

C'on nel port par tot le palés.
 Si s'i ensaient tot adés
 De renc en renc li chevalier,
 Si vos puis por voir tesmoignier
 Ni ot un sol ne fust moilliez.
 Molt par en est chascuns iriez
 Por Caradeu qui ot beü
 Que autresi moilliés n'en fu.
 La roïne en est molt dolente
 Si est mainte autre dame gente.
 Guignier en ont molt enhaïe
 Et si li portent grant envie
 Por que qu'el dist seürement.
 Tant par le heent mortelment
 Que tant ne heent rien vivant.

daz horn man durch den palas truog
 von einem zuom anderen gnuog
 für alle rittere gemeit.
 ich sage üch für die worheit,
 daz sü wurdent alle nas.
 ieklicher zornig waz,
 daz getrunken hette Karados,
 so daz er sich nüt begos.
 die künigin hette gros leit
 unde ander vrowen trurikeit.
 sü truogent Gyngenieer grozen haz
 und nidetent sü umbe daz,
 daz sü sprach: 'trinkent sicher.'
 sü hassetent sü mortlicher,
 denne ie wip gehasset were.

Speculum 9 (1934) 50-56

POLEMIUS SILVIUS, BEDE, AND THE NAMES OF THE MONTHS

By C. W. JONES

ALTHOUGH students in the West during the early Middle Ages knew very little about the language and customs of eastern races, the names of the months according to the Hebrews, Egyptians (Alexandrians), Athenians, Macedonians, and other eastern peoples appear at intervals in western literature. Professor Mountford called attention to one source for these lists.¹ This note will discuss another, and more popular, source for the names of the months according to the Hebrews, Egyptians, and Greeks (Macedonians).

Mommsen² has published a Calendar written by Polemius Silvius,³ which had previously been edited by Henschenius.⁴ Both editions are based on the one extant manuscript, *Bruzellensis 10615-10729*, saec. xii. The Calendar was only a part of a *Laterculus* written by Silvius; the remainder of the *Laterculus* Mommsen

¹ J. F. Mountford, 'De Mensium Nominibus,' *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XLIII (1923), 102-116. An extension of the work of Mountford has recently appeared: K. Hanell, 'Das Menologium des Liber glossarum,' *Bulletin de la Société des Lettres de Lund* (1931-1932). But Hanell disregards any appearance of the names of the months not mentioned by Mountford, and accepts the anonymity of the *Libellus de Anno*. Lammert, *Bursian's Jahresberichte* CCXXXI (1931), 110, suggested that the names of the months could be recovered from the writings of the Fathers, especially the names of the Hebrew months from Jerome's commentaries; but a rather careful examination shows that any such list is far from exhaustive.

² *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, I, 335-357.

³ Silvius dedicated his work to his contemporary Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons: 'Domino beatissimo Eucherio episcopo Silvius. Laterculum quem priores fecerunt cum difficilibus supputatoribus iudiciis notatum legissem, ne minus doctis esset obscurior absolute, positarum in eo rerum significationem mutavi et apud te potissimum, a quo mea omnia pro tanto qui inter nos est amoris studio comprobantur digestum direxi. Laetificabor iudicio tuo, si eum tibi placuisse cognovero.' Silvius is evidently the writer mentioned by Hilarius of Arles and Prosper of Aquitaine; cf. *Corpus Inscript.*, I, 333.

⁴ *Acta Sanctorum*, Mensis Iunii 7 (Antwerp, 1717), pp. 178-184. Henschenius' text was copied in J. P. Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, XIII, 675 ff.

sen later edited for the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*.¹ As a heading month on the Calendar appeared the names of the months according to the Hebrews, Egyptians, Athenians, and 'apud Graecos alios.' For instance

Mensis Ianuarius

Dies xxxi. Vocatur apud Hebraeos, *Sebit*; apud Aegyptios, *Tibi*; apud Aethiopes, *Pusidicon*; apud Graecos alios, *Edinen*.

The sources from which Polemius Silvius obtained his information are not extant. Mommsen surmised that he took all four lists of months from the *Menologium* with which he was acquainted.² No evidence indicates that the source was known during the Middle Ages. From Polemius' Calendar, we know that he took the complete list of the Hebrew months, which he reproduced in *structiones* II, 7.³ The compiler of the *Liber Glossarum*, in turn, took his information from Eucherius,⁴ but does not appear to have known the *Laterculus*.

In the year 725, Bede published his larger work on chronology, *De Temporum Ratione*, in which he gave the names of the months according to the Hebrews, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans (Chs. 11-14). In his extended discussion, Bede's purpose was other than merely to record information. The English-Irish Paschal controversy had centred in the *Paschalis*, allegedly written by Bishop Anatolius of Laodicea (A.D. 281-282). Recensions of the Canon seem to have been current in Britain in Bede's time. The recension now extant, was upheld by the Irish clergy. The English version, which relied upon another text, which may merely have been a passage quoted in the authentic Canon by Eusebius.⁵ The incidents which arose at the Council of Whitby and the struggle between the two churches over the interpretation of the Canon at that time are well known. The dispute continued to Bede's time and he was called upon to refute the Irish. This he did in his *Epistola ad Eboracenses*. In that letter Bede charged the Irish with adhering to a corrupt or interpolated canon; he attempted to prove that the original work of the Bishop of Laodicea had favored the English practice.⁶ Although the Irish version imposed upon the mediaeval scholars, including Roger Bacon,⁷ modern scholarship has shown that the extant Canon is undoubtedly a forgery,⁸ thereby sustaining

¹ *Chronica Minora*, I, 511 ff.

² *Corpus Inscript.*, I, 333.

³ C. Wotke, *Eucherii Opera* (CSEL, xxxi), p. 153.

⁴ J. F. Mountford, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

⁵ *Historia Ecclesiastica*, VII, 32.

⁶ 'Ipsum vero libellum Anatolii postmodum in aliquibus Latinorum exemplaribus esse corruptum nimirum fraude, qui paschae verum tempus ignorantes, errorem suum tanti patris defendere gestirent,' J. A. Giles, *Beda's Opera Omnia*, I, 161.

⁷ *The 'Opus Majus' of Roger Bacon*, edited by J. H. Bridges (London, 1900), I, 271.

⁸ Cf. C. Plummer, *Baedae Opera Historica* (Oxford, 1896) II, 191; Bruno Krusch, *Studien über die mittelalterliche Chronologie* (Leipzig, 1880), p. 319; A. Anscombe, 'The Paschal Canon to Anatolius of Laodicea,' *English Historical Review* x (1895), 515 ff.; C. H. Turner, 'The Canon of "Anatolius of Laodicea,"' *ibid.*, pp. 699 ff. I am inclined to accept Turner's suggestion that it was composed by opponents of the Victorian reckoning before the Dionysian era was introduced into England.

ment of Bede. But one letter was evidently not enough to refute the spurious Canon, for Bede many times went out of his way in the *De Temporum Ratione* to establish the authenticity of his version of the Canon,¹ although throughout the work he carefully refrained from directly naming the Irish clergy as his adversaries. The primary contention arose from a variation in the following passage:²

Est ergo in primo anno initium primi mensis, quod est xix annorum circuli principium secundum Aegyptios quidem mensis Phamenoth xxvi die; iuxta Macedones vero Dystri; [secundum Macedones Distri] mensis xxii die [om. die]; secundum Romanos vero Martii mensis xxiii, id est viii Kalendas Aprilis [after vero, the DTR. reads: undecimo Calend. April.].

Both Bede and the unknown forger used Rufinus' translation of Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* as the source for this passage.

Now the extended discussion of the names of the months according to the Egyptians and 'Greeks,' which Bede introduced into the *De Temporum Ratione*, simply prepared his readers for the following argument against the Irish recension of the Anatolian Canon:

Hic enim vicesimam secundam diem Distri mensis aeque vicesimam secundam Martii fore commendans indicat manifeste quia simul uterque mensis initium sumit. Et ne quis dicat quod Anatolius in hac sententia non scripserit undecimo Kalendas, sed octavo Kalendas Apriles, convincet hoc non ita esse mensis Aegyptiorum Phamenoth, cuius vicesima sexta dies non octava Calendarum sed undecima Calendarum Aprilium dies est. Utrique autem, id est, et qui octava Cal. et qui undecima Cal. Apriles, in Anatolio legunt vigesimam sextam diem Aegyptii mensis in eadem sententia habent annotatam, quae absque ulla dubietate in undecimo Calend. April. devenire probatur, iuxta quod superius eorum annalem describentes signavimus.³

The English-Irish Paschal controversy and the pseudo-Anatolian *Canon Paschalis*, then, were responsible for Bede's discussion of the names of the 'Greek' and Egyptian months. The question has several times been asked whence he acquired his knowledge. Undoubtedly his lists were taken from the Calendar of Polemios Silvius, which Bede described as 'nuper transmissus ad nos de Roma computus.'⁴ Bede would not have referred to the Macedonian months as 'Greek' if they had been correctly given in his source, for in both recensions of the Canon *Distros* was called Macedonian. Bede's argument would have been further supported if he had been able to say Macedonian instead of Greek. But the heading of Polemios Silvius, 'apud Graecos alios,' misled him, and Bede was too careful a writer to make alterations in his source without sufficient authority. From the same Calendar, Bede copied the names of the Hebrew months, but by moving them forward one month he changed their relation to the Roman months from that made by Silvius. Bede thus explained his action:

¹ DTR., Chs. 6, 16, 22, 30, 35, 42.

² I have given the passage according to the Irish recension found in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*, x, 211, which was copied from the edition of Bucherius, and I have placed in brackets the variant readings of Giles' text of the *De Temporum Ratione* (*Bedae Opera Omnia*, vi, 177). The principal variation lay in the date of the annual equinox, which the Irish observed on March 25, the English on March 21.

Primum mensem novorum, qui Paschae ceremoniis sacratus est, Nisan appellantes, qui propter multivagum lunae discursum, nunc in Martium mensem, nunc incidit in Aprilem, nunc aliquot dies Maii mensis occupat. Sed rectius Aprili deputatur; quia semper in ipso vel incipit vel desinit vel totus includitur; ea duntaxat regula cuius et supra meminimus, observata ut quae xv post aequinoctium luna extiterit, primum sequentis anni mensem faciat; quae vero antea, novissimum praecedentis, sicque per ordinem.¹

Bede copied the names of the Hebrew months, not only because the position of the month *Nisan* was of primary importance in the reckoning of the date of Easter, but also because the names of the Hebrew months were needful in Biblical exegesis. But he naturally omitted the names of the Athenian months as irrelevant.

These lists of Bede have been disregarded by chronologists because the 'Greek' months in Giles' text do not agree with any other extant list. Students who are acquainted with Giles' text know that it is extremely faulty. The text was based on the ancient edition of Hervagius of the complete works of Bede, published at Basle, A.D. 1563; but the editor maintained that he had, with the assistance of Thomas Wright, collated the earlier edition with manuscripts in the British Museum and the Bibliothèque Nationale.² The evidence which follows will, I think, show that neither the editor nor his assistant seriously endeavored to obtain an accurate text. The accepted names of the Macedonian months are: Dios, Apellaios, Audynaios, Peritios, Dystros, Xanthikos, Artemisios, Daisios, Panemos, Loos, Gorpaios, Hyperberetaios.³ Giles' text disagrees in three places: *ελαφρολιών* for Apellaios, *νυχίων* for Audynaios, *θαργελίων* for Peritios.⁴ The other nine names agree with the list of Ginzel, and the list of Polemios Silvius. I am unable to account for the presence of these three names in Giles' text, but a rotograph of the Berlin MS., *Phill. 1831*, an excellent manuscript of the *De Temporum Ratione* written at Verona in the late eighth or early ninth century, shows that in that manuscript the names all agree with the text of Polemios Silvius. That evidence, together with other facts given below, shows that Bede correctly copied the Macedonian months from Silvius' Calendar. His list, then, in some way was garbled in the printed editions. Since this note was written, I have examined rotographs of the following manuscripts of the *De Temporum Ratione*: Karlsruhe, *Reichenau 167*; British Museum, *Cotton, Vespasian B 6*; St Gallen *251*; Bibliothèque Nationale, *Latin 7296*; Munich, *Königl. Bibl. 14725*. Professor Laistner kindly sent me transcripts from St Gallen *250* and *Bibl. Nat. Lat. 13403*. All these manuscripts give the correct list with minor variations which will be recorded in my edition of Bede's *D.T.R.* The manuscript from which the present printed text was taken is still unknown to me.

Professor Mountford transcribed a short work, *De Anno*,⁵ found in the MS., *Valllicelli E 26*, where it appears immediately after Bede's *De Temporum Ratione*.

¹ DTR. 11 (Giles, *Bedae Opera Omnia* vi, 168-169).

² Giles, *op. cit.* vi, v. The 'collations' appear in the same volume, pp. 456-459.

³ F. K. Ginzel, *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie* (Leipzig, 1906-14), III, 20.

'A librarian at some time or other marked off the work entitled *De Anno* and in the margin has written *Libellus Bedae de Anno*.' I give Mountford's reasons for rejecting it as a work of Bede's:

So far as the Hebrew, Egyptian, and Athenian month-names are concerned, this little tractate is remarkably accurate, and the month-names which are referred to the 'other Greeks' agree entirely with the correct list of Macedonian months. But is the *Libellus* a work of Bede? If we turn to Bede's account of non-Roman months (*De Temporum Ratione*, xi-xiv), we discover that only in the Egyptian months does his list agree with that given in the *Libellus*. He has no separate or complete list of the Athenian months. His Hebrew months commence with *Nisan* as the equivalent of April instead of March. The months of the 'Graeci' which he gives are a mixture; for they agree with the normal Macedonian list from March to November, but December is given as *Elaphebolion*, January as *Nuchion* and February as *Thargelion*. We need not go further and enquire whether the exordium of the *Libellus* could have come from Bede. It is clear that this tractate cannot be a work of Bede nor even a compendium based on his work.

De Anno, which Mountford was unable to assign to a date or author, contains an exordium which is really an exact transcript of a paragraph or chapter entitled *De Anno* in Polemii Silvii's Prologue to his *Laterculus*.¹ Silvius took this paragraph almost verbatim from Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1, 12-13, a passage which Bede had known before his acquaintance with Silvius' work. After the exordium comes a list of months according to the Romans, Hebrews, Egyptians, Athenians, and 'apud Graecos alios.' The list is simply a copy of the headings on the Calendar of Silvius. The work, *De Anno*, then, is equivalent to the exact source from which Bede took his information. Students familiar with the methods of copyists in the early Middle Ages with respect to computative works will not find it hard to imagine that the *Libellus de Anno* travelled with the *De Temporum Ratione* until it was copied into the Vallicelli manuscript, less than a hundred years after the composition of the latter work.

Bede's change in the order of the Hebrew months allows us to determine whether lists of foreign months compiled after Bede were taken from the *Laterculus* or the *De Temporum Ratione*. Of the examples which follow, all are derived from the latter work. This use of the *De Temporum Ratione* is natural; for five centuries following its composition, it was the most popular *computus* in the West. The *Laterculus*, on the contrary, seems to have survived somewhat by chance.

The first list is found in the *Liber de Computo* of Hrabanus Maurus.² Hrabanus' work as a whole was little more than a copy from Bede and Alcuin, and the lists of the months were undoubtedly taken from Bede, although Hrabanus was wary of Bede's arrangement of the Hebrew months; he did not compare the Hebrew months with the Roman months, but merely numbered them from *Nisan*, the first month of the Hebrew year. The 'Greek' months are Macedonian, and agree with the Berlin MS., *Phill. 1831*, rather than Giles' text.

In an appendix to the works of St Germanus, *Patrologia Latina*, LXXII, 619-624, is a *Calendarium Anglicanum*, to which attention has not, to my knowledge, recently been called. The Calendar is based on Bede's *Martyrology*, with additions

especially from two churches—Winchester and Ely.¹ The most plausible conclusion from the notices is that a Winchester calendar was carried to Ely at the time Ethelwold, Bishop of Winchester, reformed the convent at Ely and established the Benedictine rule there. Ethelwold was the last to die (*ob.* 984) of those whose names are on the Calendar. The Calendar, then, was probably unchanged after the tenth century. Our interest, aside from dating and placing the Calendar, lies in the fact that each month is headed with a list of names for that month according to the Hebrews, Egyptians, 'Greeks,' Romans, and 'Saxons.' These names were all copied from Bede's *De Temporum Ratione*. Again, evidence that Bede correctly wrote the names of the Macedonian months appears, for this Calendar gives: December, *Apileos*; January, *Cynidios*; February, *Penitios*.

Another early English writer, Byrhtferth of Ramsay (*circ.* A.D. 1000) copied the names of the months from the *De Temporum Ratione* when he composed his *Manual*. But his editor, the late Professor S. J. Crawford, hesitated to assign the correct source because of the discrepancy between the list of 'Greek' months in Byrhtferth's *Manual* and the list in Giles' text of Bede's *De Temporum Ratione*.² Like all writers save one who copied from Bede, Byrhtferth called the Macedonian months 'Greek.' He, too, gave the names of the English months according to Bede, but, more correctly than the author of the *Calendarium Anglicanum*, called them *Englisc*, the vernacular form of Bede's *Anglorum*.

Another *computus* which has not attracted wide attention and which I hope to discuss in detail at a later date is published in *Patrologia Latina* CXXIX, 1273-1372. It was transcribed by Muratori from the MS. *Ambrosianus 150* in *Anecdota Latina* III, 111-209; cf. Krusch, *Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie* (Leipzig, 1880), pp. 206 ff. The manuscript was written in the ninth century, probably at Bobbio. There is reasonable certainty that part of it was written in the year 784, and another part in the year 810. Some of it was copied from a *computus* written as early as the sixth century. In this work the lists of months³ were taken from the *De Temporum Ratione*.⁴ The Hebrew months are given according to Bede's arrangement, with *Nisan* the equivalent of April. The list of 'Greek' months is correctly labelled Macedonian, and the Roman equivalents fall one month behind Bede's list. But the compiler could easily have inferred 'Macedonian' from the context of the *De Temporum Ratione*, and the order differs from Polemii Silvii and the *Liber Glossarum* as well as from Bede.

Honorius Augustodunensis⁵ also copied his list of Hebrew, Egyptian, and

¹ E.g.: March, Withburga of Ely; Edward, King of England; May, Elfgiva, Queen at Shaftsbury; June, Eadburga of Winchester; July, Swithun of Winchester; Grimbald of Winchester; Edgar King of England; Kenelm of Gloucester; Christina of Winchester; August, Ethelwold of Winchester; December, Birinus, who assisted in founding Winchester. The early saints of Ely are all named: Ermenilda (February), Elheldreda (June), Sexburga (July). These latter were also in Bede's *Martyrology*.

² S. J. Crawford, *Byrhtferth's Manual* (E. E. T. S., London, 1929) 1, 22-25.

³ *P.L.*, CXXIX, 1363.

⁴ Other evidence indicates that Bede's work was known only to the compiler who wrote in the

reek' months from Bede. Since all these works are to be found in available editions, it is unnecessary to reproduce the names of the months according to the authors mentioned. Although this list of works written in the early Middle Ages which contain the non-Roman names of the months may not be exhaustive, it is early so. When we consider the large number of *computi* compiled during those centuries, most of them based on the *De Temporum Ratione*, we may be surprised at the small number of citations. The Old English versifier of the *De Temporum Ratione* candidly explained the omission from his work of the names of the months, and his reason may apply to many other mediaeval computistic works: Weeks and months are known to men according to their understanding of them, and though we should describe them according to bookish meaning, it will seem to unlearned men too deep and uncommon.¹

OBERLIN COLLEGE.

THE ISENHEIM ALTAR

By ARTHUR BURKHARD

THE Isenheim altar commands attention on two accounts. Its nine painted panels, the main work of Matthias Grünewald, are commonly considered the most imposing single monument of German painting. The altar itself represents one of the largest commissions ever entrusted to a German or any other Northern artist. It surpasses in size by far the Ghent altar of the van Eycks or any of the altars executed by Dürer. Only Michael Pacher's work at St Wolfgang might possibly be compared with it in respect to magnitude and splendor, but even this masterpiece is less impressive in artistic composition and grandiose effect, despite the fact that it has been preserved intact in the place of religious worship for which it was originally constructed. The Isenheim altar has suffered a much harsher fate. It was ordered for the monastery church of St Anthony in Isenheim, near Colmar in Alsace, by the abbot Guido Guersi, and its paintings were presumably completed by Grünewald several years before the abbot's death in 1516. During the reign of terror following the French revolution, the altar was carelessly dismembered in order to save it from destruction. Subsequently almost all of the super-structure and some of the sculptured figures, which had been broken off, were lost, stolen, or destroyed. Fortunately, even though the altar has never been reconstructed, most of the figures and all of Grünewald's paintings have been preserved. These are today assembled for display in the Unterlinden Museum of Colmar, where they fairly overwhelm the visitor with their imaginative boldness, emotional power, brilliant variety of color, and sheer magnificence of design and execution. These nine paintings from the Isenheim altar form the most comprehensive and representative work of Matthias Grünewald, and clearly establish his claim to rank with Dürer and Holbein as one of the most important German masters of all time.

¹ *Popular Treatises on Science written during the Middle Ages*, edited by Thomas Wright, p. 6. I

The Isenheim altar is mediaeval in manner in its combination of painting and wood-carving, and specifically German in tradition in possessing two sets of movable wings. When these wings were closed, as was the case ordinarily, and regularly during Lent, the large central expanse, formed by two wings joining, was covered by the Crucifixion scene, while on stationary panels stood, on the left, St Anthony, the patron saint of the Isenheim monastery, and on the right, St Sebastian [Plate V A]. When the wings were opened for special occasions, the sombre Crucifixion gave way to brighter scenes: on the left wing, the Annunciation, in the centre, the Incarnation, and on the right wing, the Resurrection [Plate V B]. When the second pair of wings was opened, a shrine appeared with St Anthony, carved in wood, seated in the centre, flanked by the standing figures of St Augustine and St Jerome, while in paintings on the backs of the wings were portrayed the temptation of St Anthony and his visit to St Paul [Plates X and XI]. This third view, predominantly concerned with St Anthony, was probably exposed on days which celebrated his memory. The predella below the central portion of the altar, on which is portrayed the scene of mourning over the dead Christ, could also be opened to reveal carved half-figures of the apostles to the right and left of the bust of Christ resting in a compartment at the centre. The sequence of these three different views, which could be exposed by twice turning the wings, was carefully calculated to move the spectator by means of contrasts: first, the despairing sorrow of the Crucifixion; then, the radiant joy and mystic ecstasy of Annunciation, Incarnation and Resurrection; and finally, after these two emotional extremes, the calm of firm reality in the plastic figures of the shrine.

Grünewald's mastery of composition is manifest in the arrangement of the first series of paintings [Plate V A]. As the main picture, the Crucifixion dominates. The three other pictures appear only as parts of the general composition, subordinated to the central panel in line, rhythm and color. Beginning with the hooded head of Mary in the predella, the curve which passes beyond the kneeling figure of Magdalene and rises over the head of the apostle John is continued to include Anthony on the left panel. A more gentle curve runs from the head of Mary in the Crucifixion, beyond Magdalene, along the feet of Christ, which are turned in this same direction, past the lamb, to join the line made by the arched back of John on the predella. The extended left arm of Sebastian on the right panel prepares for the prominently pointing arm of John the Baptist. The line of St John's arm and finger points past the drooping face of Christ to run directly along His right arm. The uplifted arms and clasped hands of Magdalene are repeated in the gesture of Mary. The folds of the mantles of the two saints on the wings fall down in almost straight lines at the sides adjoining the altar to make parallels with the frame of the central panel.

Colors, like lines, follow an artistic system which applies to the entire composition. The colors lacking or subdued in the Crucifixion are supplied or reinforced by those in the predella and the stationary panels. The mantles of the saints on the wings complement the color scheme of the main painting. The warm red of the robe of the apostle John is taken up and intensified in the bright car-