***Topics on which assembled computists were questioned, together with a representation of the kind of answers they gave and the order in which they were rendered.***

I. How many years did they wish to count from the Incarnation of God to the present year? *Response*: 809.

II. On what day of the month did they say that Christ was crucified? *Response*: March 25.

At this point they were told first to count back the years of the Lord from the present to the first, and then from it forward to His Passion, finding whether the day of His Passion agreed with their answer of March 25. And so, when they found what they had been asked for by studying the traditional cycles, they were not able [to make the two agree] because of an inherent difficulty. They replied that they could not find a formula to make those calculations agree.

Then they were asked which calculation they wished to accept. *Response*: The authority of the Fathers, that is, of Augustine, Jerome, Dionysius, Bede, who predicated the Lord's Passion on March 25.

III. Then they were asked how many years they thought the Lord had lived among men from the Nativity to the Passion. *Response*: 33 and ½ years, according to authority.

IV. They were asked to state the number of years from the beginning of the world to the Incarnation of Christ.

Although at first they advanced different answers because the authorities of different men differed, at last they concluded that the number of the Hebrew Truth was to be trusted. [Of the many Mundane Eras in circulation, that of Eusebius-Jerome (*inc.* 5199 B.C.) was overwhelmingly popular in the West because it was the common basis of Western Christian historiography. However, Bede (*Epistola ad Pleguinam*) had advocated a radically different calculation (*inc.* 3952 B.C.), based on "Hebrew Truth," i.e., Jerome's translations of Hebrew Scripture.]

V. Where would they set the equinox? *Response*: March 21. [*xi* evidently a scribal error for *xii*.]

VI. Because some of them said that it was taken for granted that it was not allowable to begin *pascha* [Passover, whence Easter] before the vernal equinox, they were questioned closely as to where it was prescribed in the Law. *Responsе*: This is not made literally clear anywhere in the Law.

VII. It was asked, what is the first day of the fourteenth [i.e., full] moon? What could be the last date? *Responsе*: From March 21 to April 18.

VIII. It was inquired how it was right to set the age of the paschal moon and the first and last dates of Easter.

They professed that regarding this question they followed the authority transmitted by the Nicene Council (A.D. 325).

VIIII. On the problem of the twenty-nine days, to wit, from March 21 to April 18, on which the position of the fourteenth moon is observed, what is the reason that ten of these days are excepted, so that the fourteenth moon never occurs on them?

The answer to this question was given by reading from what the venerable abbot Adalbard had composed.

X. It was inquired for what reason the fourteenth moon never exceeded the months of March or April.

In answer, the passage from the Law was cited in reply. [In fact, and in light of the previous responses, such an answer is absurd, since no canonical Scripture equates Hebrew and Roman months. However, Deuteronomy xvi,1 (cf. Exod. xxiii,4; xxiii,15; xxxiv,18) was probably cited and accepted. Possibly the reporter has not correctly reported the phrasing of the question.]

XI. Why were common and embolismic years developed—and not all equal? *Responsе*: Because of the observation of the fourteenth moon.

XII. On this topic it was further asked why, in the last year of the decennovenal cycle [i.e., the Cyrillan-Dionysiac paschal cycle], there remained not eleven days, as in the years above, but twelve days in the course of the sun.

To this question they had no reply. [The lunar *saltus*.]

XIII. They were asked where the lunar *saltus* ought to be created, or what would prevent our determining the lunar *saltus* for ourselves.

To this they gave no response. [The *saltus*, a necessary mathematical rectification, Dionysius set at the end of his cycle, but Victorius inserted in the sixth year.]

XIV. It was asked whether the calculation of the *bissextus* [leap-year intercalation] applied to the moon.

They replied that they had never heard the matter discussed. [This reply seems unbelievably stupid, as reported; one wonders whether the text is correctly copied at this point.]

XV. With regard to the lunar cycle, why does it not begin with the paschal terms? Then, what is the use of it?

Regarding the utility of that cycle, they had something to say; but regarding its inauguration, nothing. [The "lunar cycle" was the same as the Dionysiac cycle, but anchored to a different year. Dionysius had devoted a column of his tables for equating the two. His sixth-century problem was now archaic, but Carolingian scribes continued to copy the column.]

XVI. How do epacts come about? Then, how are they composed?

They explained the fixed pattern of addition of eleven days.

XVII. It was asked why, to a solar year of fifty-two weeks, that is, a year containing 364 days, one day should be added. Then, how that [three hundred sixty-] fifth day arises.

But on this score they opined that there is no reason.

XVIII. It was asked in what way the *quadrans* [six hours], out of which the *bissextus* develops, accrues in four solar years; then, what would be the problem if the *bissextus* were not added?

To this question they made a satisfactorily clear response.

XIX. What is the reason that at some points in the decennovenal cycle it works out that three [*iiii* evidently a scribal error] successive lunations of thirty days each have to be calculated? Likewise as many of twenty-nine days?

For this they turned to the exposition in Bede's book. [See Bede's *De Temp. Rat.*, xli, xlii.]

XX. It was asked: Since every lunation is designated by the month in which it concludes, to what month ought the lunation be assigned in which the month of March 22 begins on the second or third day and ends before the last day of that same month?

They replied that it should be determined according to the formula for embolisms. [Question and reply are directly based upon *De Temp. Rat.*, xlv. The "Dionysiac" formula which Bede used and called "Hebrew" does not allow Nisan (the Hebrew First Month) before March 8, in opposition to the "Victorian" formula which Bede called "Roman." March 22, *sedes epactarum* by Dionysiac reckoning, would never occur before Nisan 15 (cf. *De Temp. Rat.*, 1: *Unde multum errare constat eos qui lunae paschalis initium a tertio Nonarum Martiarum die* (March 5) *quaerendum definiunt*. Also *De Temp. Rat.*, li).]

XXI. Formulas for finding the *anni Domini,* Indictions, Lunar Cycle, concurrents, epacts?

They replied that Dionysius was the author to be followed.

XXII. On the topic of Indictions, it was inquired for what purpose they had been invented or what utility they had in our calculations.

On the utility they had in calculations, something was said; but about why they were invented, there was no response.

XXIII. Regarding the "regulars," thirty-six forMarch and thirty-five for April, which we use for determining the fourteenth, paschal moon, they were asked how they arose.

They gave the scheme according to the authority of the Egyptians for adjusting the days of the aforesaid months by five days. But regarding the other regulars, which they call "minor," from which we find the weekday of the fourteenth moon by adding four in March but six in April, they could not explain how that came about. [None of the "authorities" cited treats or uses these "major" and "minor" regulars: but formulas for developing them appear in J. P. Migne's *Patrologia Latina,* Tom. XC, col. 712A. Migne's text, copied from a sixteenth-century printed book, contains a good deal of matter which has been demonstrated to have come from the Carolingian computists.]