set, si vero improbum cogetur ad hoc ut)\(^{36}\) eius societatem non ha-
beat cum tamen neutrum velit.

Quidam enim ausi sunt etiam complexionem, enumerationem\(^{37}\) et sim-
plicem 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 pre-
sens 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 cor-
rection, that Thierry's term "divisio" probably is from Ad Her. IV, 40, 52, this type of disjunctive 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)nume-r(ati)o quoque secundum eosdem continet genus et speciem in adiunctis (negotio) quia contentorum soleat f(i)eri enumeratio ut aliquid de continenti probetur. Simplex autem conclusio secundum eosdem cetera attributa continet. Illud quoque a quibusdam dictum est quod complexio, enumeratio et simplex conclusio loci 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] tractaretur vel enumeratione vel simplici conclusione. Sed nos Victorini sententiam preponentes quomodo hunc exposuerit locum explanabimus...

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).

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, while Thierry referred quid to conjecturalis and diffinitiva, quantum, quale, ad aliquid to generalis, the rest to translativa constitutio. 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.
41) MS Cambr.... fol. 89 vb ad De Inv. I, 20, 29: "Videndum enim est ne-quid dicatur contorte i.e. ut non fiat difficilis transitus sicut faciit Aristotiles qui cum loqueretur de divisivis differentiis quasi ex abrupto intulit de constitutivis dicens: Quare quecumque erunt predicati eodem erunt (erint MS) etiam subjici; unde tota li(t)era 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.
43) Thierry, Com. De Inv. MS Brit. Mus. Arund. 348, fol. 118 v: "Notandum vero quod he quattuor constitutiones ad predicamenta referuntur hoc modo: Conjecturalis 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. 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 defuit ex arte (alte MS) logica nititur Quintil l ian us constitutiones quatuer ad decem predicamenta redigere hoc modo: Dicit enim: constitutio coniecturalis et diffinitiva ad predicamentum substantiae quodam modo pertinent... Generalis vero constitutio sub tribus predicamentis includitur... ad predicamentum /fol. 86 va/ qualitatis pertinent... ad predicamentum quantitatis refertur. In hoc rursus[us] quod in ea quieritur 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.