Hybrid forms: translating Boethius in Anglo-Saxon England

ERICA WEAVER

ABSTRACT

Critics have long wondered about the setting and intent of the Old English translation of Boethius's *De consolatione philosophiae*, first into prose and then into prosimetrum. This article situates the dual translation within the broader context of ninth- and tenth-century literary culture, challenging the received view of the two versions as separate projects and arguing instead that the Old English *Boethius* was conceived and received as a vernacular *opus geminatum*, or 'twinned work'. While the *opus geminatum* and the prosimetrum are generally thought to maintain distinct generic identities, this case study allows for a more capacious understanding of both modes, which I demonstrate were inescapably linked in Anglo-Saxon circles – and which were shaped by a broader aesthetic of prose-verse mixture.

Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* contains what is undoubtedly the most famous surviving story of an Anglo-Saxon poet, the illiterate cowherd Cædmon, whose divine inspiration is supposed to have initiated a new strain of vernacular, Christian poetry, and who continues to provoke an unending series of questions about Anglo-Saxon poetic communities.[1] But Bede's history also contains a less famous anecdote about a poet, just as illuminating for Anglo-Saxon conceptions of genre and translation. In his discussion of the works of Aldhelm, abbot of Malmesbury and later bishop of Sherborne (d. 709), Bede comments on the form of the *De virginitate*, which consists of a Latin treatise in prose paired with an accompanying poem in quantitative verses – one of the first to be written by an Anglo-Saxon.[2] Explaining Aldhelm's writing process,

[1] For recent insights on the broader implications of the story of Cædmon, see E. V. Thornbury, *Becoming a Poet in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge, 2014).

[2] Aldhelm himself relished his presumed position as the first Englishman to write quantitative Latin poetry, proclaiming, 'constat neminem nostrae stirpis prosapia genitum et Germanicae gentis cunabulis confotum in huiuscemodi negotio ante nostram mediocritatem tantopere desudasse' ('It is well known that no one born to the lineage of our race and tended in the cradles of the Germanic people has exerted himself so much in work of this kind before my humble self'). Aldhelm, *De metris et enigmatibus ac pedum regulis*, *Aldhelmi Opera*, ed. R. Ehwald, MGH Auct. antiq. XV (Berlin, 1915), 59–204, at 202. For a general account of Aldhelm's career, see W. F. Bolton, *Anglo-Latin Literature* (Princeton, 1967) I, 68–100; and M. Lapidge and M. Herren, *Aldhelm: the Prose Works* (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 5–19. For the seminal position

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Bede notes: 'Scripsit et de virginitate librum eximium, quem in exemplum Sedulii geminate opere, et versibus exametris, et prosa composuit.'[3]

Bede's phrase *geminate opere* here gives the first attested use of a unique Anglo-Saxon generic term, *opus geminatum* ('twinned work').[4] The term describes what became a distinctive Latin form consisting of a pair of texts, one in verse and one in prose, ostensibly addressing the same subject matter – in the manner of the *De virginitate* and often under its influence. Writing in the first half of the fifth century, Caelius Sedulius penned what Bede recognized as the model for Aldhelm's form, the *Carmen* and *Opus paschale*, first in hexameters and then in prose. As Gernot Wieland notes, many of the great Latin poets of the fourth to sixth centuries – including Arator, Dracontius, Avitus, Juvencus, Paulinus of Perigueux, Venantius Fortunatus, Prosper of Aquitaine and Damasus – participated in the closely related paraphrase tradition, in which an existing composition in verse or prose was supplemented with a *contrafactum* in the opposite mode.[5] For Sedulius and the Anglo-Latin authors who would follow him, writing both versions at once clarified that their writings were more than mere paraphrase; they were instead larger, freestanding works, for which the prose and verse halves were composed by the same author at the same cultural moment – broadly defined to allow for a temporal gap between the initial undertaking in one genre and the completion of the work in the other.

Following Sedulius's literary experiment, the twinned form flourished under Aldhelm (639–709), Bede (672/3–735) and Alcuin (*c.* 730–804) and was later adopted as the hagiographic genre *par excellence*, not only in England but

of Aldhelm's Latin poetry in the development of Anglo-Saxon poetic style, see A. Orchard, *The Poetic Art of Aldhelm* (Cambridge, 1994); M. Lapidge, 'Aldhelm's Latin Poetry and Old English Verse', *Comparative Lit.* 31.3 (1979), 209–31; and E. V. Thornbury, 'Aldhelm's Rejection of the Muses and the Mechanics of Poetic Inspiration in Early Anglo-Saxon England', *ASE* 36 (2007), 71–92.

[3] 'He wrote a noteworthy book about virginity, which he composed in both hexameter verses and in prose, as a twinned work in imitation of Sedulius.' Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica* [hereafter *HE*] v. 18, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969), p. 514.

[4] To my knowledge, the *opus geminatum* is the only Anglo-Saxon genre that is explicitly named in contemporary sources. As I will discuss below, the form was also in use at Carolingian centres, but it was presumably imported to Francia by Alcuin and is therefore still inherently Anglo-Saxon.

[5] G. Wieland, '*Geminus Stilus*: Studies in Anglo-Latin Hagiography', *Insular Latin Studies: Papers on Latin Texts and Manuscripts of the British Isles: 550–1066*, ed. M. W. Herren (Toronto, 1981), pp. 113–33. B. Friesen outlines how the genre's form evolved out of classical paraphrase or *conversio* – as described by Cicero, Theon and Quintilian – as well as late antique practices of scriptural paraphrase. In the *conversio* tradition, students would render a prose passage into poetry and vice-versa, in order to master both genres; in Anglo-Saxon England, this school-room practice evolved into a full-fledged literary form. Friesen, 'The *Opus Geminatum* and Anglo-Saxon Literature', *Neophilologus* 95 (2011), 123–44.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

also amongst Alcuin's students in Carolingia.[6] Like Bede, Hrabanus Maurus provided a name for the genre, the *geminus stilus*, again testifying to an awareness of the twinned work as a form with specific uses.[7] Indeed, both Bede and Hrabanus adopted the term *geminus* not only as a useful way to classify earlier – one might even say canonical – literature but as the name for a genre still ripe for contemporary composition, whether for Bede's *Vita S. Cuthberti* or Hrabanus' *De laudibus sanctae crucis*.

To the extent that a core curriculum existed in Anglo-Saxon England,[8] it included three *opera geminata* at the forefront – Sedulius's *Carmen paschale*,[9] Aldhelm's *De virginitate*,[10] and Bede's own *Vita S. Cuthberti*[11] – all particularly

[6] For an overview of the form, see P. Godman, 'The Anglo-Latin *Opus Geminatum*: from Aldhelm to Alcuin', *MÆ* 50 (1981), 215–29, esp. 220–3; and Friesen, '*Opus Geminatum*'.

[7] 'Mos apud veteres fuit ut gemino stylo propria conderent opera, quo jucundiora simul et utiliora sua legentibus forent ingenia' ('It was a custom among the ancients to compose their works in the twinned style, so that their inventions would be simultaneously more delightful and more useful to their readers'). Hrabanus Maurus, *De laudibus sanctae crucis*, PL 107, col. 265. This model of pleasurable and useful writing derives from the Horatian ideal: 'Aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae / aut simul et iucunda et idonea dicere vitae' ('Poets want to be either useful or amusing, or to say things that are both agreeable and applicable to life at once'). Horace, *Ars poetica*, lines 333–4, in C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 2011) II, 51–72, at 67. Glending Olson notes that the Horatian unity of ethical utility and aesthetic delight became 'probably the most familiar literary commonplace in the Middle Ages' and was often transmitted implicitly through other texts. G. Olson, *Literature as Recreation in the Later Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY, 1982), p. 21.

[8] For a fuller treatment of the centrality of these texts and an account of their surviving manuscript witnesses, see Thornbury, *Becoming a Poet*, pp. 46–50, esp. 47–8. See also P. Lendinara, 'The World of Anglo-Saxon Learning', *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature*, ed. M. Godden and M. Lapidge (Cambridge, 2013), pp. 295–312. See also M. Lapidge, 'The Study of Latin Texts in late Anglo-Saxon England: the Evidence of Latin Glosses', *Latin and the Vernacular Languages in Early Medieval Britain*, ed. N. Brooks (Leicester, 1982), pp. 99–140.

[9] The *Carmen paschale* was well known in Anglo-Saxon England; many pre-Conquest manuscripts survive, and two contain commentaries on the work: Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 144/194 (s. x[1], England?, provenance Canterbury StA) and Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 134 (s. x ex., England, provenance Salisbury). See H. Gneuss and M. Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: a Bibliographical Handlist of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100* (Toronto, 2014), 120 (pp. 123–4) and 735 (p. 532), respectively. For more background on the transmission of the *Carmen paschale* in Anglo-Saxon England, see C. P. E. Springer, 'The Manuscripts of Sedulius a Provisional Handlist', *Trans. of the Amer. Philosophical Soc.* 85 (1995), i–xxii and 1–244.

[10] Aldhelm remained in wide circulation through the tenth century, when renewed attention to his writings led to the rise of the hermeneutic style. M. Lapidge notes that his verse – of course including his *opus geminatum*, the widely popular *De virginitate* – 'was diligently studied', while Aldhelm himself served 'as a curriculum author in English and continental schools'. M. Lapidge, *Anglo-Latin Literature: 600–899* (London, 1996), p. 249. For more on Aldhelm's influence on tenth-century Latin, see M. Lapidge, 'The Hermeneutic Style in Tenth-Century Anglo-Latin Literature', *ASE* 4 (1975), 67–111.

[11] The circulation of Bede's own twinned work, the prose and verse *Vita S. Cuthberti*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

popular in the tenth century. Later in the century, these were joined by two works in a stylistically related form, the prosimetrum, which alternates prose and verse in the same work instead of separating them: Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* and Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius's *De consolatione philosophiae* [hereafter *DCP*].

PROSIMETRUM AND THE *OPUS GEMINATUM*

Previous studies of the *opus geminatum*, most notably by Bill Friesen and Gernot Wieland, have explicitly excluded prosimetrical works like Boethius's *DCP* from the ambit of the true 'twinned work',[12] but closer attention to tenth-century literary culture demonstrates that the two were inextricably linked in Anglo-Saxon circles. While this exclusion may make sense from a post-medieval perspective, for which the *opus geminatum* and the prosimetrum have coalesced into distinct, easily separable forms, it does not adequately take stock of the milieu into which Boethius's *DCP* was initially received – or the doubly hybrid nature of the Old English translations, which will serve as the test case at the heart of this article.

Indeed, from the perspective of the later Middle Ages and after, the prosimetrum appears to be a genre of obvious cultural centrality whose arrival on the scene can have occasioned little surprise. In the early tenth century, however, it had nothing like the same currency as the *opus geminatum*. Indeed, whereas Bede and Hrabanus both thought of the twinned work as a known, named genre with a distinct tradition, the word 'prosimetrum' itself is not found before the twelfth century.[13] And before the arrival of the *DCP* itself, there was no prosimetrum in England at all – only the vastly popular *opus geminatum* tradition, into which Boethius's text was received. As Karl Reichl and Joseph Harris observe, 'in Bede's day a competent Latinist might write, not prosimetrical, but matching prose and verse versions of his work'[14] – a

[hereafter *VSC*], is especially secure in the beginning of the tenth century, since King Athelstan (r. 924–39), Alfred's grandson, donated a lavish copy to Cuthbert's *familia* at Chester-le-Street. A surviving list of the donated books includes '.i. sancti Cuthberti vitam, metrice et prosaice scriptam' ('.i. life of Saint Cuthbert, written in verse and prose'), clarifying that the complete *opus geminatum* circulated together at this time. For the full list, see M. Lapidge, 'Surviving Booklists from Anglo-Saxon England', *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies presented to Peter Clemoes on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. M. Lapidge and H. Gneuss (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 33–90, at 49–50.

[12] See, for instance, Friesen's addendum to his definition of the form: 'Nor again must this form be confused with prosimetrum, which alternates between prose and verse throughout a single work' in '*Opus Geminatum*', p. 124.

[13] Early writers often labelled these mixed works *satura*. J. Ziolkowski, 'Prosimetrum and the Classical Tradition', *Prosimetrum: Crosscultural Perspectives on Narrative in Prose and Verse*, ed. J. Harris and K. Reichl (Suffolk, 1997), pp. 45–65, at 46.

[14] K. Reichl and J. Harris, 'Introduction', *Prosimetrum: Crosscultural Perspectives*, pp. 1–16, at 9–10.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

state of affairs that remained true later in the period as well, particularly as Aldhelm's popularity surged in the tenth century, and he became a stylistic model not only for the hermeneutic Latin then coming into vogue but also for the increasingly widespread use and adaptation of the *opus geminatum* as a formal mode.[15] At the same time, Bede became a particularly important figure in authorizing vernacular projects, with the tenth century witnessing a sharp uptick in the popularity of the poem now known as *Bede's Death Song* – and the incumbent representation of Bede as an English-language poet.[16] While she emphasizes the continuing importance of continental poets like Sedulius, the originator of the twinned form, Patrizia Lendinara notes that Anglo-Latin writers made substantial contributions to the Anglo-Saxon curriculum, and 'from English schools came the great masters whose writings instructed generations, centuries even, of Insular and continental students alike: one has only to think of the works of Aldhelm, Bede and Alcuin' – including their *opera geminata* – 'which were copied and studied intensively up to the twelfth century and beyond'.[17]

In contrast, because of the lack of pre-tenth-century English prosimetrum, when the works of Boethius and Martianus resurfaced among the Carolingians and made their way to England, their prosimetrical form would hardly have seemed to belong to a recognizable genre – and certainly not one with a history in England.[18] Around the year 900, Boethius's text was itself a fairly recent arrival on English shores,[19] and, as Michael Lapidge notes, knowledge of the next best-known Latin prosimetrum, the *De nuptiis*, was 'unusual at any time

[15] For an overview of the style – and the central place of Aldhelm in its revival, see Lapidge, 'The Hermeneutic Style'.

[16] For a brief overview of the poem and its circulation history, see H. D. Chickering, 'Some Contexts for Bede's Death-song', *PMLA* 91.1 (1976), 91–100.

[17] Lendinara, 'World of Anglo-Saxon Learning', p. 295.

[18] Brief poetic interludes sometimes appear in longer works, as when Bede inserts Cædmon's *Hymn* into his larger history. From 937 to 1065, there are six verse entries in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which similarly embed verse within a broader work of historiography. These embedded poems hardly constitute a sustained use of the mixed form, however. Renée Trilling has argued for the prosimetrical nature of the *Chronicle*, but the six inset poems suggest the influence of the Latin historiographic tradition more than a conscious prosimetrical design. Moreover, the *Chronicle* poems all postdate the arrival and translation of Boethius's *DCP*, since the earliest, *The Battle of Brunanburh*, was written in 937, while the dual translations of the Old English *Boethius* were likely completed by 930. For Trilling's view, see her *Aesthetics of Nostalgia: Historical Representation in Old English Verse* (Toronto, 2009), pp. 180–6.

[19] Malcolm Godden and Susan Irvine note that the *DCP* 'seems to have been totally unknown or at least unread until the end of the eighth century, and the earliest evidence for it in England, apart from the OE Boethius itself, is from the early tenth century': *The Old English Boethius: an Edition of the Old English Versions of Boethius's De consolatione Philosophiae*, ed. M. Godden and S. Irvine, 2 vols. (Oxford, 2009) I, 69. For a full account, see A. Papahagi, 'The Transmission of Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae* in the Carolingian Age', *MÆ* 78.1 (2009), 1–15.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

before the 9th c. in Europe, and the late 10th c. in England'.[20] In early tenth-century England, then, prosimetrum was only just emerging as a genre. In contrast, the *opus geminatum* was popular and well attested – practised by many accomplished Latinists before (and after) the turn of the century, when the first extant traces of Boethius's *DCP* may be found in England.[21]

The *DCP* might have crossed the Channel at any time after its rediscovery by the Carolingians. Whenever it arrived in England, however, the dominance of the *opus geminatum* ensured that it would be read in relation to the better-established literary mode. The relationship between the two was further cemented by the fact that Boethius's prosimetrum was rediscovered in circles where *opera geminata* were being written, such as Alcuin's *Vita S. Willibrordi* (785 × 797), Hrabanus Maurus's *De laudibus sanctae crucis* (810) and Candidus Bruun's *Vita Aegili* (*c.* 840).[22] The rediscovery of Boethius has been traditionally attributed to Alcuin himself, although Theodulf of Orléans (*c.* 750/60–821) has recently been proposed as another candidate.[23] Either way, the wide circula-

[20] M. Lapidge, *The Anglo-Saxon Library* (Oxford, 2006), p. 44, n. 65. On Tatwine's exceptionalism, see D. Shanzer, 'Tatwine: an Independent Witness to the Text of Martianus Capella's *De grammatica*', *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 112 (1984), 292–313.

[21] In 'Transmission of Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae*', A. Papahagi suggests that London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. xiv (s. ix$^{1/4}$, N or NE France; provenance England s. x^{in} (before 912); Canterbury CC?) is the earliest attested manuscript witness to the *DCP* in England, with fragments of Boethius's metres scrawled on flyleaves. This manuscript also includes Isidore's *Synonyma* and religious texts. For the full list of contents, see Gneuss-Lapidge, 392 (pp. 317–8). Godden has also observed possible late-ninth-century Welsh glosses in [Rome], Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat. 3363 (s. ix), perhaps moving the arrival of Boethius in Britain a bit earlier. M. Godden, 'The Latin Commentary and the Old English Text; Authorship and Kingship', reported at the fourth annual symposium of The Alfredian Boethius Project, Univ. of Oxford, August 2006, and accessible on their website. For further details on the glosses' possible ties to Wales and Asser, see M. B. Parkes, 'A Note on MS Vatican, Bibl. Apost., lat 3363', *Boethius: his Life, Thought, and Influence*, ed. M. Gibson (Oxford, 1981), pp. 425–7.

[22] Hrabanus studied with Alcuin at Tours and later took charge of the monastic school at Fulda, where Candidus likely succeeded him, when he himself became abbot.

[23] P. Courcelle, *La Consolation de Philosophie dans la tradition littéraire: Antécédents et postérité de Boèce* (Paris, 1967), p. 335: 'A la fin du VIIIe siècle, Alcuin semble avoir découvert la *Consolation*' ('At the end of the eighth century, Alcuin seems to have discovered the *Consolation*'). See also: D. K. Bolton, 'The Study of the *Consolation of Philosophy* in Anglo-Saxon England', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 44 (1977), 22–78, at 34; M. T. Gibson, 'Boethius in the Carolingian schools', *TRHS* (1982), 43–56, at 45; M. Godden, 'Alfred, Asser, and Boethius', *Latin Learning and English Lore: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature for Michael Lapidge*, ed. K. O'Brien O'Keeffe and A. Orchard (Toronto, 2005), pp. 326–48, at 327. See also M. Godden, 'King Alfred and the Boethius Industry', *Making Sense: Constructing Meaning in Early English*, ed. A. diPaolo Healey and K. Kiernan, Publ. of the Dictionary of OE 7 (Toronto, 2007), 116–38. In contrast, Papahagi argues that Theodulf of Orléans, rather than Alcuin, revived and disseminated the *Consolatio* during the Carolingian era in 'Transmission of Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae*'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tion of *opera geminata*, both in England and Carolingia, provided a backdrop for the *DCP* once it re-emerged and made its way across the Channel.

THE *TWIFEALD WEORC* AND THE OLD ENGLISH *BOETHIUS*

Although the *opus geminatum* was largely conceived of and executed as a Latin genre, it has an Old English name as well: the *twifeald weorc* ('two-fold work').[24] This was the term coined by the translator of the Old English *Bede*, a vernacular version of the *Historia ecclesiastica* perhaps undertaken *c.* 883 × 930, which abridges, augments, and omits parts of Bede's text but carefully preserves its account of Aldhelm intact.[25] This phrase may be significant. Just as the *opus geminatum* received a vernacular name around the turn of the tenth century, so the form itself seems to have been adopted, at about the same time, as a model for a composition in the vernacular. This composition was the Old English translation of Boethius's *DCP*. As I argue in the remainder of this article, this English version seems to have been explicitly modelled after the Latin form.

The affiliations shared by the Old English *Boethius* and the *opus geminatum* tradition have in recent years sparked renewed interest and led to an emerging body of new work on the topic.[26] As suggestive as these studies are, however,

[24] 'Wrat he [Aldhelm] eac heah boc 7 weorðlice de uirginitate, 7 þa on bysene Sedulius twifealde weorce meterfersum asang 7 geradre spræce gesette' ('Aldhelm also wrote a noble and distinguished book *De Virginitate*, and following the example of Sedulius's double work he composed it in verse and also set it down in suitable speech'). *The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. T. Miller, 2 vols. (London, 1890–8) I, 448. In 'Formal Encounters in Early England: When Poetry Met Prose' (unpubl. PhD dissertation, Yale Univ., 2016), Anne Schindel identifies the *twifeald weorc* as a revealing source for Anglo-Saxon ideas about genre.

[25] The Old English *Bede* has traditionally been seen as part of the Alfredian revival, but Sharon M. Rowley and others have recently argued that the translation was an independent work, unassociated with any school. The dating relies mainly on paleographic grounds. S. M. Rowley, *The Old English Version of Bede's Historia ecclesiastica* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 15–35.

[26] Recent work includes my 'The *Opus geminatum* and the Old English *Meters of Boethius*', paper delivered at The Anglo-Saxon Studies Colloquium Annual Conference, New York University, April 2011, and 'Latin Learning and the Vernacular: Translating Boethius in Anglo-Saxon England', delivered at the International Congress on Medieval Studies, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, May 2013; B. Mize, *Traditional Subjectivities: the Old English Poetics of Mentality* (Toronto, 2013), pp. 161–3; S. Irvine, 'The Protean Form of the Old English Boethius', *The Legacy of Boethius in Medieval England*, ed. A. J. McMullen and E. Weaver (Tempe, AZ, forthcoming). Susan has been a generous supporter and interlocutor ever since she was kind enough to listen to an early version of this paper at Kalamazoo in 2013. I owe her many thanks for her mentorship, for contributing 'Protean Form' to my and Joey's *Legacy of Boethius*, and for her permission to cite this essay in advance of publication. Scholars, who have previously connected the *Boethius* to the *opus geminatum*, include B. Griffiths in his *Alfred's Metres of Boethius* (Pinner, Middlesex, 1994), p. 12; D. Anlezark, 'Three Notes on the Old English *Meters of Boethius*', *N&Q* 51 (2004), 10–15, at 10, n. 4; and P. E. Szarmach, 'An Apologia for the *Meters of Boethius*', *Naked Wordes in Englissh*, ed. M. Krygier and L. Sikorska (Frankfurt, 2005), pp. 107–36, at 119.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the subject – together with the place of prosimetrum in late Anglo-Saxon England – has not received a full account until now. This article broadens outward from earlier models like Aldhelm, Bede and Alcuin to situate the *Boethius* within the framework of ninth- and tenth-century literary culture. Furthermore, it explains *why* an Anglo-Saxon translator would make the formal decision to render Boethian prosimetrum as a *twifeald weorc* – and what that suggests about generic hybridity in Anglo-Saxon England.

As an analysis of the two prefaces and the first Metre will make clear, the reasons are fittingly *twifeald*: Motivated by both form and content, the translators positioned the *Boethius* within the larger milieu of Latin genres to produce what they saw as a fitting recreation of the *DCP* in the vernacular. Fittingly, then, the Old English *Boethius* exists in two versions, both 'the work of an unknown writer of substantial learning, not necessarily connected with King Alfred or his court, but working some time in the period 890–930, probably in southern England', as Malcolm Godden and Susan Irvine have noted.[27] One version translates Boethius's prosimetrum into Old English prose. This all-prose text is preserved in the late-eleventh- or early-twelfth-century B manuscript (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 180).[28] A second version, made within perhaps twenty years of its predecessor, versifies the majority of the metres to create a prosimetrical translation, now preserved in the mid-tenth-century C manuscript (London, British Library, Cotton Otho A. vi, fols. 1–129).[29] C was badly damaged when the Cotton library fire swept through Ashburnham House in 1731, but a seventeenth-century transcription made by the Dutch scholar and collector Franciscus Junius (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 12) has allowed editors to restore the incinerated poetry.[30]

B has always been understood either as a first draft prepared in order to make the prosimetrical translation possible or as a complete translation later

[27] *The Old English Boethius* I, 146. The outer *terminus ante quem* is *c.* 950, when the earliest extant manuscript was copied, but I follow Godden and Irvine in assuming some intermediate time between the completion of the translation and this manuscript witness.

[28] Gneuss-Lapidge, 555 (p. 440). A fragment of a single leaf, now lost, perhaps preserved the earliest known copy of the text, but its history is puzzling and unlikely to be untangled unless the fragment resurfaces. For the details, see Godden and Irvine on the Napier Fragment in *The Old English Boethius* I, 34–41.

[29] This manuscript was produced in southeastern England; for more details, see Gneuss-Lapidge 347 (pp. 274–5).

[30] For an account of the fire and its aftermath, see A. Prescott, '"Their Present Miserable State of Cremation": the Restoration of the Cotton Library', *Sir Robert Cotton as Collector: Essays on an Early Stuart Courtier and his Legacy*, ed. C. J. Wright (London, 1997), pp. 391–454. For more details about the restoration process, see K. S. Kiernan, 'Alfred the Great's Burnt Boethius', *The Iconic Page in Manuscript, Print, and Digital Culture*, ed. G. Bornstein and T. Tinkle (Ann Arbor, MI, 1998), pp. 7–32, at 15–16; and S. Irvine, 'Fragments of Boethius: the Reconstruction of the Cotton Manuscripts of the Alfredian Text', *ASE* 34 (2005), 169–81.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

supplanted by the more formally faithful prosimetrical version.[31] Kenneth Sisam and Bill Griffiths advance the former view; however, Griffiths based his argument on a misunderstanding of the *opus geminatum*, reading the prose halves of Aldhelm's *De virginitate* and Bede's *Vita S. Cuthberti* as drafts whose survival is incidental.[32] Griffiths thus acknowledges the close relationship between the two forms – both of the Old English prose and prosimetrum and of the Old English *Boethius* and the *opus geminatum* – but does not make sense of the circulation history. Ælfric consulted a version of the prose text, now preserved in B, at the end of the tenth century, which suggests that it continued to be read.[33] Furthermore, B itself was copied some 150 years after C had been completed, which indicates that *both* versions remained current. If the prosimetrical version were the second and final stage, closer to the original and therefore generally understood as superior to the version in prose, then the prose version would hardly continue to circulate for well over a hundred years.

As Godden and Irvine have noted, the draft theory is particularly untenable, since B was outfitted with a list of chapters, chapter divisions, and a preface – all suited more to scholarly consultation than to a translator's scrap work.[34] Godden and Irvine have argued that the prose version was instead a finished copy intended for circulation, while the prosimetrical version was perhaps created as a 'successor to, or substitute for, the prose version' – either 'conceived and initiated by the original translator', who 'commissioned another more expert than himself to compose the verse', or 'a separate and independent project'.[35] More recently, Irvine has argued for the latter, concluding that 'the prose version seems to have been conceived as an independent project'.[36] Irvine thus denies the relationship highlighted by Sisam and Griffiths, arguing that the two versions are independent and were repositioned as a pair in the course of their transmission history.

Irvine's reconstruction is inherently unlikely, however. As a closer

[31] Godden and Irvine helpfully summarize the two hypotheses: 'The author may have produced the prose version (PV) as a draft for the use of the metrist who created the prosimetrical version (PMV), and have from the outset intended the latter as the final form of the work for circulation. Or he may have conceived the PV as a final text and circulated it and then he or another may have subsequently created the PMV as an alternative, in imitation of the form of the Latin text': *The Old English Boethius*, I, 45.

[32] K. Sisam, *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (Oxford, 1953), pp. 293–7; and Griffiths, *Alfred's Metres*, p. 12. Godden and Irvine's objections may be found in *The Old English Boethius* I, 45.

[33] M. Godden, 'Ælfric and the Alfredian Precedents', *A Companion to Ælfric*, ed. H. Magennis and M. Swan (Boston, 2009), pp. 139–63.

[34] Godden and Irvine, *The Old English Boethius* I, 45.

[35] *Ibid.* I, 150.

[36] Irvine, 'Protean Form'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

examination of the *opus geminatum* tradition will show, the different formal responses suggest just the opposite: the Anglo-Saxon translators and readers conceived of the *Boethius* as a unified work, in which the all-prose and the prosimetrical versions would cater to readers' varying desires, sometimes for a straightforward account and sometimes for a more stylized version. Rather than an initial prose-only translation superseded by a subsequent, separate prosimetrical one, Boethius's prosimetrum took its place as an Anglo-Saxon equivalent, a native genre, which required two translations arising from a single project.

Indeed, the two Old English prefaces – one in prose and one in verse – efficiently identify the generic affiliations of the translation project for contemporary readers attuned to reading *opera geminata*. Hearkening to the Alfredian revival,[37] the prose preface, which appears in both B and C, claims that the beleaguered king, 'þas boc hæfde geleornode and of Lædene to Engliscum spelle gewende, þa geworhte he hi eft to leoðe swa swa heo nu gedon is'.[38] The generic implications are difficult to ignore: *Engliscum spelle* ('English prose') and *leoðe* ('verse') are presented as parallel nouns – even as definite genres.[39] This early claim has led critics to accept not only the prose's priority but also its conceptual separation. The model presented by the preface belies any separation, however. We are to imagine a single translator rendering the Latin twice, translating *eft* ('again') – not in order to create one ultimate version to supplant an earlier attempt but to complete a pair, two translations that are clearly presented as parts of one whole. Moreover, the foregrounding in the preface of *both* genres further opens the possibility that the prose and prosimetrum formed two parts of the same translation programme.

In order to think that the two projects are independent or that one supersedes the other, all scholars have to assume that the prose preface has been corrupted

[37] For the larger context of King Alfred's translation programme and overall reign, see *Alfred the Great: Asser's Life of King Alfred and other Contemporary Sources*, ed. S. Keynes and M. Lapidge (London, 1983).

[38] Prose Preface, lines 7–9, *The Old English Boethius* I, 239: 'had studied this book and turned it from Latin to English prose, then he worked it again into verse just as it is now done'. Here, where Junius records 'þa geworhte he' for C, the prose preface in B has 'and geworhte', but the sense is the same. All translations are my own.

[39] In her quest to establish 'What oral-culture equivalent to the printed page', which we now format with clear line breaks and a jagged right-hand margin, 'alerted Anglo-Saxon audiences to put on a poetic hat, to prepare to hear words sing', Roberta Frank turns to this *spell / leoð* division to bolster her conclusion that the Anglo-Saxons 'certainly distinguished between verse and prose'. R. Frank, 'Poetic Words in Late Old English Prose', *From Anglo-Saxon to Early Middle English: Studies presented to E. G. Stanley*, ed. M. Godden, D. Gray and T. Hoad (Oxford, 1994), pp. 87–107, at 88.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in transmission either by scribal error or confusion. First, scholars have been troubled by the inclusion in B of the assurance that the text has been reworked in Old English verse, *swa swa heo nu gedon is* ('just as it is now done'). This allusion to poetry in a preface to the all-prose version has traditionally been seen as a mistake, since it implies that it introduces a work in verse.[40] Focusing on this anomaly, Irvine argues that '[t]he allusion to the poetic version, along with the clumsy repetition of "as it is now done," is most convincingly explained as an interpolation'.[41] Second, in her analysis of the prose preface, Irvine has further noted the anomaly of labelling the prosimetrical version as straight *leoð* 'poetry', again observing that the preface introduces a generically mixed translation while nonetheless 'bring[ing] Alfred's role as poet (*leoðwyrhta*, l. 3) to the fore. Its primary interest is in poetry, and it strongly implies that it introduces a work composed in verse.'[42]

But there is an alternative provided by the prevalence of the *opus geminatum* in tenth-century England. This alternative allows us to see the two texts in dialogue, with the prose preface speaking for the pairing – not just for itself. Here, the appearance of *swa swa heo nu gedon is* ('just as it is now done') in the prose-only B manuscript may be more accurately recognized as a signpost from one half of the twinned work to the other and from prose to poetry. Tellingly, Bede makes a similar gesture towards his poetic life of Cuthbert in the preface to his prose life, reminding readers that the full work exists across two genres: 'Sciat autem sanctitas vestra quia vitam eiusdem Deo dilecti patris nostri quam vobis prosa editam dedi, aliquanto quidem brevius, sed eodem tamen ordine rogantibus quibusdam e nostris fratribus heroicis dudum versibus edidi.'[43] Thus, whether in Latin or Old English, the preface-writer accounts for the full work by directing readers from the prose to the coexisting verse – both produced 'to the same purpose'.

When read in this way, the prose preface to the *Boethius* falls in line with the theoretically savvy frameworks proposed by Latin authors in prefaces to *opera geminata*. In the Latin tradition, prefaces often provided a space for authors to theorize about the formal implications of their generic choices and

[40] For more background, see *The Old English Boethius* II, 243.

[41] *Ibid.* Godden and Irvine have argued that the entire sentence, 'Ða bisgu … gedon is' forms one long interpolation, while David Pratt reads the odd wording as a 'light modification'. *The Old English Boethius* II, 242–4. D. Pratt, 'The Voice of the King in "King Edgar's Establishment of Monasteries"', *ASE* 41 (2012), 145–204, at 204.

[42] Irvine, 'Protean Form'.

[43] 'Your holiness should also know that the life of this same father of ours, the beloved of God, which I have given you set forth in prose, I also produced a little while ago in heroic verses, somewhat shorter indeed, yet to the same purpose at the request of some of our brethren.' Bede, *VSC*, Prose Preface, *Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert: a Life by an Anonymous Monk of Lindisfarne and Bede's Prose Life*, ed. B. Colgrave (Cambridge, 1940), p. 146.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the receptions they hoped to receive. Moreover, these prefaces were usually ascribed to a named author, so the attribution of the *Boethius* to Alfred may be in imitation of the Latin genre. In the preface to the *Vita S. Cuthberti* discussed above, Bede notes that such prefaces were 'iuxta morem' ('according to custom'), suggesting that they were a common feature of twinned works.[44] These prefatory remarks played a particularly important role in *opera geminata*, where they provide unique witnesses to Anglo-Saxon ideas about poetry and prose, and the prefaces to the *Boethius* similarly aspire to a crisp generic identity. Besides, when taken seriously, the phrase *swa swa heo nu gedon is* strongly suggests that the two texts were indeed related, as Sisam and Griffiths assume. In this model, the prose and prosimetrical versions of the Old English *Boethius* were conceived of as the two halves of a twinned whole, each of which fulfilled a complementary rhetorical – and perhaps pedagogical – purpose, each of which was capable of circulating independently, but which constituted the full translation only when they were conjoined.

HYBRID FORMS, AUTHORSHIP AND AESTHETICS

One might object that the two versions do not comprise a unified translation on the grounds that they are not conjoined in the surviving manuscripts; however, this fact is not a difficulty for this hypothesis. As Britt Mize observes, the prose and verse counterparts of *opera geminata* circulated either separately or together, but were still received as complementary parts of a single work.[45] In his definition of the form, Bill Friesen similarly notes that the generic conventions of the *opus geminatum* do 'not require that the same writer compose both halves, nor that they be written or read in a particular order'.[46] The question of whether or not B and C are the work of a single translator is thus irrelevant to this unified model of translation, though the prefaces certainly posit a single hand at work.[47] For *opera geminata* and the paraphrases from which the tradition arose, neither the temporal distance between the original and the counterpart nor the question of authorship, individual or collective, would prevent the pair of texts from being conceived of as a single work. Indeed, some *opera geminata* had one author, who penned both the prose and verse halves, while

[44] Bede, *VSC*, Prose Preface (ed. Colgrave, p. 142).

[45] Mize observes that 'the alternative versions' of *opera geminata* 'were copied, disseminated, and received separately more often than together in a single codex' in his *Traditional Subjectivities*, p. 161.

[46] Friesen, '*Opus Geminatum*', p. 124.

[47] The two versions are heavily reliant on one another. For a detailed comparison of the B and C texts with the Latin original, see *The Old English Boethius*, pp. 44–9. D. Donoghue also details the poetic processes underlying the Old English metres in 'Word Order and Poetic Style: Auxiliary and Verbal in the Metres of Boethius', *ASE* 15 (1986), 167–96.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

others had an earlier author in one genre whose work was later twinned by another, sometimes writing decades later, as in the case of the works of the continental Latin poets mentioned above.[48] Closer at hand, the metrical *Vita S. Iudoci* – likely written at Winchester under Æthelwold's bishopric (963–84) – served as a verse *contrafactum* to the Carolingian prose life now known as the *Vita prima S. Iudoci*, which was likely written by an anonymous Breton (913 × 931).[49] Tellingly, however, the norm in England was for one author – or one workshop, as in another example from Old Minster, Winchester, which I will discuss below – to compose both halves, sometimes written years apart. The unity inherent in the form lends the sense that 'there was one mind at work (though probably never entirely on its own)', as Janet M. Bately has observed of the two versions of the *Boethius*.[50] For the purposes of this article, it does not matter whether that mind was Alfred's or someone else's;[51] the idea of the *opus geminatum* was alive and well not only in Alfred's Wessex but also in the following century.

Whoever was behind it, the prose preface presents the dual translations as a single project that conceived and produced a prose translation and a prosimetrical translation from the start. It is impossible to do more than speculate about whether one translator cum versifier executed both versions, intending an *opus geminatum* from the outset; or whether a later versifier twinned an earlier prose translation, conceiving of his efforts as forming the second half of an unfinished project and writing the prefaces to reflect the unified nature of the two versions; or still whether a later preface-writer received the dual versions as an *opus geminatum* and penned prefaces to that effect after the fact, as Irvine has suggested.[52] The C-translator's reliance on the prose passages from B strongly suggests that he was explicitly working in the model of the *opus geminatum*, however. As Daniel Donoghue has observed, the versifier followed the prose

[48] See above, n. 5, on the medieval Latin poets who participated in this tradition.

[49] The poem is *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina* [hereafter *BHL*] no. 4512, now preserved in London, British Library, Royal 8. B. xiv, 137r–144v (s. xi[1], France [Saint-Josse, Brittany?]; s. xi[2], England; both parts in England [Winchester?] by s. xi ex.). See Gneuss-Lapidge, 474.5 (p. 387). It has been edited and translated by M. Lapidge in 'A Metrical *Vita S. Iudoci* from Tenth-Century Winchester', *Jnl of Med. Latin* 10 (2000), 251–306. The prose life is *BHL* no. 4504, ed. M. Jullien and F. Perelman, in *Clavis scriptorum Latinorum Medii Aevi: auctores Galliae, 735–987*, II: *Alcuin* (Turnhout, 1999), pp. 497–8.

[50] J. M. Bately, 'Lexical Evidence for the Authorship of the Prose Psalms in the Paris Psalter', *ASE* 10 (1982), 69–95, at 94–5, n. 167.

[51] On the question of Alfredian authorship, see M. Godden, 'Did King Alfred Write Anything?', *MÆ* 76.1 (2007), 1–23; and J. M. Bately, 'Did King Alfred Actually Translate Anything?: the Integrity of the Alfredian Canon Revisited', *MÆ* 78.2 (2009), 189–215. See also J. M. Bately, 'Alfred as Author and Translator', *A Companion to Alfred the Great*, ed. N. G. Discenza and P. E. Szarmach (Leiden, 2015), pp. 113–42.

[52] Irvine, 'Protean Form'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

text 'quite faithfully and without referring back to the Latin originals', so that '[i]n many verse passages one can find words and half-lines which are direct transcriptions from the prose', suggesting that the *Boethius* developed one genre from the other, much as an *opus geminatum* would.[53] If the larger goal were to produce a translation that more accurately captured Boethius's original, then the translator would hardly have relied on a 'botched' or 'inaccurate' all-prose translation to remake the Latin text in English. The intention must have been different: to dial up the poetic nature of the second version but to retain sections from the first, creating a flexible, hybrid version in the vernacular.

The *Boethius* is thus the result of an often collaborative, often evolving mode of textual production that characterizes late Anglo-Saxon England – and that ultimately refuses to answer neatly to our concerns about authorship. It is the product of a literary culture that privileges diffusion just as much as known authorship, doubleness as much as unity, even unity composed of doubles. Boethian dialectic engendered other exploratory, speculative forms. And the Old English *Boethius* takes its place alongside other potential twinned works in English, from *Solomon and Saturn* to *Andreas*.[54]

And yet, both compositional scenarios – the single translator or the pair – fit the rather flexible constraints of the *opus geminatum*. Bede's own efforts at composing a twinned work answer to similar questions of authorship and temporal distance, and the earliest lives of Cuthbert provide an illustrative point of comparison. Bede's *Vita S. Cuthberti* emerged gradually, first in a way more akin to the Late Antique paraphrase tradition and then progressing to a fully-fledged *opus geminatum*. The Venerable Bede set to work twinning an anonymous prose life (written 699 × 705) with a poetic version (*c.* 716), before later undertaking a longer prose version (*c.* 721), suggesting that the genre remained flexible, though single-author twinned works were perhaps to be preferred.[55] It is notable that Bede does not mention his anonymous source in either version, implying that he intended an independent matched pair.[56] Cuthbert of Wearmouth and Jarrow, Bede's own student and later abbot of that twin-foundation monastery, sent the full work in prose and verse to Lull, bishop of Mainz (754–86), further implying that the two genres were meant to

[53] Donoghue, 'Word Order and Poetic Style', p. 167. Donoghue's findings are supported by Griffith, who likewise notes that the prosodic systems of the Metres were 'reshaped by constant contact with the prose source': 'The Composition of the Metres', *The Old English Boethius* I, 130. See also Anlezark, 'Three Notes'.

[54] See, for instance, B. Friesen, 'Visions and Revisions: the Sources and Analogues of the Old English *Andreas*' (unpubl. PhD dissertation, Univ. of Toronto, 2008), for the suggestion that *Andreas* may fall under the umbrella of the *opus geminatum* tradition.

[55] For more on the dating, see Colgrave, *Two Lives of Saint Cuthbert*, pp. 11–16.

[56] Bede does, however, mention reading about Cuthbert in the writings of various Lindisfarne monks in *HE* iv. 27–32 (ed. Colgrave and Mynors, pp. 431–49).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

work in tandem.[57] Similarly, rather than in two, largely separate translations, Boethius's *DCP* manifested itself at once in an Anglo-Saxon form that tailored prose and poetry for complementary receptions: a work in which the prose and verse sections are thoroughly interdependent – and a translation process that was not fully realized until both forms had been completed.

As Irvine has noted, the prosimetrical version is not just verse, so it does not look like the standard poetic half of an *opus geminatum*, but this is not the only pairing where prosimetrum stands in for an unmixed genre. In fact, there is an Anglo-Saxon analogue to the model I propose for the *Boethius*: the twinned lives of Swithun, produced at Winchester in the last quarter of the tenth century. Renée Trilling argues that the prose text, Lantfred of Winchester's *Translatio et miracula S. Swithuni*,[58] is the first and only 'true' example of original prosimetrum in Anglo-Saxon England, since Lantfred includes five poetic interludes – two headings, two prayers and an inscription, altogether comprising sixty-two lines of verse.[59] Yet, this rare example of original Anglo-Saxon prosimetrum is not in the vernacular and not by an Anglo-Saxon.[60] Lantfred was a Frankish monk, who trained at and later returned to Fleury, re-crossing the Channel soon after finishing his narrative, so tenth-century Anglo-Saxon prosimetrum is still decidedly hard to come by.[61] Moreover, five poetic interludes spread across forty chapters hardly make for fully-fledged prosimetrum – further highlighting the exceptional nature of the *DCP*'s formal categories. Indeed, Lantfred's semi-prosimetrical *Translatio* was broadly received as straight prose – even at Old Minster, Winchester, where it was produced.

Two decades after its initial composition, it was reconfigured as one half of an *opus geminatum* when Wulfstan Cantor, or Wulfstan of Winchester, rendered Lantfred's text into hexameters (composed 992 × 994, published *c.* 996).[62] Rather than providing an immutable example of original Anglo-Saxon

[57] Cuthbert promises the twinned copies of Bede's work in a letter, ed. M. Tangl, MGH Epist. select. I (Berlin, 1916), 250–2, no. 116.

[58] Lantfred of Winchester, *Translatio et miracula S. Swithuni*, in *The Cult of St Swithun*, ed. M. Lapidge (Oxford, 2003), pp. 252–333.

[59] Trilling, *Aesthetics of Nostalgia*, p. 182. Five poetic interludes make for a small fraction of the total, but the prose-verse mixture on display here may be productively read alongside formal mixtures elsewhere, whether in the *Boethius* or in the Norse tradition of similar inclusions discussed in J. Harris, 'Icelandic Saga', *Prosimetrum: Crosscultural Perspectives*, pp. 131–64.

[60] I have found another example, a short letter – part prose, part verse – from the eleventh century. This letter has been edited by W. Somner, *Dictionarium Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum* (London, 1659) and by M. Förster, 'Die Altenglische Glossenhandschrift Plantinus 32 (Antwerpen) und Additional 32246 (London)', *Anglia* 41 (1917), 94–161, at 153–4.

[61] For more on the localization of Lantfred to Fleury, see Lapidge, *Cult of St Swithun*, pp. 218–24.

[62] This verse *contrafactum* is known as the *Narratio metrica de S. Swithuno* and may also be found in Lapidge, *Cult of St Swithun*, pp. 335–549. Lantfred and Wulfstan's translations were clearly intended to circulate together: London, British Library, Royal 15. C. vii (s. x/xi with additions

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

prosimetrum, then, Lantfred's *Translatio* demonstrates the ways in which prosimetrical texts may be reconceived of as halves of *opera geminata*. Lantfred wrote the *Translatio* in 972–4, well after the mid-tenth-century *terminus ante quem* of the *Boethius*, but his reception history nonetheless provides a telling parallel: In both the Lives of Swithun and the *Boethius*, the formal flexibility ascribed to prosimetrum allows for its adoption as an unmixed genre – whether as straight prose in the *Translatio* or as straight poetry in the *Boethius*. They are similar literary experiments, if not quite formally or generically identical. In both cases, the semi-prosimetrical *opera geminata* forge a new, doubly hybrid form from two already hybrid genres: the *opus geminatum* and the prosimetrum.

These literary experiments thus urge hybridity beyond its customary limits. They also embody a certain kind of creative experimentation within the two genres. It is this formal flexibility – and formal invention – that allows the prose of the *Boethius* to emerge again as prosimetrum, and that prosimetrum to reemerge as the poetic half of a larger project, an *opus geminatum* that alternates prose and verse within its broader coupling of prose and verse. Here and elsewhere, hybrid forms were vehicles for literary and philosophical experimentation, their generic openness allowing for a similarly unencumbered speculative enterprise. Lantfred's poems could slip unnoticed into his prose life, without shifting the text's generic affiliation – just as the C version, which we would call 'prosimetrical', was able to pass as unadulterated *leoð*.

Thus, Anglo-Saxon ideas of genre were broader than ours, even if the labelling of prosimetrum as *leoð* now seems only partially accurate. The *Boethius* preface's allusions to poetry are neither clumsy nor accidental; rather, they offer a sophisticated reading of the generic affinities of the complete work. Just as Lantfred's prosimetrical life stands in as the prose counterpart to Wulfstan's verse *contrafactum*, so does the prosimetrical *Boethius* stand in as the verse partner to the prose. In both twinned works, the addition of poetry completes the pair. Fittingly, the versified metres in C total almost 10,000 words, whereas their prose counterparts in B only tally some 7,800, heightening the sense of C as a poetic project and of the *Boethius* as a translation in prose and verse.[63]

CONTEMPORARY READERS AND FORMAL CATEGORIES

Writing later in the tenth century, Æthelweard (d. 988?) provides rare insight into the contemporary reception of the translations, and to an awareness of their dual form. While Paul E. Szarmach and Malcolm Godden have situated

s. xi^2; Winchester Old Minster) preserves the complete *opus geminatum*, possibly in Wulfstan's own hand. For further details, see Gneuss-Lapidge 496 (pp. 398–9).

[63] As Mark Griffith notes, this constitutes 'an amplification of around 28 per cent, but loss of material from prose to verse means that the added proportion is in fact a little higher'. M. Griffith, 'The Composition of the Metres', *The Old English Boethius* I, 82.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

these remarks within the broader milieu of Alfredian authorship,[64] the generic implications of Æthelweard's statement have thus far gone unrecognized – especially in relation to Alcuin's literary-theoretical statements about the unique capabilities of the twinned work, which will be discussed below. Following the Old English prefaces in ascribing the *Boethius* to King Alfred, Æthelweard further situates the dual translation within the frame of the *opus geminatum*: 'Nam ex Latino rhetorico fasmate in propriam veterat linguam volumina, numero ignoto, ita varie, ita praeopime, ut non tantum expertioribus sed et audientibus Boetii lachrymosus quodammodo suscitaretur motus.'[65] In describing the *Boethius*, Æthelweard recognizes a similar split to that proposed by Alcuin in the preface to his *Vita S. Willibrordi*. Here, Alcuin conceives of separate audiences for prose and verse texts, musing on the intended receptions of each genre:[66] 'tuis parui, Pater sancte, praeceptis, et duos digessi libellos, unum prosaico sermone gradientem, qui publice fratribus in ecclesia, si dignum tuae videatur sapientiae, legi potuisset: alterum Pierio pede currentem, qui in secreto cubili inter scholasticos tuos tantummodo ruminari debuisset'.[67] Just as Alcuin's *opus geminatum* was crafted both for reading *publice* and for private reading *inter scholasticos*, so does Æthelweard conceive of the *Boethius* as a dual text – one translated *non tantum expertioribus sed et audientibus* and therefore suited to separate purposes. Each caters to a different sensibility and only together do they form a unified whole suitable for all 'readers', listeners as well as experts, the monk in the chapter house and the monk in his cell, even the same person over the course of the day, turning to prose in the morning and to poetry at night.

Wieland has suggested that this twinned style thus solved the dilemma of which audience a writer should target, since 'by writing both, the "high" and the "low" style, the author sacrificed neither clarity nor beauty, but simply separated them'.[68] For Alcuin, prose is suited to reading aloud to the

[64] P. E. Szarmach, 'Boethius's Influence in Anglo-Saxon England: the Vernacular and the *De consolatione philosophiae*', *A Companion to Boethius in the Middle Ages* (Leiden, 2012), pp. 221–54, esp. 221–3; and M. Godden, 'King and Counselor in the Alfredian Boethius', *Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture presented to Paul E. Szarmach*, ed. V. Blanton and H. Scheck (Tempe, AZ, 2008), pp. 191–207.

[65] Æthelweard, *Chronicon*, iv. 3, in *The Chronicle of Æthelweard*, ed. A. Campbell (London, 1962), p. 50: 'For from ornate Latin rhetoric he translated unknown numbers of books into his own language with such variety and such richness, that not only for the more tested [i.e. for readers] but also for auditors, the tearful passion of Boethius would be in a certain way brought to life.'

[66] Wieland presents similarly explanatory moments from Bede and Aldhelm in '*Geminus Stilus*', pp. 115–17.

[67] Friesen, '*Opus Geminatum*', p. 140: 'I have obeyed your commands, holy Father, and I have set out two little books: one advancing in prose-like diction, which would be able to be read publicly by the brothers in the church, if it seems fitting to your wisdom; the other running in poetic feet, which only ought to be ruminated among your scholars in a private cell.'

[68] Wieland, '*Geminus Stilus*', p. 125.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

community, while verse is reserved for private, meditative reading. *Gradiens*, the prose could be more easily comprehended by a congregation, while the verse, *currens*, could be teased apart by a more advanced reader. Szarmach has suggested a similar division in intended audiences for the *Boethius*, suggesting that C preserves a 'high art' version, while B fulfills a pedagogical role.[69] Perhaps this division in intended audiences explains the inclusion of a list of chapters in B but not in C: the all-prose version is suited for reading; the prosimetrical, or 'poetic', for hearing.

Just as Alcuin and Bede conceived of complementary receptions for prose and verse, so do the two prologues manifest a similar division in the intended functions of the dual texts of the *Boethius*. Indeed, the verse preface found in C raises a new question, as the poet adopts the wording and tone of a *scop* and forces the reader – or listener – to ask whether verse is more popular or more elevated. Whereas Alcuin's sparse, useful prose was the more 'populist' form, and his more stylized, pleasurable verse was keyed into a higher, more scholarly register, the *Boethius*-translator complicates, even reverses, the paradigm. Here, we see devotional prose ripe for private contemplation, while the more entertaining and widely appealing poetry demands to be read aloud: 'Hliste se þe wille.'[70]

As a whole, the verse preface strikes a popularizing tone. From the beginning, describing Alfred's motivations for re-translating the poetic sections *qua* poetry, the preface-poet relates how:

> Him wæs lust micel
> ðat he ðiossum leodum leoð spellode,
> monnum myrgen, mislice cwidas,
> þy læs ælinge ut adrife selflicne secg[71]

In these lines, the translator demonstrates intentionality for his use of verse. Ascribing a usefulness and delight to poetry, he clarifies that the very form of the verse wards off boredom. Such a view of poetry befits a translation of Boethius, since the larger framework of the *DCP* addresses the appropriate environments for prose and verse respectively. In addition to its larger prosimetrical form, the *DCP* is peppered with asides that further distinguish between prose and poetry. After her lengthy account of divine foreknowledge, for instance, Lady Philosophy pauses to take stock of her listener, observing, 'Sed uideo te iam dudum et pondere quaestionis oneratum et rationis prolixitate

[69] P. E. Szarmach, 'Meter 20: Context Bereft', *ANQ* 15 (2002), 28–34.

[70] Verse Preface 10b, *The Old English Boethius* I, 384: 'Let him listen who wishes.'

[71] Verse Preface 3b–7a, *The Old English Boethius* I, 384: 'For him there was a great desire to proclaim songs to these people, various discourses to make the men mirthful, lest weariness should drive away the self-satisfied warrior.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

fatigatum aliquam carminis exspectare dulcedinem; accipe igitur haustum quo refectus firmior in ulteriora contendas.'[72] Here and at other places in the *DCP*, Boethius treats poetry as a soothing balm that enables the exhausted reader to press forward with prose.

Although Boethius made use of generic differences in advancing his philosophical arguments in the *DCP*, the *twifeald* structure of the Old English *Boethius* builds on his formal innovations. The Anglo-Saxon translator's emphasis on using *mislice cwidas* ('unlike or various discourses') perhaps refers to his heightened use of a mixed form, here split into a prose and a prosimetrical version. For *mislice cwidas*, we might substitute Æthelweard's *ita varie*, *ita praeopime*: dual forms that work in tandem to get the message across. In private correspondence, Audrey Walton has also observed that, in a loose way, the phrase *leoð spellode* also 'performs the work of the *opus geminatum* writ small', combining *spell* ('prose'), in verbal form ('spoke' or 'narrated'), and *leoð* ('poetry') to enact transference between the two genres. Here and elsewhere, the prefaces to the *Boethius* show familiarity with the *opus geminatum* and its conventions, describing two versions in two genres for two distinctive audiences.

Rather than collapsing prose and poetry into one work, the *Boethius* separates them, heightening the text's accessibility. The resulting *opus geminatum* of sorts could appeal not only to experts, who would consult a physical copy, but also to anyone who might hear it read – for those with a philosophical bent and those who just want to be entertained. As the verse preface makes clear, the larger decision to provide a poetic version as well as a prose translation is explicitly invoked as a cautionary measure against boredom. The poetry must exist as well as the prose, *þy læs ælinge ut adrife selflicne secg* ('lest weariness should drive away the self-satisfied warrior'). While straight prose could deliver Boethius's philosophy to a scholarly community, a broader audience requires poetic refreshment, lest weariness drive them away – just as Anglo-Saxon homilies sometimes switch between the two genres to cultivate mass appeal.

After his opening statement about composing in *mislice cwidas*, the *Boethius*-poet goes on to assure his audience:

> Ic sceal giet sprecan,
> fon on fitte, folccuðne ræd
> hæleðum secgean. Hliste se þe wille.[73]

[72] 'But I see that you are now burdened by the weight of the question, and tired from the prolixity of our reasoning, and waiting for the gentleness of song. Therefore take your drink, be refreshed, and press forward the stronger.' Boethius, *De consolatione philosophiae*, iv. p6.57, in *Boethii: Consolatio Philosophiae*, ed. L. Bieler, CCSL 94 (Turnhout, 1975), 84.

[73] Verse Preface 8b–10, *The Old English Boethius* I, 384: 'I shall speak again, begin in my song, relate the folk-known tale to heroes. Let him listen who wishes.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Here, just as the prose preface hinges on *eft* ('again'), so is the verse preface centered on *giet* ('again'). Yet, whereas the prose was translated twice-over, the poetry is spoken once more, further cultivating the sense that complementary receptions were intended for the two versions. As a whole, the *Boethius* emerges from this emphasis on delivering the same matter again and again – and thereby forming a pair of texts, one in verse and one in prose, which ostensibly address the same subject matter: the definition of an *opus geminatum*.

This split in intended receptions clarifies why the translation would take shape as a *twifeald* enterprise. The poet's rhetoric and closing exhortation, *Hliste se þe wille*, echo standard openings to more heroic texts like the Old English *Exodus* and thus position the verse metres within an unexpected context. In contrast, the prose preface adopts a hagiographic tone, as the author requests prayers from his readers: 'and nu bit and for Godes naman healsað ælcne þara þe þas boc rædan lyste þæt he for hine gebidde'.[74] With this, the author of the prefaces reverses the dichotomy set up by Alcuin, creating more personal and reflective prose, while tailoring the prosimetrum – spiced up as it is by the inclusion of poetry – for public entertainment: thereby writing *non tantum expertioribus sed et audientibus*.

This mode of writing heroic verse and instructive prose is tantalizingly mirrored in Bede's prose and metrical lives of Cuthbert, which were likewise outfitted with two prefaces. As mentioned above, in the preface to his prose life, Bede notes that he penned his shorter, poetic version *heroicis . . . versibus* ('in heroic verses') but then promised to write *latius* ('more fully') in prose.[75] When presenting Bishop Eadfrith with this prose life, Bede makes sure to remind him of its verse counterpart, which, though *aliquanto quidem brevius* ('somewhat shorter indeed'), had been produced *rogantibus quibusdam e nostris fratribus* ('at the request of some of our brethren') and might, presumably, therefore have enduring appeal as a more entertaining rendition, lacking the more scholarly aspect of prose but nonetheless catering to audience requests.[76] The intimate community invoked as Bede's poetic audience is paralleled by the intriguing phrasing of the verse preface to the *Boethius*, which specifies that the versification was done *ðiossum leodum* – for *these* people, similarly implying a community with specific generic preferences, and with a taste for poetic

[74] Prose Preface, lines 9–10, *The Old English Boethius* I, 383: 'and now he prays and in God's name he entreats each of those who enjoy reading this book to pray for him'.

[75] Bede, *VSC*, Prose Preface (ed. Colgrave, p. 146).

[76] *Ibid.* M. Lapidge argues that 'Bede clearly intended his poem to serve as a contrafactum of the [anonymous] prose life – to be read in conjunction with it, and to offer a meditation on the spiritual significance of the events described prosaically by the Lindisfarne author': 'Bede the Poet', *Bede and his World: the Jarrow Lectures 1973–1993*, 2 vols. (Aldershot, 1994) II, 929–56, at 940.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

interludes. Thus, motivated by formal considerations, the *Boethius*-translator and his later readers, including Æthelweard, adopted the idea of the *opus geminatum* – however strictly we apply it here – and its separate audiences for prose and poetry to locate a more fitting model for the relationship of the two translations.

SAINT BOETHIUS: METRE 1 AND *TWIFEALD* TRANSLATION

While theories of literary form played a key role in deciding the shape of the *Boethius* translation, content equally drove the decision to compose in the twinned style, as the literary and interpretive currents underpinning the first Old English metre make clear. This metre provides a biographical account of Boethius's misfortunes, appearing in C as verse and in B as prose. It constitutes a traditional twinned work, which provides an informative opening to both versions of the Old English *Boethius* as the first metre and first chapter, respectively, and which introduces Theoderic's brutal rise to power and Boethius's subsequent persecution.

Readings of the passage have been hampered by the conventional understanding of this metre as an original Old English composition because it does not have a direct counterpart in the *DCP*,[77] but it does, in fact, have a source, and this source sheds a great deal of light on the manifestation of the *Boethius* as a *twifeald weorc*. While it is true that the first Old English metre does not form a part of Boethius's Latin text, early English copies of the *DCP* often circulated with one or more prefatory Latin *vitae*, and the first Old English metre is best understood as a product of this tradition.[78] Nicole Guenther Discenza has demonstrated certain moments when the *Boethius*-translator draws from one or more of these prose *vitae* in drafting his own biographical account,[79] but the fact that the *Boethius* translator was working from a manuscript with a *vita* has larger stylistic ramifications as well.

Crucially, the opening Old English biography exists in *both* prose and verse, even though the surviving *vitae* are all in prose. Because the *Boethius* twins even

[77] See, for instance, Mize, who reads Metre 1 as an example of the traditionalizing impulses of the versifier, unquestioningly assuming that the passage has 'no direct Latin source' and is 'an Old English versification of a prose text that is itself original to Old English' in *Traditional Subjectivities*, pp. 155–235, at 155.

[78] These *vitae* have been treated most recently by N. G. Discenza in 'The Unauthorized Biographies of Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius', given at the first annual symposium of *The Alfredian Boethius Project*, Univ. of Oxford, July 2003, and accessible on their website. As Discenza explains, in 'Unauthorized Biographies', p. 1, six of these early *vitae* were included in Rudolfus Peiper's 1871 edition, but because 'more recent editions do not print these later accretions with the text . . . they are often forgotten'. They can be found in *Anicii Manlii Severini Boetii Philosophiae consolationis libri quinque*, ed. R. Peiper (Leipzig, 1871).

[79] Discenza, 'Unauthorized Biographies'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

this, the translator – whether of just the prosimetrical copy or the whole – cannot be relying solely on Boethius's prosimetrum to dictate his stylistic choices. He is not simply creating a prose paraphrase and then a more faithful prosimetrical copy; rather, faced with a prefatory *vita*, the translator executed the *DCP* in *both* genres, adapting and translating even as he experimented with literary form. Here, he rendered the full *DCP* as he encountered it – including the *vita* or *vitae* – in Old English, not just Boethius's text as we now receive it. Furthermore, these prefatory *vitae Boetii* present Boethius as a saint.

Cued by this hagiographic framework, it is only natural that a translator would self-consciously emulate the *opus geminatum* – the ultimate Anglo-Saxon hagiographic genre – in rendering the *DCP* into English.[80] By adapting the prestigious Latin hagiographic genre to his vernacular project, the translator signals that Boethius's *DCP* is not only a work of philosophical merit but also of moral import, a work most necessary for all men to know in more ways than one. In Old English, the *DCP* emerges as more than a secular, if visionary, autobiography. It becomes a pseudo-devotional work, formally modelled on the accounts of exemplary figures whose lives are presented in *opera geminata* from Aldhelm's virgins onward – sometimes even participating in the conventions of a passion.

Following the Carolingians,[81] early English readers framed the *DCP* as the last words of a Christian martyred by the heretical Theoderic, and the shape of the Old English *Boethius* may owe just as much to this aspect of the philosopher's reception as to the formal considerations outlined above. Æthelweard certainly viewed the translation in affective terms, extolling Alfred for making *Boetii lachrymosus . . . motus* ('the tearful passion of Boethius') available to a wider audience. While *motus* refers to an emotional state rather than to Christian martyrdom, Æthelweard's remarks about the *Boethius* immediately follow his praise of the departed king, who had been 'divinis quippe super omnia documentis imbutus' ('obviously steeped in sacred literature above all things').[82] The subsequent mention of the *liber Boetii* thus flows from – and justifies – this

[80] For an overview of the hagiographic associations of the genre, see Wieland, 'Geminus Stilus'.

[81] Alcuin has traditionally been thought to underlie this hagiographic framework. As R. F. Glei, N. Kaminski and F. Lebsanft have observed, 'Alkuin initiierte bekanndich eine dezidierte interpretatio Christiana des Boethius' ('as is generally known, Alcuin initiated a distinctly *interpretatio Christiana* of Boethius'): *Boethius Christianus?: Transformationen der Consolatio Philosophiae in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit*, ed. R. F. Glei, N. Kaminski, and F. Lebsanft (Berlin, 2009), p. 3. Papahagi has also suggested Fleury as a potential point of origin for Christianizing commentary on the *Consolation* in 'Destin et providence (*Consolatio Philosophiae* IV.pr.6): la réception du néoplatonisme Boécien à l'époque carolingienne', *Académie des Inscriptions de Belles-lettres: Comptes rendus des séances de l'année* (2006), 671–711, at 700–2.

[82] Æthelweard, *Chronicon*, iv. 3, in *The Chronicle of Æthelweard*, ed. A. Campbell (London, 1962), p. 51.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

image of the pious king, even as the *Boethius* is itself provided as the sole named example of a *divinum documentum* rendered into Old English – the crowning achievement in Æthelweard's account of Alfred's life. Malcolm Godden has asked whether Æthelweard 'had done more than glance at the beginning', since his portrayal of Boethius's *DCP* seems like an 'odd response to the work as a whole',[83] but Æthelweard's response does not imply his inattention so much as shifting perceptions of Boethius and his text.

The Old English *Boethius* is patterned after a hagiographical framework in other ways as well. Whereas the Boethius of the Latin text suffers great misfortune, he is hardly a Christian martyr. As Discenza has observed, however, the Boethius of the Old English certainly is, and the translator even adds an aside about 'þa halgan martiras' ('the holy martyrs'), framing Boethius's transformation as that of the repentant sinner making amends.[84] Sometimes the Old English Lady Philosophy stand-in, *Wisdom*, is referred to instead by *Gesceadwisnes*, a less common term that Discenza notes is elsewhere 'confined almost completely to religious prose'.[85] Moreover, just as the prose preface solicited prayers from readers, situating the translation within a hagiographic framework from the very beginning, the prose translation likewise ends with an 'AMEN', followed by a supplementary prayer that appeals to God, Mary, Michael and then all of the saints together.[86]

The collation of glosses to contemporary copies of the *DCP* may soon provide new insights into these additions.[87] Indeed, Rosalind Love has already noted the christological and moralizing tendency of glosses in English manuscripts of the *DCP* – a framework that dovetails with the hagiographical context outlined above.[88] There are other Christianizing elements within the text of the *Boethius* itself, which I do not have space to discuss here,[89] but the salient feature is the generic choice triggered by this thread of Boethius's

[83] Godden, 'King and Counselor', p. 191, n. 2.

[84] Ch. 6, line 149, *The Old English Boethius* I, 406.

[85] N. G. Discenza, 'The Old English *Boethius*', *A Companion to Alfred the Great*, pp. 200–26, at 209.

[86] This prayer is omitted from Godden and Irvine but may be found in *King Alfred's Old English Version of Boethius De consolatione Philosophiae*, ed. W. J. Sedgefield (Oxford, 1899), p. 149, lines 11–26.

[87] This collation is currently being undertaken by Malcolm Godden, Rohini Jayatilaka, and Rosalind Love as part of the Boethius in Early Medieval Europe Project based at the University of Oxford. As Love has noted, nearly eighty glossed manuscripts and fragments survive from before the year 1100, preserving a broad body of *scholia* that both accreted and shifted across time. For more on this, see R. Love, 'The Latin Commentaries on Boethius's *De Consolatione Philosophiae* from the 9th to the 11th Centuries', *A Companion to Boethius in the Middle Ages*, pp. 75–134.

[88] Love, 'Latin Commentaries', p. 120.

[89] On Christian additions in the Old English, see, for instance N. G. Discenza, *The King's English: Strategies of Translation in the Old English Boethius* (Albany, NY, 2005), pp. 31–56.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reception: Cued by the presentation of Boethius as a martyr in his source manuscript, the Old English translator or translators set about presenting the *DCP* as a proper life in prose and verse. Because *twifeald* texts are most often associated with religious matters, the *twifeald* nature of the *Boethius* evokes an increasingly sombre, and sobering, framework for the imprisoned narrator. In more ways than one, Boethius's text was primarily situated as a visionary work with salvific force, while Boethius himself was akin to a holy martyr – a categorization signalled by the *twifeald* nature of the translation.

CONCLUSIONS

Emily V. Thornbury has recently argued that the *Boethius* was meant to approximate, in English, the style and cadences of Latin – even to serve as a simulacrum of the experience of reading the original.[90] If this attempt to replicate the original were a motivating factor, as it appears to be, then the *opus geminatum* was well suited to the task. Indeed, in the absence of an Anglo-Saxon prosimetrical tradition, the *opus geminatum* was the only genre that would have seemed fitting. As soon as the *DCP* arrived in England, it had to be translated, and to be translated in an English context, it had to be geminated.

For an Anglo-Saxon audience, the prosimetrical version would have been an odd one-off, patterned on Boethius's Latin original but never explicitly theorized as an Anglo-Saxon form. In the *Boethius*, we instead see the vernacular aspiring most of all to the Latin form native to England – not just to the new prosimetrical mode, which was subsumed within the twinned style, but also to the vastly more familiar, and decidedly more Anglo-Saxon tradition. Perhaps, too, we see not only an imitation of but also a bold improvement on Boethius's prosimetrum, much as Eleanor Johnson has traced Middle English experiments in mixed forms, which have Boethius's *DCP* at the centre but nonetheless make radical formal departures from the strictly prosimetrical model.[91]

As Reichl and Harris have observed, too-narrow conceptions of prosimetrum – like Friesen and Wieland's overly rigid definitions of the twinned work – rely on 'the assumption of two timeless categories, two clearly defined and distinguishable media of verbal expression, prose and verse' – or, in this

[90] Thornbury writes that the *Boethius* 'enabled readers to enjoy the illusion that they were themselves reading an important and difficult work of Latin literature' in *Becoming a Poet*, pp. 224–35, at 235. R. Stanton likewise observes in his own treatment of translation in the reign of Alfred that 'Old English prose texts in a period dominated by translation will inevitably be affected by the nature of the Latin originals . . . [T]hey are attempting to deal with problems raised by Latin style and idiom'. R. Stanton, *The Culture of Translation in Anglo-Saxon England* (London, 2002), p. 58.

[91] See, for instance, her discussion of Chaucer's *Boece* as the prose counterpart to his poem *Troilus and Criseyde* in E. Johnson, *Practicing Literary Theory in the Middle Ages: Ethics and the Mixed Form in Chaucer, Gower, Usk and Hoccleve* (Chicago, 2014), pp. 55–91.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

case, *opus geminatum* and prosimetrum.[92] Reichl and Harris have instead advocated for prosimetrum itself as 'an omnibus term for a phenomenon, or a congeries of phenomena' marked by the 'mixture of verse and prose'.[93] The time has come to reassess the *opus geminatum* as a more flexible form as well – one that predominates in the hybrid texts that proliferated in Anglo-Saxon England.

Attention to formal hybridity is particularly essential for the vernacular works that survive in multiple recensions, from the *Boethius* to *Solomon and Saturn*, which likewise circulated in separate prose and poetic versions.[94] While a rigid geminate-or-prosimetrical distinction works well enough for the Latin texts at the heart of Friesen and Wieland's studies, it is certainly at odds with English literature, for which even a fixed definition of what constitutes poetry or prose has proven elusive. One need only think of Ælfric of Eynsham to be quickly embroiled in seething categories and 'rhythmical prose'. And yet, the formal relocation of the *DCP* and the flexibility of the *Boethius* suggest that Ælfric's blending of prose and verse enacts on the level of the line the kind of textual hybridity then unfolding on the scale of entire works – and entire corpora, whether in the proliferating lives of Cuthbert or Swithun. Friesen himself advocates for the 'inherited textual dynamics of the *opus geminatum*' in *Andreas*, asserting that the twinned work 'paradigm opens numerous horizons of engagement' for other kinds of formal mixture in Anglo-Saxon England.[95]

In the *Boethius*, rather than one recension taking priority over the other, we see a more diffuse process – one capable of moving between two kinds of composition and one offering a new conception of both how the full translation relates to the Latin original *and* how the prose and prosimetrum relate to each other. This dual model of translation suggests a great deal not only about the relationship between prose and poetry in Anglo-Saxon England but also about the overall relevance of generic categories to the twenty-first-century reader of medieval – and particularly early medieval – texts. When read as a vernacular project participating in the same tradition as the *opus geminatum*, the prose and poetry of the Old English *Boethius* present a unified whole, a *twifeald weorc*. One genre does not supplant the other; rather, they work together to

[92] Reichl and Harris, 'Introduction', p. 7. See also K. Hanson and P. Kiparsky, 'The Nature of Verse and its Consequences for the Mixed Form', *Prosimetrum: Crosscultural Perspectives*, pp. 17–44.

[93] Harris and Reichl, 'Introduction', pp. 2–3.

[94] See *The Old English Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn*, ed. and trans. D. Anlezark (Cambridge, 2009). T. A. Bredehoft has suggested that the author of the *Metres* may have known of *Solomon and Saturn* and that the texts may share a point of origin in *Authors, Audiences, and Old English Verse* (Toronto, 2009), pp. 65–103.

[95] Friesen, 'Visions and Revisions', pp. ii–iii. See especially ch. 1, '*Andreas* and the *Opus Geminatum*', pp. 1–32.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cultivate different forms of audience and attention. The influence of the *opus geminatum* on vernacular writing elucidates native English ideas about genre, while reminding us that Anglo-Saxon literary culture is always *twifeald*, and there is always more going on in the gap between Latin forms and Old English representations of them than we tend to acknowledge.

Recent decades have brought many illuminating studies on the deep interconnectedness of Latin and Old English literature, but too often the languages are still too quickly separated – viewed as elements of separate literary circles rather than one permeable multilingual culture. Situated in their late-ninth- and early-tenth-century contexts, the *opus geminatum* and the *Boethius* allow for a temporally appropriate and intellectually productive point of comparison – one that clarifies not only the model of translation at work in the Old English *Boethius* but also Anglo-Saxon ideas about genre at large. Sometimes translators proceeded word by word, sometimes sense by sense, and sometimes, I argue, form by form.[96]

[96] This article originated in a Spring 2011 seminar at Yale, and I am indebted to Roberta Frank for a number of early suggestions and corrections, as well as for her continued support of my work, which has been characteristically generous. I am also grateful to the questions and comments of audience members, especially Susan Irvine, at the Anglo-Saxon Studies Colloquium and at Kalamazoo, and to Paul E. Szarmach, who graciously met with me to discuss my argument. I thank, too, Patricia Dailey, Christopher Baswell, Audrey Walton and A. Joseph McMullen for their generous comments, questions, and suggestions, and, above all, Daniel Donoghue and Nicholas Watson, who have helped immeasurably to cast this article in its final form.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0263675100080273 Published online by Cambridge University Press