

[Theory and History of Ontology \(www.ontology.co\)](http://www.ontology.co) by Raul Corazzon | e-mail: rc@ontology.co

Boethius' Metaphysics. Studies in English: Second Part: Gra - Mez

Contents of this Section

Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius

This part of the section [History of Ontology](#) includes the following pages:

[Boethius' Metaphysics of Being and Goodness](#)

[Boethius' Metaphysics. Studies in English: First Part: A - Gib](#)

[Boethius' Metaphysics. Studies in English: Second Part: Gra - Mez \(Current page\)](#)

[Boethius' Metaphysics. Studies in English: Third Part: Mic - Z](#)

[Boèce: Bibliographie sélective des traductions et des études en français](#)

[Boezio: traduzioni Italiane e bibliografia degli studi sulla sua filosofia](#)

[Boethius: Übersetzungen und Studien in Deutsch](#)

[On the website "Bibliographia. Annotated bibliographies"](#)

[Boethius' Contribution to the *Quadrivium*. Selected bibliography](#)

[On the website "History of Logic"](#)

Boethius' Contribution to the Development of Medieval Logic

[The Philosophical Works of Boethius. Editions and English Translations](#)

[Selected Bibliography on the Logical Works of Boethius](#)

Studies in English

1. Gracia, Jorge J.E. 1981. "Boethius and the Problem of Individuation in the *Commentaries on the Isagoge*." In *Congresso Internazionale di Studi Boeziani*

(Pavia, 5-8 ottobre 1980): *Atti*, edited by Obertello, Luca, 169-182. Roma: Editrice Herder.

"The paper I am going to read here consists of a section from a much longer study on which I am presently working. This longer study deals with the problem of individuation not only in relation to Boethius, but also discusses the views of other early medieval figures, such as John Eriugena, Gilbert of Poitiers and Abailard. Unfortunately, due to time constraints I cannot engage here in a presentation of the views of so many authors. My efforts, therefore, will be directed only to the presentation of Boethius' views on the stated topic and to the defense of my interpretation of those views. (1) Moreover, again for reasons of time, I shall have to restrict my remarks to Boethius' views as presented in the two editions of his Commentary on Porphyry's « Isagoge » (2)." (p. 169)

(1) I would like to express my appreciation to Eleonore Stump for reading an early draft of this paper and for bringing to my attention a number of ambiguities and infelicities present in the text.

(2) In « *Isagogen* » *Porphyrii commentorum editio secunda*, ed. Samuel Brandt, in *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum*, vol. XXXXVIII (Vienna: Tempsky, 1906; rep. N.Y.: Johnson Rep. Corp., 1966), p. 135; PL 64, 71.

2. Gracia, Jorge J. E. 1984. *Introduction to the problem of individuation in the Early Middle Ages*. München: Philosophia Verlag.
Chapter II. *Formulation of the Issues: Boethius*, pp. 65-121.
3. Hall, Douglas C. 1992. *The Trinity: An Analysis of St Thomas Aquinas' Expositio of the De Trinitate of Boethius*. Leiden: Brill.
Contents: I. Introduction 1; II. Boethius: The *Theological Tractates* 16; III. Aquinas: The *Expositio* of the *De Trinitate* 38; IV. Conclusion 112; Bibliography 124; Index of Authors 130-131.
"In the entire history of Western Trinitarian theology, one of the most bold attempts to logically and philosophically penetrate the *De Trinitate* of Augustine was, precisely, the *Trinitas unus Deus ac non tres Dii* (*The Trinity is One God and not Three Gods*) - also known as the *De Trinitate* - of Boethius; and the greatest medieval analysis of this theological tractate of Boethius was that of Thomas Aquinas. The purpose of the present study is to disclose the theological methodologies and the contents of this Boethian tractate and the *Expositio* of Aquinas." (p. 2)
4. Hankey, Wayne J. 1981. "The *De Trinitate* of St. Boethius and the Structure of the *Summa Theologiae* of St. Thomas Aquinas." In *Congresso Internazionale di Studi Boeziani (Pavia, 5-8 ottobre 1980): Atti*, edited by Obertello, Luca, 367-375. Roma: Editrice Herder.
"The paper I am going to read here consists of a section from a much longer study on which I am presently working. This longer study deals with the problem of individuation not only in relation to Boethius, but also discusses the views of other early medieval figures, such as John Eriugena, Gilbert of Poitiers and Abailard. Unfortunately, due to time constraints I cannot engage here in a presentation of the views of so many authors. My efforts, therefore, will be directed only to the presentation of Boethius' views on the stated topic and to the defense of my interpretation of those views. (1) Moreover, again for reasons of time, I shall have to restrict my remarks to Boethius' views as presented in the two editions of his Commentary on Porphyry's « Isagoge » (2)." (p. 169)
(1) I would like to express my appreciation to Eleonore Stump for reading an early draft of this paper and for bringing to my attention a number of ambiguities and infelicities present in the text.
(2) In « *Isagogen* » *Porphyrii commentorum editio secunda*, ed. Samuel Brandt, in *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum*, vol. XXXXVIII (Vienna: Tempsky, 1906; rep. N.Y.: Johnson Rep. Corp., 1966), p. 135; PL 64, 71.
5. ———. 2018. "Ratio, Preces, Intuitus: Prayer's Mediation in Boethius' Consolation." In *Praying and Contemplating in Late Antiquity: Religious and*

- Philosophical Interactions*, edited by Pachoumi, Eleni and Edwards, Mark, 71-96. Tübingen.
6. Hansen, Heine. 2020. "Boethius' *De topicis differentiis*, Commentaries on." In *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy: Philosophy Between 500 and 1500. Second Edition*, edited by Lagerlund, Henrik, 304-308. Dordrecht: Springer.
 7. Harding, Brian. 2005. "Metaphysical Speculation and its Applicability to a Mode of Living: The Case of Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae*." *Bochumer Philosophisches Jahrbuch Fur Antike Und Mittelalter* no. 9:81-92.
Abstract: "This paper argues that Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae* presents theoretical metaphysical speculation as having a direct bearing on the life of the metaphysician. Boethius accomplishes this through his depiction of Lady Philosophy's 'therapy' wherein complex metaphysical arguments are utilized to pull Boethius out of his depression, returning him to what she calls his true self. I begin the paper by contextualizing this discussion in terms of the debate as to whether or not the 'philosophic life' of pagan antiquity is present in medieval thought. I then turn to a discussion of the therapeutic metaphysical arguments of Lady Philosophy and their effects on Boethius' mental and emotional state. I conclude the essay by listing some questions raised and directions for further study."
 8. Harpur, James. 2006. "Fortune's Prisoner: An Introduction to the Poems of Boethius's "Consolation of Philosophy"." *The Poetry Ireland Review* no. 85:44-51.
 9. Hatch Marshall, Mary. 1950. "Boethius' definition of *persona* and mediaeval understanding of the Roman theater." *Speculum* no. 25:471-482.
 10. Heckman, Christina M. 2013. "The Order of the World: Boethius's Translation of Aristotle's "Categoriae" and the Old English "Solomon and Saturn" Dialogues." *Carmina Philosophiae* no. 22:35-64.
 11. Helm, Paul. 2009. "Eternity and Vision in Boethius." *European Journal for Philosophy of Religion* no. 1:77 - 97.
Abstract: "Boethius and Augustine of Hippo and are two of the fountainheads from which the long tradition of regarding God's existence as timelessly eternal has flowed, a tradition which has influenced not only Christianity, but Judaism and Islam too. But though the two have divine eternity in common, I shall argue that in other respects, in certain crucial respects, they differ significantly over how they articulate that notion."
 12. Herold, Christian. 1994. "Boethius's *Consolatio Philosophiae* as a Bridge Between the Classical and Christian Conceptions of Tragedy." *Carmina Philosophiae* no. 3:37-52.
Reprinted in Noel Harold Kaylor Jr., Philip Edward Phillips, (eds.), *New Directions in Boethius Studies*, Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications 2007, pp. 17-31.
 13. Humphrey, Illo. 2012. *Boethius (*Rome, ca. 480 – †Pavia, ca. 524): His Influence on the European Unity of Culture: from Alcuin of York (†804) to Thierry of Chartres (†1154)*. Nordhausen: Traugott Bautz.
 14. Jensen, Steven J. 2007. "Boethius and Three Kinds of Good." *Carmina Philosophiae* no. 16:51-70.
 15. Jürgasch, Thomas. 2021. "Boethius: the first Christian philosopher in the Latin West?" In *The Routledge Handbook of Early Christian Philosophy*, edited by Edwards, Mark, 584-596. New York: Routledge.
 16. Kaldramova, Elitza. 2018. "Understanding and Truth in Boethius's "The Consolation of Philosophy"." *Archiv für mittelalterliche Philosophie und Kultur* no. 24:47-54.
Abstract: "Understanding is associated with reason. It is correct when it corresponds to the truth and is incorrect when fallacy is mistaken as truth. The latter is considered as great value because it is necessary for achieving human's ontological purpose, namely achieving the good. Truth also leads to understanding and is

- associated with light. Correct understanding provides information about the value of different things and thus striving for seemingly valuable and god things is avoided. It has a significant role in noticing the differences between truth and false opinion. Understanding and truth are necessary conditions for acquiring knowledge and have a two-way relationship between them. On the one hand, understanding is acquired by means of the spark of truth present in the human soul. On the other hand, truth leads to understanding different relations, for example the one between material and non-material world."
17. Karfiková, Lenka. 2019. "Providence, fate, and freedom according to Origen and Boethius." In *Pronoia: the providence of God = die Vorsehung Gottes. Forscher aus dem Osten und Westen Europas an den Quellen des gemeinsamen Glauben ; Studententagung Warschau, 30. August - 4. September 2017*, edited by Hainthaler, Theresia, Mali, Franz, Emmenegger, Gregor and Lenkaityté Ostermann, Manté, 263-282. Innsbruck.
 18. Kaylor Jr., Noel Harold. 2012. "Introduction: The Times, Life, and Work of Boethius." In *A Companion to Boethius in the Middle Ages*, edited by Kaylor Jr., Noel Harold and Phillips, Philip Edward, 1-46. Leiden: Brill.
 19. Kaylor Jr., Noel Harold, and Phillips, Philip Edward, eds. 2007. *New Directions in Boethian Studies*. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications.
 Contents: Noel Harold Kaylor Jr. and Philip Edward Phillips: Introduction XI;
 Part I: Boethius's Latin *De Consolatione Philosophiae*
 William J. Asbell Jr: The Philosophical Background of *Sufficientia* in Boethius's *Consolation*, Book 3 3; Christine Herold: Boethius's *Consolatio Philosophiae* as a Bridge between Classical and Christian Conceptions of Tragedy 17; Krista Sue-Lo Twu: This is Comforting? Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy*, Rhetoric, Dialectic, and "Unicum Illud Inter Homines Deumque Commercio" 33;
 Part II: Vernacular Translation of the *Consolatio*
 J. Keith Atkinson: A Dit Contre Fortune, the Medieval French Boethian *Consolatio* Contained in MS Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale, fr. 25418 53; Glynnis M. Cropp: An Italian Translation of *Le Livre de Boece de Consolacion* 75; Francesca Ziino: Some Vernacular Versions of Boethius's *De Consolatione Philosophiae* in Medieval Spain: Notes on Their Relationship with the Commentary Tradition 83;
 Part III: Boethius in Art and Literary History
 Ann W. Astell: Visualizing Boethius's *Consolation* as Romance 111; Christoph Houswitschka: The Eternal Triangle of Writer, Patron, and Fortune in Late Medieval Literature 125; Michael Masi: Boethius, the Wife of Bath, and the Dialectic of Paradox 143;
 Part IV: Boethius in Religion and Mythography
 Romanus Cessario: Boethius, Christ, and the New Order 157; Graham N. Drake: The Muses in the *Consolation*: The Late Medieval Mythographic Tradition 169;
 Part V: Reedition of The Boke of Coumfort of Bois
The Boke of Coumfort of Bois Bodleian Library, Oxford MS AUCT. F. 3.5: A Transcription with Introduction—Originally transcribed, edited and introduced by Noel Harold Kaylor Jr., Jason Edward Streed, and William H. Watts, Reedited here by Noel Harold Kaylor Jr., and Philip Edward Phillips 223-280.
 20. ———, eds. 2012. *A Companion to Boethius in the Middle Ages*. Leiden: Brill.
 Contents: Preface IX, Acknowledgments XV; Note on Contributors XIX; Noel Harold Kaylor, Jr.: Introduction: The Times, Life, and Work of Boethius 1; Stephen C. McCluskey: Boethius's Astronomy and Cosmology 47; Rosalind C. Love: The Latin Commentaries on Boethius's *De consolatione philosophiae* from the 9th to the 11th Centuries 75; Jean-Yves Guillaumin: Boethius's *De institutione arithmetica* and its Influence on Posterity 135; Siobhan Nash-Marshall: Boethius's Influence on Theology and Metaphysics to c. 1500 163; John Patrick Casey: Boethius's Works on Logic in the Middle Ages 193; Paul E. Szarmach: Boethius's Influence in Anglo-Saxon England: The Vernacular and the *De consolatione philosophiae* 221; Christine Hehle: Boethius's Influence on German Literature to c. 1500 255; Glynnis

M. Cropp: Boethius in Medieval France: Translations of the *De consolatioe philosophiae* and Literary Influence 319; Dario Brancato: Readers and Interpreters of the *Consolatio* in Italy, 1300-1500 357; Ian Johnson: Making the *Consolatio* in Middle English 413; Mark T. Rimple: The Enduring Legacy of Boethian Harmony 447; Ann E. Moyer: The *Quadrivium* and the Decline of Boethian Influence 479; Fabio Troncarelli: Afterword: Boethius in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages 519; Philip Edward Phillips: Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius: A Chronology and Selected Annotated Bibliography 551; List of Contributors; Index of Manuscripts Cited 591; Index 596.

21. Kijewska, Agnieszka. 2003. "Boethius' conception of the supreme good." In *Metamorphoses of Neoplatonism: Being or Good?*, edited by Kijewska, Agnieszka, 307-317. Lublin: Wydaw. KUL.

"Yet this reasoning, based on the dialectic of Platonic and Aristotelian tradition will remain paradoxical and difficult to accept from the standpoint of common-sense thinking. It is also hard to imagine such paradoxical dialectic bringing any real consolation to someone who is in plight like that of Boethius the prisoner. What, then, should we make of the encounter of Dame Philosophy and Boethius?"

4. Suggestion of a solution

It is my opinion - and in this I am in full agreement with John Marenbon - that in trying to interpret the *Consolation* it is worthwhile to realize the importance of the literary genre in which this work was written, namely the Menippean satire. The cynical philosopher Menippus in his lost writings upheld stoical ideals and derided human vices and weaknesses. He made fun of philosophical theories by introducing personifications of abstract concepts and parodies of mythological and literary characters (32).

It seems, by the way, that element of comedy is not totally absent from the *Consolation*, as in the scene of chasing the Muses from Boethius' bedside, though it is overshadowed by the pathos of Boethius' fate. Now Dame Philosophy is a typical allegorical character personifying the Platonic and Aristotelian ideal of wisdom. Yet, impressive as she is, it seems she is not the principal character of the work. The focus seems to be rather on Boethius the prisoner, it is he that is the dynamic character of the piece, as he undergoes a radical metamorphosis.

We know of him that he received excellent education in philosophical schools of late antiquity, to which Dame Philosophy clearly testifies by saying that he had been nourished with Eleatic and Academic teachings (33). It is no longer doubtful that, like other Roman aristocrats, Boethius was a Christian and a Catholic, and that he took special interest in theological discussions. He put to good use his philosophical skills and experience in explaining and clarifying theological notions and in perfecting theological methods. Why, at the end of his life, faced with a violent death, should he look for consolation to philosophy rather than religion?

It may be the case that Boethius, in choosing this precise literary genre and in constructing his dialogue the way he did, wanted to call into doubt sufficiency of human reason alone, or human reason deprived of assistance from living, painful experience, in discovering the Supreme Good, that would give man his happiness. Philosophy demonstrates that there exists the Supreme Good that is both God and Providence, yet this supreme goodness is constantly found to be incommensurable with the expectations of the humans and thus philosophical reasoning and everyday thinking part company. As Karl Jaspers wrote: *Philosophizing has, as it were, two wings, one that moves in the medium of communicable thinking, common theory, the other, whose medium is the individual existence. Only these two wings together are able to effect flight.* And a number of lines above he affirms: *Every essential philosophical idea points beyond itself to reality, without which it is not possible that the meaning of philosophizing be fulfilled.* (35). Thus it is life experience coupled with philosophical reasoning that can provide a proof there existing a reality that, though not apparent, yet can be discovered by the philosopher, who may bear witness to this discovery even by a sacrifice of his own life; for this hidden reality is no other than the Supreme Truth and the Supreme Good. *Consolation* -

- writes von Albrecht - *is merged in the comersion to God*. His work is a *προτρεπτικός εἰς θεόν* rather than a *consolatio*, (36) Boethius came close to that reality under the guidance of the Dame Philosophy, yet he had to testify to the truth of his knowledge by laying down his life. As we know he was eventually executed in 524 or 525, some sources say that he had to undergo torture before his death. King Theoderic allegedly ordered his body to be cleared away in order to prevent spreading of the martyr's cult, so claims in his *History of the Wars* (37) Procopius of Caesarea. Yet his scheme came to naught and Boethius has ever since been venerated as a martyr, his feast day being the 23 October, formally approved on the 15 December 1883." (pp. 316-317)
- (32) Cf. Marenbon, *Boethius*, [2003] p. 160-161.
- (33) Cf. Boethius, *The Consolation* I, 1, p. 133.
- (34) In that way Bovo of Corvey read the text; Cf. Huygens, 'Mittelalterliche Kommentare zum *O qui perpetua*', [*Sacris erudiri*, VI (1954) pp. 373-427] p. 384.
- (35) K. Jaspers, *Der philosophische Glaube angesichts der Offenbarung*, München 1963, p. 471-472.
- (36) M. von Albrecht, *A History of Roman Literature*, vol. II Leiden-New York-Köln 1999, p. 1715.
- (37) Cf. Procopius of Caesarea, *History of the Wars* I, 1, 34, tr. By H. B. Dewing, Cambridge Mass., London 1953, p. 13: *Symmachus and his son-in-law Boethius were men of noble and ancient lineage, and both had been leading men in the Roman senate and had been consuls. But because they practised philosophy and were mindful of justice in a manner surpassed by no other men (...) they attained great fame and thus led men of the basest sort to envy them. Now such persons slandered them to Theoderic, and he, believing their slanders, put these two men to death, on the ground that they were setting about a revolution, and made their property confiscate to the public treasury.*
22. ———. 2013. "Boethius — Divine Man or Christian Philosopher?" In *Divine Men and Women in the History and Society of Late Hellenism*, edited by Dzielska, Maria and Twardowska, Kamilla, 75-89. Cracow: Jagiellonian University Press.
23. ———. 2014. "Divine Logos in the Heart of Boethius's Path Toward *Summum Bonum*." *Revista Española de Filosofía Medieval* no. 21:39-52.
Abstract: "This paper presents an outline of the way Boethius conceived the human path to the Supreme Good (*Summum bonum*). In order to achieve this goal one has first to specify the way he construed this Supreme Good, and this discussion is naturally related to the much-discussed problem concerning the Christian identity of Boethius: was he indeed a Christian? does his *Consolation*, from which any overt allusions to Christian faith are absent, provide us with any clue as to whether the Supreme Good of Boethius can be identified with the God of the Gospel? In the course of the analysis we propound a hypothesis that the message that Boethius puts forward through the means of his *Consolation* and the utterances he puts in the mouth of his dame Philosophy are not far removed from the advice offered by Fulgentius to Proba.
She, too, was encouraged to acknowledge her own weakness and lack of sufficiency, to be contrite, and to have humble trust in wisdom and guidance of God, who is the best of all doctors. Is dame Philosophy's message not very similar? did not Alcuin, who regarded himself as a faithful «disciple» of Boethius, share a conception of philosophy as being the «teacher of virtues» and wisdom, as the one who leads man along the path of wisdom towards the divine light?"
24. King, Peter. 2007. "Boethius: First of the Scholastics." *Carmina Philosophiae* no. 16:23-50.
"Boethius was the first of the scholastics in much more than paraphrases and his word-for-word commentaries, Boethius also provided the mediæval world with an object lesson in how to think about it. His theological treatises set the style for later scholastic investigations of dogma: concise, tightly-reasoned chains of argument applied to matters of faith, rich enough to be commented on in their own right. His

intellectual influence was so pervasive in the Middle Ages that we might be tempted to paraphrase Whitehead's famous dictum (1) and declare mediæval philosophy to consist in a series of glosses on Boethius.

One work, however, has been left out of this accounting. While the influence and impact in the Middle Ages of Boethius's translations, paraphrases, commentaries, and theological treatises has long been studied and is well known, the same cannot be said for his masterpiece, the *Consolation of Philosophy*. Yet it too received its 'series of glosses' in the Middle Ages. In what follows I propose to look into this neglected history, focusing primarily on the reception of the *Consolation* as a philosophical text by later mediæval thinkers.

Putting aside its literary qualities, then, we can ask: What did later scholastics make of the *Consolation* as a philosophical treatise? What philosophical problem did they take it to address, and how did they take it to solve that problem?

I'll proceed as follows. In §1, I'll describe the tradition of philosophical commentary on the *Consolation*, as far as it can be made out at present. In § 2, I'll discuss the interpretation of the logical structure of the *Consolation* in the commentary tradition. In § 3, we'll look at the particular question of how the issues and arguments given in Book 5 are related to the rest of the work, a question that has consequences for the unity of the *Consolation* as a whole.

In § 4, the medicinal metaphors Boethius uses to present the 'therapeutic' arguments will be looked at in detail as an example of how the commentary tradition can illuminate the logical structure of the text." (p. 23)

(1) Alfred Whitehead [*Process and Reality*. New York: Macmillan, 1929] 63: "The safest general characterization of the European philosophical tradition is that it consists in a series of footnotes to Plato."

25. ———. 2011. "Boethius' Anti-Realist Arguments." *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* no. 40:381-401.

"Boethius opens his discussion of the problem of universals, in his second commentary on Porphyry's *Isagoge*, with a destructive dilemma: genera and species either exist or are concepts; but they can neither exist nor be soundly conceived; therefore the enquiry into them should be abandoned (*In Isag. maior* 1.10).

Boethius' strategy to get around this dilemma is well known. He follows the lead of Alexander of Aphrodisias, distinguishing several ways in which genera and species can be conceived, and he argues that at least one way involves no falsity. Hence it is possible to conceive genera and species soundly, and Porphyry's enquiry into them is therefore not futile after all (1.11).

Boethius thus resolves the second horn of his opening dilemma.

Yet he allows the first horn of the dilemma, the claim that genera and species cannot exist, to stand. The implication is that he takes his arguments for this claim to be sound. If so, this would be a philosophically exciting and significant result, well worth exploring in its own right.

Yet there is no consensus, either medieval or modern, on precisely what Boethius' arguments are, or even how many arguments he offers, much less on their soundness. (1) One reason for the lack of consensus is that Boethius' arguments need to be understood in the light of their ancient philosophical sources — particularly his difficult regress argument, which can be reconstructed only in this light — and this is rarely done. (2) In what follows I shall try to establish Boethius' dependence on his sources, and to show that Boethius offers three arguments as part of a unified dialectical strategy to establish that genera and species cannot be things (in some suitably robust sense of 'things')." (pp. 381-382)

(1) The secondary literature is sparse. Boethius' arguments do not rate even a single mention in J. Marenbon (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Boethius* [*Companion*] (Cambridge, 2009). There is an analysis of Boethius' entire discussion in M. Tweedale, *Abailard on Universals* [Abailard] (Amsterdam, 1976), and of these arguments in P. Spade, 'Boethius against Universals' [*Boethius*], which takes into account unpublished work by Spade and King. The brief treatment in A. de Libera, *La Querelle des universaux de Platon à la fin du Moyen Âge* [*Querelle*] (Paris,

- 1996), 128-30, is expanded in id., *L'Art des généralités: théories de l'abstraction [L'Art]* (Paris, 1999), 175-214. Some relevant material can be found in J. Barnes, *Porphyry: Introduction [Introduction]* (Oxford, 2003), 37-9. For Boethius' works in general see J. Magee and J. Marenbon, 'Boethius' Works', in Marenbon (ed.), *Companion*, 303-10, and the references given there.
- (2) There is still controversy over Boethius' relation to his ancient sources: see J. Shiel, 'Boethius' Commentaries on Aristotle', in R. Sorabji (ed.), *Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and their Influence*. (London, 1990), 349-72, and S. Ebbesen, 'Boethius as an Aristotelian Commentator', *ibid.* 373-91. For the most recent overview of the debate see S. Ebbesen, 'The Aristotelian Commentator', in Marenbon (ed.), *Companion*, 34-55.
26. ———. 2013. "Boethius on the Problem of Desert." *Oxford Studies in Medieval Philosophy* no. 1:1-22.
27. Kirby, Helen. 1981. "The Scholar and His Public." In *Boethius: His Life, Thought and Influence*, edited by Gibson, Margaret, 44-69. Oxford: Blackwell.
- "Today, the Tractates are again generally accepted as Boethian. The turning point was the publication in 1877 of a fragment of Cassiodorus discovered by Alfred Holder in a Reichenau manuscript and edited by Hermann Usener. In this fragment, called the *Anecdoton Holderi*, (2) Cassiodorus remarks that Boethius wrote a book on the Holy Trinity, some chapters on dogma, and a book against Nestorius. (3) This list seemed to accord well with the topics covered by the works themselves. Specifically, the 'book on the Holy Trinity' corresponded with Tractate I, and that 'against Nestorius' with Tractate V. The 'chapters on dogma' were taken as references to Tractates II and III, which deal respectively with the questions whether Father, Son and Holy Spirit may be predicated of God as substances; and how substances can be good simply by existing. The genuineness of Tractate IV, 'On the Catholic faith', remained in doubt. E. K. Rand wrote a doctoral thesis to disprove its genuineness, (4) but some years later 'deemed it expedient to recant' and concluded that the work was after all by Boethius. (5) It now seems clear that it is to this tractate that the term 'chapters on dogma' most aptly applies; and it may therefore be reasonable to treat Tractates I, II and III as together constituting the 'book on the Holy Trinity'. (6)
- At all events, even if perhaps not yet irrefragable, (7) the authenticity of the *Opuscula Sacra* seems beyond reasonable doubt, and is assumed in what follows." (pp. 206-207)
- (1) The text of the Tractates, with English translation, is most conveniently available in the Loeb Library revised edition by H. F. Stewart, E. K. Rand, and S. J. Tester (Cambridge, Mass./London, 1973), pp. 1-129. The Latin text in this edition is based upon Rand's collations of all the important manuscripts (Introduction, p. VII), and is substantially the same as that printed in the first Loeb Library edition in 1918. See further below, p.211.
- (2) H. Usener, *Anecdoton Holderi, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Roms in ostgothischer Zeit* [Festschrift zur Begrüssung der 32. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner zu Wiesbaden] (Bonn, 1877). The text of the *Anecdoton* is now conveniently available in Cassiodori. . . Opera I, ed. A. J. Fridh and J. W. Halporn (Turnhout, 1973: CCSL XCVI), pp. V-VI.
- (3) Scripsit [Boethius] librum de sancta trinitate et capita quaedam dogmatica et librum contra Nestorium: op. cit., p.V.
- (4) E. K. Rand, 'Der dem Boethius zugeschriebene Traktat *de fide catholica*' *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*: Supplement-band XXVI (1901), 401-61.
- (5) *Founders of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, Mass., 1928), pp. 156-7, 315, η. 28; cf. the Loeb edition (note i above), p. 52, note a, and M. Cappuyns' excellent article, 'Boèce', in DHGE [*Dictionnaire d'Histoire et Géographie Eccllesiastique*] I (Paris, 1937), 358-61; 371-2. Tractate IV is further discussed, and its authenticity affirmed, by Henry Chadwick in JTS [*Journal of Theological Studies*] XXXI (1980), 551-6.
- (6) Cappuyns, op. cit., 371.

- (7) For the view that excessive reliance may have been placed upon the *Anecdota Holderi* see H. F. Stewart, *Boethius* (Edinburgh/London, 1891), pp. 11—14. A. Hildebrand, *Boethius und seine Stellung zum Christentume* (Regensburg, 1885), pp. 148-314, argued from internal evidence for the authenticity of the Tractates.
28. Koterski, Joseph W. 2004. "Boethius and the Theological Origins of the Concept of Person." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* no. 78:203-224.
Abstract: "Boethius's famous definition of "person" as *naturae rationalis individual substantia* (an individual substance of a rational nature) is frequently cited without reference to the specific theological purpose of his formulation (an attempt to provide some clarification about the mysteries of Christ and the Trinity). This article elucidates some of the theological issues that required philosophical progress on the nature of "personhood." It also considers some of the residual difficulties with the application of this definition to divine persons that have been raised by subsequent theologians such as Thomas Aquinas who are otherwise sympathetic to Boethius's definition of person when applied to human beings."
29. Kretzmann, Norman. 1985. "*Nos Ipsi Principia Sumus*: Boethius and the Basis of Contingency." In *Divine Omniscience and Omnipotence in Medieval Philosophy. Islamic, Jewish and Christian Perspectives*, edited by Rudavsky, Tamar, 23-50. Dordrecht: Reidel.
"Introduction. Boethius's two commentaries on Aristotle's *De interpretatione* contain an account of the metaphysical foundations of contingency in their discussions of Chapter 9. (1) For the countless medieval discussions of future contingents only *De interpretatione* 9 itself is of greater historical importance than Boethius's discussions of it. In this chapter, however, my concern is with the content of Boethius's theory of contingency and not with its historical sources or influences. In order to give his theory the kind of consideration I think it deserves, I need to extract it from the other material in the commentaries and expound it in its own right; I also want to examine some of its consequences. Because those tasks are the only ones I can undertake in this paper, I am not now concerned with what the later medievals thought about Boethius or with what Boethius thought about Aristotle or with what Aristotle thought about contingency, but only (or as nearly as possible only) with what Boethius thought about contingency in his two commentaries on *De interpretatione*. (2)" (p. 23)
(1) The Latin texts of the commentaries are published in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. 64, cols. 329-342 and 487-518; and in the critical edition by C. Meiser, *Boetii Commentarii in Librum Aristotelis II EPI EPMHNI A Σ*, Leipzig: Teubner, 1877-1880 (2 vols.), Vol. I, pp. 103-126, and Vol. 11, pp. 185-250. All my references to and quotations from Boethius's commentaries in the notes will be taken from Meiser's edition. For the definitive edition of Boethius's translation of Aristotle see L. Minio Paluella (ed.), *Aristoteles Latinus II 1-2: De Interpretatione vel Periermenias*, Desclée de Brouwer, Bruges 1965.
(2) See also Boethius, *Consolation of Philosophy in Boethius. The Theological Tractates and the Consolation of Philosophy*, H. F. Stewart and E. K. Rand (eds.), Harvard University Press, Cambridge Mass 1968, Bk V, esp. Prose 1 and 2; and *In Ciceronis Topica* in *Ciceronis Opera*, J. C. Orelli and G. Baiterus (eds.), Zurich 1833, Bk V, chs, 15.60-17.64. I owe the latter reference to Eleonore Stump.
30. ———. 1987. "Boethius and the Truth about Tomorrow's Sea Battle." In *Logos and Pragma: Essays on the Philosophy of Language in Honour of Professor Gabriel Nuchelmans*, edited by Rijk, Lambertus Marie de and Braakhuis, Henk A.G., 63-97. Nijmegen: Ingenium Publishers.
Reprinted in: D. Blank, N. Kretzmann (eds.), *Ammonius on Aristotle On Interpretation 9 with Boethius on Aristotle On Interpretation 9*, London: Duckworth, 1998, pp. 24-52 (cited from the reprint).
"Lukasiewicz's interpretation of Aristotle's response to determinism in *Int.* 9 has stood, in one version or another, at the center of the modern controversy that has its

source in his 1930 article. (*)

(...)

"Recent commentators on *Int.* 9, whether they accept or reject the oldest interpretation, have tended to follow Hintikka's lead in designating it 'the traditional interpretation'. (5)" (p. 25)

(...)

"My concern here is with the principal ancient rival to the so-called traditional interpretation, a rival whose subsequent medieval career was so long and so eminent that it provides another reason for feeling uneasy about calling the simple denial of universal bivalence 'the traditional interpretation'. Since the one I am focusing on is the second-oldest on record, I will refer to it simply as the second-oldest interpretation and continue referring to the denial of universal bivalence as the oldest. I will also continue to refer to both of them as interpretations even when I am primarily interested in them as responses to logical determinism, regardless of their accuracy as interpretations of Aristotle. The second-oldest interpretation's claim to preserve bivalence while rejecting determinism is what essentially distinguishes it from the oldest interpretation. Its details will emerge gradually." (p. 25)

(...)

"Boethius' version of the second-oldest interpretation is based on his thoroughgoing Aristotelian correspondence theory of truth: 'the nature of predicative [i.e. categorical] propositions is acquired from the truth and falsity of things, events, or states of affairs; for however they are, so will the propositions that signify them be'. (28) For that reason propositions 'about past and present things, events, or states of affairs are, indeed, like those things themselves, stable and definite; ... [and], for that reason, of that which has happened it is true to say definitely that it has happened ... And concerning the present as well: whatever is happening has a definite nature in that it is happening. It is necessary to have definite truth and falsity in the propositions, too; for of whatever is happening it is definitely true to say that it is happening, [definitely] false that it is not happening.' (29)" (p. 29)

(*) [J. Lukasiewicz, 'Philosophische Bemerkungen zu mehrwertigen Systemen des Aussagenkalküls', *Comptes Rendus des Séances de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Varsovie, Classe III*, vol. 23 (1930) pp. 51-77, translated by H. Weber as 'Philosophical Remarks on Many-Valued Systems of Propositional Logic' in Storrs Mc Call (ed.), *Polish Logic 1920-1939*, Oxford 1967, pp. 40-65.]

(5) R. Gaskin, *The Sea Battle and the Master Argument. Aristotle and Diodorus Cronus on the Metaphysics of the Future*, Berlin 1995. Chapter 12 is dedicated to the interpretation of the ancient commentators, especially Boethius and Ammonius. (28) II 188,14-17: 'praedicativarum autem propositionum natura ex rerum veritate et falsitate colligitur. quemadmodum enim sese res habent, ita sese propositiones habebunt, quae res significant.'

(29) II 189,5-7, 9-10, 13-18: 'de praeteritis quidem et de praesentibus, ut res ipsae, stabiles sunt et definitae.... idcirco de eo quod factum est verum est dicere definite, quoniam factum est ... et de praesenti quoque: quod fit definitam habet naturam in eo quod fit, definitam quoque in propositionibus veritatem falsitatemque habere necesse est. nam quod fit definite verum est dicere quoniam fit, falsum quoniam non fit.'

31. LaChance, Paul Joseph. 2004. "Boethius on Human Freedom." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* no. 78:309-327.
 Abstract: "It is commonly asserted that Boethius defined free will as the judgment of the will or a rational choice. Accordingly, sin or evil is identified with ignorance or vice of the intellect, which prevents or distorts rational deliberation. However, Boethius adopted a more complex understanding of the self-motion of the soul and, consequently, articulated a more nuanced account of sin and the healing effects of Providence. Boethius treated human freedom as a complex including a natural motion, identified as the desire for happiness, the determination of reason following the judgment of deliberation, and the sovereignty of the will over its own acts and, to some extent, over other acts of the soul. Sin, therefore, involves mistaken ideas

about reality but also deformations in the affective orientation of the will to the world and in the exercise of the will's control over the soul."

32. ———. 2011. "Transcendental Prediction in Boethius' Signification Theory: *De hebdomadibus* in the Context of the Commentaries on *Peri hermeneias*." In *Philosophy and Theology in the Long Middle Ages: A Tribute to Stephen F. Brown*, edited by Emery, Kent jr., Friedman, Russell L. and Speer, Andreas, 248-274. Leiden: Brill.
- "In this essay I shall set out the basic terms and relations for an explanatory account of the central meaning of Boethius' *De hebdomadibus*. The basic terms and relations include *bonum*, *esse* and *id quod est* as well as the principle that terms which refer to objects that share a particular meaning but that subsist differently are analogically predicated. I shall argue that Boethius distinguished between the meaning of predicates and the mode or manner in which their referents are said to subsist. Boethius offered only very brief and often tantalizing explanations of these concepts, leaving much room for interpretation as to their exact meaning. I will approach my interpretive task from two directions.
- First, I shall investigate Boethius' logical commentaries and treatises, in which he discusses foundational questions of human knowing and the manner in which the content of one's predications may be brought closer to the meaning that one intends to communicate. Second, I shall adopt a hypothesis that locates Boethius' third tractate in the context of trinitarian theology. What I have to offer with respect to the meaning of *De hebdomadibus* will not verify the hypothesis, but I think that the hypothesis sheds light on the possible intention and meaning of the tractate. Thus, the linking of the hypothesis and the data of the text will yield an advance in 'understanding'. (1) (p. 248)
- (1) Boethius commented on the importance of the task of understanding prior to judgment, noting that Aristotle treated the two parts of logic, understanding and judgment, whereas the Stoics neglected understanding. Cf. *Commentaria In Topica Ciceronis*, Lib. I–IV, PL 64, col. 1039–1174; english trans. by E. Stump, Ithaca 1988. Despite the fact that in this context judgment appears to be a logical activity concerned with the forms of arguments, evidence from the *De divisione liber* (cf. infra, n. 18) suggests that Boethius recognized the importance of a range of activities in the articulation of a definition. If we consider that predication involves not simply the synthesis of meanings but also the positing of a particular mode of subsistence (substantial, accidental, relational) or manner of occurrence (necessary, contingent, or free), then the discussion of contingency in the commentaries on *Peri hermeneias* takes on a greater importance in the articulation of Boethius' epistemology.
33. Lazella, Andrew. 2008. "Creation, *Esse*, and *Id Quod Est* in Boethius's *Opuscula Sacra*." *Carmina Philosophiae* no. 17:35-56.
34. Lewftow, Brian. 1990. "Boethius on Eternity." *History of Philosophy Quarterly* no. 7:123-142.
- "The concept of eternity was prominent in medieval discussions of divine foreknowledge and human freedom and of God's relation to the world. Perhaps most importantly, the medievals took it to express the distinctive quality of God's life, experience and mode of being. For such writers as Boethius and Aquinas, the claim that God is eternal, properly understood, says most of what we can know about what it is like to be God. So an examination of the concept of eternity promises to repay our efforts with a better understanding of the history of philosophical theology and with insight into the concept of God.
- Some thinkers see eternity as everlasting duration through time. Others liken it to a static, durationless instant, a timeless *nunc stans*. Language appropriate to both views occurs in such authors as Plato, Plotinus and Boethius, leading some scholars to conclude that these men wrote misleadingly, wavered between different views of eternity or were just inconsistent. (1) In a well-known article, Eleonore Stump and Norman Kretzmann suggest another possibility. (2) On their view, when Boethius *et*

- al.* seem to waffle between talk of a durationless now and talk of everlasting duration, they are actually trying to communicate a single thesis, that eternity is "atemporal duration." This paper will argue that at least as regards Boethius, Stump and Kretzmann are correct, though not for the reasons they give. Stump and Kretzmann have recently tried to defend the concept of atemporal duration against an attack by Paul Fitzgerald. (3) I will suggest that their defense is inadequate, then offer a different defense and a different view of atemporal duration." (p. 123)
- (1) Thus Richard Sorabji, *Time, Creation and the Continuum* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983), pp. 108-13.
- (2) Eleonore Stump and Norman Kretzmann, "Eternity," *Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 78 (1981), pp. 429-58.
- (3) Eleonore Stump and Norman Kretzmann, "Atemporal Duration," *Journal of Philosophy*, 84 (1987), pp. 214-19. They are responding to Paul Fitzgerald, "Stump and Kretzmann on Time and Eternity," *Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 82 (1985), pp. 260-69.
35. Lewis, C. S. 1964. *The Discarded Image: An Introduction to Medieval and Renaissance Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
On Boethius see pp. 75-90.
36. Liebeschütz, Hans. 1967. "Boethius and the Legacy of Antiquity." In *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, edited by Armstrong, Arthur Hilary, 538-564. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
37. Love, Rosalind C. 2012. "The Latin Commentaries on Boethius's *De consolatioe philosophiae* From the 9th to the 11th Centuries." In *The Brill Companion to Boethius in the Middle Ages*, edited by Kaylor Jr., Noel Harold and Phillips, Philip Edward, 75-134. Leiden: Brill.
38. MacDonald, Scott. 1988. "Boethius's Claim that all Substances are Good." *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* no. 70:245-279.
Appendix: Boethius's *De hebdomadibus* (How Can Substances Be Good in Virtue of the Fact That They Have Being When They Are Not Substantial Goods?), translated by Scott MacDonald, pp. 274-279.
"Boethius's short treatise *Quomodo substantiae*, known in the Middle Ages as *De hebdomadibus* (DH), has been oddly neglected. (1) It deserves close attention for at least two reasons. First, in it Boethius presents a philosophically sophisticated defense of a provocative metaphysical position, viz., that all substances are good in virtue of the fact that they have being. Moreover, in the course of defending this position he lays out and attempts to resolve a deep philosophical problem the resolution of which appears to be necessary for *any* account of the nature of goodness, not just his own.
Second, DH deserves attention because of its historical significance.
The extant *De hebdomadibus* commentaries from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and the number of references to DH in the works of Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas, for example, testify to the use made of it by later medieval philosophers.(2) In addition, the subject matter of the treatise places it in a long and distinguished philosophical tradition: Boethius's thesis that all substances are good in virtue of the fact that they have being is clearly a near relative of the Augustinian view that everything which exists is good insofar as it exists and of Aquinas's claim that 'being' and 'good' have precisely the same referents although they differ in sense. (3) The fact that the account underlying Boethius's thesis is significantly different from either Augustine's or Aquinas's makes DH's position in the philosophical tradition all the more interesting. In this paper I will offer a detailed analysis of DH in order to evaluate the support Boethius offers for his counter-intuitive thesis and identify the historical context into which his account of the nature of goodness fits." (pp. 245-246)
(1) I have provided a translation of *De hebdomadibus* in an appendix. All references to DH are to line numbers of this translation.

(2) The medieval commentaries on DH which have been edited are the ninth century glosses edited by E. K. Rand in *Commentaria in Boethium, Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters* (München, 1906), the twelfth-century commentaries by Gilbert of Poitiers, Thierry of Chartres, and Clarenbald of Arras, all edited by Nikolaus M. Haering in (respectively) *The Commentaries on Boethius by Gilbert of Poitiers* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1966), *Commentaries on Boethius by Thierry of Chartres and his School* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1971), and *Life and Works of Clarembald of Arras* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1965), and the commentary of Thomas Aquinas edited by Fr. M. Calcaterra in the Marietti edition of Aquinas's works, *Opuscula theologica II* (Rome, 1954).

For Albert's use of DH, see his *Summa de bono*, vol. 28 in *Opera omnia* (Cologne edition), edited by Henricus Kuehle (Cologne, 1931), especially the first seven articles of the first question. For Aquinas's use of DH outside of his commentary, see especially *Summa theologiae* Ia.5 —6 and *De veritate* I and XXI.

(3) For a statement of Augustine's thesis, see, e. g., *Confessiones* VII. For Aquinas's claim, see *Summa theologiae* Ia.5.1—3.

39. Magee, John. 1987. "The Boethian Wheels of Fortune and Fate." *Mediaeval Studies* no. 49:524-533.
40. ———. 1988. "Note on Boethius, *Consolatio* I.1,5; 3,7: a new biblical parallel." *Vigiliae Christianae* no. 42:79-82.
41. ———. 1997. "Note on Boethius, "*Consolatio Philosophiae*" III 5,8." *Hermes* no. 125:253-257.
42. ———. 2005. "Boethius' "*Consolatio*" and the Theme of Roman Liberty." *Phoenix* no. 59:348-364.
43. ———. 2007. "Boethius, Last of the Romans." *Carmina Philosophiae* no. 16:1-22.
44. ———. 2009. "The Good and Morality: *Consolatio* 2–4." In *The Cambridge Companion to Boethius*, edited by Marenbon, John, 181-206. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
45. ———. 2010. "Boethius." In *The Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, edited by Gerson, Lloyd, 788-812. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

"It is difficult to determine how much of the corpus [*of Boethian works*] has disappeared. There may have been a translation, possibly with draft commentary, of the *Physics*. (15)

Boethius was acquainted with the *Posterior Analytics*, although it is uncertain whether he translated or commented on it; he certainly had access to Themistius' paraphrases of both *Analytics* and to Praetextatus' translation thereof (*In Perih.* 2.3.7–4.3; *Div.* 885d; *In top. Cic.* 1051b). A bucolic poem has evidently vanished, but the *Liber de definitionibus* transmitted under his name belongs to Victorinus (*In top. Cic.* 1098a; 1100b). Certain works are mentioned in such a way as to make it impossible to say whether they were merely planned, partially drafted, or actually completed. A treatise *De ordine Peripateticae disciplinae* was evidently written some time between the second *Peri Hermeneias* commentary and *De divisione*; another on the harmony of Plato and Aristotle was planned but may not have been written, and the same holds for a planned compendium of the *Peri Hermeneias* (*In Perih.* 2.80.1–6; 2.251.8–16; *Div.* 877b). Boethius obviously planned numerous projects in advance and must have worked on more than one at a time, and although some of his cross-references furnish reliable evidence for establishing relative chronology, others, having been penned with an eye only to his readers' presumed order of study, carry no implication as to the order of composition. Boethius' failure to mention a work, or his mentioning it in such a way as to suggest borrowing from a source, does not amount to proof that he had no direct knowledge of the same. For example, certain hints of *De generatione et corruptione* in the commentaries may well reflect mere borrowing from a source (e.g., *In Cat.* 262a (cf. *Porph.*, *In Cat.*

141.14)), but the *Consolatio*, which draws from many sources but is a copy of none, suggests direct acquaintance with the treatise (cf. below, p. 802)." (p. 796)

46. ———. 2014. "Boethius's *Consolatio* and Plato's *Gorgias*." In *Boethius as a Paradigm of Late Ancient Thought*, edited by Kirchner, Andreas, Jürgasch, Thomas and Böhm, Thomas, 13-29. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- "Our understanding of Boethius the Platonist is remarkably less clear than that of Boethius the Peripatetic, owing to the fact that the precise range of Boethius's later Platonic sources is difficult to ascertain from his extant writings, which include no translation of or commentary on a Platonic dialogue. (1) Although there has been much discussion of his interpretation of the *Timaeus*, especially as evidenced in *Consolatio* III,m9 (2), and although numerous allusions to other Platonic dialogues have been teased out of various Boethian works, the evidence is generally rather piecemeal. For example, does Boethius's reference to Plato on the rule of philosopher-kings (3) indicate a direct knowledge of the *Republic* or is it merely echoing a commonplace? (4) And if the former, then how much of the *Republic* are we entitled to read into our interpretation of the *Consolatio* or of Boethius's Platonism generally? The most notable exceptions to this rather sparsely populated terrain are perhaps *Consolatio* IV,2 and IV,4, prose sections which since Klingner have been taken to reflect direct engagement with Plato's *Gorgias*. (5) The contrast between Boethius's use of the *Timaeus* and his use of the *Gorgias* seems particularly striking. For if the *Timaeus* serves in the context of the *Consolatio* to affirm the essential goodness of creation and to foster hope for the mind's ascent to the ordered serenity of the heavens, the *Gorgias*, with its pessimistic sense of a philosophical life desperately wagered (6) on hopes for improved conditions here on earth, is suggestive of much darker undercurrents within Boethius's dialogue. It seems worth reconsidering the case of the *Gorgias*, and in what follows I hope to shed some light on Boethius's understanding of that great dialogue. Did he merely copy from it, or did he form an original interpretation? If the latter, then is it necessary to suppose that he had a copy of the *Gorgias* to hand when he wrote the *Consolatio*, or did he work from memory? And did he work exclusively from Plato, or did he consult a later intermediary?" (pp. 13-14)
- (1) Cf. John Magee: "Boethius", in: Lloyd P. Gerson (Ed.): *The Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, vol. 2, Cambridge 2010, 798–810. I would like to thank my hosts in Freiburg, especially Dr. Thomas Jürgasch, for their hospitality and the invitation to present the paper on which the present essay is based.
- (2) Cf. Friedrich Klingner: *De Boethii consolatione philosophiae*, (= *Philologische Untersuchungen*; 27), Berlin 1921, 38–67; Pierre Courcelle: *La consolation de philosophie dans la tradition littéraire. Antécédents et postérité de Boèce*, Paris 1967, 163–165; Pierre Courcelle: *Late Latin Writers and their Greek Sources*, transl. by Harry E. Wedeck, Cambridge (Massachusetts) 1969, 302–303; Helga Scheible: *Die Gedichte in der Consolatio Philosophiae des Boethius*, (= *Bibliothek der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaften*; 2/n. F. 46), Heidelberg 1972, 101–112; Henry Chadwick: *Boethius: The Consolations of Music, Logic, Theology, and Philosophy*, Oxford 1981, 233–235; Béatrice Bakhouché: "Boèce et le Timée", in: Alain Galonnier (Ed.): *Boèce ou la chaîne des savoirs: Actes du colloque international de la Fondation Singer-Polignac, Paris, 8–12 juin 1999*, (= *Philosophes médiévaux*; 44), Louvain/Paris 2003, 5–22; Joachim Gruber: *Kommentar zu Boethius, 'De consolatione philosophiae'*, (= *Texte und Kommentare*; 9), Berlin/New York 2006, 275–288.
- (3) Cf. Cons. I,4,5. All citations of the *Consolatio* are from Boethius: *De consolatione philosophiae. Opuscula theologica*, ed. C. Moreschini, (= *Bibliotheca Teubneriana*), München/Leipzig 2005. Internal divisions indicate prose passages unless marked by the letter "m" (e.g. III,9,3; III,m9,3). Plato's *Gorgias* is cited according to the traditional Stephanus numbers.
- (4) Cf. (e.g.) Pierre Courcelle: *La consolation de philosophie dans la tradition littéraire*, 60–62.
- (5) Friedrich Klingner: *De Boethii consolatione philosophiae*, 84–88.

47. Magee, John, and Marenbon, John. 2009. "Boethius's Works." In *The Cambridge Companion to Boethius*, edited by Marenbon, John, 303-310. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
48. Mair, John. 1981. "The Text of the *Opuscula Sacra*." In *Boethius: His Life, Thought and Influence*, edited by Gibson, Margaret, 206-213. Oxford: Blackwell.
 "Today, the Tractates are again generally accepted as Boethian. The turning point was the publication in 1877 of a fragment of Cassiodorus discovered by Alfred Holder in a Reichenau manuscript and edited by Hermann Usener. In this fragment, called the *Anecdoton Holderi*, (2) Cassiodorus remarks that Boethius wrote a book on the Holy Trinity, some chapters on dogma, and a book against Nestorius. (3) This list seemed to accord well with the topics covered by the works themselves. Specifically, the 'book on the Holy Trinity' corresponded with Tractate I, and that 'against Nestorius' with Tractate V. The 'chapters on dogma' were taken as references to Tractates II and III, which deal respectively with the questions whether Father, Son and Holy Spirit may be predicated of God as substances; and how substances can be good simply by existing. The genuineness of Tractate IV, 'On the Catholic faith', remained in doubt. E. K. Rand wrote a doctoral thesis to disprove its genuineness, (4) but some years later 'deemed it expedient to recant' and concluded that the work was after all by Boethius. (5) It now seems clear that it is to this tractate that the term 'chapters on dogma' most aptly applies; and it may therefore be reasonable to treat Tractates I, II and III as together constituting the 'book on the Holy Trinity'. (6)
 At all events, even if perhaps not yet irrefragable, (7) the authenticity of the *Opuscula Sacra* seems beyond reasonable doubt, and is assumed in what follows." (pp. 206-207)
 (1) The text of the Tractates, with English translation, is most conveniently available in the Loeb Library revised edition by H. F. Stewart, E. K. Rand, and S. J. Tester (Cambridge, Mass./London, 1973), pp. 1-129. The Latin text in this edition is based upon Rand's collations of all the important manuscripts (Introduction, p. VII), and is substantially the same as that printed in the first Loeb Library edition in 1918. See further below, p.211.
 (2) H. Usener, *Anecdoton Holderi, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Roms in ostgothischer Zeit* [Festschrift zur Begrüssung der 32. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner zu Wiesbaden] (Bonn, 1877). The text of the *Anecdoton* is now conveniently available in Cassiodori. . . Opera I, ed. A. J. Fridh and J. W. Halporn (Turnhout, 1973: CCSL XCVI), pp. V-VI.
 (3) *Scriptis [Boethius] librum de sancta trinitate et capita quaedam dogmatica et librum contra Nestorium: op. cit., p.V.*
 (4) E. K. Rand, 'Der dem Boethius zugeschriebene Traktat *de fide catholica*' *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*: Supplement-band XXVI (1901), 401-61.
 (5) *Founders of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, Mass., 1928), pp. 156-7, 315, η. 28; cf. the Loeb edition (note i above), p. 52, note a, and M. Cappuyns' excellent article, 'Boèce', in DHGE [*Dictionnaire d'Histoire et Géographie Eccllesiastique*] I (Paris, 1937), 358-61; 371-2. Tractate IV is further discussed, and its authenticity affirmed, by Henry Chadwick in JTS [*Journal of Theological Studies*] XXXI (1980), 551-6.
 (6) Cappuyns, op. cit., 371.
 (7) For the view that excessive reliance may have been placed upon the *Anecdoton Holderi* see H. F. Stewart, *Boethius* (Edinburgh/London, 1891), pp. 11—14. A. Hildebrand, *Boethius und seine Stellung zum Christentume* (Regensburg, 1885), pp. 148-314, argued from internal evidence for the authenticity of the Tractates.
49. Malcolm, John. 1986. "Some Consolation for Boethius." *The New Scholasticism* no. 60:35-45.
 "I should like to address myself to the contention of several contemporary commentators to the effect that there is a critical inconsistency between Boethius's rejection of realism and his own solution to the "problem of universals." I shall propose an interpretation which will charge the time-honored transmitter with terminological laxity rather than basic conceptual confusion.

In his second commentary on Porphyry's *Isagoge* (1) Boethius takes as his starting point Porphyry's question as to whether genera and species are extramental entities (subsistant) or are only concepts or mental entities. On pp. 161-163 he rejects the first option and concludes (p. 163) that the genus, or any other universal (which would, under Porphyry's classification, be a species, differentia, property or accident), cannot be an entity existing in re. A realist theory of universals requires that one and the same thing exist in many at the same time as a whole, but Boethius adduces considerations which, he believes, show this to be impossible. The genus, for example, if present as a whole at the same time in several species, will lose its unity and fail to be as "one over many." (p. 35)

(1) All references to this work are to *In Isagogen Porphyrii Commenta*, ed. Schlepse and Brandt, CSEL, 48 (Vienna, 1900).

50. Marenbon, John. 1982. "Making Sense of the *De Trinitate*: Boethius and Some of His Medieval Interpreters." *Studia Patristica* no. 17:446-452.
51. ———. 1998. "Boethius: From Antiquity to the Middle Ages." In *Routledge History of Philosophy. Volume III: Medieval Philosophy*, edited by Marenbon, John, 11-28. New York: Routledge.

"Boethius is a difficult figure to place in the history of philosophy.

Considered just in himself, he clearly belongs to the world of late antiquity. Born in 480, at a time when Italy was ruled by the Ostrogoths under their king, Theoderic, Boethius was adopted into one of the most distinguished patrician families of Rome and benefited from an education which made him at home not only in classical Latin culture but also in Greek literature and philosophy. Although most historians doubt that Boethius actually went to Alexandria or Athens to study, he certainly knew the work of Greek neoplatonists of the immediate past: Proclus, Porphyry and probably Ammonius. Although a Christian, writing in Latin, he therefore falls into a tradition stretching back directly to Plotinus and, ultimately, to Aristotle and Plato. Yet considered as a late antique philosopher, his importance is limited. Most of Boethius' ideas and arguments derive from his Greek sources; his own contribution lay more in choosing, arranging and presenting views than in original thinking. By contrast, from the perspective of medieval philosophy, Boethius looms large. Only Aristotle himself, and perhaps Augustine, were more important and wide-ranging in their influence. Besides providing scholars in the Middle Ages with two of their most widely-read textbooks on arithmetic and music,⁽¹⁾ through his translations, commentaries and monographs Boethius provided the basis for medieval logic. His short theological treatises helped to shape the way in which logical and philosophical techniques were used in discussing Christian doctrine. His *Consolation of Philosophy*, read and studied from the eighth century through to the Renaissance, and translated into almost every medieval vernacular, was a major source for ancient philosophy in the early Middle Ages and its treatment of goodness, free will and eternity continued to influence thirteenth- and fourteenth-century thinkers. In short, it would be hard to understand the development of philosophy in the medieval Latin West without looking carefully at Boethius' work — and it is for this reason that, although he falls outside its chronological limits, a chapter on his work (with glances forward at its medieval influence) begins the present volume." (pp. 11-12)

(1) For these works (and possible works on geometry and astronomy), which fall outside the scope of this discussion, see Chadwick [1.12] 69–107 and the articles in Gibson [1.16] by Caldwell, Pingree and White.

References

1.12 Chadwick, H. *Boethius: the Consolations of Music, Logic, Theology and Philosophy*, Oxford, 1981.

1.16 Gibson, M. (ed.) *Boethius: His Life, Thought and Influence*, Oxford, 1981.

52. ———. 2003. *Boethius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Contents: Abbreviations of Boethius's Works XV; 1 Introduction 3; 2 Life, Intellectual Milieu, and Works 7; 3 Boethius's Project: The Logical Translations and

Commentaries 17; 4 The Logical Textbooks and Topical Reasoning: Types of Argument 43; 5 The *Opuscula Sacra*: Metaphysics, Theology, and Logical Method 66; 6 The *Consolation*: The Argument of Books I-V.2 96; 7 The *Consolation*, V.3-6: Divine Prescience, Contingency, Eternity 125; 8 Interpreting the *Consolation* 146; 9 Boethius's Influence in the Middle Ages 164; Notes 183; Bibliography 219; Index Locorum 237; General Index 243-252.

"I shall argue that, in his theological treatises (*Opuscula sacra*) and in the *Consolation*, Boethius is an original and important thinker — one who fully deserves to have been treated by medieval readers as a great author. His individual arguments are often far more careful, sophisticated, and, in their own terms, successful than has usually been recognized, although it is certainly true that Boethius often bases himself on ideas taken from others. But Boethius's especial distinction as a thinker lies in how he uses, combines, and comments on philosophical arguments. The *Opuscula* are innovative in their very approach to theology. The *Consolation* is, as its complex literary structure should immediately suggest, a work not just of but about philosophy: a subtle text which can be understood on various levels. The remaining writings — treatises on music and arithmetic, logical translations, commentaries — that make up Boethius's oeuvre are not usually innovative, but they are at the least very competent examples of genres where originality was not sought. The logical monographs offer an insight into two branches of logic, hypothetical syllogistic and the theory of topical inferences, about which there are no other extensive treatises from late antiquity. The logical commentaries are remarkable for the way they continue the project of the first great Neoplatonic logician, Porphyry, rather than follow the more usual approach of Boethius's contemporaries." (pp. 4-5)

53. ———. 2004. "Boethius and the Problem of Paganism." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* no. 78:329-348.
Abstract: "The "problem of paganism" is my name for the set of questions raised for medieval thinkers and writers, and discussed by some of them (Abelard, Dante, and Langland are eminent examples), by the fact that many people--especially philosophers--from antiquity were, they believed, monotheists, wise and virtuous and yet pagans. This paper argues that Boethius, though a Christian, was himself too much part of the world of classical antiquity to pose the problem of paganism, but that his *Consolation of Philosophy* was an essential element in the way medieval writers saw and resolved this problem. In particular, because it was a text by an author known to be Christian which discusses philosophy without any explicitly Christian references, it opened up the way to treating texts by ancient pagan philosophers as containing hidden Christian doctrine."
54. ———, ed. 2009. *The Cambridge Companion to Boethius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Contents: List of contributors XI; List of abbreviations of Boethius' works XIV; List of abbreviations XV; John Marenbon: Introduction: Reading Boethius whole 1; Part I. Before the *Consolation* 11;
1. John Moorhead: Boethius' life and the world of late antique philosophy 13; 2. Sten Ebbesen: The Aristotelian commentator 34; 3. Christopher J. Martin: The logical textbooks and their influence 56; 4. Margaret Cameron: Boethius on utterances, understanding and reality 85; 5. David Bradshaw: The *Opuscula sacra*: Boethius and theology 105; 6. Andrew Arlig: The metaphysics of individuals in the *Opuscula sacra* 129; 7. Christophe Erismann: The medieval fortunes of the *Opuscula sacra* 155;
Part II The *Consolation* 179;
8. John Magee: The Good and morality: *Consolatio* 2-4 181; 9. Robert Sharples: Fate, prescience and free will 207; 10. Danuta Shanzer: Interpreting the *Consolation* 228; 11. Lodi Nauta: The *Consolation*: the Latin commentary tradition, 800-1700 255; 12. Winthrop Wetherbee: The *Consolation* and medieval literature 279;
Appendix. John Magee and John Marenbon: *Boethius' works* 303; Bibliography: 311; Index: References to Boethius' works 340; General index 343-356.

55. ———. 2009. "Boethius." In *The History of Western Philosophy of Religion. Volume 2: Medieval Philosophy of Religion*, edited by Oppy, Graham and Trakakis, N. N., 19-32. Stocksfield: Acumen.
56. ———. 2013. "Divine Prescience and Contingency in Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy*." *Rivista di Storia Della Filosofia* no. 1:9-21.
Abstract: "This article discusses Boethius's argument in *Consolation* V.3-6 that divine omniscience of even the future is compatible with some things happening contingently. Section 1 argues that, according to Boethius, the kernel of the problem is not that God's beliefs about the future are true, but that they must be incapable of turning out false – something which seems incompatible with the unfixeness of contingent events. Section 2 looks at the Modes of Cognition Principle (everything that is cognized is cognized, not according to its own power, but rather according to the capacity of those who are cognizing), one of the building blocks of Boethius's solution, and contends that it is far bolder than anything Boethius may have found in his sources, putting forward as it does a limited relativism about knowledge. Section 3 argues that the other important building block, the view that all things, past, present and future, are present to God, should be understood epistemically (he knows them as if they were in his present) rather than metaphysically (God's present is co-extensive with worldly past, present and future)."
57. ———. 2014. "Boethius's Unparadigmatic Originality and its Implications for Medieval Philosophy." In *Boethius as a Paradigm of Late Ancient Thought*, edited by Böhm, Thomas, Jürgasch, Thomas and Kirchner, Andreas, 231-244. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
"The title of this article needs an apology and an explanation. Not only is it unwieldy.
It also presents itself as a discordant rejection of the line of thinking about Boethius on which this volume, and the conference which gave rise to it, are based. But 'paradigm' is, in my view, a strange word to use in connection with Boethius. Rather than acting as a paradigm, he is a writer who seems to resist being fitted into any of the apparently appropriate existing paradigms. This exceptionality emerges even when trying to answer some of the simplest questions about him. Was he a Church Father (like, for instance, Jerome or Gregory of Nyssa) or an ancient philosopher (like his near contemporary Ammonius)? The answer is obviously neither — and both. Does he belong to the Middle Ages — his birth coincided with the deposition of the last Western Roman Emperor — or to antiquity, with which his cultural ties were so much closer than those of Augustine, a century earlier? Again, it would be wrong to choose either alternative, and the same would be true even if it were asked, simply, whether he fits best into Greek or into Latin culture." (p. 231)
58. ———. 2015. "Boethius." In *Pagans and Philosophers: The Problem of Paganism from Augustine to Leibniz*, edited by Marenbon, John, 42-53.
59. ———. 2017. "Boethius, Abelard and Anselm." In *The Cambridge History of Moral Philosophy*, edited by Golob, Sacha and Timmermann, Jens, 125-137. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
60. ———. 2021. "The Whole Boethius. What are the Links between the *Consolation* and Boethius's Other Works?" *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-Scolastica* no. 113:9-18.
Abstract: "This article aims to indicate the unity of Boethius's thought, which is often overlooked. It focuses on how the contingency of some future events can be compatible with God's foreknowledge of everything. It argues that the complex and elusive discussion of this issue in the last four prose sections of the *Consolation of Philosophy* is closely linked to discussions in two of Boethius's earlier logical commentaries, the second commentary on Aristotle's *On Interpretation* and the second commentary on Porphyry's *Isagoge*. A connected reading of the three texts shows that the notion of divine prescience in the *Consolation* should not be understood, as they are by most historians, in metaphysical terms, but rather in logical and epistemological ones: it is only relative to God's eternal power of

cognition that future events, which in themselves remain contingent, are known as if they were necessary."

61. Marshall, David J. 2002. "The Argument of *De hebdomadibus*." In *Die Normativität des Wirklichen*, edited by Buchheim, Thomas, Schönberger, Rolf and Schweidler, Walter, 35-73. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
62. Marshall, Mary Hatch. 1950. "Boethius' Definition of Persona and Mediaeval Understanding of the Roman Theater." *Speculum* no. 25:471-482.
 "In this paper, I wish to draw attention to a rather explicit source of information on ancient representation of formal comedy and tragedy, widely known in the Middle Ages, which has hitherto been ignored in histories of mediaeval drama — Boethius' definition of *persona* in his fifth theological tract, *De Duabus Naturis et Una Persona Jesu Christi, contra Eutychem et Nestorium*, c.3. Cloetta mentioned the passage, but only to show that Boethius himself knew the old dramas, since he alluded familiarly to rôles in plays by Euripides and Seneca, Plautus and Terence. (10) This tract, longest and most interesting of Boethius' *Opuscula Sacra*, was of fundamental importance to post-Augustinian conceptions of the Trinity; and the definition of *persona*, widely accepted but often contested or modified, was a crux of the Trinitarian controversy of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. (11) One conservative monk of the eleventh century, Otloh of St Emmeram, in the preface of his *Dialogus de Tribus Quaestionibus* objected vehemently to dialecticians who put more credence in Boethius than in Holy Scriptures for some things, and who reproved him if he used *persona* in any but the Boethian theological sense. (12) Although criticized by conservatives, Boethius' theological authority was second only to Augustine's in the early scholastic period. Because Boethius' definition of the important theological concept of 'person' refers to the ancient theatrical masks called *personae* and their uses, many men of learning with theological interests incidentally derived from it a reasonable idea of the representation of Roman plays by masked actors using voice and gesture. In the evidence to be presented here from Boethius and his mediaeval commentators and interpreters, it is clear that some understanding of the Roman theater was a great deal more common than we have thought, particularly in the twelfth century in France." (p. 472)
 (10) W. Cloetta, *Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* (2 vols. in one, Halle, 1890-1892), I: *Komodie und Tragodie im Mittelalter*, 16-17.
 (11) On the concept of *persona* in Boethius and in the Middle Ages, see A. Vacant and E. Mangenot, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, VII (Paris, 1922), cols. 369-437, s.v. *Hypostase* (A. Michel); M. Buchberger, *Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche*, VIII (Freiburg i/B., 1936), cols. 97-98, s.v. *Person* (A. Stohr); M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode*, (2 vols., Freiburg i/B., 1909-1911), I, 173-175; K. Bruder, *Die philosophischen Elemente in den Opuscula Sacra des Boethius* (Leipzig, 1928), pp. 64, 67-72; J. de Ghellinck, 'L'Histoire de "persona" et d' "hypostasis" dans un écrit anonyme porretain du xiie siècle,' in *Revue néoscholastique de philosophie*, xxxvi (1934), Hommage à M. deWulf, pp.111-127; M. Bergeron, 'La Structure du concept latin de personne . . . :Commentaire historique de la Pars, q. 29, a.4,' in *Etudes d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale du XIIIe siècle* (Ottawa, 1932), pp. 121-161. The major recent semantic study is by H. Rheinfelder, *Das Wort "Persona" ; Geschichte seiner Bedeutungen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des französischen und italienischen Mittelalters* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, LXXVII, Halle, 1928). I owe this reference to the kindness of Professor Robert J. Menner. See also the historical discussion by Gordon W. Allport, *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation* (New York, 1937), pp. 25-36.
 (12) Migne, *PL*, CXLVI, col. 60. B. Smalley, *The History of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1941), p. 30.
63. Martindale, John Robet. 1980. "Boethius." In *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire II (A.D. 395–527)*, 233-237. Cambridge: Cambridge University

- Press.
64. Mastrangelo, Marc. 2017. "The Early Christian Response to Platonist Poetics. Boethius, Prudentius, and the Poeta Theologus." In *The Poetics of Late Latin Literature*, edited by Elsner, Jaś and Lobato, Jesús Hernández, 391-423. New York: Oxford University Press.
65. Matthews, John. 1981. "Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius." In *Boethius: His Life, Thought and Influence*, edited by Gibson, Margaret, 15-43. Oxford: Blackwell. "Today, the Tractates are again generally accepted as Boethian. The turning point was the publication in 1877 of a fragment of Cassiodorus discovered by Alfred Holder in a Reichenau manuscript and edited by Hermann Usener. In this fragment, called the *Anecdoton Holderi*, (2) Cassiodorus remarks that Boethius wrote a book on the Holy Trinity, some chapters on dogma, and a book against Nestorius. (3) This list seemed to accord well with the topics covered by the works themselves. Specifically, the 'book on the Holy Trinity' corresponded with Tractate I, and that 'against Nestorius' with Tractate V. The 'chapters on dogma' were taken as references to Tractates II and III, which deal respectively with the questions whether Father, Son and Holy Spirit may be predicated of God as substances; and how substances can be good simply by existing. The genuineness of Tractate IV, 'On the Catholic faith', remained in doubt. E. K. Rand wrote a doctoral thesis to disprove its genuineness, (4) but some years later 'deemed it expedient to recant' and concluded that the work was after all by Boethius. (5) It now seems clear that it is to this tractate that the term 'chapters on dogma' most aptly applies; and it may therefore be reasonable to treat Tractates I, II and III as together constituting the 'book on the Holy Trinity'. (6) At all events, even if perhaps not yet irrefragable, (7) the authenticity of the *Opuscula Sacra* seems beyond reasonable doubt, and is assumed in what follows." (pp. 206-207)
- (1) The text of the Tractates, with English translation, is most conveniently available in the Loeb Library revised edition by H. F. Stewart, E. K. Rand, and S. J. Tester (Cambridge, Mass./London, 1973), pp. 1-129. The Latin text in this edition is based upon Rand's collations of all the important manuscripts (Introduction, p. VII), and is substantially the same as that printed in the first Loeb Library edition in 1918. See further below, p.211.
- (2) H. Usener, *Anecdoton Holderi, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Roms in ostgothischer Zeit* [Festschrift zur Begrüssung der 32. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner zu Wiesbaden] (Bonn, 1877). The text of the Anecdoton is now conveniently available in Cassiodori. . . Opera I, ed. A. J. Fridh and J. W. Halporn (Turnhout, 1973: CCSL XCVI), pp. V-VI.
- (3) Scripsit [Boethius] librum de sancta trinitate et capita quaedam dogmatica et librum contra Nestorium: op. cit., p.V.
- (4) E. K. Rand, 'Der dem Boethius zugeschriebene Traktat *de fide catholica*' *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*: Supplement-band XXVI (1901), 401-61.
- (5) *Founders of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, Mass., 1928), pp. 156-7, 315, η. 28; cf. the Loeb edition (note i above), p. 52, note a, and M. Cappuyns' excellent article, 'Boèce', in DHGE [*Dictionnaire d'Histoire et Géographie Ecclesiastique*] I (Paris, 1937), 358-61; 371-2. Tractate IV is further discussed, and its authenticity affirmed, by Henry Chadwick in JTS [*Journal of Theological Studies*] XXXI (1980), 551-6.
- (6) Cappuyns, op. cit., 371.
- (7) For the view that excessive reliance may have been placed upon the *Anecdoton Holderi* see H. F. Stewart, *Boethius* (Edinburgh/London, 1891), pp. 11—14. A. Hildebrand, *Boethius und seine Stellung zum Christentume* (Regensburg, 1885), pp. 148-314, argued from internal evidence for the authenticity of the Tractates.
66. McNerny, Ralph. 1990. *Boethius and Aquinas*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press. Contents: Preface IX-XIV; Introduction: Two Italian Scholars 1; Part One. The Art of the Commentary. 1. Commenting on Aristotle 33; 2. *Altissimum negotium*:

Universals 61; Parto Two: *De trinitate*. 3. Thomas Comments on Boethius 97; 4. *Tres speculativae partes* 121; 5. Metaphysics and Existence 148; Part Three. *De hebdomadibus*. 6. Survey of Interpretations 161; 7. The Exposition of St. Thomas 199; 8. More on the Good 232; Epilogue: *Sine Thoma Boethius Mutus Esset* 249; Appendix: Chronologies of Boethius and St. Thomas 255; Bibliography 259; Index 265-268.

"This volume has been a long time emerging from well over a decade of research aimed at writing "a book about Boethius," a project I had the temerity to announce in an article devoted to Boethius and Saint Thomas which appeared in the 1974 commemorative volume of *Rivista di filosofia Neo-Scolastica*. Originally I thought of presenting the thought of Boethius in all its scope to English readers, by which I mean of course readers of English. J. K. Sikes's book on Abelard and Gilson's on Augustine and Scotus suggested models of what I might do. A chapter on Boethius in Volume 2 of the *History of Western Philosophy* I undertook with my late colleague A. Robert Caponigri was the first fruits of my labors. The work I wrote on Thomas for the Twayne series on world authors dwelt on the role Boethius had played in the formation of Thomas's thought. And various papers, notably several read at the spring gatherings of medievalists in Kalamazoo at Western Michigan University, formed if only in my own mind pieces of the larger thing.

By 1974, I had made enough progress to permit me to refer in a footnote to a "work in progress, devoted to the thought of Boethius in its full scope." However, that same year appeared the imposing two volumes of Luca Obertello's *Severino Boezio*. Boethian studies would never be the same again. Here was a massive survey of the Boethian corpus along with the secondary literature on it accompanied by a full volume of bibliography. I will not say that my thunder had been stolen, since that would suggest that I could, then or now, achieve what Obertello had. But I did feel a bit deflated. My hopes began to revive when I considered that there are many who do not read Italian. And, after all, the book I planned was not at all like the one Obertello had written. And then in 1981 came the publication of Henry Chadwick's masterful book on Boethius.

Chadwick's book did, so much better than I ever could, what I had dreamt of doing that it forced a rethinking of my whole project. I leafed through the chapters I had written on Boethius's Quadrivial Pursuits and acknowledged that the world would not be a poorer place if they were never published. But it was not until 1985, after I resigned as Director of the Medieval Institute, that I saw my way clear. The book I would write would be a focused monograph on the relation between Boethius and Thomas Aquinas." (pp. XII-XIII).

67. McKinlay, Arthur Patch. 1907. "Stylistic tests and the chronology of the works of Boethius." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* no. 18:123-156.
 "Whoever undertakes to treat of Boethius finds himself in illustrious company. Potentates, churchmen, scholastics, and philosophers have busied themselves with this "last of the Romans."
 It would appear that but little remains to be said on such a well worn subject. Much less does it seem fitting in a beginner to essay that little. Yet, as the recent researches of Usener and Brandt and the acute suggestions of Rand have marked an epoch in *Boethiana*, one may hope to gain still further insight into the character and mode of thought of the author of the *Consolatio*. With this purpose in view, by the help of the so-called stylistic method, I intend to examine the writings of Boethius, in case it may be possible more accurately to place works the dates of which are not yet certain. To be explicit, I hope to show that the *De Arithmetica* and the *De Musica* should be placed neither first nor together; more definitely to place certain other works; to throw light on the authenticity of the *De Geometria* and the *De Fide Catholica*, and incidentally to test the value of the so-called stylistic method in determining the relative chronology of an author's writings.
 For a definition of the meaning of stylistic method, and an illustration of its application, I may refer to the well-known work of Lutoslawski, entitled *The origin*

and growth of Plato's logic with an account of Plato's style and of the chronology of his writings, 1897." (p. 123)

(...)

"In the beginning of my paper I implied that any such study as I have undertaken, to be of value, must serve to give us a deeper insight into the character of our author. What have the present results contributed to this end? One thing at least. If the *De Arithmetica* and *De Musica* were not written first of Boethius's works nor together, we must place a new estimate on our author's temperament and habits." (pp. 154-155)

(...)

"For all must concede that before he had carried out his plan of translating and perhaps of commenting on all the works of Aristotle and Plato, he had begun to work on Cicero. In the same way, he may have undertaken the *De Musica* as a parergon." (p. 156)

68. McMahon, Robert. 1995. "The structural articulation of Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy*." *Medievalia et Humanistica* no. 21:55-72.
69. Meliadó, Mario. 2013. "Axiomatic Wisdom: Boethius' "De hebdomadibus" and the "Liber de causis" in Late-Medieval Albertism." *Bulletin de philosophie médiévale* no. 55:71-131.
70. Merlan, Philip. 1968. "Ammonius Hermiae, Zacharias Scholasticus and Boethius." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* no. 92:193-203.
71. Mezel, Balasz M. 2009. "Boethius and the Unity of Human Persons." In *Europäische Menschenbilder*, edited by Gerl-Falkovitz, Hanna-Barbara, Gottlober, Susan, Kaufmann, René and Sepp, Hans Rainer, 277-286. Dresden: Thelem.