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

Boethius' Metaphysics. Studies in English: First Part: A - Gib

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 (Current page)

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

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. "Boethius." 2004. *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* no. 78:175-348.
Contents: Siobhan Nash-Marshall: Editor's Introduction 175; Claudio Micaelli: Boethian Reflections on God: Between Logic and Metaphysics 181; Joseph W.

Koterski: Boethius and the Theological Origins of the Concept of Person 203; Siobhan Nash-Marshall: God, Simplicity, and the *Consolatio Philosophiae* 225; Jonathan Evans: Boethius on Modality and Future Contingents 247; M. V. Dougherty: The Problem of *Humana Natura* in the *Consolatio Philosophiae* of Boethius 273; John R. Fortin: The Nature of Consolation in the *Consolation of Philosophy* 293; Paul J. Lachance: Boethius on Human Freedom 309; John Marenbon: Boethius and the Problem of Paganism 329-348.

2. Acerbi, Ariberto. 2012. "Aquinas's Commentary on Boethius's *De Trinitate*." *The Review of Metaphysics* no. 66:317-338.

3. Adams, Marilyn McCord. 2012. "Evil as Nothing: Contrasting Construals in Boethius and Anselm." *The Modern Schoolman*:131-145.
    Abstract: "Anselm inherited a Platonizing approach to philosophy from Augustine and Boethius. But he characteristically reworked what he found in their texts by questioning and disputing it into something more rigorous. In this paper, I compare and contrast Anselm's treatment of the trope 'evil is nothing, not a being' with Boethius's use of it in *The Consolation of Philosophy*. In the first section, I expose a fallacious argument form common to them both: paradigm Fness is identical with paradigm Gness; X participates in paradigm Fness and so is F; therefore, X participates in paradigm Gness and so is G. In the second section, I contrast Philosophy's "strong medicine"-'evil is nothing,' evil-doings are nothing,' evil humans do not exist'-with Anselm's development of the point that injustice is a privation and so parasitic on the beings that are deprived. By contrast with Boethius, Anselm emphasizes that the will-instrument, will-power, the will's action and turnings are something and so from God. Likewise, Anselm insists pace Boethius that Adam's fallen race is still the human race. In the final section, I turn to Anselm's distinction between injustice (iniustitia) and disadvantage (incommoda), his concession that some disadvantages are something, and his explanation of happiness in terms of advantage or bona sibi. For Anselm, happiness and justice break apart, so that it is possible in this world for the just to lack advantage. Moreover, in the world to come, the damned will suffer radical deprivation not only of the justice, which they deserted, but of advantages. I contrast this with Boethius's insistence (based on the argument in section I) that virtue suffices for happiness and vice for unhappiness, and that there is no such thing as bad fortune. I conclude by pondering why Anselm treated disadvantage as a something rather than as a misfit between somethings."

4. Albrecht, Michael von. 1997. *A History of Roman Literature: From Livius Andronicus to Boethius*. Leiden: Brill.
    With special regard to his influence on world literature; revised by Gareth Schmeling and by the author.
    Trans!ated with the Assistance of Frances and Kevin Newman.
    Volume II: Fiffth Chapter: *Literature of the Middle and Late Empire*, pp. 1708-1738: *Boethius*.

5. Arlig, Andrew W. 2005. *A Study in Early Medieval Mereology: Boethius, Abelard, and Pseudo-Joscelin*, Ohio State University.
    Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (available on line).
    Chapter 3: *Boethius and the Early Mereological Tradition*, pp. 62-140.
    "In what follows I will examine the mereological tradition founded by Aristotle and presented to the early medieval West by Boethius. Given the paucity of what was available from Aristotle's extensive opera, it is no surprise that some important concepts are not carried over to the early medieval period, or if they do appear, they often do so in a distorted form. Sometimes this omission and distortion is attributable to Boethius. Boethius' logical works are almost without exception introductory treatises. As one would expect from introductory textbooks, Boethius' treatment of mereology often glides over complexities, which a more advanced work would stop to address. Hence, Boethius' remarks about parts and wholes are often general and devoid of nuance.

It is by no means clear that Boethius actually has a theory of parts and wholes. He might, as some of his contemporary interpreters have urged, be merely parroting remarks he finds in elementary, (probably) neoplatonic textbooks without worrying whether these remarks are consistent. (49) I will not assume that this is the case from the start. Rather, I will attempt as best as I can to reconstruct Boethius' metaphysics of mereology. This reconstruction will require that I piece together stray remarks, think through the specific examples that he gives, and generally extrapolate from an admittedly sparse collection of rules, examples and hints. My method carries the risk of yielding not Boethius' theory of parts and wholes, but rather a Boethian theory. But this is the same risk that Abelard, Pseudo-Joscelin, and all the thinkers of the early medieval period took when attempting to piece Boethius' remarks into a coherent metaphysics of mereology." (pp. 64-65).

(49) Some have argued that Boethius' *De divisione* is derived from Porphyry's lost commentary on the *Sophist*. Andrew Smith reprints the entire *De Div*. as 169F in his edition of Porphyry's fragments. On his reasons for inclusion consult his introduction (Frag. x-xii). Others suggest that Boethius had two sources, one being Porphyry's commentary and the second being a treatise on division by Andronicus of Rhodes.

Magee concludes that Porphyry's prolegomena to his *Sophist* commentary is the direct source of Boethius' *De divisione*. However, he does not discount the possibility that Andronicus is an indirect source, nor does he discount the possibility that some of the material in *De divisione* is original to Boethius (1998, lv-lvii).

One of the reasons that scholars suspect that Boethius borrows from more than one source is that there are problems with Boethius' presentation of the modes of division (Zachhuber 2000, 88-89).

References:

Zachhuber, J. 2000. *Human nature in Gregory of Nyssa: Philosophical background and theological significance.* Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, no. 46. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

6.   ———. 2009. "The Metaphysics of Individuals in the *Opuscula sacra*." In *The Cambridge Companion to Boethius*, edited by Marenbon, John, 129-154. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

"Three of the five treatises that comprise the *Opuscula sacra* [= OS] contain interesting philosophical material. (1) All three treatises attempt to make aspects of God intelligible using Greek philosophical concepts.

The treatise *Quomodo substantiae* (OS III) discusses how something can be essentially predicated of both God and His creatures. *On the Trinity* (OS I) and *Against Eutyches and Nestorius* (OS V) are concerned with the individuality and unity of, respectively, God and Christ. Along the way to formulating his solution to his chosen puzzles, Boethius presents some of the elements of a general theory of individuals.

In this chapter we will concentrate on the general theory of individuals that can be reconstructed from Boethius' Opuscula. (2) The theological treatises are not the only places that he discusses individuals, and at times we will make use of Boethius' commentaries on Aristotle and Porphyry to flesh out some of his remarks. (3) Nonetheless, we will focus on the account of individuals that can be reconstructed from the theological treatises for two reasons. First, this account has exerted a tremendous influence on subsequent generations. Second, Boethius admits that his main role in the logical commentaries is to present a sympathetic elucidation of Aristotle's or Porphyry's views. (4) The doctrines in the *Opuscula* presumably are Boethius' own.

After we have examined and reconstructed Boethius' general treatment of individuals, we will finish this chapter by asking whether this general account of individuals can illuminate the nature of the Incarnation and the Trinity." (p. 129)

(...)

"Conclusion.

In his *Opuscula sacra*, Boethius presents some of the elements of a metaphysical theory of individuals. He does not flesh out his theory.

But what he does tell us is tantalizing. It is little wonder that Boethius' brief and incomplete treatments of individuals captured the imagination of numerous medieval philosophers. (29) The elements of the theory of individuals that he presents in the *Opuscula* are marshaled in order to make the Incarnation and Trinity intelligible in so far as these Divine truths can be made intelligible to the unaided human intellect. Our assessment has been that Boethius comes up short. But then again, Boethius admits that his task is doomed to fail.

These inadequacies, however, should not detract from the importance of Boethius' *Opuscula*. The student of medieval metaphysics should begin with Boethius. Boethius defines the problems that will inspire generations of philosophers, and he gestures toward many of the solutions that subsequent philosophers will offer." (p. 151)

(1) All references are to the Latin edition by Claudio Moreschini (Boethius 2000), in the format of number of the opusculum, followed by its section and the line of the edition. As an aid to students who do not have much Latin, citations of passages from the *Opuscula* will include a reference to the corresponding English passage in the Loeb edition (Boethius 1973).

The Loeb edition is still the only volume that contains a complete English translation of the *Opuscula*. For a good, recent English translation of *Quomodo substantiae* see MacDonald 1991b. A good, recent translation of *On the Trinity* is Kenyon 2004. There is a new French translation of *Quomodo substantiae* with commentary in Galonnier 2007. Galonnier's translations of *On the Trinity* and *Against Eutyches* are to appear in a future volume [*Opuscola sacra II*, Louvain: Peeters, 2013].

(2) For this reason, we will not be able to touch upon many of the interesting and puzzling aspects of the *Quomodo substantiae*. The third theological treatise is an extremely difficult one, and there is significant disagreement over its structure and meaning. For introductions to *Quomodo substantiae* see Marenbon 2003a, 87–94 and Chadwick 1981, 203–11.

For detailed studies see De Rijk 1988; MacDonald 1988; and McInerny 1990, 161–98. There are book-length studies by Schrimpf (1966)) and Siobhan Nash-Marshall (2000), and a detailed commentary by Galonnier (2007). Pierre Hadot's interpretation of Boethius has been extremely influential. See, in particular, Hadot 1963 and 1970. Recently there has been a lot of work on Boethius' metaphysical *Opuscula* in Italian. For example, see Maioli 1978; Micaelli 1988 and 1995.

(3) For a survey of Boethius' remarks on individuals and individuation that carefully considers not only the *Opuscula sacra*, but also the logical commentaries, see Gracia 1984, Chapter 2, 65–121.

(4) For example, in his famous discussion of universals Boethius announces that he has provided an Aristotelian solution to the problem because he is commenting on an Aristotelian treatise, not because it is the best solution (2IS [Second Commentary on *Isagoge*] 167.17–20; English translation in Spade 1994, 25).

(29) On Boethius' influence in general see the next chapter. [Christophe Erismann, *The medieval fortunes of the* Opuscola sacra, pp. 155-177] For Boethius' influence on medieval ruminations on the metaphysics of individuals, start by consulting Gracia 1984; Spade 1985 I, Chapter 23; and King 2000.

References

7.   ———. 2020. "Boethius." In *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy: Philosophy Between 500 and 1500. Second Edition*, edited by Lagerlund, Henrik, 289-298. Dordrecht: Springer.

8.   Asbell, William J. 1998. "The Philosophical Background of Sufficientia in Boethius's *Consolation*, Book III." *Carmina Philosophiae* no. 7:1-17.
Reprinted in Noel Harold Kaylor Jr., Philip Edward Phillips, (eds.), *New Directions in Boethius Studies*, Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications 2007, pp. 3-16.

9.   Astell, Ann W. 1994. *Job, Boethius, and Epic Truth*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

10.   Bark, William. 1946. "Boethius' Fourth Tractate, the So-Called *De Fide Catholica*." *Harvard Theological Review* no. 39:55-69.
Reprinted in Manfred Fuhrmann und Joachim Gruber (Hrsg.), *Boethius*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1984, pp. 232-246.
"The exact status of the fourth tractate included among the *Opuscula Sacra* of Boethius is still uncertain, though the other theological works are now almost universally accepted as genuine. Boethian scholars of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were generally inclined to reject Tractate IV. (1)" (p. 55)
(...)
"Another possibility, more prosaic, corresponds better with what we know about the treatise. Tr. IV is simple and brief, but it is not incomplete. It is so written, with energy, with conviction, and with sensitiveness, as to be exceedingly impressive. There are, in addition, definite indications of a didactic motive on the part of the author. (46) Because of these considerations, I wonder if it is not more likely that Boethius meant it to be a guide for the layman. We know that the doctrinal questions of Boethius' day, especially those of Oriental origin, were very confusing to ordinary Western Christians, who were interested in them but for obvious reasons could not always distinguish between the orthodox and the heretical. We know also that there were attempts both by the Scythians and by their opponents in Rome to win public support. (47) It has already been shown that Boethius' theology was very close to the Scythian; whether their alliance was openly avowed or not, we do not yet know. Boethius unquestionably understood the Eastern doctrines then being discussed so widely in Rome better than any of his countrymen. Perhaps he and his friends thought it advisable for him to turn from his highly specialized theological works to edify, to protect, and if possible, to win over the Romans. That would accord with the strange weaving together of Trinitarian doctrine and a compact narrative of Christian history. In that fabric nothing is clearer than the importance the writer put upon his Trinitarian teaching, which he proclaimed one of the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic faith." (pp. 68-69)
(1) Viktor Schurr lists some of those for and against in *Die Trinitiitslehre des Boethius im Lichte der "skythischen Kontroversen"* (Paderborn, 1935), 8, n. 40. He mistakenly cites August Hildebrand as supporting the authenticity of the document.
(46) Lines 94-96 and 247-253. Note Schurr's comment, 8-9, n. 46.
(47) For that reason an unknown Scythian compiled the *Collectio Palatina* and in it appealed to the definitions of Nestorianism and Eutychianism patriot, John, bishop of Tomi, who was presumably John Maxentius. Dionysius Exiguus made his translations of theological documents for the same reason. Pope Hormisdas vigorously defended his rather hostile treatment of the Scythians and Maxentius replied. A senator, Faustus by name, asked the presbyter Trifolius to explain the Scythian formula and Trifolius gave an unfriendly interpretation of the Theopaschite position. Both sides energetically tried to win the support of senate and people.

11.   Barrett, Helen M. 1940. *Boethius: Some Aspects of his Times and Work*. New York: Russell & Russell.
Reprint: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
Contents: Preface VII; Chapter I. Introductory 1; II. Western Europe in the Fifth Century a.d. 9; III. Theodoric the Ostrogoth 18; IV. Boethius the Scholar 33; V. Boethius and Theodoric 44; VI. The Fall of Boethius 57; VII. The *Consolation of Philosophy* 75; VIII. The Philosophical Background of the *Consolation* 102; IX. Eternal Life 123; X. The Theological Writings 139; XI. Boethius and Christianity 153; XII. Conclusion 164; Bibliography 170; Index 173.
"In writing about Boethius and his work I have had in mind the general reader who is not equipped with any special knowledge of the Classics or of Philosophy; I have therefore given translations of all passages quoted from Greek and Latin authors. Though I am aware that footnotes are a cause of irritation to some readers, I have

employed them for the double purpose of acknowledging my own indebtedness where it is due and of indicating the sources of fuller information.

But in addition to the references I make in the course of the book, I wish to express here my special sense of obligation to two writers, Dr H. F. Stewart and Dr E. K. Rand; to Dr Stewart for his valuable *Boethius, An Essay* (1891), a book now out of print, to Dr Rand for the chapter he devotes to Boethius in his *Founders of the Middle Ages* and for his article " On the Composition of Boethius' Consolatio Philosophiae " in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, vol. xv, and to Dr Stewart and Dr Rand jointly for giving in that volume of the Loeb Classical Library Series for which they are responsible the text and translation of Boethius's theological writings. This is the only English translation so far as I know of these tractates. My indebtedness to these two writers is great in spite of the fact that on a number of points I have reached conclusions that are different from theirs." (Preface, VII-VIII)

12.   Barrett, Sam. 2019. "Creative Practice and the Limits of Knowledge in Reconstructing Lost Songs from Boethius's *On the Consolation of Philosophy*." *The Journal of Musicology* no. 36:261-294.

13.   Beaumont, Jacqueline. 1981. "The Latin Tradition of the *De Consolatione Philosophiae*." In *Boethius: His Life, Thought and Influence*, edited by Gibson, Margaret, 278-305. Oxford: Blackwell.

14.   Belli, Margherita. 2014. "Boethius, disciple of Aristotle and master of theological method. The term *indemonstrabilis*." In *Boethius as a Paradigm of Late Ancient Thought*, edited by Böhm, Thomas, Jürgasch, Thomas and Kirchner, Andreas, 53-82. Berlin: de Gruyter.

15.   Betsey, Andrew. 1991. "Boethius and the *Consolation of Philosophy*, or, how to be a good philosopher." *Ratio* no. 4:1-15.

16.   Blackwood, Stephen. 2015. *The Consolation of Boethius as Poetic Liturgy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

17.   ———. 2017. "Scriptural Allusions and the Wholeness of Wisdom in Boethius' Consolation of Philosophy." In *Papers presented at the Seventeenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 2015. 23. From the fourth century onwards (Latin writers), Nachleben*, edited by Vinzent, Markus, 237-244. Leuven: Peeters.
Studia Patristica Vol. 97.

18.   Böhm, Thomas, Jürgasch, Thomas, and Kirchner, Andreas, eds. 2014. *Boethius as a Paradigm of Late Ancient Thought*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Contents: Vorwort 7; John Magee: Boethius's *Consolatio* and Plato's *Gorgias* 13; Monika Asztalos: Nomen and Vocabulum in Boethius's Theory of Predication 31; Margherita Belli: Boethius, disciple of Aristotle and master of theological method. The term i*ndemonstrabilis* 53; Claudio Moreschini: *Subsistentia* according to Boethius 83; Thomas Jürgasch: *Si divinae iudicium mentis habere possemus*. Zu den formalen Argumentationszielen des Boethius in den Theologischen Traktaten und in der *Consolatio Philosophiae* 101; Jorge Uscatescu Barrón: Boethius' Glückseligkeitsbegriff zwischen spätantikem Neuplatonismus und Christentum vor dem Hintergrund einer an Gott orientierten Ethik 147; Andreas Kirchner: Die *Consolatio Philosophiae* und das philosophische Denken der Gegenwart. Was uns die *Philosophia* heute noch lehren kann 171; Fabio Troncarelli: Boethius from Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages 213; John Marenbon: Boethius's Unparadigmatic Originality and its Implications for Medieval Philosophy 231; Elisabeth Schneider: *Naturae rationalis individua substantia*. Eine theologische oder juristische Definition der Person? 245-269.

19.   Boschung, Peter. 2004. "Boethius and the early medieval quaestio." *Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales* no. 71:233-259.

20.   Bradshaw, David. 2009. "The *Opuscula sacra*: Boethius and Theology." In *The Cambridge Companion to Boethius*, edited by Marenbon, John, 105-128.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

"The *Opuscula sacra* are a collection of brief but dense and highly influential theological treatises. Their unquestioning commitment to Catholic orthodoxy, not to mention their concern over issues of dogma, has seemed to many to be at odds with the philosophical

detachment of Boethius' other works. For a time in the nineteenth century scholars almost unanimously denied their authenticity, but this situation was reversed in 1877 with the publication of a fragment from a hitherto unknown work by Cassiodorus. The fragment states that Boethius "wrote a book concerning the Holy Trinity and certain dogmatic chapters and a book against Nestorius."(1) This description corresponds nicely to the first, fourth, and fifth of the treatises that have come down to us. Although the others are not mentioned, since they are included in all the manuscripts, and all save the fourth are explicitly attributed to Boethius, there seems little reason to doubt them as well. Our concern here will be the relevance of the treatises for revealed theology, as distinct from their relevance for metaphysics (to be discussed in the next chapter [*Andrew Arlig, The metaphysics of individuals in the Opuscula sacra*]). Accordingly we will set aside the third treatise, the so-called *Quomodo substantiae* or *De hebdomadibus*, and focus upon the others." (p. 105)

(...)

"Conclusion.

I have observed that each of the four treatises discussed here is problematic. The problems derive in part from Boethius' desire to treat theological issues using a purely philosophical method, and in part from his exclusive reliance on Augustine as a theological authority. In addition, there is a certain tendency to exaggerate the role of authority itself within theology, as if theology's sole task were to make authoritative pronouncements which it is then the job of philosophy to render rationally coherent. This is not a very fruitful way to think of the relationship between the two disciplines. Despite such problems, however, the treatises remain a remarkable achievement.

Boethius almost single-handedly made philosophy into theology's indispensable handmaiden, in the process raising theology to a new level of sophistication. (54) Anyone who finds his views unsatisfactory would do well to consider the challenge posed at the end of the *Utrum Pater*: "if you are in any point of another opinion, examine carefully what has been said, and if possible, reconcile faith and reason" [37)]." (pp. 124-125)

(54) As B. E. Daley ['Boethius's Theological Tracts and early Byzantine Scholasticism', *Mediaeval Studies* 46, 1984, pp. 158–191] observes, this process occurred almost simultaneously with a similar movement in the Greek-speaking East, so that scholasticism had two more or less independent births.

21.   Casey, Gerard. 1987. "An Explication of the *De Hebdomadibus* of Boethius in the Light of St. Thomas Commentary." *The Thomist* no. 51:419-434.

"Introduction

The writings of Ancius Manlius Severinus Boethius exercised a powerful influence on the nature and development of mediaeval philosophy. The extent of his influence was such that I think it fair to say that anyone seeking more than a superficial grasp of mediaeval philosophy must acquire some first-hand knowledge of his work. The trouble is, however, that while *The Consolation of Philosophy* is well-known and much commented upon, Boethius's other works are relatively neglected. (1) Included in this latter group are the five theological tractates, one of which has this imposing title: *Quomodo Substantiae In Eo Quod Sint Bonae Sint Cum Non Sint Substantialia Bona*. This tractate also has the more manageable title *De Hebdomadibus* and it is as such that I shall refer to it throughout this article. (2) I have chosen to give an explication of the *De Hebdomadibus* for three reasons. First the problem with which it deals (the nature of the relation between goodness and substance) is intrinsically interesting and Boethius's solution to the problem is a model of philosophical analysis. Second, in addition to the fact that the

philosophical status of the nine axioms listed in the tractate is a matter of some scholarly controversy, the answer to the obvious question of how these axioms function in the tractate as a whole is not at all clear. And third, this tractate is philosophically significant to those philosophers who take St. Thomas as their inspiration since it appears that St. Thomas's existence/essence distinction is adumbrated here. I shall begin my explication by giving a brief overview of the main lines of the tractate. Then I shall lay out the arguments contained in the statement and resolution of the dilemma which Boethius constructs, indicating (by means of Roman numerals in parentheses) where I think particular axioms are meant to apply. Finally, I shall display the axioms as perspicuously as possible and comment on them." (pp. 419-420)

(1) I am obliged to Professor Ralph Mclnerny for awakening my interest in Boethius and for his suggestion that the *De Hebdomadibus* would repay careful study.

(2) All references are to the H. F. Stewart and E. K. Rand edition of *The Theological Tractates* and *The Consolation of Philosophy*, in the Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1973)

22.   Caster, Kevin J. 1996. "The Distinction between Being and Essence according to Boethius, Avicenna, and William of Auvergne." *The Modern Schoolman* no. 73:309-332.

"A close analysis of William of Auvergne's metaphysics reveals a distinction between being and essence that more closely approximates the celebrated real distinction of St. Thomas than has generally been recognized. Like St. Thomas, William maintained both a real distinction and a real composition between being and essence in the metaphysical structure of the concrete thing. Since William's position thus represented a marked development in the history of philosophy with respect to this topic, it is obviously valuable to look at William's sources, namely, Boethius and Avicenna. Of course, I am in no sense suggesting that the study of Boethius and Avicenna is valuable only for the insights it might lend to one's perspective of William's position. On the contrary, such study is eminently valuable in itself.

1. Boethius's Contribution to the Doctrine of the Real Distinction

In his *Opuscula Sacra*, Boethius distinguishes between being (*esse*) and that which is (*id quod est*). Because William, who borrowed Boethius's terminology for his own position, was especially influenced by the *De hebdomadibus*, one needs to look at this work in order to reach a more complete understanding of William. While the scholarly opinion on Boethius's distinction is quite divergent, Pierre Hadot's work — in my opinion — represents the best of the scholarly interpretations regarding this topic. Hadot not only seems best to capture Boethius's doctrine, but his perspective of Boethius also highlights what William seemed to find in him.

In "La distinction de l'êtr*e et de l'étant dans le De Hebdomadibus de Boèce*," Hadot summarizes the differences between being (esse) and that which is (id quod est) as they appear in the axioms found in the De hebdomadibus. The characteristics of being (esse) and that which is (id quod est) may be translated as follows. Being: 1) "is not yet," 2) "in no way participates in anything," and 3) "has nothing besides itself added on." That which is: 1) "has received the form of being," 2) "has received being," 3) "participates in that which is being," 4) "is and exists," 5) "is able to participate in something," and 6) "is able to have something besides the fact that it is." (1)

(1) See Pierre Hadot, "La distinction de l'être et de l'étant dans le *De hebdomadibus de Boèce*," *Die Metaphysik im Mittelalter*, Miscellanea Mediavalia, 2 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1963), p. 147. The characteristics of *esse*: 1) "nondum est," 2) "nullo modo aliquo participat," and 3) "nihil aliud praeter se habet admixtum." The characteristics of *id quod est*: 1) "accepit formam essendi," 2) "suscipit esse," 3) "participat eo quod est esse," 4) "est atque consistit," 5) "participare aliquo potest," and 6) "potest habere aliquid praeterquam quod ipsum est."

23.   Chadwick, Henry. 1980. "The authenticity of Boethius's fourth tractate, *De fide catholica*." *Journal of Theological Studies* no. 31:368-377.

24.   ———. 1980. "Theta on philosophy's dress in Boethius." *Medium Ævum* no. 49:175-179.

25.   ———. 1981. *Boethius: The Consolations of Music, Logic, Theology, and Philosophy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Contents: Abbreviations IX; Chronological Table X; Introduction XI; I Romans and Goths 1; II Liberal Arts in the Collapse of Culture 69; III Logic Part of Philosophy or a Tool of all Philosohy? 108; IV Christian Theology and the Philosophers 174; V Evil, Freedom, and Providence 223; Preservation and Transmission 254; Editions 258; Bibliography 261; Notes 285; Index 307-313.

"Born fifteen hundred years ago (within a reasonable approximation), Boethius wrote one of the dazzling masterpieces of European literature. But he has been seldom studied as a whole, and has been seen more through the eyes of those whom he influenced than in relation to the writers whom he had read and who influenced him.

The purpose of this book is to see the man in the setting of his own turbulent and tormented age, not to trace his large posterity in thought and literature. Moreover, the latter concern predominates in the collection of studies on Boethius by various authors, including myself, edited by Dr Margaret Gibson ([*Boethius*] Blackwell, 1981). Much is also said of that in the studies of Boethius by Pierre Courcelle ([*La consolation de philosophie dans la tradition littéraire: antécedents et posterité de Boèce*. Paris,] 1967). Modern reappraisal of Boethius, especially since the work of Klingner ([*De Boethii Consolatione Philosophiae*. Philologische Untersuchungen, 27. Berlin,]1921) and Courcelle ([*Les lettres grecques en occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore*. 2nd edn. Paris,] 1948. [Eng. tr. by H.E. Wedeck, *Late Latin Writers and their Greek sources*. Harvard, 1969.]), has concentrated on his debt to the late Platonists of Athens and especially of Alexandria. The present book continues that line, and adds fresh Neoplatonist evidence for the interpretation of the five tractates on Christian theology. On the other side, I have also found more affinity with Augustine than has been generally recognized, and therefore conclude with a portrait of Boethius simultaneously more deeply Neoplatonic and more deeply Augustinian than has been acknowledged. I have also tried to integrate the various constituent elements in his intellectual achievement. The substructure of the *Consolation of Philosophy* is only clear when one has also seen something of his arithmetic, music, and logic, the last being the grand obsession of his mind. It is then possible to make a fresh attack on the question of his religious allegiance, debated since the tenth century when Bovo of Corvey asked how the evidently Christian author of the theological tractates could write a work of so exclusively non Christian inspiration as the *Consolation*. The examination in the first chapter of the political tangle between the Gothic kingdom of Theoderic the Great and the Byzantine ambitions of Justinian leads me to conclude that it is quite wrong to exclude religion from the causes of his tragic arrest and execution." (*Preface*, p. V)

26.   Chase, Michael. 2014. "Time and Eternity from Plotinus and Boethius to Einstein." *Schole* no. 8:67-110.

Abstract: "This article seeks to show that the views on time and eternity of Plotinus and Boethius are analogous to those implied by the block-time perspective in contemporary philosophy of time, as implied by the mathematical physics of Einstein and Minkowski. Both Einstein and Boethius utilized their theories of time and eternity with the practical goal of providing consolation to persons in distress; this practice of consolatio is compared to Pierre Hadot's studies of the "Look from Above", of the importance of concentrating on the present moment, and his emphasis on ancient philosophy as providing therapy for the soul, instead of mere abstract speculation for its own sake. In the first part of the article, Einstein's views are compared with those of Plotinus, and with the elucidation of Plotinus' views provided in the Arabic *Theology of Aristotle*. The second part of the article studies Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy*, which, contrary to recent interpretations, is indeed a genuine consolation rather

than a parody thereof. The *Consolation* shows how the study of the Neoplatonic philosophical curriculum can lead the student along the path to salvation, by awakening and elaborating his innate ideas. To illustrate this doctrine, a passage from the little-known Pseudo-Boethian treatise *De diis et praesensionibus* is studied. Finally, after a survey of Boethius' view on fate and providence, and Aristotle's theory of future contingents, I study Boethius' three main arguments in favor of the reconcilability of divine omniscience and human free will: the distinction between absolute and conditional necessity, the principle that the nature of knowledge is determined by the knower, and finally the doctrine that God lives in an eternal present, seeing past, present, and future imultaneously. This last view, developed primarily from Plotinus, is once again argued to be analogous to that advocated by contemporary block-time theorists on the basis of Eisteinian relativity. God's supratemporal vision introduces no necessity into contingent events. Ultimate, objective reality, for Boethius as for Plotinus and Einstein, is atemporal, and our idea that there is a conflict between human free will and divine omniscience derives from a kind of optical illusion, caused by the fact that we cannot help but think in terms of temporality."

27.   Claassen, Jo-Marie. 1999. *Displaced Persons: The Literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

28.   Collins, James. 1945. "Progress and Problems in the Reassessment of Boethius." *The Modern Schoolman* no. 23:1-23.

29.   Cooper, Lane, ed. 1928. *A Concordance of Boethius: The Five Theological Tractates and the Consolation of Philosophy*. Cambridge: Medieval Academy of America.

30.   Corrigan, Kevin. 1990. "A New Source for the Distinction between *id quod est* and *esse* in Boethius' *De Hebdomadibus*." *Studia Patristica* no. 18:133-138.
"In his treatise on how substances are good in virtue of their existence without being substantial goods (1) Boethius draws a distinction between the existing object (*id quod est*), composed of a subject and the forms it receives, and pure Being (*esse*), simple in itself. All things are good in their own substantial existence only because their *ipsum esse* derives from the First Good, whereas the First Good is good simply and solely in the fact that it exists. In several articles (2) Pierre Hadot has traced the roots of this distinction to two principal sources: (I) the distinction between absolute Being and determinate Being (respectively Being-infinitive, To εἶναι, and being — participle, Tò ov) found in the anonymous *Commentary on the Parmenides* (ascribed to Porphyry) and in Marius Victorinus (3). And (II) the late Neoplatonic distinction (of Proclus, Damascius (4) and Victorinus) between *hyparxis* (preexistence) and *ousia* (substance), i.e., between pure Being in its simplicity prior to all things and Substance, as the determinate subject taken together with all its accidents. I think Hadot is correct in his assessment of these sources, but what I shall do here is attempt to show firstly, that an earlier source is Plotinus himself and secondly, that the distinction is ultimately based upon something more general, but well-founded, in Graeco-Roman thought."
(1) In the middle ages this treatise was mistakenly entitled *De hebdomadibus*. On this and on the treatise in general see H. Chadwick, *Boethius: The Consolations of Music, Logic, Theology and Philosophy* (Oxford, 1981) pp. 203-211.
(2) P. Hadot, "La distinction de l'être et de l'étant dans le *De hebdomadibus* de Boèce", in *Miscellanea Mediaevalia*, ed. P. Wilpert, 2 (Berlin, 1963), pp. 147-153; Id., "Forma essendi: interprétation philologique et interprétation philosophique d'une formule de Boèce", *Les Études Classiques*, 38 (1970), pp. 143-156; Id., "L'être et l'étant dans le Néoplatonisme"; *Revue de Théologie et Philosophie* (1973), pp. 101-113.
(3) P. Hadot, *Porphyre et Victorinus*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1968). See Vol. 2: pp. 98-112. Marius Victorinus, *Adversus Arium*, Sources Chrétiennes, ed. P. Henry and P. Hadot (Paris, 1960), IV: 19,4ff.

(4) Damascius, *Dubitationes et Solutiones*, ed. C.E. Ruelle (Paris, 1889), Vol. 1, 120, p. 312, 11-121, p. 312,29. Proclus, *The Elements of Theology*, ed. E.R. Dodds (Oxford: 1933), props. 8-10.

31.   Coster, Charles Henry. 1968. "The Fall of Boethius: His Character." In *Late Roman Studies*, edited by Coster, Charles Henry. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

32.   Courcelle, Pierre. 1969. *Late Latin Writers and their Greek Sources*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
English translation by Harry E. Wedeck of *Les lettres grecques en Occident. De Macrobe à Cassiodore*; on Boethius see Part Third pp. 273-330.
Contents: Abbreviations XII; Introduction 1; Part One. The mainstream of Hellenism at the death of Theodosius.
1. Pagan Hellenism: Macrobius 13; 2. Christian Hellenism: St. Jerome 48;
Part II. Attempts at confrontation and the decline of Hellenism in the fifth century.4. Greek studies in Italy 131; St. Augustine and Hellenism in Africa 149; 5. Greek culture in Gaul 224;
Part III. The renaissance of Hellenism under the Ostrogoths.
6. The East to the rescue of Pagan culture: Boethius 273; Introduction 273 6.1. Boethius's scientific works 278; 6.2. Boethius' works on logic 280; 6.3. The neoplatonism of the *De consolatione philosophiae* 295; 6.4. Boethius' Christianity 318; 6.5. Symmachus' course of studies and his failure 322; 7. Hellenism in the service of monastic culture: Cassiodorus 331; 8. The monks in the service of Hellenism: Vivarium and the Lateran 361; Conclusion 410; Bibliography 425; Supplementary Bibliography 442; Index of Manuscripts 447; General Index 449-467.

33.   Craig, William Lane. 1988. "Boethius on theological fatalism." *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* no. 64:324-347.
Abstract: "Incarcerated and awaiting execution on a trumped up charge of treason, Boethius (d. 524) comforted himself by writing *The Consolation of Philosophy*. In book five of this work he deals with the problem of theological fatalism, an issue with which he had become familiar as a translator and commentator on Aristotle's *De interpretatione*. His discussion draws heavily upon the commentaryof Ammonius and the tradition of Plotinus and Proclus in order to frame his solution, which would have a profound effect upon medieval theology's conception of God and His knowledge of the world."

34.   ———. 1988. *The Problem of Divine Foreknowledge and Future Contingents from Aristotle to Suarez*. Leiden: Brill.
Chapter III, *Boethius*, pp. 79-98.
"Summary: With regard, then, to the problem of divine foreknowledge and human freedom, Boethius seems to have granted that future contingent propositions are as such neither true nor false because the corresponding states of affairs are indeterminate. Hence, they cannot as such be known by God. If He did know them to be antecedently true or false, then the corresponding states of affairs would have to occur necessarily. That does not, however, mean that God has no knowledge of future contingents. Though we cannot know them, the faculty of divine intelligence exceeds the faculty of human reason by virtue of its eternity. In His timeless eternity God has no past, present, or future, but only a timeless present. In this eternal "now" the whole course of time is present to God and known to Him. He knows, as if present, which events are occurring contingently and which necessarily. His knowledge imposes no absolute necessity on the things He knows, but only a conditional necessity: if He knows them, then they must exist—but there is no necessity that He know them. Therefore, events which for us lie in the future are known by God as present and as occurring contingently, in sofar as they are the product of our free decisions." (pp. 97-98)

35.   Crooks, James. 2013. "Grief and Homecoming in Boethius's 'Consolation of Philosophy'." In *Ideas under Fire. Historical Studies of Philosophy and Science in*

Adversity, edited by Lavery, Jonathan, Groarke, Louis and Sweet, William, 67-88. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

36.   Cross, Richard. 2012. "Form and Universal in Boethius." *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* no. 20:439-458.
       Abstract: "Contrary to the claims of recent commentators, I argue that Boethius holds a modified version of the Ammonian three-fold universal (transcendent, immanent, and conceptual). He probably identifies transcendent universals as divine ideas, and accepts too forms immanent in corporeal particulars, most likely construing these along the Aphrodisian lines that he hints at in a well-known passage from his second commentary on Porphyry's Isagoge. Boethius never states the theory of the three-fold form outright, but I attempt to show that this theory nevertheless underlies and gives structure to what Boethius has to say on the topic."

37.   Crouse, Robert Darwin. 1985. "The Doctrine of Creation in Boethius. The *De hebdomadibus* and the *Consolatio*." *Studia Patristica* no. 16:501-510.

38.   Curley III, Thomas F. 1987. "The Consolation of Philosophy as a Work of Literature." *The American Journal of Philology* no. 108:343-367.

39.   Curran, Martin. 2011. "The Circular Activity of Prayer in Boethius' *Consolation*." *Dionysius* no. 29:193-204.

40.   d'Onofrio, Giulio. 1986. "Dialectic and Theology. Boethius' *Opuscula sacra* and Their Early Medieval Readers." *Studi Medievali* no. 27:45-67.

41.   ———. 2008. *Vera philosophia. Studies in Late Antique, Early Medieval, and Renaissance Christian Thought*. Turnhout: Brepols.

42.   Daley, Brian E. 1984. "Boethius' Theological Tracts and Early Byzantine Scholasticism." *Mediaeval Studies* no. 46:158-191.
       For biographical as well as literary and philosophical reasons, then, the riddle of the depth and orientation of Boethius' Christianity remains important. I do not propose to solve it completely here, when so many others have failed. But I do think it helps us towards a solution to look more carefully at his theological writings, not just by themselves but in the context of the kind of theology being done in the first two decades of the sixth century, especially in the Greek-speaking East. The main point I want to make is simply that Boethius' theological work 'fits', far better than many modern students have supposed: fits organically into his own life and program of work, into his intellectual profile, precisely because it fits into a general pattern of philosophical and theological thinking that was just then beginning to emerge among Greek Christian writers, especially in Alexandria and Palestine. As a result, I believe Boethius deserves to be taken more seriously than he often is as a Christian thinker, and possibly even as an ecclesiastical politician." (p. 163)
       (...)
       "The point I have been making throughout this article - the closeness of Boethius' theological tracts, in method, style and content, to contemporary Greek 'scholastic' theology- leaves some central riddles still unsolved. What, for instance, was the 'home' of this new style of theological writing in the East? Where would Boethius or his informants have made its acquaintance? In what kind of 'school' was it originally done? Were there lecture halls, similar to that of Ammonius, where Christians carried on their theological debates and taught others how to take this dialectical approach to revelation and tradition?" (p. 185)
       (...)
       ("That Boethius could find Lady Philosophy consoling in her own right during his final days should not surprise us, or cause us to doubt in the least the sincerity of his Christian faith. It should simply remind us of the respect he felt he owed her, and of the thoroughness with which he had made the Greek cultural tradition which nurtured her his own." (p. 191)

43.   Daly, Gerald O. 1991. *The Poetry of Boethius*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

44. Dane, Joseph A. 1979. "Potestas / Potentia: Note on Boethius's *De Consolatione Philosophiae*." *Vivarium* no. 17:81-89.

"Boethius's treatment of the two words *potestas* and *potentia* in the *Consolatio* is based on a hierarchical model, a model which finds both political and philosophical expression. In classical and medieval usage, *potestas* implies a legitimate realm of power, and is often the title of a particular office. *Potentia,* on the other hand, implies the exercise of power; its military applications further suggest the notion of external resistance. (5)" (p. 82)

(...)

"In Boethius's commentaries on Aristotle, a similar distinction appears in a philosophical context. In his commentary on Aristotle's *De interpretatione* (*Editio secunda*, ed. Meiser II, 459.19-464.4) *potestas* is used in conjunction with *actus* to express the abstract relation between potential and act. *Potentia*, however, appears to have a more concrete application. In Book III of *In Categorias Aristotelis*, *potentia* is used in the dichotomy *potentia/ impotentia* in relation to a physical ability to run or fight: *quae ex quadam naturali potentia impotentia que proveniat* (244C). The political distinction between "legitimate domain" or "office" (*potestas*) and "exercise of physical power" (*potentia*) clearly influences this latter usage. Both the political and philosophical contexts suggest an individual "potens" as intermediary. His legitimate power expressed in the epithet *potensis* derived from a realm (*potestas*) and is expressed concretely as physical power (*potentia*)." (p. 83)

(...)

"What has taken place, then, is a redefining and refining of a verbal pair centering on the concept of power in such a way that the once *vana nomina* with their cumbersome worldly referents can participate in the final union asserted in Book V. Throughout the *Consolatio*, Boethius rigorously maintains the relation of *potestas* to *potentia* - a relation which in both political and philosophical contexts implies subordination of the second term. Once the connection of *potentia* with s*ummum bonum* is established, *potestas* cannot retain its specifically worldly connotations without denying the linguistic subordination of a now highly elevated *potentia*. When *potestas* does reenter the dialectic with a positive connotation, it relates to the psychological dimension on which the definitions of *potentia* and *summum bonum* itself depend.

Reversal or confusion of this proper relation is inevitable whenever notions of power are referred to various levels within a worldly hierarchy (*potentia* of kings or *potestas* of mice). Reorientation toward the spiritual leads to reestablishment of proper linguistic relations." (pp. 88-89)

(5) See v.Lübtow, "Potestas", *Paulys Real-encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Band 22, I, Stuttgart 1953, cols.1040-46 and J.H. Heinr. Schmidt, H*andbuch der lateinischen und griechischen Synonymik*, 1889; (rpt. Amsterdam 1968), 351-68. See also Charles du Cange, *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*, Vol. VI, (ed. 1883-87; rpt. Graz-Austria [1954]), 438-41 and Carlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford 1879, s.v. References below to the *Consolatio* and *Opuscula Sacra* are to Boethius: *Tractates, De Consolatione Philosophiae*, ed. H. F. Stewart et al., *The Loeb Classical Library*, Cambridge, Mass. 1973. In the passages cited, no significant textual variants are listed in the editions of R. Pieper, Leipzig 1871 or L. Bieler, *Corpus Christianorum*, *Series Latina*, 94, Turnholt 957. References to Boethius 's commentaries are to columns in *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*, *Series Latina*, vol. 64, ed. J.-P. Migne, Paris 1847.

45. Davies, Martin. 1983. "Boethius and others on divine foreknowledge." *Philosophical Quarterly* no. 64:313-329.

46. de Filippis, Renato. 2020-2021. "Essence and substance in Boethius: A matter of terminology." *Chora. Journal of Ancient and Medieval Studies* no. 18-19:289-304.

47. Dietrich, Julia. 2012. "Boethius's Reading of the "beati Augustini scriptis" in the *Opuscula sacra*." *Carmina Philosophiae* no. 21:43-65.

48. Dod, Bernard G. 1982. "*Aristoteles Latinus*." In *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy from the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100-1600*, edited by Kretzmann, Norman, Jenny, Anthony P. and Pinborg, Jan, 46-79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
"All of Aristotle's works were translated into Latin in the Middle Ages and nearly all were intensely studied. The exceptions are the *Eudemian Ethics*, of which no complete translation survives, and the *Poetics*, which, although translated by William of Moerbeke, remained unknown. Most of the works were translated more than once, and two of them, the *Physics* and *Metaphysics*, were translated or revised no fewer than five times. The translations we are concerned with spanned a period of about 150 years; some were made from the Arabic, but the majority directly from the Greek. Some translations became popular and remained so; some became popular but were then superseded by other translations; others barely circulated at all." (p. 45)
(...)
"At the beginning of our period only two of Aristotle's logical works, the *Categories* and *De interpretatione*, were known in Latin, in Boethius' translation; these two works, which together with Porphyry's *Isagoge* became known as the 'logica vetus', had already become standard school texts in logic. One of the results of the quickening interest in logic in the early twelfth century was the recovery, from about 1120 onwards, of the rest of Boethius' translations of the logic: the *Prior Analytics*, *Topics* and *Sophistici elenchi*. How and where these translations, made some six centuries earlier, were found is not known. The logical corpus was completed by James of Venice's translation (from the Greek) of the *Posterior Analytics*; in 1159 John of Salisbury in his *Metalogicon* shows a familiarity with all these works. (He also quotes from a second translation of the *Posterior Analytics*, that of Ioannes, which otherwise remained virtually unknown.)" (p. 46)

49. Donato, Antonio. 2012. "Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy* and the Greco-Roman Consolatory Tradition." *Traditio* no. 67:1-42.
"The aim of this study is to show that an adequate assessment of the literary genre of the *Consolatio* requires (i) a thorough analysis of features (*topoi*, themes, and methods) considered typical of the consolatory genre and (ii) a consideration of the goal of Greco-Roman consolations. (11)
It is only by following this approach that we can gain the knowledge and insights necessary to determine accurately the ways in which Boethius's text resembles and differs from Greco-Roman consolations. (12)
The significance of an investigation into whether the *Consolatio* is a consolatory text is not only that of assessing its literary genre, but has further exegetical importance. Typically, an author's choice of employing a specific literary genre — particularly in the case of ancient and medieval authors — is a telling sign of the purpose of the text, the way the content of the text is to be considered, and the author's motivation to write it. (13) Thus, the exegetical importance of assessing the literary genre of the *Consolatio* is that, among other things, it crucially affects the way we interpret the text's goal and its philosophical arguments. If we consider the *Consolatio* to be a consolatory text, then it is appropriate to focus on its overt meaning and consider its philosophical arguments as designed to offer consolation. On the other hand, if we think that the *Consolatio* is, for example, a "Menippean satire" we cannot stop at the overt meaning of the text but have to read between the lines in order to identify the text's underlying agenda. (14)
This paper will be divided into seven parts. After a brief discussion of the origin of the Greco-Roman consolatory tradition, we shall examine, one by one, those features of the *Consolatio* which can be traced back to Greco-Roman consolations (sections 2–5) and those which seem to distinguish it from these texts (sections 6–7)." (pp. 3-4)

(11) Means and Phillips offer very persuasive arguments in support of the interpretation that the *Consolatio* is a consolation; yet they give no consideration to Boethius's relation to Greco-Roman consolations (M. Means, *The Consolatio Genre in Medieval English Literature* [Gainesville, 1972], 18; P. Phillips, "Boethius's De Consolatione Philosophiae and the Lamentatio/Consolatio Tradition," *Medieval English Studies* 9 [2001]: 5–27).

(12) The very significant number of consolatory texts composed before and immediately after the *Consolatio* makes it impossible to study, within the limited scope of a paper, the relation between the *Consolatio* and ancient as well as medieval consolatory texts. Thus, we shall limit our study to the investigation of the relation between the *Consolatio* and some well-known Greco-Roman consolations. Greco-Roman consolatory texts present several advantages for our study: 1) scholars such as Gruber (*Kommentar zu Boethius*) have persuasively demonstrated that Boethius knew these texts; 2) many of the consolatory strategies contained in these texts are very clearly spelled out and easy to recognize; 3) these texts are amongst the earlier examples of consolations and hence it is reasonable to start from them when investigating the place of the *Consolatio* within the consolatory tradition.

(13) R. B. Rutherford, *The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius: A Study* (Oxford, 1989); P. Hadot, "Forms of Life and Forms of Discourse in Ancient Philosophy," *Critical Inquiry* 16 (1990): 483–505.

(14) The scholars who consider the Consolatio to be a "Menippean satire" believe that the goal of its philosophical arguments is not really to convey philosophical ideas, but to present flawed arguments that are supposed to illustrate the limitations (Marenbon) or failures (Payne, Relihan) of the discipline of philosophy. See Marenbon, *Boethius*; Payne, *Chaucer and Menippean Satire*; Relihan, *The Prisoner's Philosophy*.

50. ———. 2013. *Boethius' Consolation of Philosophy as a Product of Late Antiquity*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Contents: Acknowldgements VII; Introduction 1; 1. Boethius and the Ideology of the Roman Senatorial Aristocracy 7; 2. The Hillness and the Healer 57; 3. How does *Philosophy* Convey her Therapy? 101; 4. Christiantity and the *Consolation* 163; Concluding Remarks 197; Bibliography 199; Index 217-221.

"In the last 50 years the field of Late Antiquity has advanced significantly. Today we have a picture of this period that is more precise and accurate than ever before. Nonetheless, the study of one of the most significant texts of this age, i.e. Boethius' Consolation of Philosophy (henceforth *Consolation*), did not sufficiently benefit from these advancements in the scholarship. This book aims to fill this gap by investigating how the study of the *Consolation* can profit from the knowledge of Boethius' cultural, philosophical and social background that is available today. The goal of this enterprise, however, is not simply that of placing the *Consolation* in its historical and cultural background, but to unlock its exegetical difficulties by employing an approach hitherto mostly unexplored. In this text, I show that some of the *Consolation*'s long-standing exegetical issues can be more adequately addressed by going beyond the text and investigating the extent to which the cultural, philosophical and social context of Late Antiquity informs Boethius' last work. In this book I explore the hypothesis that the *Consolation* is not simply influenced by the context of Late Antiquity, but is a 'product' of Late Antiquity. A text may be regarded as the 'product' of its age when (i) it does not simply contain individual views and features that are common to intellectuals of a particular age, but also (ii) presents elements that are specific to the mindset of the time in which it was written. The view that the *Consolation* is a product of Late Antiquity, however, does not imply that the text lacks originality and can be reduced to its background. On the contrary, it is by examining how Boethius receives, refashions and expresses literary, philosophical and cultural elements that are typical of his age that it is possible to fully appreciate the *Consolation*'s originality." (From the *Introduction*)

51. ———. 2013. "Forgetfulness and Misology in Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy*." *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* no. 21:463-485.

Abstract: "In book one of the *Consolation of Philosophy*, Boethius is portrayed as a man who suffers because he forgot philosophy. Scholars have underestimated the significance of this portrayal and considered it a literary device the goal of which is simply to introduce the discussion that follows. In this paper, I show that this view is mistaken since it overlooks that this portrayal of Boethius is the key for the understanding of the whole text. The philosophical therapy that constitutes the core of the 'Consolation' can in fact be properly evaluated only if we recognize the condition it is designed to cure. Through the portrayal of Boethius's forgetfulness, the 'Consolation' illustrates that it is the very nature of philosophical knowledge that makes it susceptible to being forgotten. Philosophical knowledge can (i) turn into misology, when it appears unable to solve certain problems, and (ii) be overrun by strong emotions. The therapy offered in the 'Consolation' is designed to make Boethius aware of the 'fragility' of philosophical knowledge and show him how to 'strengthen' it. He is taught how to more fully embody philosophy's precepts and that philosophy's inability to solve certain problems reveals not its failures but its limits."

52. Dougherty, M. V. 2004. "The Problem of *Humana natura* in the *Consolatio Philosophiae* of Boethius." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* no. 78:273-292.

Abstract: "In Boethius's *Consolatio Philosophiae* one finds a rather unusual argument contending that human beings can lose their natures as the result of immoral or virtuous activity. A number of texts in the work argue that the polarities of beast and god serve as options for those who lead highly immoral or highly virtuous lives. This argument is examined in detail in light of its philosophical ancestry. The paper argues that those who think the Boethian doctrine is Platonic in origin tend to read the texts about the loss of human nature as metaphorical. The paper then suggests that if one places the argument in an Aristotelian context one is able to see it as a metaphysical argument, and more particularly, as part of Boethian psychology. This paper thus provides a new context for approaching Boethius's contention that human beings can lose their natures."

53. Erismann, Christophe. 2009. "The Medieval Fortunes of the *Opuscula Sacra*." In *The Cambridge Companion to Boethius*, edited by Marenbon, John, 155-177. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

"The history of the medieval reception of the *Opuscula sacra* shows that, like late ancient philosophy, medieval philosophy was often a question of exegesis. Early medieval philosophy is characterised by its frequent reliance on ancient, late ancient and Patristic texts, as a basis for speculation. Commenting on an authority was often the occasion of expressing original thought, as noted by John Marenbon: 'It is in commentaries that much of the most important philosophical work of the ninth to twelfth centuries was accomplished.' (6)

Despite its particular rules, the practice of commentary did not restrain philosophical thought; on the contrary, it often stimulated it. Gilbert of Poitiers and Thomas Aquinas are good examples of this phenomenon.

I shall proceed in three stages: first, I shall give an historical overview of the medieval reception of the *Opuscula sacra*; I shall then consider the methodological and lexical influence of Boethius, and conclude with a presentation of some of the philosophical discussions

which Boethius initiated in the Middle Ages." (pp. 156-157)

(6) John Marenbon ('Making Sense of the de Trinitate: Boethius and Some of His Medieval Interpreters', in *Studia Patristica* 18, ed. E. A. Livingstone, Kalamazoo and Leuven: Cistercian Publications and Peeters, 446–52 1982) 446.

54. Evans, Jonathan R. 2001. *The Boethian Solution to the Problem of Future Contingents and its Unorthodox Rivals*, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

Unpublished Ph.D. thesis available at ProQuest, reference number 3034374.

Abstract: "One concern bothering ancient and medieval philosophers is the logical worry discussed in Aristotle's *De Interpretatione* 9, that if future contingent propositions are true, then they are settled in a way that is incompatible with freedom. Another is if we grant God foreknowledge of future contingent events then God's foreknowledge will determine those events in a way precluding freedom. I begin by discussing the standard compatibilist solution to these problems as represented in Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy* and then examine theories that allegedly deviate from the Boethian solution. Boethius's solution to these separate problems involves showing that both problems operate on an ambiguity in the scope of the modal operator 'necessarily' present in the articulation of the problem. Once the ambiguity is removed we see that both disambiguations fail to offer a sound argument against the compatibility of free action with either God's omniscience or future contingent proposition's being true. The only difference between the solutions is that before executing the scope distinction strategy in the theological problem, Boethius reminds us that God knows future contingents rather than foreknowing them, since God is timeless.
The rest of my discussion examines positions that allegedly deviate from the Boethian solution: positions held by Peter de Rivo, William Ockham and Plotinus. I argue that Ockham doesn't in fact deviate from the Boethian solution to the theological problem as is commonly held. Instead of offering a compatibilist position where God's omniscience includes foreknowledge, Ockham denies that God foreknows the future advocating instead a more sophisticated Boethian position. The other two philosophers, Rivo and Plotinus, deviate from Boethius, but unfortunately neither position appears philosophically plausible. Rivo's incompatibilist solution to the logical problem is inconsistent with his retention of the Boethian solution to the theological problem and is probably implausible on its own. Plotinus's compatibilist account fails not because it claims that necessity and freedom are compatible, but because the account of moral responsibility Plotinus offers to justify the compatibility fails."

55.   ———. 2004. "Boethius on Modality and Future Contingents." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* no. 78:247-271.
Abstract: "In *The Consolation of Philosophy* Boethius addresses two main problems posed by the problem of future contingents that shed important light on his conception of necessity and possibility: (1) a logical problem that alleges that if propositions about the future are true now then they are necessarily true, and (2) a theological problem that centers on a supposed incompatibility between divine foreknowledge and a contingent future. In contrast to established readings from the Consolation, this paper argues that a proper understanding of book 5 requires understanding the modal concepts employed there in atemporal terms. This interpretation requires revising the traditional understanding of the two problems present in the Consolation text, particularly in seeing how timeless knowledge or truth could be conceived as a threat to human freedom. It also stresses the importance of a strategy used by Boethius to disambiguate the scope of modal operators used in his opponent's arguments and how that strategy unifies his discussion in book 5."

56.   ———. 2018. "Boethius and the Causal Direction Strategy." *Ancient Philosophy* no. 38:167-185.
Abstract: "Contemporary work on Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy* often overlooks a discussion in CP.V.3 of a Peripatetic strategy for dissolving theological fatalism. Boethius' treatment of this strategy and the lesson it provides about divine foreknowledge requires a reorientation of our understanding of the *Consolation* text. The result is that it is not foreknowledge nor any other temporally-conditioned knowledge that motivates Boethian concern but divine knowledge simpliciter."

57.   Ford, Lewis S. 1968. "Boethius and Whitehead on Time and Eternity." *International Philosophical Quarterly* no. 8:38-67.

58.   Fortin, John R. 2004. "The Nature of Consolation in the *Consolation of Philosophy*." *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* no. 78:293-308.
Abstract: "Does *The Consolation of Philosophy* console? Is Philosophy able to bring the prisoner not simply to an acceptance of and reconciliation with his situation, but further to move him beyond this to ultimate peace through philosophical activity? The *Consolation* does offer some consolation but only ironically and not in the way intended by the character Philosophy. Philosophy is attempting to bring the prisoner to a philosophical experience in which he will contemplate and enjoy eternal truths, and thereby be consoled. Nevertheless the prisoner will in the end reject this project which takes him away from what he perceives to be his life's work. Philosophy's failure to console the prisoner is disconsoling in part to herself because the prisoner ultimately rejects her invitation to become a martyr for her sake. It is disconsoling in part to the prisoner who seeks a consolation that would support his firmly held desire to remain engaged in public life."

59.   Fournier, Michael. 2011. "Boethius *pro se de magia*." *Dionysius* no. 19:205-222.

60.   Frakes, Jerold C. 1984. "The ancient concept of casus and its early medieval interpretations." *Vivarium* no. 22:1-34.
"Even after the Prisoner has accepted Philosophia's specific arguments concerning fortuna, however, he is not yet prepared to accept the abstract principle necessitated by this analysis: i.e. that the all-encompassing divine ordo precludes the existence of any and all random events.
Thus Boethius presents in *Cons*. V, pr. 1 a brief analysis of the abstract concept of *casus*. This treatment is heavily dependent on the Aristotelian and post-Aristotelian analyses, but Boethius omits much of the traditional material and incorporates subtle alterations into his argument, especially in changing the emphases of the Aristotelian presentation, resulting to a certain degree in a new definition of chance. The concept naturally undergoes further modifications in the post-Boethian tradition. The first attempts to assimilate the *system* of the *Consolatio* in the vernacular were the translations by Alfred the Great in the ninth century into Old English and by Notker Labeo at the turn of the eleventh century into Old High German. They further modify the tradition derived from antiquity, not only by translating the text of the *Consolatio*, their principle source for that tradition, but also by attempting to translate Boethius' system of thought in such a fashion as to render it accessible to their own cultures. The present study investigates the concept of casus as it is developed by Boethius, Alfred and Notker in the context of the tradition. The analysis must then begin by establishing this context, and thus Aristotle's discussion of the topic must be briefly treated, since his was the first full examination of the problem, which then through Boethius' adaptation became the basis for medieval analyses." (pp. 1-2)
(...)
"Boethius transforms the Aristotelian concept through his 'metaphysical' perspective; Alfred treats Boethius' transformation with the reverence which he deemed appropriate for an ancient work of Christian philosophy, but in doing so transforms the concept again; and Notker presents an annotated translation/edition. One sees in the three texts three quite distinct methods and products, and thus three different stages in the interpretation and reception of the ancient philosophical concept of chance." (p. 33)

61.   Gersh, Stephen. 1986. *Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism. The Latin Tradition*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
Volume II, Part II, *Neoplatonism*, Chapter 9: *Boethius*, pp. 647-718.
"That Boethius should be considered primarily as part of the Platonic tradition follows from a consideration of both his aims and his achievements. On the one hand, we have his projected but never completed program of translating with commentary all of Aristotle's writings on logic, ethics, and physics; of translating with commentary all of Plato's dialogues; and of demonstrating that the two philosophers are in agreement on the most fundamental questions. (2) This program

should be understood in terms of the Alexandrian Neoplatonic one, in which Aristotle's works were studied not for their own sake but as introductions to Plato's philosophy. (3) On the other hand, we ave the extant work *De Consolatione Philosophiae* which includes not only frequent allusions to passages in Plato's *Gorgias, Meno, Republic,* and *Timaeus* (4) but also references to Plato as a profound philosophical authority. (5) This should be contrasted with the same work's relatively limited appeal to Aristotle's *Protrepticus* and *Physics*. (6) But Boethius was also a Christian, and this immediately leads to the question: how did he reconcile Platonism and Christianity? Here the influence of Augustine, who is explicitly cited on one occasion as a source, (7) is perhaps the crucial factor. Indeed, Boethius seems to have fashioned the synthesis along his redecessor's lines, realizing clearly that this involved both a responsibility and an opportunity.

In the first place , only those aspects of Platonism consistent with the Christian teaching could be adopted. (8) Thus, Boethius made no place in his theory for the order of henads postulated by Proclus; he combined the first and second hypostases of the Neoplatonists: the One and Intellect, in order to remove a subordination element from the divinity; and he found little use for the Platonic doctrine of the world soul . (9) In requiring these modifications of the doctrine derived from contemporary philosophical schools, Christianity played an indirect role in determining the character of the system which finally emerged.

In the second place, it was possible to pursue Platonism independently of Christian teaching from a methodological viewpoint. (10) This was demonstrated when Boethius employed philosophical theories as additional support for dogmatic positions in *De Trinitate* and *Contra Eutychen et Nestorium*. (11) and in detachment from theological dogma in *De Consolatione Philosophiae*. (12) In permitting such elaborate discussion of philosophical questions to take place, Christianity assumed a subordinate role at least in the presentation of material.

That he is primarily a Platonist and that Christianity often plays merely an indirect or subordinate role in his arguments are two facts which make it imperative to include Boethius in our survey of the pagan philosophical tradition in late antiquity. In describing his teaching , we shall therefore take our starting point from its relation to the philosophical tenets of the pagan schools, although sometimes it will be necessary also to take account of peculiarly Christian transformations of the material." (pp. 651-654)

(2) Boethius: *In De Interpr.* ed II. 2, 3, 79, 1-80, 17.

(3) See for example Elias: *In Categ.* pr. 123, 7-11.

(4) See Boethius: *De Consol. Philos.* IV, pr. 2. 1 ff. (to Plato: *Gorg*. 466 a ff. on the respective powers of the good and the wicked); ibid. I. pr. 2, 13-14 (to Plato: *Meno* 81 c ff . on learning as recollection); ibid. I. pr. t , 18-21 (to Plato: *Rep. V*. i 7.3c-d on the need for philosopher-kings); ibid. III. pr. 9. 99-101 (to Plato: *Tim*. 27b on the need to pray for divine assistance); ibid. 111. pr. 12. 110-112 (to Plato: *Tim*. 29h on language and reality); and ibid. V , pr. 6, 31 ff. (to Plato: *Tim*. 37d on the perpetuity of the cosmos). On the passages in this work influenced by Plato see P. Courcelle: *Late Latin Writers and their Greek Sources*, translated by H . E. Wedeck (Cambridge, MA, 1969), pp. 296-297 and J. Gruber: *Kommentar zu Boethius De consolatione philosophiae* (Texte und¡ Commentate 9) (Berlin/New York, 1978), p. 36.

(5) In the passages mentioned above Philosophy refers to our Plato' (*Plato noster*), to Plato's decree' (*Platone sanciente*). and so on.

(6) See Boethius: *De Consol. Philos*. III, pr. 8, 23 together with lamblichus: *Protr*. 8. 47, 13 (to Aristotle: *Protr*. on the eyes of Lynceus); ibid. V, pr. 1, 33 ff. (to Aristotle: *Phy*s. II, 4 , 195b 31 ff. on the relation between causation and chance); and ibid. V. pr . 6, 18-22 (to Aristotle: *De Caelo* II, 1. 283b26-31 on the world's eternity). On the passages in this work influenced by Aristotle see Courcelle: *La Consolation de Philosophie dans la tradition littéraire. Antecedents et posterité de Boece*, pp. 25-26 and 124-125; and Gruber: op. cit. , pp. 36-37.

(7) At *De Trin*. pr. 31 -.32 Boethius asks the addressee: ' You should however examine whether the seeds of argument from Saint Augustine's works have borne

any fruit in my writing' (*Vobis tamen etiam illud inspiciendum est, an ex beati Augustini scriptis semina rationum aliquos in nos venientia fructus extulerint*).

(8) Cf . Augustine: *De Vera Relig*. 4, 7 (CCSL 32, 192-193) where it is stated that the Platonists could become Christians by changing a few words and opinions. The kinds of modification required are described in texts like *Conf*. VII, 9 (CSEL 33/1, 154-157); *Civ. Dei*. X, 30 (CCSL 47. 307-308); etc.

(9) These doctrines will be discussed in detail below.

(10). Cf. Augustine: *De Ord*. II, 5, 16 (CCSL 29, 115-116) where two separate methodological routes to the doctrine of the Trinity are postulated: that of reason and that of faith. That the first method is prior in reality and the latter prior in time is stated at ibid. II, 9, 26 (CCSL 29. 121- 1 22).

(11) In accordance with this approach, certain chapters like Boethius: *De trin*. 2 and 4; *Contra Eutych. et Nest*. 1-3 are free of explicitly Christian content.

(12) In accordance with this approach, the only indisputable scriptural citation is that of *Sap*. 8: 1 at Boethius: *De Consol. Philos*. III , pr. 12. 63-64.

62.   ———. 1998. "Dialectical and Rhetorical Space: The Boethian Theory of Topics and its Influence During the Early Middle Ages." In *Raum und Raumvorstellungen in Mittelalter*, edited by Aertsen, Jan A. and Speer, Andreas, 391-401. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

"According to L. Obertello's chronology, Boethius' writings on topics: the commentary on Cicero's 'Topica' and the 'De Topicis Differentiis' date from the last few years of his life (ca. 518 — 524) (1). They do indeed reveal the maturity of reflection characteristic of a thinker who has translated and commented upon Aristotle's *Organon* and is perhaps on the threshold of elaborating the Platonic synthesis of which 'De Consolatione Philosophiae' stands as a poignant reminder. In this paper I hope to show how the notion of 'place' (*locus*) developed in Boethius' topical writings lies at the heart of important issues not only in rhetoric and dialectic but also in metaphysics." (p. 391)

(...)

"Boethius develops in response to Cicero two definitions of 'topic': a. A topic is the seat or foundation of an argument (24); and b. A topic is that from which one draws an argument (25). These formulations are of considerable interest because of the connection established with the notion of 'argument'.

Since for Boethius, an argument is a rather complicated phenomenon — on the surface it is simply a reason producing belief regarding something which is in doubt (26), yet on a deeper level it embraces the complementary aspects of being 1a. something expressed verbally (27) and 1b. something thought conceptually (28); and 2a. a connected set of propositions (29) and 2b. that through which propositions are connected (30) — then we must allow that this complexity arises from the topic as the argument's source. Thus, it may be that a topic is implicitly both verbal and conceptual, both connected and connecting (31)." (p. 395)

(1) See L. Obertello, *Severino Boezio* I, Genova 1974, 342. Cf. L. M. de Rijk, 'On the Chronology of Boethius' Works on Logic II', in: *Vivarium* 2 (1964), 159-161.

(26) *De top. diff.*. I, 1180 C; *In Cic. Top*. I, 1048 B.

(27) *In Cic. Top*. I, 1050 B *oratione prolatum*. Strictly speaking, Boethius distinguishes I. 'argumentation' (*argumentatio*) which is verbal and II. 'argument' (*argumentum*) which is conceptual. See *In Cic. Top*. I, 1050B. However, the distinction having been made quickly breaks down in practice. See *In Cic. Top*. I, 1053 B.

(28) *De top. diff*. I, 1180 C *ratio*.

(29) *In Cic. Top*. I, 1050 B *propositionum contexione dispositum*.

(30) *In Cic. Top*. I, 1051 *A medietatis inventio*. The mediating function of a topic is an important matter which cannot be pursued here. In brief, it operates in an argument by supplying either a middle term or a second premiss for a syllogism. See Stump, *Boethius's De topicis differentiis*, 183-204 for detailed discussion. Cf. O. Bird, 'The Formalizing of the Topics in Mediaeval Logic', in: *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 1 (1960), 138-149; id., 'The Tradition of Logical Topics. Aristotle

to Ockham', in: *Journal of the History of Ideas* 23 (1962), 307-323; J. Pinborg, 'Topik und Syllogistik im Mittelalter', in: *Sapienter Ordinare. Festgabe für E. Kleineidam*, Leipzig 1969, 157-178; id., *Logik und Semantik im Mittelalter. Ein Überblick*, Stuttgart - Bad Cannstatt 1972, 21 sqq., 69 sqq.
(31) That the topic cannot be totally separated from its argument follows from the dynamic nature of both. See below.

63.   ———. 2012. "The First Principles of Latin Neoplatonism: Augustine, Macrobius, Boethius." *Vivarium* no. 50:113-138.

Abstract: "This essay attempts to provide more evidence for the notions that there actually is a Latin (as opposed to a Greek) Neoplatonic tradition in late antiquity, that this tradition includes a systematic theory of first principles, and that this tradition and theory are influential in Western Europe during the Middle Ages. The method of the essay is intended to be novel in that, instead of examining authors or works in a chronological sequence and attempting to isolate doctrines in the traditional manner, it proceeds by identifying certain philosophemes (a concept borrowed from structuralist and post-structuralist thought and here signifying certain minimal units from which philosophical "systems" can be constructed), and then studying the combination and re-combination of these philosophemes consciously and unconsciously by a selection of important medieval writers. These philosophemes occur in Augustine, *De Genesi ad Litteram*; Augustine, *De Trinitate*; Augustine, *De Vera Religione*; Augustine, *De Musica*; Macrobius, *Commentarius in Somnium Scipionis*; and Boethius, *De Consolatione Philosophiae*. The sampling of medieval authors who use these philosophemes includes Eriugena, William of Conches, Thierry of Chartres, and Nicholas of Cusa."

64.   ———. 2014. "Damascius and Boethius." In *Interpreting Proclus: From Antiquity to the Renaissance*, edited by Gersh, Stephen, 125-134. Cambridge: Cambridge Univesity Press.

65.   Gibson, Margaret, ed. 1981. *Boethius: His Life, Thought and Influence*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Table of Contents: Henry Chadwick: Introduction 1; John Matthews: Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius 15; Helen Kirkby: The scholar and his public 44; Jonathan Barnes: Boethius and the study of logic 73; Patrick Osmund Lewry: Boethian logic in the medieval West 90; John Caldwell: The *De institutione arithmetica* and the *De institutione musica* 135; David Pingree: Boethius' geometry and astronomy 155; Alison White: Boethius in the medieval quadrivium 162; John R. S. Mair: The text of the *Opuscula sacra* 206; Margaret Templeton Gibson: The *Opuscula sacra* in the Middle Ages 214; Anna M. Crabbe: Literary design in the *De consolatione philosophiae* 237; David Ganz: A tenth-century drawing of Philosophy visiting Boethius 275; Jacqueline Beaumont: The Latin tradition of the *De consolatione philosophiae* 278; Christopher Page: The Boethian metrum *Bella bis quinis*: a new song from Saxon Canterbury 306; Alastair J. Minnis: Aspects of the medieval French and English traditions of the *De consolatione philosophiae* 312; Nigel F. Palmer: Latin and vernacular in the northern European tradition of the *De consolatione philosophiae* 362; Anthony Grafton; Epilogue: Boethius in the Renaissance 410; Malcolm R. Godden: King Alfred's Boethius 419; Malcolm Beckwith Parkes: A Note on MS Vatican, Bibl. Apost., lat. 3363 425; Diane K. Bolton: Illustrations in manuscripts of Boethius' works 428-437.

66.   ———. 1981. "The *Opuscola Sacra* in the Middle Ages." In *Boethius: His Life, Thought and Influence*, edited by Gibson, Margaret, 214-234. Oxford: Blackwell.

"Ergo, domine, non solum es quo maius cogitari nequit, sed es quiddam maius quam cogitari possit. St Anselm, *Proslogion* c. 1078 (2)
Over five centuries earlier Boethius had made the same point: we cannot extend our thought and language to describe God. 'Ten categories can be predicated of all things: substance, quality, quantity, relation, place, time, condition, position, being active or passive . . . But if you apply them to God, everything in the case is changed5. (3) For both the acknowledged master was Augustine. 'When we think of

God the Trinity, (5) he had written 'our very thought itself is aware of how far it falls short of its object; it does not grasp God as he is, but through a glass darkly. (4) Yet Augustine persevered. Throughout the fifteen books of the *De Trinitate* he defined his linguistic tools and applied them to the nature of God. Within his own terms it is virtually complete: Boethius and Anselm say nothing that is not said in greater detail in the *De Trinitate*. Augustine was the catalyst, and the quarry of material, bold explorer of the divine and at the same time a sheltering authority. (5) Given the dominance of the *De Trinitate*, we may well ask why the *Opuscula Sacra* had any future beyond the remote political infighting of the early sixth century. Boethius' prose has a hard clarity of expression that may seem more objective than Augustine's, and here at least he is brief. Such qualities — and no doubt others which I have not discerned — commended the *Opuscula* as teaching texts, and it was principally in the schoolroom that they were to survive: as useful lo the electic scholars of the ninth century as to the sophisticated professionals of twelfth-century Paris and fifteenth-century Cracow." (pp. 214-215)

(2) *Proslogion*, cap. 15: *Anseimi Opera*, ed. F. S. Schmitt (Edinburgh, 1946), I. 112.

(3) *Op. Sac*. I. iv. 1-9.

(4) Augustine, *De Trinitate* V. i, ed. W. J. Mountain (Turnhout, 1968: CCSL 1), p. 206, quoting *1 Cor.* 13. 12.

(5) Ex beati Augustini scriptis semina rationum ... in nos uenientia (*Op. Sac*. I praef. 31-3) ; Quapropter si cui uidebitur, quod in eodem opusculo aliquid protulerim, quod aut nimis nouum sit aut a ueritate dissentiat: rogo, ne statim me aut praesumptorem nouitatum aut falsitatis assertorem exclamet, sed prius libros praefati doctoris Augustini *De trinitate* diligenter perspiciat, deinde secundum eos opusculum meum diiudicet (*Monologion* prol. : *Anselmi Opera*, ed. cit. [note 2 above], I. 8).