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History only makes sense to us when we don’t reflect upon it too much. Otherwise we would expire of cognitive dissonance caused by the sheer lack of logic in how randomly the chronological layers are shuffled together, interspersed by many centuries when humans were apparently immersed into utter hibernation and didn’t bother with fighting, inventing, migrating or trifles like that. Nonsensical, is it? But this is what the very concept of the Dark Ages implies, just as the popular belief in Father Christmas implies believing in reindeer-driven celestial sleighs as well.

One wonders how the minds of professional historians appear unaffected by all of these hideous inconsistencies of history. The Orwellian concept of doublethink comes to mind. Roman senators congregating among the ruins of the Capitol whose roof appears to have been made of concrete (which apparently hadn’t been invented until the XVI century), Gothic cathedrals that it took several centuries to erect, and so on, and so forth. The most rational humans can invent the most implausible explanations where simple ones would mean taking their holy cows to the altar of Reason, a most intimidating deity. History as we know it now is just too bloated and too nonsequential to fit it into your head for proper conceptualization. So we become experts in short historical periods; should those, in turn, prove to contain insoluble problems or paradoxical occurrences, these can always be blamed on the ignorant scribes or the peculiar and idiosyncratic perception of our venerable ancestors.

It took one brilliant mind to notice that the inconsistencies all fit together in the most bizarre way. A mathematician’s mind. Anatoly Fomenko, one of the world’s leading experts in the field of mathematical statistics, has spent thirty years studying all the ambiguities of human history using nothing but natural scientific methods for his research. He is the first to have conceptualized an alternative chronological scale for human history; a scale so short that it frightens poor historians into frenzy. The new version of history is extremely logical in addition to its brevity, and can finally fit into the cranium of a logical human being without causing too many pains; however, it leaves no room for your old dogma, so be warned before you embark on your journey to the crystalline peaks of the Professor’s logic. You won’t be the same after his latest
fundamental work entitled *History: Fiction or Science?* now available in English. You won’t be able to hear the word “Troy” ever again without a smirk of righteous derision upon your face. Judging by the successes of the modern cinematographic industry, it is just as well.

**The Da Vinci code broken for good**

Unnerving as the idea might seem, popular fiction dealing with conspiracies of one sort or another is actually quite tame as compared to reality. The Roman Catholic Church, for instance, is involved in a much greater hoax than the most daring writer could possibly conceive of – one that deals with the very foundations of history itself.

The above statement is neither an exaggeration, nor a metaphor. Very few people are aware that the B.C./A.D. chronology as we know it was created by a handful of Jesuits in the XVI-XVII century – Joseph Scaliger, Dionysius Petavius, and their successors. We have grown so accustomed to a timeline that runs through many millennia, from the Egyptian pyramids to the present day, that the mere thought of questioning its veracity seems perfectly preposterous – just like the notion of a rotating earth must have seemed in the epoch of Galileo Galilei, and just as heretical.

But nevertheless, the entire conception of ancient and mediaeval history known to us today owes its existence to a XVI century Jesuit hoax. A hoax that has finally been exposed with the aid of astronomy, mathematical statistics and modern computational facilities.

* * *

The material of *The Issue with Antiquity* book crowns scores of years of meticulous and extensive research performed by the eminent mathematician Anatoly Fomenko and his colleagues. This book is also the 5th volume in *History: Fiction or Science?* e-series, the fundamental oeuvre that exposes and expounds the numerous inveracities of the traditional version of history.

The e-series *History: Fiction or Science?* contains data and conclusions that aren’t anything short of revolutionary. The alternatives offered to classical history are stunning, unorthodox to the extent of being labelled heretical by virtually every scholar of history, and daring enough to be considered preposterous at first sight, although this impression never lasts longer than it takes one to read a few pages attentively.

The author dissects every historical age and analyses the data from every source imaginable – concensual chronology takes a good beating, and it goes rapidly downhill
from there. *The Issue with Antiquity* is actually the result of creation in XV-XVII centuries of a mythical Classical Age that never was by misdating mediaeval events by hundreds and thousands of years as very ancient ones.

*Franck Tamdhu*

*July 2015*
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Are History and Astronomy incompatible? By Béla Lukács
Preface by Anatoly T. Fomenko

PART ONE: The Middle Ages referred to as the “Antiquity”. Mutual superimposition of the Second and the Third Roman Empire...
1. Identifying the Second and the Third “ancient” Roman Empire as the same state. A chronological shift of 330 years
   1.1. A dynastic description of the Second and the Third Roman Empire
   1.2. Biographical parallelism between the Second and Third Roman Empires. The 330-year shift
2. The correlation between two different dating methods illustrated by the superimposition of two epochs from the history of Roman Papacy one over the other. A brief scheme
3. The superimposition of the Israelite (Theomachist) Kingdom over the Third Roman Empire in the West. A shift of circa 1230 years
4. Identifying the theocratic Kingdom of Judah as the Third Roman Empire in the East. A shift of circa 1230 years (short diagram)
5. Saint Basil the Great in the alleged IV century a.d. and his prototype in the XII century A.D. – Jesus Christ. The resulting shift of 820 years

PART TWO: The famous reform of the Occidental Church in the XI century by “Pope Gregory Hildebrand” as the reflection of the XII century reforms of Andronicus (Christ). The Trojan war of the XIII century A.D.
6. “Pope Gregory Hildebrand” from the XI century A.D. as a replica of Jesus Christ (Andronicus) from the XII century.
   6.1 Astronomy in the Gospels
      6.1.1. The true dating of the evangelical eclipse
      6.1.2. The Gospels apparently reflect a sufficiently advanced level of astronomical eclipse theories, which contradicts the consensual evangelical
6.2. The Roman John Crescentius of the alleged X century a.d. as a reflection of the Evangelical John the Baptist from the XII century a.d. A biographical parallelism
6.3. “Pope” Gregory VII Hildebrand from the Roman chronicles dated to the XI century a.d. as the reflection of Jesus Christ (Andronicus) from the XI century a.d. A biographical parallelism
6.4. The Bethlehem Star of the alleged I century and the famous supernova explosion of circa 1150 (subsequently shifted to 1054 by the chronologists)
6.5. The Crucifixion of Jesus on Mount Beykos, or the evangelical Golgotha, which is located outside Constantinople, near the shore of the Bosporus

7. Identifying Livy’s “Ancient Imperial Rome” as the Third Roman Empire after a 1053-year shift
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“Who controls the past controls the future; who controls the present controls the past.”

George Orwell, 1984.

“History is a pack of lies about events that never happened told by people who weren’t there.”

George Santayana, American philosopher.
Are History and Astronomy incompatible?

By Béla Lukács

History: Fiction or Science? is a most unusual book series, one that undermines the very foundations of History. According to the author and his team of researchers, History as it has been taught in Europe ever since the Renaissance is fundamentally false, verified history beginning around 1250 A.D. the earliest. Jesus Christ was born in 1053 and crucified in 1086, the First Crusade being an immediate reaction to his Crucifixion. Homer identifies an anonymous poet of the second half of XIII century A.D., and the event led to the creation of the Iliad had been the fall of the Latin Empire of Constantinople in 1261 A.D. The list goes on and on.

Historians generally oppose the author's views without making much commentary. The author is not a historian, period. He is only a leading differential geometrician (mathematician), successful and respected. A. T. Fomenko is also a corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences; his main argumentation is of a statistical and astronomical nature. I happen to be a physicist myself and not a historian. However, astronomy and differential geometry are known to me well from the area of general relativity, and I cannot recommend this book enough, since its author approaches History, usually a highly emotional discipline ascribed to the field of humanities, armed with impartial mathematics.

History is collective memory; yet even our own memory errs at times, and no real memory extends beyond three generations. There are written sources, but each one of those might easily prove a forgery. There are material remnants of archaeological nature, but they may be misinterpreted.

Astronomy is precise by definition, and a historical dating that can be calculated from information about eclipses should satisfy any researcher. Yet the XIX century astronomers did not use the lunar tidal friction term in the equations of lunar motion, which would make ancient lunar eclipses appear several hours off the mark and relocate several total eclipses of the sun geographically (assuming tidal friction has remained the same all the time but there is no reason to believe it hasn’t). How could XIX century calculations have conformed to consensual history?

I must say that a methodical recalculation of ancient eclipse datings shall invariably
bring surprises; in the unlikely case these datings are correct, we shall prove the existence of erratic changes in telluric rotation over the last 4,000 years instead. Both possibilities are highly alarming.

Fomenko demonstrates the incompatibility between consensual history and modern astronomy. This incompatibility is a sad fact. (He exposes a number of other contentious issues as well, but those do not fall into my professional scope.) Which is more reliable – history or hard-boiled scientific facts? Science cannot afford subjectivity; most of us would feel the same way about history as well.

Chronological problems are very serious indeed; Fomenko offers a viable solution to most of them, and a radical one at that – a “Copernican revolution” of history, no less. I am not using the term to predict the final and total victory of his version; that is a matter for a multitude of scientific and scholarly discussions to come. But the contradiction between history and astronomy that becomes graver with the day cannot and must not be tolerated, in the best interests of both history and the theory of telluric rotation.
The materials contained in this book correspond to the research that was started in 1973.

One might wonder why we should want to revise the chronology of ancient history today and base our revision on new empirical-statistical methods. It would be worthwhile to remind the reader that in the XVI-XVII century chronology was considered to be a subdivision of mathematics, prior to having gradually transformed into a field of historical studies considered complete in general, and only requiring minor eventual clarifications leaving the actual edifice of chronology intact. And yet we discover that the contemporary official version of the chronology of ancient history is full of prodigious contradictions and inconsistencies which deserve an attempt of partial clarification and rectification based on the methods of modern statistics at the very least.

One often hears the question about what could possibly motivate a mathematician into wanting to study a seemingly historical problem. The answer is as follows. My primary interests are those of a professional mathematician; they are thus rather distant from historical and chronological issues. However, in the early 70’s, namely, in 1972-1973, I had to deal with the dates of ancient eclipses during my studies of one of the key problems in celestial mechanics (see Chron1, Chapter 2 for more details). It had to do with computing the so-called coefficient $D''$ in the Theory of Lunar Motion. The parameter characterizes acceleration and is computed as a time function on a large historical interval. The computations were performed by Robert Newton, a contemporary American astronomer and astrophysicist. Upon their completion, he had made the unexpected discovery of parameter $D''$ behaving in the most peculiar manner, namely, performing an inexplicable leap on the interval of VIII-X century A.D. This leap cannot be explained by conventional gravitational theory, and is improbable to the extent of making Robert Newton invent mysterious “extragravitational forces” in the Earth-Moon system that suspiciously refuse to manifest in any other way.

This inexplicable effect attracted the professional interest of the mathematician in me. The verification of R. Newton’s work showed that his computations conformed to the highest scientific standards and contained no errors. This made the gap in the diagram even more enigmatic. A prolonged pondering of this topic led me to the idea of checking the exactitude of datings of the ancient eclipses that the $D''$ parameter computations
were based upon since they implicitly affected the result. This idea turned out to have been unprecedented for the scientists that had dealt with the problem previously. Robert Newton himself, an eminent expert in the field of astronavigation and theoretical dynamics of natural and artificial celestial bodies, trusted the ancient historical dates completely and attempted to explain the leap in the behaviour of parameter $D''$ from within his professional paradigm. That is to say, without the merest hint of the very idea of questioning ancient chronology. I was more fortunate in that respect: I found out that N. A. Morozov, a renowned Russian scientist and encyclopedist, had analyzed the datings of ancient eclipses and claimed most of them to be in need of revision. This happened as early as the beginning of the XX century. He offered new datings for a large number of eclipses that were considerably more recent. Having obtained his tables, I have repeated Newton’s calculations using Morozov’s dates in lieu of the consensual ones as input data. I was amazed to discover that the $D''$ graph altered instantly and drastically, having transformed into a rather even horizontal line that concurred with the conventional gravitational theory perfectly. The enigmatic leap disappeared along with the necessity to invent fictitious “extragravitational forces”.

The satisfaction from having finished a body of scientific work successfully was accompanied by a sudden awareness of a very knotty point arising in this respect, one of great peculiarity and paramount importance. Namely, that of whether the consensual chronology of ancient history was to be trusted at all.

It was true that the new datings of many ancient eclipses offered by N. A. Morozov led to the equalization of the $D''$ function diagram, the elimination of a strange contradiction from celestial mechanics, and to the discovery of the conformance of an important parameter in the theory of lunar motion to perfectly normal patterns of behaviour.

It was equally true, however, that fitting something like the idea that the three ancient eclipses described in the History of the prominent ancient author Thucydides took place in the XI or even the XII century A.D. and not in the V B.C. as it is believed today into one’s perception proved quite impossible. The issue here is that the dating of the “triad of Thucydides” can only correspond to these two astronomically precise solutions (see Chron1, Chapter 2). The inevitable question that arose in this respect was that of which discipline had been correct in this case, astronomy or contemporary chronology.

I had to address several distinguished historians with this quandary, including the ones from our very own Moscow State University. Their initial reaction was that of polite restraint. According to them, there was no point whatsoever in questioning the
The consensual chronology of ancient history since all the dates in question can easily be verified by any textbook on the subject and have been proved veracious a long time ago. The fact that the diagram of some parameter $D''$ started to look natural after revised calculations based on some flimsy new chronology was hardly of any relevance. Moreover, it would perhaps be better for the mathematicians to occupy themselves with mathematics and leave history to historians. The same sentiment was expressed to me by L. N. Gumilyov. I refrained from arguing with him.

The reply offered by the historians failed to satisfy me. Firstly due to the fact that chronology, being a problem of calculating dates, bears immediate relevance to applied mathematics. This includes astronomical calculations, the verification of their precision, calendrier problems, the interpretation of old writings based on their frequency characteristics etc, and may present an extensive number of complex issues. Secondly, becoming familiar with the contemporary chronological tables soon proved that the ancient dates were quoted rather arbitrarily, with hardly any references at all given. At best, the first chronological tables get a quote – however, those were compiled relatively recently, in the XVI-XVII century. Delving deeper into the problem showed me that the version of chronology that we agree upon today wasn’t the only one available historically. I found out that eminent scientists in various countries expressed the idea that ancient datings required a radical revision. I realized that the answer was the furthest thing from simple, and that shedding some light on the issue would require plenty of time and effort. This is how 1973 saw me commencing work in this direction, aided by colleagues – most of them professional mathematicians and physicists.

The research progressed rapidly. Over the years that passed since 1973 many points have been clarified and a great volume of interesting information obtained. A lot of it was published by myself and my colleagues in a number of books and scientific articles quoted in the literature list. The first related publication saw light in 1980. It has to be noted that over the course of time our opinions on certain chronological problems have changed. Said alterations never concerned the general picture, but occasionally led to significant shifts in our perception of details. Today we feel that the empirical-statistical methods that our chronological research was based upon need to be formulated and coordinated again. This is how the books *Chron1* and *Chron2* came to existence.

*Chron1* is based on the first book I wrote on the subject – *Methods of Statistical Analysis of Narrative Texts and their Application to Chronology (Identifying and Dating Dependent Texts, The Statistical Chronology of Ancient History, The

Certain important results that get briefly mentioned in Chron1 and Chron2 were achieved with the aid of outstanding scientists – Professor V. V. Kalashnikov, Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences (Moscow State University and the National Research Institute for System Studies, Moscow, Russia), and the Senior Scientific Associate G. V. Nosovskiy, Candidate of Physical and Mathematical Sciences (the Department of Mathematics and Mechanics, Moscow State University) – experts in fields of probability theory studies and mathematical statistics. The formation of the author’s concept of chronology is largely a result of having collaborated with V. V. Kalashnikov and G. V. Nosovskiy for many years, and I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to both of them.

I would like to state explicitly that over the period of time from 1981 and until presently our collaboration with G. V. Nosovskiy has been constant and very fruitful, as the two of us have published a number of what we consider to be milestones of the new chronology. The formulation of the main principles of reconstructing modern chronology and mediaeval history is a direct result of the work we have done together over these years, which adds particular importance to this period.

Let us briefly describe the structure of Chron1 and Chron2. The consensual versions of chronology, as well as those of ancient and mediaeval history, had evolved completely by XVII century AD and appear to contain major flaws. Many prominent scientists have been aware of this and have discussed it for quite a while (see Chron1, Chapter 1). However, the creation of a new concept of history that would be free from inconsistencies proved a truly formidable task.

A group of mathematicians, most of them from the Moscow State University, commenced research on the problem in 1974. The results were most captivating, and got covered in a number of monographs (see bibliography) and several dozens of publications in scientific periodicals. Let us emphasize that the new concept of chronology is based primarily on applying methods of modern statistics to the analysis
of historical sources and extensive cybernetic computations.

The main subject of the books *Chron1* and *Chron2* is the research of new empirical-statistical methods of finding dependencies in historical texts and derived procedures of dating historical events.

The task of recognizing the difference between dependent and independent texts is really that of identifying images. One encounters it in various scientific paradigms including applied statistics, linguistics, physics, genetics, historical source studies etc. Finding dependent texts is of great utility as applied to studying historical sources where they may be traced to a common original that had been lost before our time. It is also very useful to be able to tell which texts are independent, or derived from non-correlating sources.

The very concept of text can be interpreted in a wide variety of ways. Any sequence of symbols, signals, and codes can be referred to as “text” – the sequences of genetic code in DNA chains, for instance. The common problem of finding dependent texts is formulated as follows: one has to find “similar fragments” in long signal sequences – that is, fragments of text that duplicate one another.

There is a multitude of methods for recognition of dependencies and identifying “similar images” available today. We offer some new empirical-statistical methods. They might be of use in analyzing historical chronicles, manuscripts, and archive materials as well as in finding the so-called homologous fragments in texts of a significantly different, more general nature.

This book is divided into several parts or topics for the reader’s convenience. This should help us to securely differentiate between proven statistical facts and hypotheses. At the same time, one has to state that such topical division is rather artificial since the topics really have lots and lots of points in common.

**The first topic**

Solving the problem of statistical recognition of dependent and independent historical texts. Formulating new statistical models and hypotheses, as well as verifying them with extensive experimental material of actual historical chronicles. It turns out we’re able to acquire general verifications of the models offered. In other words, we have managed to discover interesting statistical tendencies that define the evolution of textual information over a period of time, such as what really happens to the data contained in the manuscripts during their duplication etc.

*Having discovered these tendencies is our first result.*
The discovered trends are used as basis for the formulation of new methods of dating the events described in the chronicles. This is achieved by statistical comparison of the chronicles and documents pertinent to the research with the ones possessing confirmed datings. The methods are verified by a large body of correctly dated materials. Their application to the chronicles and documents describing the events of the XVII-XX century appears to confirm the efficacy of these methods. Namely, the statistical datings that we got as a result of our research concur with the ones confirmed by traditional methods. The \textit{a priori dependent} chronicle pairs turn out to be \textit{dependent statistically} with the use of our methods. The ones that are \textit{independent a priori} turn out to be \textit{independent statistically} as well.

Experimental examination of veraciously dated chronicles describing the events of XVII-XX century A.D. led to the discovery of natural numeral coefficients that allow us to differentiate between \textit{a priori dependent chronicles} and \textit{a priori independent ones} in 1974-1979. Basically, these numbers are rather small for \textit{a priori} dependent pairs and rather large for \textit{a priori} independent ones. This means that nowadays we can compare arbitrary chronicles $X$ and $Y$ and find out whether their proximity coefficients are within the zone that refers to dependent chronicles or the one that refers to independent ones. It is needless to say that the boundaries of these zones were found experimentally.

The discovery of the hidden dependencies that define the evolution of information in rather large historical chronicles as well as the development and experimental verification of the new dating methods (currently comprising a total of eight) – is the \textit{second principal result of our work}. The datings achieved by our methods cannot be regarded as finite, so we shall refer to them as “statistical datings” and nothing more. We shall occasionally drop the word “statistical” for the sake of brevity. The above is to say that we regard the empirical-statistical dates that we computed to be a result of applying statistical methods to historical materials. Nevertheless, the concurrence of these statistical datings with the ones verified a priori that we have discovered in the interval of XVII-XX century A.D. implies that our results are of an objective nature.

\textbf{The second topic}

It can also be referred to as \textit{critical}. We analyze the traditional datings of events that occurred in ancient and mediaeval Europe, Asia, the Mediterranean countries, Egypt, and America. Bearing the reader’s convenience in mind, we have collected various materials here that can be found scattered across all kinds of scientific literature and are
known to specialists of various profiles, but often remain beyond the awareness of the general public. These materials illustrate serious difficulties that are presently inherent to the problem of scientific dating of historical events preceding the XIV century A.D.

We shall inform the reader of the fundamental research conducted by a prominent Russian scientist and encyclopedist Nikolai Aleksandrovich Morozov (1854-1946), honorary member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, who was the first to have formulated the problem of confirming the ancient and mediaeval chronology with the means offered by natural sciences in its entirety in addition to having collected a great volume of critical materials and suggested a number of innovative hypotheses.

We shall also tell of the chronological research conducted by Sir Isaac Newton, who questioned many datings of historical events, and several other representatives of the critical current in history and chronology. We quote from eminent authorities in the fields of archeology, source studies, and numismatics, and a variety of other well-known scientists, and extensively compare different points of view so that the readers could develop their own opinions of the problems in question.

The primary application of novel empirical-statistical methods is the analysis of dates of historical occurrences. This is why we were forced to analyze as many dating versions of events in question as we could find in this day and age. The issue here is that various ancient and mediaeval chronicles frequently demonstrate significant discrepancies in dating certain important events. Attempting to navigate in this chaos of mediaeval versions, we devote special attention to those reflected in the chronicles of XV-XVI century A.D. due to the fact that the chronologists of that epoch were temporally closer to the events described than we are. Subsequent chronological versions of XVII-XX century are often revisions of derivative material, obscuring and heavily distorting the original mediaeval meaning.

Starting with XVI-XVII century A.D., the version of the chronology of ancient history that was created in the works of prominent mediaeval chronologists J. Scaliger and D. Petavius «rigidifies». The main points of the official version of contemporary chronology coincide with those of Scaliger and Petavius. Hence we are to use the term “Scaligerian chronology” and refer to the consensual datings of ancient events as “Scaligerian datings”.

We presume the reader to be more or less familiar with the traditional – Scaligerian de facto – chronology concepts familiar from school and university. We shall thus refrain from quoting the Scaligerian concept in detail, considering this knowledge to be in public domain. On the contrary, we shall be making a special emphasis on its
inconsistencies. Further on, we shall give a brief analysis of traditional dating methods: datings based on historical sources, archaeological datings, radiocarbon datings, dendrochronology etc. It is expedient for allowing the reader evaluate the veracity and the precision of these methods as well as their application areas.

The third topic

In 1975-1979 the author compiled a table that received the name of a “Global Chronological Map”, which may be referred to as GCM for the sake of brevity. It may be regarded as a rather complete “Scaligerian textbook” of ancient and mediaeval history. All the principal events of ancient history with their dates according to Scaliger (the ones used today), lists of main historical characters etc were placed along the horizontal axis of time. All the key original sources that survived and contained descriptions of contemporary life were quoted for each epoch. The resulting chronological map contains tens of thousands of names and dates. The physical space it covers amounts to several dozens of square metres. This map proved a priceless encyclopedia and guide for the edifice of contemporary – Scaligerian de facto – ancient and mediaeval chronology. Due to the large volume of the material, it made its way into Chron1 and Chron2 with many expurgations, as small tables and diagrams.

The fourth topic

In 1974-1979, the entire arsenal of the new empirical-statistical dating methods was applied to the factual material collected on the map of the Scaligerian chronology. This was done by inspecting all manner of pairs of historical epochs and the key original sources pertinent to them. These chronicles were processed statistically and then compared in pairs, and eventually the dependence coefficients of compared historical texts were computed.

If such coefficients for the two compared chronicles $X$ and $Y$ proved to belong to the same numeric order as those of the a priori dependent chronicles from the “certainty interval” of XVII-XX century A.D., we called them statistically dependent. In this case, both correlating epochs (temporal periods) were marked on the map with the same arbitrarily chosen symbol such as the letter $R$.

If the proximity coefficient (or measure) of the two compared chronicles $X$ and $Y$ proved to belong to the same numeric order as those of the a priori independent chronicles from the “certainty interval” of XVII-XX century A.D., we called them statistically independent. In this case, both correlating epochs (temporal periods) were marked on the map with different arbitrarily chosen symbols such as the letters $N$ and
As a result of statistical research, pairs of statistically dependent chronicles and epochs pertinent to them were found and marked in the “Scaligerian history textbook”. We called such chronicles and arrays of events they described statistical duplicates.

We discovered that the results of using different empirical-statistical methods correlate very well. Namely, the chronicle pairs “statistically similar” according to one method turned out to be “statistically similar” according to all the others (if such methods are at all applicable to the chronicles in question). This result correlation is perceived as important.

It is vital that our empirical-statistical methods have found no unforeseen duplicates, or chronicles whose dependent nature we weren’t aware of a priori, on the interval of XVII-XX century A.D.

At the same time, the same methods found a large number of new statistically similar chronicles (duplicates) that were previously considered underived, independent in all senses of the word and ascribed by contemporary historians to various epochs before the XVII century A.D., preceding the XI century in particular. The compilation of the Scaligerian chronological map and the discovery of statistical duplicates therein amount to the third principal result of this book.

The fourth principal result is the division of the Scaligerian chronological map into the sum of four chronicle layers discovered by the author. These chronicle layers are nearly identical, but they are shifted in time in relation to each other. These shifts amount to significant amounts of time and their correspondent chronicle layers may be regarded as “short chronicles” of sorts. A very rough description of “The Contemporary Scaligerian Textbook of Ancient and Mediaeval History” would be calling it a sum, or a collage, of four copies of the same short chronicle, statistically speaking.

A criticism of the Scaligerian chronology and the description of the four statistical results mentioned above comprise the main part of the present book. Its other parts are of a hypothetical and interpretational nature. They aid the formulation of a possible answer to the naturally occurring question about the meaning of all the discovered empirical-statistical facts, and what the history was “really like”.

The fifth topic

This topic can be called interpretational. This is where we offer the hypotheses that may explain the trends we have discovered and the reasons why the “Scaligerian textbook of
history” might contain duplicates. Neither this material, nor the “textbook of truncated history” that we offer are to be considered finite in any way. They may only be regarded as offering a possible version that requires a great body of work to be conducted by experts of various profiles, and maybe even special research facilities.

* * *

The author’s position on a significant number of points raised in *Chron1* and *Chron2* has formed as a result of interaction, collective research, and extensive discussions with specialists from a wide variety of fields, most notably, the field of mathematics and fellow mathematicians. Specifically, the new statistical models and the results we have achieved have all been presented and discussed over the span of the past twenty-plus years:

- the First International Bernoulli Society for Mathematical Statistics and Probability Theory Congress in Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 1986;
- the Multidimensional Statistical Analysis and Probabilistic Modelling of Real-Time Processes seminar by Prof. S.A. Aivazyan at the Central Institute of Economics and Mathematics of the USSR Academy of Sciences;
- several national seminars on Stochastic Model Continuity and Stability by Prof. V. M. Zolotaryov (The V. A. Steklov Mathematics Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences) and Prof. V. V. Kalashnikov (The National Research Institute for System Studies);
- Controllable Processes and Martingales seminars by Prof. A. N. Shiryaev (V. A. Steklov Mathematics Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences) and Prof. N. V. Krylov (Department of Mathematics and Mechanics, Moscow State University);
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The Middle Ages referred to as the “Antiquity”.
Mutual superimposition of the Second and the Third Roman Empire, both of which become identified as the respective kingdoms of Israel and Judah.
1. Identifying the Second and the Third “ancient” Roman Empire as the same state. A chronological shift of 330 years

1.1. A dynastic description of the Second and the Third Roman Empire

Let us recall that under the First Roman Empire we understand the “ancient” kingdom as founded by Romulus and Remus, presumably about 753 B.C. ([72]). It had ended with the reign of the Roman King Tarquin the Proud, sometime around the alleged year 509 B.C. ([72]).

The Second Roman Empire is the kingdom which was actually founded by Lucius Sulla in the alleged years 83-82 B.C. and ended with the reign of Emperor Caracalla in the alleged year 217 A.D.

Under the Third Roman Empire we understand the newly founded kingdom that is supposed to have been “restored” by Emperor Lucius Aurelian in the alleged year 270 A.D. and ended with King Theodoric in the alleged year 526 A.D.

The comparison of the Second and Third Roman Empires reveals dynastic currents twined by an explicit dynastic parallelism, qv in Fig. 1.1. See also Chron1, Chapter 6. The chronological shift that separates those empires approximately equals 330 years. In this case, a dynastic current from the Second Empire includes virtually every ruler of the empire. The respective dynastic current from the Third Empire comprises the best-known rulers of the Third Roman Empire. We provide complete lists of both dynastic currents below.
Fig. 1.1. The dynastic parallelism between the Second “ancient” Roman Empire of the alleged years 82 B.C. – 217 A.D.
N. A. Morozov had been the first to point out the parallels between the Second and the Third Roman Empire in [544]. However, lacking a prejudice-free methodology for the selection and comparison of parallel dynastic currents, he had to contend himself with mere selection. As a result, the sequences of kings proposed by him prove to be far from optimal, and happen to be outright erroneous at times. The author of the present book found the optimal parallel dynastic currents whose details differ from the parallels proposed in [544]. Moreover, it soon became clear that the parallel between the Second and Third Roman Empires was by no means basic. It is of a secondary nature, that is, both empires themselves are phantom reflections of a much later mediaeval kingdom. Nevertheless, we decided to begin our list, which contains the most important dynastic parallelisms with this example, since it is a sufficiently vivid one, and also useful for further understanding.

Let us recall the parallelism table (see Chron1, Chapter 6). The rulers of the Second Roman Empire are listed in the first position, and the respective rulers of the Third Roman Empire that they’re identified as, in the second. All the reign durations are indicated in parentheses (see also [72], pages 236-238). Besides reign durations, the table contains other curious numeric data, which were not taken into account in the calculation of the proximity coefficient $c(a, b)$ – we were only proceeding from reign durations.

The Scaligerian history considers the first three emperors of the Second Roman Empire – Sulla, Pompey and Caesar – to have been “fictitious emperors”, bearing the title of emperor just formally, as if something about it had been “out of the ordinary”. However, this opinion is at odds with a number of “ancient” sources calling those rulers emperors very perspiciously. See Plutarch, for instance ([660], Volume 2, pages 137-138).

1a. Lucius Sulla, ruled for 4 years: 82-78 B.C.
   1b. Aurelian (Lucius Domitian Aurelian) ruled for 5 years: 270-275 A.D.

2a. Strife, less than 1 year: 78-77 B.C.
   2b. Strife, less than 1 year: 275-276 A.D.

3a. Marius Quintus Sertorius, 6 years: 79-72 B.C.
   3b. Probus (Marcus Aurelius Probus), 6 years: 276-282 A.D.
4a. Strife, 2 years: 72-71 B.C.
4b. Strife, 2 years: 282-284 A.D.

5a. Gnaeus Pompey the Great, 21 years: 70-49 B.C.
5b. Diocletian the Divine (Caius Aurelius Valerius Diocletian), 21 years: 284-305 A.D.

6a. Joint rule of Pompey and Julius Caesar (first triumvirate), 11 years: 60-49 B.C.
6b. Joint rule of Diocletian and Constantius I Chlorus (first tetrarchy), 12 years: 293-305 A.D.

7a. Strife, 4 years: 49-45 B.C.
7b. Strife, 4 years: 305-309 A.D.

8a. Julius Caesar, the conqueror of the first triumvirate, 1 year: 45-44 B.C.
8b. Constantius I Chlorus (Marcus or Caius Flavius Valerius Constantius), the conqueror of first tetrarchy, 1 year: 305-306 A.D. or 13 years: 293-306 A.D.

9a. Triumvirate, 17 years: 44-27 B.C.
9b. Tetrarchy, 18 years: 306-324 A.D.

10a. Augustus (Caius Julius Octavian Augustus), the conqueror of the second triumvirate, 41 years: from 27 B.C. to 14 A.D., or 37 years: from 23 B.C. to 14 A.D.
10b. Constantine I (Caius Flavius Valerius Constantine Augustus), the conqueror of the second tetrarchy, 31 years: 306-307 A.D., or 24 years: 313-337 A.D., with the defeat of Licinius taking place in 313 A.D., or 13 years: 324-337 A.D., where year 324 A.D. marks the death of Licinius.

10'a. The birth of Jesus Christ in the 27th year of Octavian Augustus.
10'b. The birth of Saint Basil the Great (The Great King) in the 27th year of Constantine I.

11a. Tiberius (Tiberius Claudius Nero Julius), 23 years: 14-17 A.D.
11b. Constantius II, 24 years: 337-361 A.D., or 21 years: 340-361 A.D.

12. Struggle between Tiberius and Germanicus (assassination of Germanicus), 13 years: 6-19 A.D.
   12b. Struggle between Constantius II and Constans (assassination of Constans), 13 years: 337-350 A.D.

13a. Caligula (Caius Julius Caligula Germanicus), 4 years: 37-41 A.D.
   13b. Julian, 2 years: 361-363 A.D.

14a. The strife after the death of Caligula (brief unrest with the emperor present), less than 1 year: 41 A.D.
   14b. The strife after the death of Julian (brief unrest with the emperor present), less than 1 year: 363 A.D.

15a. Claudius (Tiberius Claudius Nero Drusus Germanicus), 13 years: 41-54 A.D.
   15b. Valentinian I, 11 years: 364-375 A.D.

16a. “Joint rule” of Claudius and Pallas within the “triumvirate”: Claudius, Pallas, Narcissus; not more than 13 years: 41-54 A.D.
   16b. “Joint rule” of Valentinian I and Valens within the “triumvirate”: Valentinian I, Valens, Gratian; 11 years: 367-375 A.D.

17a. Nero (Lucius Domitian Ahenobarbus Tiberius Claudius Drusus Germanicus Nero), 14 years: 54-68 A.D.
   17b. Valens, 14 years: 364-378 A.D.

18a. Joint rule of Nero with Burrus and Seneca, 8 years: 54-62 A.D.
   18b. Joint rule of Valens with Valentinian I and Gratian, 11 years: 364-375 A.D.

19a. Joint rule of Nero and Seneca, 11 years: 54-65 A.D.
   19b. Joint rule of Valens and Gratian, 11 years: 367-368 years A.D.

20a. Galba (Servius Sulpicius Galba), 1 year: 68-69 A.D.
20b. *Jovian*, 1 year: 363-364 A.D.

21a. *Strife*, less than 1 year: 69 A.D.

21b. *Strife*, less than 1 year: 378 A.D.

22a. Two *Tituses Flaviuses Vespasians* (the names are completely identical), 12 years: 69-81 A.D.

22b. *Gratian* and *Valentinian II* (after the death of *Valens*), 13 years: 379-392 A.D.

23a. *Domitian* (*Titus Flavius Domitian*), 15 years: 81-96 A.D.

23b. *Theodosius the Great*, 16 years: 379-395 A.D.

24a. *Nerva* (*Marcus Cocceius Nerva*), 2 years: 96-98 A.D.

24b. *Eugenius*, 2 years: 392-394 A.D.

25a. Joint rule of *Nerva*, 2 years: 96-98 A.D.

25b. Joint rule of *Eugenius*, 2 years: 392-394 A.D.


26b. *Arcadius*, 13 years: 395-408 A.D.

27a. *Hadrian* (*Publius Aelius Hadrian Trajan*), 21 years: 117-138 A.D.

27b. *Honorius*, 28 years: 395-423 A.D.

28a. *Antoninus Pius* (*Titus Aurelius Fulvius Boionius Arrius Antoninus Hadrian*), 23 years: 138-161 A.D.

28b. *Aetius*, 21 years: 423-444 years A.D., or 14 years: 423-438 the years A.D.

29a. *Marcus Aurelius* (*Marcus Annius Catilius Severus Aelius Aurelius Verus Antoninus*), 19 years: 161-180 A.D.

29b. *Valentinian III*, 18 years: 437-455 A.D., or 11 years: 444-455 A.D., or 32 years: 423-455 A.D.
Commodus (Lucius Marcus Aurelius Commodus Antoninus), 16 years: 176-192 A.D., or 12 years: 180-192 A.D.

Recimer, 16 years: 456-472 A.D.

Pertinax (Publius Helvius Pertinax), less than 1 year: 193 A.D.

Olybrius, less than 1 year: 472 A.D.

Didius Julian (Marcus Didius Severus Julian), less than 1 year: 193 A.D.

Glycerius, less than 1 year: 473-474 A.D.

Clodius Albinus (Decimus Clodius Albinus Septimius), less than 1 year: 193 A.D.

Julius Nepos, less than 1 year: 474 A.D.

Pescennius Niger (Caius Pescennius Justus Niger or Nigrus), 1 year: 193-194 A.D.

Romulus Augustulus, 1 year: 475-476 A.D.

Septimius Severus (Lucius Septimius Severus Pertinax), 18 years: 193-211 A.D.

Odoacer, 17 years: 476-493 A.D.

Caracalla (Septimius Bassianus Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Caracalla), 24 years: 193-217 A.D., or 6 years: 211-217 A.D.

Theodoric the Great, 29 years: 497-526 A.D., or 33 years: 493-526 A.D.

Besides reign durations, this table contains additional data irrelevant for the calculation of the $VSSD = c (a, b)$ proximity coefficient, and hence not taken into account in computation. $VSSD = 10^{-12}$ in the statistical model that we present and prove correct in *Chron1*, Chapter 5; it indicates a manifest dependence between the discovered dynastic currents.

Aggregate timelines of the empires under comparison are somewhat different. Namely, the Second Empire spans 299 years. This figure equals 256 years in case of the Third Roman Empire, qv in fig. 1.2. Although a 43-year difference is minute as compared with the total timeframe, it should be taken into account nevertheless. The
Second Empire turns to have zero joint rules of any significance, by which we mean joint rules comparable to the duration of the corresponding reign, while the Third Empire has four pairs of such rulers (8, 9), (12, 13), (16, 17) and (19, 20).

Let us present both dynasties on the time axis. If every ruler is represented by a section whose beginning and end would correspond to the beginning and the end of said ruler’s reign, four “major joint rules” shall separate the Third Empire into five blocks. What would happen to the chart of the Third Empire if we eliminated these joint rules – as in dividing the respective pairs of emperors and placing them one after the other in succession instead? Let us perform these four unidirectional shifts by the length of respective joint rules, keeping the individual sections unchanged. After such separation, the reign tables of the Second and the Third Empire turn out to be virtually identical, qv in fig. 1.2. The calculation of joint reign durations separated by the authors of the present book (with ruler number 29 made redundant, qv in the list) yields the exact difference of 43 years between the durations of the empires’ existence. Thus, the difference became accumulated due to four prominent joint rules. Having made the distinction between the co-rulers, we find that the difference disappears, the durations
of empires begin to coincide, and the two dynasties become virtually identical.

The mechanism of duplication becomes clear. Two different chroniclers would ascribe “extra age” to two different copies of the same mediaeval dynasty of the X-XIII or XIV-XVI century. Or, alternatively, one of the chroniclers, whilst transposing a mediaeval dynasty into the past, would separate its co-rulers, recording them in succession for the sake of simplicity; another chronicler would do the contrary and “combine rulers” by superimposing them one over the other, thus reducing the total timeframe of the entire dynasty. This was how the two phantom duplicates – namely, the Second and Third Roman Empires – had come into existence.

As we have already mentioned, the dynastic current of the Second Empire included in the parallelism virtually covers the entire Second Empire. Namely, it is only the following four emperors that remain outside the parallelism:

- **Otho (Marcus Salvius Otho)**, 69 A.D.,
- **Vitellius (Aulus Vitellius Germanicus)**, 69 A.D.,
- **Lucius Verus (Lucius Ceionnius Commodus Verus Aelius Aurelius)**, 161-169 A.D.,
- **Geta (Lucius or Publius Septimius Geta)**, 209-212 A.D.

It is clear why they had fallen out of the parallelism. They had all ruled jointly with political figures of greater prominence included in the parallelism. Namely, Lucius Verus is “covered” by Marcus Aurelius (161-180), and Geta by Caracalla (193-217). Both Otho and Vitellius had ruled for less than a year.

Let us now consider the Third Roman Empire and produce a complete list of its emperors, with all versions of their rules, and the strife periods. We use the data from [767], [327], [76], [579]. The list uses CAPITAL LETTERS for highlighting the emperors covered by the parallelism.

1. Tetricus, 270-273 A.D.,
2. LUCIUS AURELIAN, 270-275,
3. Tacitus, 275-276,
4. STRIFE, 275-276,
5. Florian, 276 year,
6. PROBUS, 276-282,
7. STRIFE, 282-284,
8. Carus, 282-283,
9. Julian, 283,
10. Carinus, 283-285,
11. Numerian, 283-284,
12. Carausius, 286-293,
13. DIOCLETIAN, 284-305,
14. Allectus, 293-296,
15. Maximian, 286-305,
16. Constantius I Chlorus, 293-306, first version,
17. Galerius 293-311, first version,
18. CONSTANTIUS I CHLORUS, 305-311, second version,
19. Flavius Severus, 306-307,
20. Galerius, 305-311, second version,
21. STRIFE, 305-309,
22. Maximinus Daia or Daza, 306-313,
23. Maxentius, 307-312,
24. Alexander, 308-311,
25. TETRARCHY, 306-324,
26. Licinius, 308-324, first version,
27. Licinius, 313-324, second version,
28. CONSTANTINE I, 306-337, first version,
29. Constantine I, 313-337, second version,
30. Constantine I, 324-337, third version,
31. Constantine II, 337-340,
32. Constans, 337-350,
33. CONSTANTIUS II, 337-361, first version,
34. Constantius II, 340-361, second version,
35. Magnentius, 350-353,
36. JULIAN, 361-363,
37. JOVIAN, 363-364,
38. VALENTINIAN I, 364-375,
39. VALENS, 364-378,
40. Gratian, 367-383, first version,
41. STRIFE, 378,
42. GRATIAN, 379-383, second version,
43. Valentinian II, 375-392, first version,
44. VALENTINIAN II, 379-392, second version,
45. Magnus Maximus, 383-388,
46. Flavius Victor, 384-388,
47. THEODOSIUS THE GREAT in the West and in the East, 379-395,
48. EUGENIUS, 392-394,
49. ARCADIUS in the West and in the East, 395-408,
50. HONORIUS, 395-423,
51. Marcus, 407 year,
52. Gratian II, 407,
53. Constantine III, 407-411,
54. Priscus Attains, 409-410, first version,
55. Heracleon, 409-413,
56. Jovian, 410-413,
57. Priscus Attains, 414, second version, second attempt to seize power,
58. Constantius III, 421,
59. John, 423, first version,
60. John, 423-425, second version,
61. AETIUS, 423-444, first version,
62. Aetius, 423-438, second version,
63. Valentinian, III 423-455, first version,
64. VALENTINIAN III, 437-455, second version,
65. Valentinian III, 444-455, third version,
66. Petronius Maximus, 455,
67. Avitus, 455-456,
68. Majorian, 457-461,
69. RECIMER, 456-472,
70. Libius Severus, 461-465,
71. Anthemius Procopius, 467-472,
72. OLYBRIUS, 472,
73. GLYCERIUS, 473-474,
74. Anarchy and strife, 472-475,
75. JULIUS NEPOS, 474 or 474-475?,
76. ROMULUS AUGUSTULUS, 475-476,
77. ODOACER, 476-493,
78. Theodoric the Goth, 493-526, first version,
79. THEODORIC THE GOTH, 497-526, second version.
Many of the emperors that remained outside the parallelism are the so-called “short-term” ones, in other words, they had ruled for 1-2 years each, and some are only known from coins. Furthermore, some of them did not rule in Rome, but rather in the Roman provinces – Gaul, Africa, etc.

1.2. Biographical parallelism between the Second and Third Roman Empires. The 330-year shift

Alongside the statistical superimposition, there are amazing biographical parallels which all but identify the map-codes of these two dynasties as one another. We feel obliged to reiterate that the detection of a separate isolated pair of “similar biographies” certainly does not mean anything. However, the occurrence of two long sequences of such biographies spanning a total of several hundred years gives one plenty of food for thought.

The biographic parallels that we have discovered, or the proximity of the relevant map-codes (see *Chron1*, Chapter 5), compelled us to compile a number of rather extensive tables and to compare them to each other. In order to save space, we shall only list the focal points of this multi-centenarian parallelism. Naturally, the royal biographies that we have compared were written by different scribes. These scribes would sometimes contradict each other in their evaluation of a given ruler’s endeavours to a great extent. One scribe would praise an emperor, while another would pour scorn over said figure. However, the most remarkable fact in this long chain of coincidences is that all of them were discovered as a result of a continuous formal comparison of kings that had possessed identical numbers in their dynasties over the length of nearly three hundred years.

A) The parallelism between the Second and Third Roman Empires begins with prominent political figures. They both bear the name of Lucius as well as similar, almost identical, honourable titles, not applied to anyone else in these empires: Restitutor Urbis and Restitutor Orbis.

B) The parallelism ends with prominent political figures that accomplish fairly similar deeds. For instance, both of them had granted civil rights to the entire free populace.

C) Superimposition transforms empires and periods of joint rule into near-clones. Official collective joint rules, like triumvirates, are identified as similar joint rules, such as tetrarchies.

D) The “biographic parallelism”, which often surprises us by the amazing uniformity
of “conspiracy backbones”, lasting for nearly 300 years. The letter “a” stands for the Second Empire, and the letter “b” – for the Third.

1a. Lucius Sulla.
   ■ 1b. Lucius Aurelian.

   1.1a. Second Empire. The official title of Sulla: Restitutor Urbis, or “the restorer of the city”. This title was given to no one else in the Second Empire. First name, Lucius.
   ■ 1.1b. Third Empire. The official title of Aurelian: Restitutor Orbis, or “the restorer of the world” (the state). This title was given to no one else in the Third Empire. First name, Lucius. The names coincide.

   1.2a. Second Empire. Sulla is a Roman Emperor, according to Plutarch, for instance ([660], Vol. 2, pages 137-138). In the Scaligerian history, Sulla is not formally considered an emperor [327]. This, however, does not conform to direct references of the “ancient” authors who distinctly refer to Sulla by his emperor’s title, qv in Plutarch’s work ([660], Vol. 2, pages 137-138). Modern historians believe the emperor’s title to have had a “different meaning” when applied to Sulla ([660], Vol. 2, page 514, commentary 61).
   ■ 1.2b. Third Empire. Aurelian – a Roman Emperor, according to the Scaligerian history ([76]).

   1.3a. Second Empire. Sulla becomes emperor as a result of a civil war ([327]), being the most successful military leader. It was one of the bloodiest wars seen by the Second Empire. It had raged on for many years ([327], page 197).
   ■ 1.3b. Third Empire. Aurelian seizes power as a result of a war against the Goths ([327]), being the most capable military leader. The war with the Goths is one of the bloodiest wars seen by the Third Empire. It had also lasted for many years ([327]).

   1.4a. Second Empire. The war is predominantly civil and external to a lesser degree ([327]). The troops crown Sulla emperor ([660], Volume 2). The senate pronounces Sulla the dictator ([327]).
   ■ 1.4b. Third Empire. The war is both civil and external. It completes a major
civil war in Italy that dates to the middle of the alleged third century A.D. The troops pronounce Aurelian the emperor ([327]). The Roman senate approves the election of Aurelian under the pressure of the troops ([327]).

1.5a. Second Empire. Sulla actually establishes the Second Roman Empire after a period of anarchy and republican rule. He is thus the first emperor, regnant for 4 years: 83-78 B.C., or 82-78 B.C. The beginning of Sulla’s reign is dated back to either 83 B.C. ([327], page 197) or 82 B.C. – the year of his victory at the walls of Rome ([327], pages 197-202).

1.5b. Third Empire. Aurelian “restores” the Roman Empire after a severe period of strife. He is the first emperor of the Third Empire. He rules for 5 years: 270-275 A.D.([327] and [76], table 15). The two reign durations are of a virtually similar length.

2a. Period of strife.

2b. Period of strife.

2.1a. Second Empire. After the death of Sulla, the civil war flares up again – actually, a series of wars fought by Pompey et al. Two brilliant military leaders gain prominence – Junius Brutus and Marcus Aemilius Lepidus. The troops of both leaders are defeated.

2.1b. Third Empire. After the death of Aurelian, the stability of the state is lost again, and a mutiny begins. Tacitus, the successor of Aurelian, is murdered. Two new emperors gain prominence: Florian and Probus. The troops of one of the military leaders (Florian) are defeated.

2.2a. Second Empire. The strife lasts for approximately 1 year: 78-77 B.C. ([327], pages 207-208).

2.2b. Third Empire. The strife lasts for approximately 1 year: 275-276 A.D. ([327], pages 446-447). The lengths of the periods coincide.

3a. Marius Quintus Sertorius.

3b. Probus.

3.1a. Second Empire. After the death of Sulla and a brief period of strife, Marius
Quintus Sertorius – the emperor of the troops, comes to power. However, he gets murdered as a result of a plot.

■ 3.1b. Third Empire. After the death of Aurelian and a period of anarchy, Probus becomes emperor. Soldiers riot against Probus and murder him.


■ 3.2b. Third Empire. Probus rules for 6 years: 276-282 years A.D.([327], page 413). The two reign durations coincide.

4a. Period of strife.

■ 4b. Period of strife.

4.1a. Second Empire. After the death of Sertorius in 72-71 B.C. a great embroilment begins, marked by the uprising of Spartacus in particular. Over the course of these two years, two military leaders attain prominence – Pompey and Crassus. The two are the most brilliant warlords of those years.

■ 4.1b. Third Empire. The death of Probus in 282-284 A.D. was followed by a violent civil unrest. In the course of these two years, two military leaders manage to distinguish themselves – Aurelius Carinus and Numerian. The two are the most eminent public figures of the period, who are identified as the duplicates of Pompey and Crassus.

4.2a. Second Empire. The strife lasts for 2 years: 72-71 B.C. ([327], page 215).

■ 4.2b. Third Empire. The strife lasts for 2 years: from the end of 282 to the beginning of 284 A.D. ([327], pages 647-648, and [76], table 15). The durations of the periods coincide.

5a. Gnaeus Pompey Magnus, the organizer of the first triumvirate.

■ 5b. Diocletian the Divine, the organizer of the first tetrarchy.

5.1a. Second Empire. After the strife 70 B.C. the power passes into the hands of the Emperor Pompey the same year. He enjoys a splendorous triumph and becomes honoured with the consul’s title ([660], Volume 2, page 338). The period of Pompey’s reign is known as the epoch of Pompey’s Principate ([767], Volume 1,
For Pompey, the situation with his imperial title is similar to Sulla’s. Although contemporary historians do not consider Pompey to have been “an actual emperor”, Plutarch uses the title to refer to him without any hesitation whatsoever, qv in [660], Volume 2, page 338. There are also numerous ancient inscriptions in existence that call Pompey emperor without any double-talk at all ([873], page 91, No. 34).

■ 5.1b. Third Empire. After the strife of 284 A.D., Diocletian is crowned emperor ([76]). With Diocletian coming to power, “a new epoch begins in the history of the Roman Empire – The Epoch of Dominate” ([327], page 413).

5.2a. Second Empire. Pompey is one of the most famous rulers in the history of Rome. He accomplishes large-scale democratic reforms, in particular, the reformation of the court and the troops ([327], page 277). Pompey was declared divine in his lifetime ([767], Volume 1, p. 279).

■ 5.2b. Third Empire. Diocletian is one of the most eminent rulers in Roman history and the initiator of several important democratic reforms. He reforms the court as well as the military bodies; he is also the author of a monetary reform ([767], Volume 2, page 649 etc). Diocletian was also deified in his lifetime ([327], pages 422-424).

5.3a. Second Empire. In the alleged year 49 B.C., the Roman senate strips Pompey of all his powers. This marks the end of Pompey’s reign; he dies in several years.

■ 5.3b. Third Empire. In the alleged year 305 A.D., Diocletian abdicates, which marks the end of his reign ([327], page 424). He dies a few years after that.

5.4a. Second Empire. Pompey ruled for 21 years: 70-49 B.C. ([76]).


6a. Joint rule of Pompey and Julius Caesar. The First Triumvirate.


6.1a. Second Empire. a) Pompey, b) Julius Caesar, c) the first triumvirate, d) Crassus. At the peak of his fame in 60 B.C., Pompey founded the First Triumvirate to resist his enemies. For this purpose he had granted authority to two important military
leaders, entering an agreement with them – Julius Caesar and Crassus ([327], p. 227).

■ 6.1b. Third Empire. a) Diocletian, b) Constantius Chlorus, c) the first tetrarchy, d) Maximian. At the peak of his popularity, allegedly in 293 a.d., Diocletian creates the First Tetrarchy to hold his opponents at bay. Three major political figures rise to positions of authority as a result – Constantius I Chlorus, Caius Galerius, and Maximian ([327], page 420).

   6.2a. Second Empire. Pompey signs a pact with Crassus first, and then they include Julius Caesar in the coalition. This coalition is officially called the First Triumvirate in historical literature ([327], page 227).

■ 6.2b. Third Empire. Diocletian unites with his co-ruler, Maximian. Then they include Constantius I Chlorus in the group, and later on, Galerius. However, Galerius played no important part under Diocletian. In Roman history, this coalition is called the First Tetrarchy ([327]).

6.3a. Second Empire. In terms of popularity and importance, Julius Caesar is considered to rank second after Pompey, leaving Crassus behind ([327], pages 226-228). With Pompey being overthrown, the power passes on to Julius Caesar, his co-ruler.

■ 6.3b. Third Empire. In the hierarchy of power, Constantius I Chlorus (Julius Caesar's double) is considered to rank second after Diocletian (the double of Pompey) and leave Maximian (the double of Crassus) behind. After the abdication of Diocletian, Constantius I Chlorus, his co-ruler, comes to power.

6.4a. Second Empire. The joint rule of Pompey and Julius Caesar lasts for 11 years: 60-49 B.C.


Commentary. Fig.1.3 shows “the statue of Pompey, at the foot of which, as they assume, Caesar had been killed”. (Rome, Palazzo Spada – see [304], Volume 1, page 464). Fig.1.4 shows an “ancient” bust of Diocletian, Pompey’s double, kept in the Capitol museum ([304], Volume 1, page 565). However, it is difficult to expect any semblance between the two sculptures, since they were hardly portraits in the contemporary sense. Moreover, they were most likely made as late as in the XVI-XVIII
century to serve as “visual aids” for the “new Scaligerian history” introduced in that epoch – the epoch of Reformation.

---

7a. Period of strife.

■ 7b. Period of strife.

7.1a. Second Empire. Pompey becomes overthrown in 49 B.C., and a great strife begins, one that lasts for 4 years: 49-45 B.C. ([327], pages 244-247). The strife covers the entire period of Julius Caesar’s rule and the Second Triumvirate, ending with the rise of Octavian Augustus ([327], pages 244-247).

■ 7.1b. Third Empire. Diocletian abdicates in 305 A.D., which leads to a four-year period of strife (305-309 A.D., qv in [767] and [327]). The strife covers the
entire rule of Constantius I Chlorus (Julius Caesar's double) and the Second Tetrarchy. Towards the end of the period of strife, Constantine I gains prominence ([767], Volume 1, pages 330-332, and [76], table 12). The durations of the two strife periods coincide.

8a. Julius Caesar, the conqueror of the First Triumvirate.

- 8b. Constantius I Chlorus, the conqueror of the First Tetrarchy.

8.1a. Second Empire. Julius Caesar comes to power after a strife and a dynastic struggle, destroying his former companions-in-arms. In the Scaligerian history, Julius Caesar, likewise Sulla and Pompey, is considered to have been "an irregular emperor". However, Plutarch, for example, explicitly calls Julius Caesar King ([660], Volume 1, pages 486-487). There are also “ancient” coins and “ancient” inscriptions in existence that refer to Julius Caesar as to Emperor, and sans hesitation at that ([873], page 184, No.137).

- 8.1b. Third Empire. Constantius I Chlorus seizes power during the strife. A party struggle destroyed many of his former friends and supporters. He was honoured with the title Augustus.

8.2a. Second Empire. Julius Caesar adopts and elevates the nineteen-year-old Octavian. Octavian soon becomes the famous Augustus, ranking amongst demigods.

- 8.2b. Third Empire. Constantius I Chlorus enthrones his twenty-year-old son, Constantine. Note the similarity between respective ages of nineteen and twenty years. Constantine I soon becomes the famous Augustus, declared a saint and a demigod.

8.3a. Second Empire. Julius Caesar ruled for 1 year: 45-44 B.C.

- 8.3b. Third Empire. Constantius I Chlorus ruled for 1 year: 305-306 A.D. We shall remind the reader that he was pronounced Augustus in 305 A.D.

9a. The triumvirs and the increasing importance of one of their number – Caius Julius Caesar Octavian (Augustus).

- 9b. The tetrarchs and the increasing importance of one of their number – Caius Flavius Valerius Constantius I (Augustus).
9.1a. Second Empire. After the death of Julius Caesar, the nineteen-year-old Octavian, adopted by Caesar and supported by his troops, claims the throne for himself and soon attains it. In doing so, he relies on the Roman legions that he was tremendously popular with.

9.1b. Third Empire. After the death of Constantius I Chlorus, allegedly in 306 A.D., the twenty-year-old Constantine, son of Constantius I Chlorus, is appointed the Caesar of the West. It is the support of his troops that earned Constantine the title of Caesar.

9.2a. Second Empire. After a certain period of time, the Second Triumvirate is created with the participation of Octavian Augustus. Antonius, a member of this triumvirate, initially despises Octavian.

9.2b. Third Empire. The Second Tetrarchy with the participation of Constantine I is soon formed. Galerius, a member of this tetrarchy, also treats Constantine, the son of Constantius I Chlorus, with disdain at the beginning.

9.3a. Second Empire. Antony, considering the influence of Octavian Augustus’ army and his popularity in Rome, is forced to negotiate and make peace with Octavian. The end of the Second Triumvirate: Octavian defeated Antony and Cleopatra in a sea battle and became the sole ruler of the Second Empire.

9.3b. Third Empire. Galerius, “considering the strength of the Gallic army and Constantine’s popularity among the Gallic aristocracy… was forced to recognize him as the Caesar” ([327], page 424). End of the Second Tetrarchy: in a sea battle of 324, Constantine crushes the fleet of his enemies, remaining the sole emperor of the Third Empire. It is possible that “Gaul” might have formerly been used to refer to both the territory of France and Galicia.


9.4b. Third Empire. The duration of the strife and the tetrarchy equals 18 years: 306-324 A.D. ([327], pages 249-258, 289-291). The durations are similar.


10b. Caius Flavius Valerius Constantine Augustus. Conqueror of the Second
10.1a. Second Empire. In the sea battle of Accium, Octavian Augustus defeats Antony, his last enemy, completely. With this victory, “the period of civil wars in the history of Rome ends” ([327], page 259). Octavian Augustus is one of the most widely known emperors of Rome in its entire history. First name, Caius.

10.1b. Third Empire. In the sea battle of Adrianopolis, Constantine I finally defeats Licinius, his last competitor. This victory marks the end of the civil war epoch in the alleged III century A.D. ([327], page 429). Constantine I Augustus is one of the most famous rulers in the history of Rome. First name, Caius. The names of the doubles coincide.

10.2a. Second Empire. Antony, defeated by Octavian, had been his close friend and co-ruler initially, subsequently having become Octavian’s worst enemy. Before his coronation, Octavian had served in the troops in the East.

10.2b. Third Empire. Defeated by Constantine I, Licinius, who had earlier been his companion-in-arms and co-ruler, later became Constantine’s enemy. Before his coronation, Constantine I had served in the troops in the East.

10.3a. Second Empire. At the beginning of Octavian’s career, the key position of power was occupied by the Second Triumvirate, whose members had plotted against him. Then Octavian Augustus became canonized ([579], page 339). A new stage in Roman history is considered to begin with Augustus. It is often written that “this moment [27 B.C. – A.F.] signifies the very beginning of the Roman Empire” ([579], page 339).

10.3b. Third Empire. In the biography of Constantine I Augustus (the Second Tetrarchy), a political struggle ensues between its participants, known as one of the key events that had taken place at the beginning of his rule. Constantine I was pronounced a son of the God of the Sun ([767], Volume 1, page 674). Everything related to the person of the emperor in one way was declared divine. The Christian Church is considered to have recognized Constantine I as a Saint equal to the Apostles in his rank ([767], Volume 2, page 674). Constantine I is also believed to have initiated a new stage in the history of “the revived empire”, sometimes called “the holy period”. Christianity had got to enjoy the state support and grown considerably stronger – presumably, for the first time.
10.4a. Second Empire. Octavian Augustus concentrated all the important functions of military, civil and religious power in his hands ([579], page 339). Octavian’s legislative activity was highly popular. Not only were new laws issued, but the former Roman codices also got “revised” ([767], Volume 2, page 408).

10.4b. Third Empire. Constantine I is considered to have got hold of all military, civil and religious power ([767], Volume 2, page 668). Constantine’s legislative activity is renowned in particular. He published new laws, and also restored the codices of the “pre-Diocletian epoch” ([767], Volume 2, page 669).

10.5a. Second Empire. Initially, Octavian Augustus hasn’t got any permanent residence of any sort. After the end of the civil war, Augustus settles down in Rome and “transforms her into a new city”. Rome is considered to have become a highly urbanized centre of paramount importance under Octavian Augustus ([767], Volume 2, page 408).

10.5b. Third Empire. In the first years of his rule, Constantine I has got no permanent capital. He later transfers the capital of the Roman Empire from Rome to the New Rome on the Bosporus. “New Rome” is the official name of the new capital founded by Constantine I. The city received the name of Constantinople a few years later ([327], page 436, [240], page 26).

10.6a. Second Empire. Chronicles especially emphasize that Augustus transformed Rome (allegedly in Italy) into a rich city. “Under Augustus, Rome was rebuilt in marble instead of wood and brick, having undergone a radical reorganization” ([767], Volume 2, page 408). Under Augustus, 82 temples had been erected and restored ([767], Volume 2). The foundation of the New Rome on the Bosporus is mentioned as follows: “Byzantium, with its seven hills, had looked very much like Rome” ([240], page 225). However, the question would arise: which one of the cities had really resembled the other? The conclusions that ensue from the decomposition of the global chronological map into a sum of four chronicles, qv in Chron1, Chapter 6, suggest that it had most likely been the Italian Rome that was built in the XIII-XV century A.D. in the image of Czar-Grad on the Bosporus.

10.6b. Third Empire. Constantine I transforms the New Rome into a luxurious capital city ([240], page 26). The city was built as a “capital of stone” and a powerful sea fortress. The settlement of Byzantium located at that site underwent a
radical reconstruction. A specific administrative structure was introduced, which is known to have existed in the Italian Rome. Constantine had built a large number of palaces, a hippodrome, and a great many temples ([327], page 436).

10.7. **Second Empire.** In the 27th year of the rule of Octavian Augustus, Jesus Christ was born. It is from his birth that we count “the new era” nowadays.

10.7b. **Third Empire.** In the 27th year of the rule of Constantine I, the famous Saint Basil the Great was born, apparently a reflection of Jesus Christ. The parallelism between Jesus and Basil was first pointed out by N.A. Morozov ([544]).

10.8a. **Second Empire.** Augustus had ruled for 41 or 37 years. There are two versions of the beginning of his reign – either the year 27 or 23 B.C. Let us note that the year 23 B.C. marks the beginning of the absolute power period for Augustus: he is granted dictatorship, a lifelong consulate, and unlimited legislative powers ([327] and [579], page 304).

10.8b. **Third Empire.** Constantine I had ruled for 31 years. We have three reign duration versions in his case. We consider the basic version here: 306-337 A.D. The reign durations are similar.

**Commentary.** Fig.1.5 shows a triumphal statue of Emperor Octavian Augustus, located in Rome. On fig.1.6 we see an enormous “ancient” statue of Constantine I, the double of Octavian Augustus, in a portico of the Lutheran basilica in Rome ([304], Volume 1, page 572). We shall repeat what we have said about the statues of Pompey and Diocletian. Most likely, the statues of Augustus and Constantine, as well as every similar sculptural image of “antiquity”, are not lifetime representations at all, but rather were made in the XVII-XVIII century, the epoch of Reformation, as “visual aids” illustrating Scaligerian history introduced en masse at that time.
Fig. 1.5. The triumphal statue of emperor Octavian Augustus made of bronze (Rome, Via dei Fori Imperiali). Nowadays it is considered to be a copy from an “ancient” marble original which is kept in the Vatican Museum (see photograph in ChronL, Chapter 7). However, a comparison between the “original” and the “copy” demonstrates the two to be ostensibly different from each other. Apparently, in the XVII-XVIII century the manufacture of such “visual aids to the Scaligerian history textbook” assumed the character of mass production, and there was little care about such trifles as similarity between copies and originals. A possible reason may be that the creators were well aware of the fact that there hadn’t been any originals anymore – most of them faced destruction in the Reformation epoch of the XVI-XVII century. Taken from [1242], page 60.

Fig. 1.6. The “ancient” statue of Constantine I, the double of Octavian Augustus, from the portico of the Lateran Basilica in Rome ([304], Volume 1, page 572).

11a. Tiberius.

■ 11b. Constantius II.
11.1a. Second Empire. “Right after the death of Augustus, who had left no direct heir… the issue of succession arose immediately” ([767], Volume 2, page 412). A struggle for power begins. In face of the uncertainty concerning the identity of his successor, Tiberius, having acceded to the throne, had to fight other pretenders, Germanicus in particular, “on equal terms”.

■ 11.1b. Third Empire. Constantine I leaves no direct heir, but “dividing the empire between his three sons and two nephews” ([327], page 438). Naturally, after the death of Constantine I, a furious power struggle had flared up. Constantine I had brought major confusion afoot, since he had specified no single successor to the throne. Constantius II, having captured “Constantinople, exterminated the families of the two stepbrothers of Constantine” ([327], page 438).

11.2a. Second Empire. A while ago Tiberius was adopted by Octavian Augustus ([767], Volume 2, page 412). Tiberius is known to have died being “strangled with blankets” [767], Volume 2, page 423. In a sense, this death may be considered unexpected.

■ 11.2b. Third Empire. Constantius II is the son of Constantine I ([327], page 438). Constantius II, as historians tell us, “died unexpectedly” ([327], page 440).

11.3a. Second Empire. Tiberius had ruled for 23 years: 14-37 A.D.

■ 11.3b. Third Empire. Constantius II had ruled for 24 years: 337-361 A.D. The reign durations of the duplicates are similar.

---

12a. Struggle between Tiberius and Germanicus. The assassination of Germanicus.

■ 12b. Struggle between Constantius II and Constans. The assassination of Constans.

12.1a. Second Empire. Tiberius and Germanicus appear on the political scene simultaneously, as of 6 A.D.([767], Volume 2, page 414). Both come from royal families. Germanicus is Tiberius’ nephew ([767], Volume 2, page 414). Their destinies are inseparable, with Tiberius playing the key part.

■ 12.1b. Third Empire. Constantius II and Constans appear in the political life of the empire virtually at the same time, namely, in 337 A.D. Constans is the co-ruler of his brother Constantius II in the West ([327], page 439). Constantius II had always
been dominant in this pair (§327).

12.2a. Second Empire. At the beginning of his career, Germanicus had accomplished several great victories over barbarians (§767, Volume 2, page 414). He had fought in the West. The ensuing competition and struggle between Tiberius and Germanicus result in Tiberius accusing Germanicus of plotting against him (§767, Volume 2, page 417).

■ 12.2b. Third Empire. At the beginning of his political career, Constans defeats the barbarians several times (§327). Likewise Germanicus, he fights successfully in the West. Then a great discord flares up in the empire, allegedly one of a religious nature. As a result, Constantius II and Constans find themselves in different camps (§327, page 439).

12.3a. Second Empire. Germanicus was soon assassinated by Piso, governor-general in Syria. Tiberius, presumably wishing to ward off suspicions of Germanicus’ assassination, had arranged a trial over Piso and executed him.

■ 12.3b. Third Empire. Constans was soon assassinated by Magnentius the impostor (§327). Constantius II launched a campaign against Magnentius in retribution against the assassin of Constans. He took him prisoner and executed him (§327).

12.4a. Second Empire. The joint rule of Tiberius and Germanicus lasted for 13 years: 6-19 A.D.


13a. Caius Caesar Caligula.

■ 13b. Caesar Julian.

13.1a. Second Empire. Information about Caligula is scarce (§767, Volume 2). It is known, though, that he had suffered from some mental disease, imagined himself to be a deity incarnate, and pursued correspondent behaviour by extremely insalubrious means (§327, page 300, §767, Volume 2, pages 423-422).

■ 13.1b. Third Empire. Information about Julian, on the contrary, is plentiful. He is considered to have been an important reformer of religion. However, the actual
data concerning the nature of his reforms are rather contradictory. Some Byzantine historians even called him “The Lord Incarnate” ([327]). Julian is considered to have been the “restorer of pagan worship”. His reforms ended in a failure.

13.2a. Second Empire. Caligula is assassinated as a result of a plot ([327], page 301). The details of the plot are unknown. Legend has it that Caligula had received his name – “Caligula”, or, allegedly, “Soldier’s Boot”, for having worn soldier’s boots as a child.

■ 13.2b. Third Empire. Julian is assassinated on a march, allegedly with a dart. The assassin remains unknown. By and large, there are many legends about his death ([327], page 441). Julian is considered to have been an ardent worshipper of Mithras, and a priest of this god. One of important distinguishing features of the Mithraist priests was that the latter had worn red soldier’s (!) boots, or caligulae ([260], page 69).

13.3a. Second Empire. Caligula had ruled for 4 years: 37-41 A.D.

■ 13.3b. Third Empire. Julian had ruled for 2 years: 361-363 A.D. We see similar reign durations.

14a. Strife after Caligula’s death. Short strife under the emperor.

■ 14b. Strife after Julian’s death. Short strife under the emperor.

14.1a. Second Empire. In 41 A.D., after Caligula’s death, a civil discord begins in the Second Roman Empire. The troops elect Claudius as emperor ([327], page 301).

■ 14.1b. Third Empire. In 363 A.D., after Julian’s death, a strife begins in the Third Roman Empire. The legionaries elect Jovian as emperor ([327], page 441).

14.2a. Second Empire. The strife lasts for several months only. The senate fails to resist the will of the troops ([327], page 301).

■ 14.2b. Third Empire. Jovian had “ruled” for 7 months maximum, and only in the East, as he had had no time for returning to the capital of the empire. We shall recall that at the moment of the election he was on a march ([327], page 441, [76], table 16). The reign durations are thus similar.
15a. Claudius.

15b. Valentinian I.

15.1a. Second Empire. During the strife that had lasted for several months, the troops pronounced Claudius emperor. One year after Claudius’ accession, the uprising of Scribonianus flares up in the northern provinces of the empire ([327], page 301). This uprising is one of the most famous ones in the history of the Second Empire. Scribonianus is a governor-general in Illyria ([327], page 301).

15.1b. Third Empire. After the strife related to the actions of Jovian in the East, far away from the capital, legions pronounce Valentinian I emperor. One year after the accession of Valentinian I, the uprising of Procopius begins in the northern and eastern provinces of the empire ([327], page 442). This mutiny is one of the most notorious events in the history of the Third Empire. Procopius is a relative of Julian ([327], page 442).

15.2a. Second Empire. Simultaneously with the uprising of Scribonianus, a plot organized by his supporters is uncovered in Rome ([327], page 301). The troops of Scribonianus and the conspirators are crushed.

15.2b. Third Empire. Simultaneously with the mutiny of Procopius, a plot organized by his supporters was uncovered in Rome ([327], page 442). The troops of Procopius and the conspirators were also defeated.

15.3a. Second Empire. Claudius begins mass repressions against the residents and the former administration of Rome ([327]). The repressions encounter serious opposition in the troops. The praetorians and the legionaries rebel. The Roman nobility, too, rises against Claudius ([327]). Claudius is poisoned ([327]).

15.3b. Third Empire. Valentinian I launches the prosecution of large groups of the supporters of Procopius. As a response to the repressions, discontent in the troops flares up, involving “many strata of the society” ([327], page 442). The only report about the death of Valentinian I tells us that “he had died unexpectedly” ([327], page 442).

15.4a. Second Empire. Claudius had ruled for 13 years: 41-54 A.D.

15.4b. Third Empire. Valentinian I had ruled for 11 years: 364-375 A.D. The reign durations are similar.
16a. “Joint rule” of Claudius and Pallas within the “Triumvirate”: Claudius, Pallas, Narcissus.


16.1a. Second Empire. The three characters mentioned above are normally ranked by their influence in this empire as follows: 1) Claudius, 2) Pallas, 3) Narcissus. Under Claudius, the “triumvirate” comes to power, namely, Claudius himself and his two influential minions – Pallas (Valens?) and Narcissus (Gratian?). They exert a great influence upon the policy of the empire ([767], Volume 2, page 426).

16.1b. Third Empire. The ranking of these characters by their influence is as follows: 1) Valentinian I, 2) Valens, 3) Gratian. Valentinian I organizes the “triumvirate” in the following way: he appoints Valens his co-ruler, with Gratian assisting him in the West, from 367 and on ([327], pages 441-442). One cannot but note the similarity between the names of the duplicates: Pallas and Valens. The names of Gratian and Narcissus may also be related to each other in some way.

16.2a. Second Empire. The “joint rule” of Claudius and Pallas does not exceed 13 years in duration.

16.2b. Third Empire. The “joint rule” of Valentinian I and Valens lasts for 11 years. The reign durations are similar.

17a. Nero (Tiberius Claudius Nero).

17b. Valens.

17.1a. Second Empire. After the poisoning of Claudius, Nero, the stepson of Claudius, becomes emperor ([767], Volume 2, page 789). Nero is notorious for confiscations, persecutions and numerous murders that took place during his reign ([767], Volume 2, page 431). This notably distinguished Nero among the emperors of the Second Empire. He repeatedly replenished the treasury by means of mass expropriations.

17.1b. Third Empire. After the “unexpected death” of Valentinian I in 375, Valens, Valentinian’s brother, remains the sole ruler. He stands out for terrorizing the country: murders, persecutions and "political purges". Like Nero, he had often used
mass confiscations in order to replenish the state treasury ([327]). Valens was also known as Valens the Goth ([269], page 7).

17.2a. Second Empire. Nero’s policy causes resentment in the Second Empire and results in the so-called "plot of 65". This plot is headed by the representatives of the empire’s supreme nobility ([767], Volume 2, page 437). However, the plot becomes uncovered, and the would-be uprising suppressed. After this, Nero launches major repressions. This leads to mass denunciations ([767], Volume 2).

■ 17.2b. Third Empire. The cruel actions of Valens had increased tension in the Third Empire. A plot against Valens resulted in the uprising of Procopius to flare up. The plot was headed by the supreme nobility of the empire ([327], page 442). However, the plot was uncovered and the rebellion of Procopius got suppressed ruthlessly, with mass repressions coming in its wake. Numerous public denunciations followed as a result [327].

17.3a. Second Empire. Nero is known to have been a vehement persecutor of the Christians. They describe the ill-famed burnings of Christians – the so-called “Nero’s torches of tar” ([767], Volume 2). Anti-Christian repressions were especially commonplace in Rome. At the end of Nero’s rule, the position of the Second Empire is noted to have seriously worsened.

■ 17.3b. Third Empire. Valens persistently persecutes Christians. Certain sources consider him to have been an Aryan. During his reign, the famous Saint Basil the Great suffers from repressions (the “Passions” of St. Basil the Great, qv in [544], Volume 1). Since Basil the Great is a phantom reflection of Jesus Christ ([544]), it is possible that these events reflect the Gospels. In that case, “vicious Valens” is a reflection of the Evangelical “vicious King Herod”.

17.4a. Second Empire. The uprising of Julius Vindex became the culmination of this troubled period ([327], page 306). It flared up in Aquitania, on the border of the empire. Let us note that there had been no conspiracy in Rome. The rebels sought help in the western provinces of the empire calling out to dethrone Nero ([767], Volume 2, page 438). Governor-generals of the Pyrenean peninsula provinces joined the uprising ([327], page 306).

■ 17.4b. Third Empire. The insurrection of the Goths on the river Danube in 376 is regarded as a special event of that troubled epoch ([327], page 443). The uprising
took place on the borders of the empire. However, there was no conspiracy in Rome. The Goth rebels had sought help in the western provinces of the empire, calling for the dethronement of Valens ([767], Volume 2, page 443). Moesia and Thracia had joined in the insurrection ([767], Volume 2).

17.5a. Second Empire. Upper-German legions had destroyed Vindex, but turned against Nero right away, demanding a new emperor ([327], page 306). Nero attempts to escape, but perishes during the pursuit. Let us note that the full names of Nero and his predecessor, Claudius, resemble each other, qv above. The full names both contain the same formula: Claudius Tiberius Nero Drusus Germanicus ([72]).

17.5b. Third Empire. The rebels destroy the troops sent against them by the government ([767], Volume 2, page 443). Valens also attempts to escape, but ends up killed ([767], Volume 2, page 443). The names of Valens and his predecessor – Valentinian I – are very similar: Valens and Valentinian.

17.6a. Second Empire. Nero rules for 14 years: 54-68 A.D.


18b. Joint rule of Valens with Valentinian I and Gratian. Death of Valentinian I.

18.1a. Second Empire. In this empire, the three indicated characters are ranked by their influence as follows: 1) Nero, 2) Burrus, 3) Seneca. “Policy management in the first half of Nero’s rule had been in the hands of philosopher Seneca and praetor prefect Burrus” ([767], Volume 2, page 430). At this time, Burrus had even held the key position in this “triumvirate”, since he educated Nero ([327], page 305). But in reality Nero, the emperor, had been the key figure of authority.

18.1b. Third Empire. The ranking of these characters is as follows: 1) Valens, 2) Valentinian I, 3) Gratian. In the very beginning of the rule of Valens, Valentinian I had managed the policy as the elder. He is similar to Burrus in this respect. Thus, Valentinian I had been the first in the “triumvirate” during this period ([76], table 16). Gratian took the third place after Valens. But, of course, it is actually Valens the emperor who had been first there. Therefore, we list him first.
18.2a. Second Empire. Nero reigned jointly with Burrus for 8 years, 54-62 ([327], page 305). Seneca had been the co-ruler of Nero for most of his term as emperor, that is, 54 to 65 A.D.

18.2b. Third Empire. Valens had ruled together with Valentinian I for 11 years: 364-375 ([327]). Gratian, the double of Seneca, had ruled together with Valens virtually throughout the entire term of Valens as emperor, 367 to 378. The reign durations are similar.

19a. “Joint rule” of Nero and Seneca: 54-65 A.D.


20a. Servius Sulpicius Galba.

20b. Jovian.

20.1a. Second Empire. Galba was pronounced emperor by the troops. He abolished nearly all the orders and decisions of his predecessor (767], Volume 2).

20.1b. Third Empire. Jovian was declared emperor by the troops. He had decisively “broken with the past” and abolished the orders and decisions of his predecessor (767], Volume 2).

20.2a. Second Empire. Galba had ruled for about 1 year: 68-69 ([767], Volume 2, page 789, [327], page 208).

20.2b. Third Empire. Jovian had ruled for about 1 year: 363-364 A.D. ([767], Volume 2, page 793). The durations are similar.

21a. Strife.

21b. Strife.

21.1a. Second Empire. In the year of 69, after the death of Galba, a civil war breaks out. Its duration does not exceed 1 year ([327], page 309).

21.1b. Third Empire. In the year 378, right after the death of Valens, a civil war breaks out. Its duration does not exceed 1 year, either ([327], page 443). The strife periods have similar durations.
22a. Two Titus Flavius Vespasians: Titus Flavius Vespasian and his successor, another Titus Flavius Vespasian.

22b. Gratian – after the death of Valens; Valentinian II – also after the death of Valens.

22.1a. Second Empire. The names of these two rulers coincide. They are considered to have been father and son ([767], Volume 2, page 789; also [327], pages 309-310). This “double Titus” had ruled for a total of 12 years, 69-81, in the West.

22.1b. Third Empire. After the death of Valens in 378, Gratian and Valentinian II remain the only rulers of the empire. Both rule in the West. The duration of their joint rule equals 13 years: 379-392 (see [767], Volume 2, page 793). The duplicate reigns have similar durations.

23a. Titus Flavius Domitian.

23b. Theodosius I the Great.

23.1a. Second Empire. Domitian becomes emperor after the “double Titus”. Chronicles ([327], page 313) emphasize the fact that he had concentrated enormous power in his hands. Domitian demanded that “he, when addressed, was to be called Lord and God” ([327], p. 319).

23.1b. Third Empire. Theodosius I the Great comes to power in the east of the empire while the pair of emperors – Gratian and Valentinian II – rules in the west. He acquires enormous influence throughout the empire, and considerably enhances its influence in the east ([327], page 444, and [767], Volume 2, page 793). Theodosius I is known to have been an extremely pious ruler, also in full control of the ecclesiastical power in the empire [327].

23.2a. Second Empire. Under Domitian, “the Roman provinces of the Balkan Peninsula had found themselves threatened” ([327], page 314). The Dacian rebellion had made the frontier troops of Domitian suffer bitter defeat ([327]). The Second Empire enters a lengthy and hard war against Dacians thereafter.

23.2b. Third Empire. Under Theodosius I, the uprising of the Visigoths set the Roman provinces of the Balkan Peninsula in turmoil. The troops dispatched by
Theodosius I were put to rout ([327]). The Third Empire had started arduous and prolonged war against the Visigoths.

23.3a. Second Empire. Domitian negotiates a truce with the Dacians, which is considered to be unfavourable for the Second Empire. Although the Dacians were considered “allies” at that time, relations between the two parties remained extremely strained ([327], page 316). Nevertheless, this peace pact with the Dacians is regarded as one of the most important ones ever signed by the Second Empire ([327]). The truce in question was signed in the eighth year of Domitian’s rule.

23.3b. Third Empire. Theodosius I had bribed the Goths and signed a peace treaty with them ([327], page 444). The treaty is considered to have been unsuccessful for the Third Empire, since the Goths “formed a semi-independent state within the Roman Empire” thereafter ([327], page 444). The treaty with the Goths also ranks among the key treaties of the Third Empire ([327]). The treaty was signed in the seventh reign year of Theodosius I ([327], page 444). Thus, if we superimpose the Second Empire over the Third, we shall see that a very important treaty had been signed the same year. This, among other things, identifies the Dacians as the Visigoths.

23.4a. Second Empire. The war of the Second Empire against the Dacians was followed by a domestic uprising – the plot of Saturninus etc. Severe repressions had followed as Domitian’s response. The emperor had died in the atmosphere of discontent and confusion that prevailed throughout the Second Empire ([327]).

23.4b. Third Empire. After the war against the Visigoths, unrest flares up in the Third Empire, allegedly of a religious origin; we see reports of massacre, plunder, and arson ([327], page 444). Theodosius commences sweeping repressions. He dies in the atmosphere of overall civil unrest and rumblings in the Third Empire ([327]).

23.5a. Second Empire. Domitian had ruled for 15 years: 81-96 ([327], pages 444-445; also [767], Volume 2, page 793).

23.5b. Third Empire. Theodosius I had ruled for 16 years: 379-395 ([76], table 16). The reign durations are similar.

24a. Marcus Cocceus Nerva.

24b. Eugenius.
24.1a. *Second Empire*. Immediately after the death of Domitian, Nerva becomes emperor in the west. His reign *lasts for 2 years*: 96-98 ([327], page 317).


---


■ 25b. Joint rule of Eugenius.

25.1a. *Second Empire*. Throughout his entire reign, Nerva had ruled jointly with Trajan, and the famous emperor eventually “outshone” Nerva. The duration of this joint rule is *2 years*: 96-98.

■ 25.1b. *Third Empire*. Throughout his entire reign, Eugenius had ruled jointly with Theodosius I the Great – the famous emperor that had “stolen Eugenius’ thunder”. This joint rule lasts for *2 years*: 392-394. Durations coincide.

---

26a. Marcus Ulpius Trajan.

■ 26b. Arcadius.

26.1a. *Second Empire*. Trajan’s rule is considered to have been the beginning of the “golden age” in the Second Empire ([327], page 317). While still in power, Trajan wages *three major wars*.

■ 26.1b. *Third Empire*. In 395, Emperor Arcadius (the name translating as “joyful”) assumes power over “the rich and civilized East” ([327], page 445). Arcadius also wages *three major wars* during his reign.

26.2a. *Second Empire*. Trajan’s enemy in the Balkans is Decebalus, a well-known chieftain of the Dacians ([327]). The war against Decebalus is Trajan’s *first* one, one he had waged right after his accession – or, more precisely, in the third year of his rule. As we stated above, little is known about the first three years of Trajan’s rule. Decebalus is a well-known commander in the history of the Second Empire. His name may possibly hail back to “Daci-bella”, or the war with the Dacians.

■ 26.2b. *Third Empire*. The famous Alaric, chief of the Visigoths, is Arcadius’ enemy in the Balkans. Again, *we identify Visigoths as the Dacians*, as seen in
paragraph 23 above. The war against Alaric is the first one waged by Arcadius, one that started immediately after his accession ([767], Volume 2). Alaric is a legendary commander in the history of the Third Empire. His name might possibly have been pronounced “Ala-Rex”. Thus, Decebalus and Alaric may have not been names in the contemporary sense – aliases, more likely.

26.3a. Second Empire. The Great Roman Army of Trajan engages in an all-out war with Decebalus, one that had lasted for 2 years ([327] and [767], Volume 2). Finally, the Second Empire forged a truce with Decebalus ([767], Volume 2, page 789). Decebalus had taken advantage of this armistice to consolidate his army, and became the commander of a large body of troops in several years’ time. Then he violated the truce by having started the second war against the Dacians.

■ 26.3b. Third Empire. A large Roman army, headed by Roman general Stilicho, had been fighting Alaric for two years. As a result, the Third Empire had signed a peace treaty with Alaric [767], Volume 2, page 793. During the armistice, Alaric had built up his strength and formed a powerful army in several years. Afterwards, he also violated the truce, and started the second war with the Goths.

26.4a. Second Empire. The second war against the Dacians rages for several years. The outcome of the war is rather uncertain. Rome arranges for another armistice. After a short lull, a third war begins, this time against Parthia; this one also takes a few years to finish.

■ 26.4b. Third Empire. The second war against the Visigoths rages on for several years. The outcome of the war is uncertain. The empire forges another truce with the Visigoths. After a fairly calm period, the Third Gothic War flares up, also lasting for several years.

26.5a. Second Empire. The empire loses the third war. Rome suffers a bitter defeat ([767], Volume 2). We can conclude by saying that Trajan’s main enemy had been Decebalus in the Balkans.

■ 26.5b. Third Empire. The Third Empire loses the last war as well. Moreover, this had been an actual defeat of Rome, since it was Stilicho, the Roman commander that loses the war. Thus, Arcadius’s main enemy had been Alaric, who also came from the Balkans.
26.6a. Second Empire. Trajan had ruled for either 19 years: 98-117, or 16 years: 101-117. It has to be noted that very little is known about the first three years of his rule ([327], page 318; also [767], Volume 2).

26.6b. Third Empire. Arcadius had ruled for 13 years: 395-408 ([767], Volume 2, page 793; also [76], tables 16-17). Reign durations are similar.

27a. Publius Aelius Hadrian.

27b. Honorius.

27.1a. Second Empire. Hadrian was adopted by Trajan, his predecessor. Let us also note that Adrian is a relation of the emperor Trajan’s wife ([327], page 322).

27.1b. Third Empire. Honorius and Arcadius, his predecessor, had been brothers ([327]).

27.2a. Second Empire. Under Hadrian, the Roman army falls into utter decline ([327], page 324). As one can see below, similar events take place under Honorius, the duplicate of Hadrian. Moreover, these two processes of armies sliding into decline – under both Hadrian and Honorius – are so similar that the contemporary books on the history of Rome describe them in virtually the same words. We shall cite two such descriptions to illustrate. This is how historians describe the decay of the Roman army in Hadrian’s epoch: “Seeing as how many Roman citizens had refused to serve in the legions, Hadrian introduced the practice of reinforcing the ranks of legionaries by representatives of a different social stratum than the residents of the provinces, who had the rights of Roman citizenship, namely, common free provincials. The legionaries had finally lost their “Roman” character and turned into a multinational force, which had been armed with Roman weapons and used Latin as the official language” ([327], page 324). This is how the Roman army had disintegrated under Hadrian.

27.2b. Third Empire. Let us now cite the description of the Roman army in the time of Honorius: “The Roman troops of the time had looked nothing like the legions of early empires. Although they had carried on calling themselves legions, both the armament and the organization of the Roman army had changed completely after the massacre at Adrianople. They had transformed into an army of barbarian soldiers… Most of the military commanders were barbarian chieftains bearing Roman military ranks” ([327], page 324). Nowadays, the rout of the Roman troops near Adrianople,
in the alleged year 378, is linked to this deterioration in the state of army affairs. Thus, the name of Hadrian appears in the biography of his doppelganger Honorius precisely “in the right place”, manifest as “the massacre of Adrianople”. This is how a very demonstrative parallelism between the Second and Third Roman Empires appears on the pages of contemporary historical books, not recorded as a system previously.

27.3a. Second Empire. Hadrian had been afflicted by a serious illness. He was a very suspicious person, and had sired no children ([327], pages 322-325). A brief example of how he had treated his military leaders is as follows: having suddenly suspected a plot among his commanders, he inflicted a series of harsh repressions upon them. Chronicles mention no names, and only refer to schemers “among the supreme officers of the army” ([327], page 322).

■ 27.3b. Third Empire. Honorius had been notorious for his frail health, and also considered weak-minded. He had left no children ([327], page 449; also [64], page 33). The attitude of Honorius to his commanders exposes his paranoid tendencies. In the alleged year of 408, he treacherously murdered his best military leader Stilicho, who had been accused of plotting against Honorius. All of this “plotting” is supposed to have been slander ([767], Volume 2, page 793).

27.4a. Second Empire. Hadrian had forged his most important truce with Parthia. Let us recall that the war against Parthia is identified as the war against Alaric in the Third Empire, qv above.

■ 27.4b. Third Empire. Honorius had signed a very important peace treaty (by the order of Arcadius), namely, the treaty with Alaric.

27.5a. Second Empire. Hadrian had ruled for 21 years: 117-138 A.D.

■ 27.5b. Third Empire. Honorius had ruled for 28 years: 395-423.

Reign durations are fairly similar. The above data are taken from [327], page 325, [767] (Volume 2, page 793), and [76]. Let us note that old chronicles would normally preserve nothing but a number of scraps and extracts from the rulers’ biographies. Therefore, sometimes even minor facts that have managed to survive by sheer accident acquire great importance as the only evidence of the past, and should by no means remain neglected.
28a. Antoninus Pius.
■ 28b. Aetius.

■ 28.1b. Third Empire. After Honorius, the 6-year-old Valentinian III is proclaimed Emperor in the west. However, he did not actually rule at all, having been in the custody of Placidia, his mother, who, in turn, had obeyed the will of Aetius. It is said that Placidia “had fallen under the influence... of commander Aetius, a barbarian by birth” ([64], pages 33 and 40). Aetius thus becomes acknowledged as the official custodian of Valentinian III ([767], Volume 2, page 757). For many years Aetius remained the autocrat of the Third Empire. Theodosius II, his co-ruler in the east, is considered to have been an insignificant figure without any actual influence on the policy of the empire ([64], page 35).

28.2a. Second Empire. The reign of Antoninus Pius was a raging storm. Numerous chaotic wars – against the Dacians, the Germans, and in the East of the Empire ([327], page 326) – had raged all across the land during his reign. Antoninus Pius is known to have been a most successful general indeed. Despite the great number of his enemies, he had managed to guard the borders of the empire with a great deal of efficiency.
■ 28.2b. Third Empire. The epoch of Aetius was also filled with wars and conflicts. Waves of “barbarian hordes” had repeatedly raided the Third Empire over that period ([767], Volume 2). Chronicles also describe Aetius as an excellent professional commander. He had been the triumphant leader of the Empire’s numerous military campaigns ([64], page 34).

28.3a. Second Empire. Antoninus Pius was extremely resourceful in his domestic policy, considering the general instability of the Second Empire. In particular, he would make advances to the lowest strata of society, give away stocks of food, and curb the rights of masters over their slaves ([327], page 325; also [767], Volume 2, page 789).
■ 28.3b. Third Empire. Due to his barbarian origin, Aetius had been under pressure to keep fortifying his position in Rome. His domestic policy was very
flexible. He had also won the sympathies of the most diverse strata of the Roman populace. He is known to have been a prominent Roman politician in an epoch of civil unrest ([64]).


■ 28.4b. Third Empire. Aetius had ruled for 21 years: 423-444 (or 14 years: 423-437, according to another version). Mark the fact that in 437 the authority of Aetius was dealt a heavy blow by Valentinian III, whose custody had then come to its end, and who had become a de facto ruler ([64], page 486). Nevertheless, Aetius had enjoyed a formal influence until the year 444; however, after the loss of several important battles in 444, his falling out of grace had become irreversible ([64], page 486).

29a. Marcus Aurelius.
■ 29b. Valentinian III.

29.1a. Second Empire. After Antoninus Pius, the power passes on to Aurelius – the adopted son of Antoninus Pius ([327], page 326). Marcus Aurelius rules jointly with Lucius Verus ([327]). Moreover, Lucius Verus is younger than Marcus Aurelius [327].

■ 29.1b. Third Empire. After Aetius, the power goes to Valentinian III – the “adopted son” of Aetius. Let us recall that Aetius was the custodian of Valentinian III. Valentinian III rules jointly with Theodosius II, who governs over the east of the empire. Although Theodosius II had been older than Valentinian III (qv in [327]), it was Theodosius II who was usually referred to as “the youngster” ([76]).

29.2a. Second Empire. Lucius Verus is subordinate to Marcus Aurelius. They say that “the empire had actually been ruled by the elder – Marcus Aurelius” ([327], page 326). Lucius Verus, his younger age notwithstanding, had died before the end of Aurelius’s reign ([327], pages 326-327).

■ 29.2b. Third Empire. Initially, Valentinian III had been dependent on Theodosius II, but their roles became reversed subsequently ([327]). We see the scenario from the Second Empire recurring. Furthermore, Theodosius II also died before the rule of Valentinian III had ended.
29.3a. Second Empire. Marcus Aurelius faces a number of major difficulties that “transformed almost the entire period of their [co-rulers’ – A.F.] principate… into a time of bloody wars and economic depression” ([327], page 326).

29.3b. Third Empire. Valentinian III is also forced to face a number of serious challenges. His reign in the Third Empire is marked by truculent wars and economic troubles. The empire begins to slide into decline ([327] and [64]).

29.4a. Second Empire. Under Marcus Aurelius, a ferocious military campaign against the well-known King Vologaeses ([327]) begins – a long-drawn war with varying success. Finally, a peace treaty with Vologaeses is reached, in no way implying security for the Second Empire. Immediately after the signing of the treaty, a war against nomadic tribes, which broke through the Roman frontier fortifications, begins on the Danube ([327], page 280).

29.4b. Third Empire. Under Valentinian III, a bloody war against King Attila ([327]) begins – a protracted one, with success favouring both sides unevenly. The empire had negotiated a truce with Attila, which brought no real peace. Right after the signing of the truce, barbarians invade the empire, which subsequently becomes involved in a series of exhausting wars – in the west and in the east, at different times ([767], Volume 2, page 38).

We have approached the final phase of parallelism between the Second and the Third Roman Empire. In both empires, the hard and troubled times set in simultaneously. As we proceed, we shall primarily follow the events that had taken place in the west of the Third Empire. The ties between the east and the west are considered to have gradually weakened, from Theodosius II and on.

30a. Commodus.

30b. Recimer.

30.1a. Second Empire. After the death of Marcus Aurelius, his son Commodus becomes emperor. The rule of Commodus stands out against others, since several influential minions had emerged in his time ([579], pages 405-406).

30.1b. Third Empire. In 455, after the death of Valentinian III, a talented commander-in-chief by the name of Recimer works his way up to the very top of the
Third Empire’s hierarchy. He acquires enormous influence in Rome and becomes its actual ruler for several years. According to his contemporaries, “Recimer has by now become the most powerful person in Western Rome” ([579], page 487). The rule of Recimer has a notable feature: during his reign, there had been several influential imperial minions, all of them pawns of the Emperor de facto ([579], pages 487-490). The comparison of the two influential minion groups in the Second and the Third Empires exposes the two as duplicates.

30.2a. Second Empire. The first proxy ruler under Commodus was called Perennis. He had soon got killed, likewise his Third Empire double Petronius, qv below ([579], pages 405-406).

30.2b. Third Empire. The first proxy emperor under Recimer had been Petronius Maximus. He was killed three months later ([579], page 487). The two names (Petronius and Perennis) may stem from the same root.

30.3a. Second Empire. The second proxy ruler under Commodus had borne the name of Cleander; he was withdrawn from his position of power by Commodus a short while later ([579], pages 405-406).

30.3b. Third Empire. The second proxy ruler under Recimer was called Mecilius Avitus. Recimer had made him surrender the throne rather soon ([579], pages 486 and 488).

30.4a. Second Empire. The third proxy ruler under Commodus was named Eclectus; it doesn’t take Commodus too long to strip him of his powers ([579]). Furthermore, we still have assorted data telling us about other proxy rulers under Commodus – a certain Marcia, for instance ([579]). This proxy co-ruler shuffling ends with the death of Commodus.

30.4b. Third Empire. The third proxy emperor under Recimer was called Flavius Julian Majorian. Recimer had made him ruler, but soon revoked the rule ([579]). We also have rather sparse data concerning other creatures of Recimer’s – such as Libius Severus and Anthemia ([579]). This endless changing of proxy co-rulers also ended with the death of Recimer in the Third Empire.

30.5a. Commodus had either ruled for 16 years (176-192 A.D.) or 12 years (180-192 A.D.). 180 A.D. is the year when his father died.
30.5b. Third Empire. Recimer ruled for 16 years (456-472 A.D.). The durations coincide (for the first version of Commodus’ reign).

31a. Publius Helvius Pertinax.
31b. Olybrius.

31.1a. Second Empire. Pertinax had ruled for less than a year, in 193 A.D. We know very little of him; the complex situation in the Second Empire is pointed out ([579], pages 406-407).
31.1b. Third Empire. Olybrius had reigned for less than a year in 472 A.D. There is hardly anything known about him. The Third Empire’s situation is critical ([579], page 490). The reign durations all but coincide.

32b. Glycerius.

32.1a. Second Empire. The reign of Didius Julian is shorter than a year and falls on 193 A.D. We hardly know anything about him at all. His rule is accompanied by a great embroilment ([579], page 407).
32.1b. Third Empire. Glycerius had reigned for less than a year in 473 A.D. We know little about him; his rule was accompanied by a great strife ([579], page 490). The reign durations in both cases are virtually identical.

33a. Decimus Clodius Albinus.
33b. Julius Nepos.

33.1a. Second Empire. Clodius Albin had reigned for less than a year in 193 A.D. We don’t know much about him; his entire reign is accompanied by civil unrest ([579], p. 407).
33.1b. Third Empire. Julius Nepos had reigned for less than one year in 474 A.D. There is very little biographical information available of this ruler nowadays. His reign is marked by embroilment ([579], page 490). Reign durations are virtually identical.
34a. Gaius Pescennius Niger.
■ 34b. Romulus Augustulus.

34.1a. Second Empire. Niger’s reign had lasted one year – 193-194 A.D. He was defeated by Severus and deposed ([767], Volume 2, page 790; also [579], page 407).
■ 34.1b. Third Empire. Romulus Augustulus had only reigned for one year in 475-476 A.D. Odoacer defeated and dethroned him ([767], Volume 2, page 794; also [579], page 490). Reign durations coincide.

35a. Lucius Septimius Severus.
■ 35b. Odoacer.

35.1a. Second Empire. Severus was proclaimed emperor after Niger, and is related to Germany, where had been crowned ([579], page 408). Severus had defeated Pescennius Niger, the double of Romulus Augustulus from the Third Empire. Niger got killed after the battle – cf. Orestes, the father of Romulus, from the Third Empire.
■ 35.1b. Third Empire. Odoacer, leader of the German Heruls in the Roman army, was crowned emperor after Romulus Augustulus. Constantinople recognizes his authority ([767], Volume 2, page 760. Odoacer had crushed the troops of Romulus Augustulus led by Orestes, the father of Romulus. Orestes was murdered. Odoacer deposed Romulus ([579], page 493).

35.2a. Second Empire. Severus had been “a strong ruler… this leader was prudent and earnest” ([579], page 409). The rule of Severus “is an important breakpoint in many regards” ([579], page 409). We are approaching the end of the Second Empire.
■ 35.2b. Third Empire. Odoacer is known to have been a sensible and modest ruler. He had tried to restore the unity of the Third Empire that kept falling apart ([579]). The reign of Odoacer is also considered a breakpoint in Roman history marking the end of the “purely Roman” dynasty. We see the first symptoms of the Third Empire’s decline. Its last two rulers had been foreign – Odoacer the German and Theodoric the Goth.

35.3a. Second Empire. Severus had fought a single war, albeit an arduous one, struggling against the Parthian king Vologaeses IV. The course of the war kept
changing: “The North was forced to suppress the Northern peoples that had lived close to the border, which had also been a formidable task” ([579], page 410).

■ 35.3b. Third Empire. Odoacer’s only enemy had been Theodoric the Goth; the war between the two went down in history as long, violent and wearisome. Success would favour both parties unevenly. Finally the Goths led by Theodoric invaded the Empire from the North. Odoacer was defeated and surrendered in one of the battles. He had been made a co-ruler initially, but his assassination followed before too long ([579], page 493).

35.4a. Second Empire. Severus had reigned for 18 years between 193 and 211.
■ 35.4b. Third Empire. Odoacer had reigned for 17 years (476-493 A.D.). Reign durations are similar.

36a. Caracalla.
■ 36b. Theodoric the Goth (the Great).

36.1a. Second Empire. Caracalla had been a co-ruler of Severus and reigned in the West. He had constantly struggled against his co-ruler Publius Septimius Geta. Both brothers “hated one another and sowed permanent discord amidst the troops, likewise in the court; they had even thought of dividing the state” ([579], page 410).
■ 36.1b. Third Empire. Theodoric had been the co-ruler of Odoacer in the West. The reign of Theodoric is accompanied by very abrasive relations between himself and his eastern co-ruler Anastasius. This opposition would often break out into military conflicts ([579], pages 495-496). Both co-rulers already rule in the divided Third Empire – the Western and the Eastern.

36.2a. Second Empire. The domestic policy of Caracalla is characterized by the chronicles as rather lenient. His efforts to make the army obedient resulted in the corruption of the latter which, in turn, had impaired the discipline, according to [579]. Caracalla “granted full civil rights to each and every imperial community” ([579], page 410).
■ 36.2b. Third Empire. Theodoric’s domestic policy was also known for its great flexibility and religious tolerance. He was renowned a patron of the arts, and had also greatly indulged in the bribery of the troops due to his status of a foreigner in Rome and his ambition to secure support for himself amongst wider society strata
Theodoric had made foreigners equal to Romans in rights and instigated large-scale migrations on imperial territory.

36.3a. Second Empire. In 217 A.D. Caracalla was preparing a campaign against the Parthians and died at the peak of the preparations ([579]).

■ 36.3b. Third Empire. In 526 Theodoric launches a campaign against the barbarians but dies before the preparations are over ([579], page 495).

36.4a. Second Empire. Caracalla had reigned for 24 years (193-217 A.D.) or 6 years (211-217 A.D.), 211 A.D. being the year of Severus’ demise.

■ 36.4b. Third Empire. Theodoric’s reign lasts 29 years (497-526 A.D.) or 33 years (493-526 A.D.). Theodoric came to power in 493, the year of Odoacer’s death – however, it was only in 497 A.D. that Zeno in Constantinople had acknowledged his rule ([579], page 494). The durations are close enough (first versions).

This is where the dynastic currents of the Second and the Third Empire end. However, amazingly enough, the parallelism that binds them together can be traced further, spanning the alleged years 217-235 A.D. and 526-536 A.D.

37a. Second Empire ceases to exist in a blaze of warfare and anarchy. The period of 217-270 A.D. is officially known as that of “political anarchy of the middle of the III century, or the time of ‘soldier emperors’” in Scaligerian history ([327], page 406). This prolonged period of anarchy is a unique phenomenon in the history of the Second Empire.

■ 37b. The decline of the Third Empire (in the West) was accompanied by bloody wars and social discord. The period of 526-552 A.D. is officially known as one of “political anarchy in the middle of the III century. The Ostrogothic rule in Italy” ([579]). This epoch of strife and embroilment is also unique in the history of the Third Empire. As we can see, these two periods (duplicates, as we understand it now) are characterized in the same words by Scaligerite historians.

38a. Julia Maesa.

■ 38b. Amalasuntha.

38.1a. Second Empire. After the death of Caracalla, the power in the Second
Empire is inherited by Julia Maesa in 217 (after a very brief reign of Macrinus, a former slave) – see [327], pages 404-406. Julia Maesa is a relation of Caracalla’s ([327]). Near Julia Maesa we see her daughter Mamea, occupied with matters of secondary importance.

38.1. Third Empire. After the death of Theodoric (the double of Caracalla), Amalasuntha inherits the power in the Third empire ([579], pages 498-499). Amalasuntha is one of the most famous women in the entire history of Rome ([196]). She is the daughter of Theodoric ([579]). Her sister Matasuntha played a secondary part as her ally. Let us emphasize that the two duplicates (Julia Maesa and Amalasuntha) are the most prominent female rulers in the history of both empires. They were the only ones who had the power to crown Roman Emperors. Their unvocalized names (MSL for Maesa Julia and MLSNTH for Amalasuntha) might be derived from the same root.

38.2a. Second Empire. Julia Maesa enthrones her elder son – Varius Avitus Bassianus (Marcus Aurelius Atoninus) known as Heliogabalus ([327], pages 405-406), who obeys her every word. He dies a violent death. Heliogabalus had reigned for 4 years (218-222 A.D.; see [327]).

38.2b. Third Empire. Amalasuntha enthrones her son Amalaric ([579], pages 405-406), who obeys her every word. He dies a violent death. Amalaric had reigned for 5 years between 526 and 531 A.D. We observe similar reign durations.

38.3a. Second Empire. Julia Maesa hands the reins of power over to Alexander Severus, a meek and indecisive man and an obedient creature of Julia Maesa ([327]). The reign length of Alexander Severus equals 13 years (222-235 A.D.).

38.3b. Third Empire. In the Third Empire we observe Athalaric, the second minion of Amalasuntha, come to power. He had been perfectly obedient to Amalasuntha ([579]). Athalaric had reigned for 8 years (526-534 A.D.) – see [76], table 18.

Reign durations differ, but they don’t affect the general correlation of the entire current of events that characterize the Second and the Third Empire.

38.4a. Second Empire. Julia Maesa was killed in 234 A.D. The end of her reign is marked by the war with the Persians in the East of the Empire ([327]). 3 years after
the death of Julia Maesa, a large-scale war against the Goths breaks out – the Gothic war of 238-251 A.D. ([64]).

38.4b. Third Empire. Amalasuntha was killed in 535 A.D. At the end of Amalasuntha’s reign, a war against the Orient breaks out – namely, with the Persians and with Constantinople. This is how the famous Gothic war of the VI century A.D. began ([579]).

Thus, in order to conclude the parallelism, we compare the period of the alleged years 217-234 A.D. at the end of the Second empire to that of the alleged years 526-535 A.D., when the Third Roman Empire ceased to exist in the West. The parallelism does in fact span subsequent epochs as well; however, it is rather difficult to relate, since we enter parallel epoch of violent civil wars, and their history is fragmentary and extremely vague; we shall therefore end our comparison table here.

However, we must point out the following important fact. Once we reach the last days of the Second Empire (the alleged year 270 A.D.), we discover having approached the first days of the Third Empire. Let us remind the reader that this is the very year that marks the superimposition of the Third Empire over the Second. The period of the alleged years 240-270 A.D. that separates the Second Empire from the Third is considered the heyday of political anarchy in Scaligerian history. It is written that “by the time Claudius II came to power [in 268 A.D. – A. F.] there had de facto been no united empire” ([327], page 410). Thus, 270 A.D., the year we discover to correspond to the beginning of the Third Empire, needed to be referred to as one of the empire’s “reconstruction” after a presumed period of utter disarray. However, this very “disarray” is of a fictitious nature, and only became recorded in historical sources as a result of an erroneous chronology.
2.

The correlation between two different dating methods illustrated by the superimposition of two epochs from the history of Roman Papacy one over the other. A brief scheme

The dating method based on the principles of frequency damping and duplication was applied to the dynastic current of the Roman Popes that begins in the alleged I century A.D. with Paul the Apostle and exists until the present day. We have used the chronological tables of J. Blair ([76]) and the list of popes given in [544].

The time interval in question (amounting to some 1900 years) was divided into short 10-year intervals. Then we compiled an exhaustive list of all the names of Popes who occupied the Holy See between the alleged I century A.D. and 1700 A.D. 89 different papal names were ordered in accordance with the sequence of their first appearance in papal currents. After that, a rectangular matrix sized $89 \times 170$ was constructed by the author of the present book assisted by A. Makarov. Each row of the matrix possesses the length of 170 units and represents the frequency evolution of a single name out of the list of 89. The matrix contains 89 rows and 170 columns altogether. Each papal name is marked as corresponding to the decade of said pope’s ascension. The row numbered 53, for instance, lists all the decades when the Holy See was occupied by a pope named John. They fall on the following years: 523-526, 532-535, 560-573, 640-642, 685-686, 704-707, 872-882, 898-900, 914-928, 931-936, 956-963, 965-972, 983-984, 985-996, 997-998, 1003, 1003-1009, 1024-1033, 1285-1287, 1316-1334, 1410-1415.

Afterwards, the duplicate localization method based on the calculation and processing of frequencies $K(Q, T)$ was applied to the resultant rectangular frequency matrix. As a result, a square frequency matrix sized $170 \times 170$ was built. Each of its rows numbered $Q$ contains the values of $K(Q, T)$ demonstrating the manifestation frequency of names that first appeared in decade $Q$ in the subsequent decade $T$ as well as the exact amount of times a certain name is manifest. The value of $K(Q, Q)$ stands for the papal names from decade $Q$ that we haven’t come across in the papal list as to yet.

A study of the papal name frequency matrix immediately reveals several circumstances of the utmost interest. For example, we learn that the names of the I century popes (such as Linus, Anacletus, Clement and Evaristus) are unexpectedly “revived” in the XI century A.D., which corresponds perfectly well to the chronological
Similarly, other duplicates spawned by the chronological shift of 333 years approximately are also manifest in the frequency matrix. Higher concentrations of the name John, for instance (qv above) fall on the middle of the VI century A.D., the end of the VII century, the X century and the end of the XIII century. As we shall demonstrate below, this corresponds excellently to how the phantom duplicates of the $T$ series that we discovered in the “Scaligerian history textbook” are distributed along the time axis, qv in fig. 1.7. The matter is that John happens to be one of the key names in history of the XIII century war and its duplicates.

Further studies of name frequency matrices (as built for lists containing the names of Popes, Byzantine Pontifices, Roman and Byzantine emperors etc.) were subsequently carried out by the author together with G. V. Nosovskiy. The results are related in our scientific publications ([593], [594], [595], [596] and [597], in particular); see also the Annexes to Chron7. These works contain a great body of numerical material as well as frequency matrices, and also a modification of the frequency damping principle formulated in terms of a “card deck shuffling” problem.

All of our results correspond to the facts discovered with the use of the dynastical parallelism method. In Chapter 6 of Chron1 we indicate two isomorphic “parallel” Papal dynasties that we have discovered. Bear in mind that the list of the Pope, likewise the Imperial list, is considered to be the “spinal column” of Roman and European chronology. The modern list of Popes is based on the Book of the Pontifices whose origins cannot be traced further back than the XIII century A.D. ([196]).

The biography of the first pope (Peter the Apostle) and his seven successors up until St. Hyginus (137-141 A.D.) is considered quite vague in the modern “Scaligerian
textbook”. S. G. Lozinskiy, for instance, wrote that “in reality, we only encounter veracious information about the Episcopes of Rome [as the Popes were called in the alleged first centuries of the new era – A. F.] starting with III A.D. – and even this information contains many gaps… the mythical character of pre-120 A.D. pontifices is also recognized by the Protestant theologists” ([492], page 312).

Our method of dynastic parallelisms led us to the discovery that the Roman Episcopate period of 140-314 A.D. duplicates that of 314-532 A.D., qv in Chron1, Chapter 6. VSSD coefficient here equals $8.66 \times 10^{-8}$. In particular, they turn out to be phantom reflections of a later mediaeval list of popes. Out of the 47 popes that we find in the period of 141-532 A.D., 43 are covered by the parallelism, leaving just 4 short-term popes beyond it ([76]). Both duplicates are therefore extremely representative.

It is important that this collation of ecclesiastical Roman chronicles concurs perfectly well with the independent secular collation of imperial chronicles that we mention above.
3.
The superimposition of the Israelite (Theomachist) kingdom over the Third Roman Empire in the West. A shift of circa 1230 years

This parallelism was also discovered by the VSSD calculation method, confirming the claim made in [544] that the “ancient” kingdoms of Israel and Judea can be identified as the “early mediaeval” Roman empire. VSSD here equals $c(a, b) = 1.3 \times 10^{-12}$.

One must be aware of the fact that the name Israel translates as Theomachist ([544], Volume 1, pages 416 and 437) – God’s warrior, in other words, or a fighter against foreign gods. Therefore, the word “Israelite” can also be translated as “Theomachist”, as we shall be doing from time to time. The word Judean translates as “Theocratic” ([544]); it may have been used for referring to priests. There is hardly any point in delving deep into translation details, since they are of no importance to us.

In the Scaligerian chronology, the Israelite kingdom between Jeroboam I and Uzziah is dated to the alleged years X-VII B.C., or 922-724 B.C. ([72], page 192). Since the Third Roman Empire is dated to the alleged IV-V century B.C. by the Scaligerites (don’t forget that the dynastical current from this empire that is of interest to us presently dates to the alleged years 306-476 A.D.), the chronological shift (or superimposition) that we discovered between the Biblical and Roman kingdoms roughly equals 1230 years here. In other words, “ancient” history of Israel and Judea needs to be moved forward in time by 1230 years at the very least – and even this result will be far from final, as we already demonstrated in Chron1, Chapter 6. Biblical history needs to be moved forward by another 600 years at the very least.

According to the Bible, the kingdoms of Israel and Judea represent the two dynastical branches of a state that had initially been united, which is similar to the division of the formerly united Roman Empire into the Western and the Eastern parts. The first three Biblical kings (Saul, David and Solomon) had ruled a united state, which fell apart immediately after Solomon. Jeroboam I becomes the first independent Theomachist king, and Rehoboam – the first independent king of the Theocrats.

We already mentioned the fact that the Bible contains a “double entry system” that allows for easy conversions between respective Israelite and Judaic reigns, qv in Chron1, Annex 6.4. These data shall be used in the present section as well. Bear in
mind that the parallelism between the Israelite Kingdom and the Third Roman Empire is of a secondary nature, being but a reflection of more fundamental parallelisms that we shall relate in the chapters to follow.

Let us cite two parallel dynastic currents of a secondary nature, using a single number to indicate two “parallel rulers”, qv in fig. 1.8.
Fig. 1.8. The reign correlation of the “ancient” Biblical kingdom of Israel and the Third “ancient” Roman Empire.
1a. Jeroboam I – reigned for 22 years.
   - 1b. Constantine I had reigned for 24 after his victory over Maxentius – 313-337 A.D.

2a. Nadab – 2 years.
   - 2b. Constantine II – 3 years (337-340 A.D.)

3a. Baasha – 24 years.
   - 3b. Constantius II – 21 years (340-361 A.D.)

4a. Ilaa – 2 years.
   - 4b. Julian – 2 years (361-363 A.D.)

5a. Zimri – less than 1 year.
   - 5b. Jovian – less than 1 year in 363 A.D.

6a. Omri – 12 years.
   - 6b. Valentinian – 11 years (364-373 A.D.)

7a. Achab (and Elijah the Great Prophet) – 22 years.
   - 7b. Valens (and the famous St. Basil the Great) – 14 years (364-378 A.D.)

8a. Achaziah – 2 years.
   - 8b. Gratian – 4 years (379-383 A.D.)

9a. Joram of Israel – 12 years.
   - 9b. Valentinian II – 13 years (379-392 A.D.)

10a. Jehu and Elijah the Prophet (28 years).
    - 10b. A lacuna (or, according to another version – Alaric and John Chrysostom the prophet (25 years – 378-403 A.D.)

   - 11b. Theodosius – 16 years (379-395 A.D.)
12a. Jehoash of Israel – 16 years.
■ 12b. Arcadius – 13 years: 395-408 A.D.

■ 13b. Honorius – 28 years (395-423 A.D.)

14a. Zechariah – less than 1 year (6 months).
■ 14b. Constantius III – less than 1 year (7 months) – 421 A.D. or 423 A.D.

15a. Shallum – less than 1 year (1 month).
■ 15b. John – less than 1 year (2 months) – 423 A.D.

16a. Interregnum – 24 years.
■ 16b. Interregnum/custody – 21 years (423-444 A.D.)

17a. Menahem – 10 years.
■ 17b. Valentinian III – 11 years (444-445 A.D.)

18a. Pekahiah – 2 years.
■ 18b. Petronius Maximus – 1 year (455-456 A.D.)

19a. Pekah – 20 years.
■ 19b. Recimer – 16 years (456-472 A.D.)

20a. Anarchy – 2, 6 or 9 years (three versions).
■ 20b. Anarchy – 3 years (472-475 A.D.)

21a. Uzziah (before falling captive to Shalmaneser) – 1 year or 3 years.
■ 21b. Romulus Augustulus (before falling captive to Odoacer) – 1 year (475-476 A.D.)

A) The emperors of the Third Roman Empire that ended up in this dynastical current have reigned in the West for the most part – presumably, in Italian Rome. Those of the emperors listed whose primary residence had been in Constantinople had been so powerful that they played a dominant role in the West of the empire as well, often even
with a Roman co-ruler present. Let us further point out that the kingdom of Israel is covered by this parallelism **completely**.

B) Both dynasties begin with prominent political and religious leaders. In particular, we have Jeroboam I, the famous progenitor of “Jeroboam’s heresy”. His double, Constantine I Augustus (or “Holy”) is presumed to be the first patron of Christianity. The naissance and the establishment of Arianism (a possible analogue of Jeroboam’s heresy) take place in his reign.

Jeroboam I struggled against Rehoboam of Judah, who had *broken away* from him, while Constantine I battled against Licinius, who had also *initiated a secession*.

Under Jeroboam I the formerly united Biblical kingdom becomes *divided in two* – the kingdoms of Judah and Israel. The same happens under Constantine I when the formerly united Roman empire becomes *divided* into two parts, the Western and the Eastern. Constantine I went so far as to move the imperial capital from Rome in Italy to New Rome on the Bosporus.

The united Biblical kingdom had been ruled by *three prominent kings* – Saul, David and Solomon. The Third Roman Empire also has *three famous rulers* at its very beginning – Aurelian = Sulla, Diocletian = Pompey, and Constantius I Chlorus = Julius Caesar. They are the duplicates of the Biblical Saul, David and Solomon.

According to the Bible, the Israelites were *divided into 12 tribes*. Likewise, under Constantine I the Roman empire was divided into 12 dioceses, or regions. In the kingdom of Israel, a *thirteenth* tribe joined the other twelve eventually – the offspring of Dinah. The same thing happened in the Roman Empire under Constantius II, the son of Constantine I, when a *thirteenth* diocese was added to the abovementioned twelve ([544], Volume 7).

C) Both dynasties end with rulers who fall under the power of a foreign king. In the kingdom of Israel it’s Uzziah who becomes Shalmaneser’s (Czar Solomon’s?) captive, whereas in the Third Roman Empire we have Romulus Augustulus deposed by Odoacer, also a foreign king. Shalmaneser is King of *Assyria*, whereas Odoacer is a *German* king. What we have is the “ancient” Assyria superimposed over the mediaeval Germany (or Prussia, = White Russia?). See more on this subject in *Chron5*.

Both of the dynasties under comparison cease their existence under these duplicate kings. Bear in mind that the last two emperors of the Third Roman Empire (Odoacer and Theodoric) aren’t Roman anymore – they are foreigners. Among other things, they are said to have practised a different religion. This circumstance may have played a certain role in how they became reflected on the pages of the Bible, which is a distinctly
religious source.

D) The anarchy and interregnum periods coincide for both dynasties.
E) There are many stunning parallels in the “biographical” currents of the Israelite and Roman rulers. The form-codes of these dynasties coincide. We must point out that we give the translations of the Biblical names according to [544].

1a. Jeroboam I (Protector of the People).

■ 1b. Constantine I Augustus.

1.1a. Israel. The name “Jeroboam” could have stood for “The Holy Clarion” in Greek pronunciation ([544], Volume 7, page 338). Jeroboam I came to power together with Rehoboam (1 Kings 11:43, 12:2-3 and 19-20). They shared the formerly united kingdom between the two of them.

■ 1.1b. Third Empire. The name “Augustus” of Constantine I also stands for “Holy”. Constantine I was declared a saint equal to the Apostles in rank. He and Licinius acquire absolute power in the East and in the West, respectively ([327], page 429).

1.2a. Israel. Jeroboam I “rebelled” against Rehoboam in the first year of his reign, severing all relations between the two (1 Kings 12:19-20). The Bible proceeds to tell us that “there was war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam all their days” (1 Kings 14:30).

■ 1.2b. Third Empire. Constantine I severs all ties with Licinius at the very beginning of his reign, after the victory over Maxentius in 313. This leads to a war between them ([327], page 429). Licinius “was assaulted by his co-ruler Constantine already in 314” (ibid.). Constantine I wages constant wars against Licinius.

1.3a. Israel. Under Jeroboam, “Israel rebelled against the house of David unto this day” (1 Kings 12:19). Jeroboam I transferred the capital of the state to the city of Sechem (1 Kings 12:25). Let us point out that Jeroboam I is the only king of Israel who had moved the capital city as a result of the foundation of a new state.

■ 1.3b. Third Empire. Around 330, Constantine I moves the imperial capital from Rome in Italy to New Rome on the Bosporus. This important event signified the beginning of the Roman Empire’s division into two parts – the Eastern and the Western. Constantine I is the only emperor of the Third Empire to transfer the capital;
this coincided with the foundation of the new Eastern Roman Empire.

1.4a. Israel. In order to prevent the restoration of Rehoboam’s rule, Jeroboam I also seceded from him ecclesiastically. *He had founded a new religious movement* known as “Jeroboam’s heresy” (1 Kings 12:28 and 12:31). This “heresy” was adhered to by all of the subsequent Israelite kings. It played a major part in the entire history of the Theomachist Israelites. Bible refers to “Jeroboam’s heresy” in the biography of each Israelite king after Jeroboam.

- 1.4b. Third Empire. Constantine I Augustus (The Holy) is occasionally called the *founder of Orthodox Christianity* in Christian sources. Modern historians acknowledge the only fact out of the numerous legends about Constantine, namely, that he had founded a certain cult, possibly of a “heretical” nature. The fact that he had been a Christian is often disputed. It was under Constantine I that Arius, the founder of *Arianism*, had first emerged with his teaching ([579], pages 466-467). Arianism is a well-known Christian “heresy” that had made a significant impact on the entire history of the Third Roman Empire ([579]).

1.5a. Israel. The reign duration of Jeroboam I equals 22 years (1 Kings 14:20).

- 1.5b. Third Empire. Constantine I had reigned for 24 years between 313 and 337, counting from the beginning of his joint rule and the struggle against Licinius, after the defeat of Maxentius. Other versions claim his reign duration to have equalled 13 or 31 years, qv above. The durations are rather close to each other.


2b. Constantine II.

2.1a. Israel. Nadab is the son of Jeroboam I (1 Kings 15:25). Nadab came to power immediately after the death of his father (ibid). The Bible emphasizes that King Nadab *adhered to Jeroboam’s heresy*: “And he did evil in the sight of the Lord, and walked in the way of his father” (1 Kings 15:26).

- 2.1b. Third Empire. Constantine II was the son of Constantine I ([327]). Constantine II came to power *immediately after the death of his father* ([327]). He successfully *carried on with the religious policy of Constantine I* ([327]). The Biblical author may well have regarded this as “walking in the way of his father”.
2.2a. Israel. Nadab was killed by Baasha, who had seized the throne of Israel (1 Kings 15:28). Baasha became the next king. “Even in the third year of Asa king of Judah did Baasha slay him, and reigned in his stead” (1 Kings 15:28). Asa, king of Judah, might simply be a reflection of Jesus Christ.

2.2b. Third Empire. Constantine II had launched a campaign against his brother Constans and got killed in a battle ([327], page 438). Constans, the killer of Constantine II, becomes the next Roman emperor, ruling jointly with the third brother – Constantius II ([327]). This happens immediately after the death of Constantine II in 340 ([767], Volume 2, page 468). The joint rule of the three brothers began in 337; Constantine II was killed in either the fifth or the seventh year of St. Basil the Great, or The Great King (basileus = king), who is most likely to be a reflection of Andronicus, or Jesus (Asa?) from the XII century A.D. Let us point out that there are two versions for the birth date of Basil the Great. The most common one cites the year 333; the other one insists on 335 ([544], Volume 1). We see a very good concurrence of these data with the Biblical indications.

2.3a. Israel. Nadab’s reign lasted 2 years (1 Kings 15:25).

2.3b. Third Empire. Constantine II had reigned for three years between 337 and 340 ([327], page 792; also [767], Volume 2, page 468). Reign durations are similar.

3a. Baasha (The Creator).

3b. Constantius II.

3.1a. Israel. Baasha came to power as the killer of his predecessor Nadab, King of Israel. King Baasha was following Jeroboam’s heresy, or “walked in the way of Jeroboam” (1 Kings 15:34). Baasha initiated a massacre of his fellow tribesmen: “And it came to pass, when he reigned, that he smote all the house of Jeroboam; he left not to Jeroboam any that breathed, until he had destroyed him” (1 Kings 15:29). Baasha chose Tirzah as his capital; the name might actually refer to Turkey.

3.1b. Third Empire. Constantius II came to power as one of the killers of his predecessor Constantine II. Historians report that “Constantius united the entire state under his rule once again. Church disputes, which he took part in, had played an important part in his reign” ([579], page 469). Constantius II had massacred the kin of Constantine I, the double of the Biblical Jeroboam I. He had killed all the family members of the two half-brothers of Constantine ([327], page 438). Constantius II
resided in Constantinople, and had lived in Asian provinces for a long time; he relocated to Turkey in 335 ([327]). This is basically what the Bible tells us, qv above.

3.2a. Israel. Baasha’s reign duration equals 24 years (1 Kings 15:33).

3.2b. Third Empire. Constantius II reigned for 21 years, between 340-361 (after the death of Constantine II). Another version dates his reign to 337-361 (24 years), from the moment that his joint rule with Constantine II began ([327]). Reign durations are similar.


4.1a. Israel. Elah was the son of Baasha (1 Kings 16:8). It has to be pointed out that the Biblical formula “son” often refers to religious succession and not actual kinship. The name Elah (“The Lord”) concurs well with the name of his “Roman double” Julian.

4.1b. Third Empire. Julian is presumed to have been a cousin of Constantius II, the double of the Biblical Baasha. Constantius II had no children ([579]). Julian was deified while still alive; he is known as a religious reformer.

4.2a. Israel. Despite the fact that King Elah had possessed such a grandiloquent name (“The God”), the Bible hardly tells us anything about him at all. This is all the more egregious when compared to the detailed “biographies” of the Israelite kings whose names were a great deal more “modest”. Let us remind the reader that the Bible is a religious source that pays a lot of attention to the religious policies of the rulers referred to therein.

4.2b. Third Empire. Julian (“The God”) became reflected in ecclesiastical history under the alias of “The Apostate”. He is considered to have been the archenemy of Christianity and a restorer of paganism. The information on this emperor found in the Christian sources is extremely sparse and very negative. On the other hand, secular Roman historians (Marcellinus, for instance) dedicate voluminous exalted panegyrics to Emperor Julian, glorifying his deeds ([579]).

4.3a. Israel. King Elah was killed by Zimri, his commander-in-chief (1 Kings...
16:10). The Bible gives us no details of the murder. Elah’s reign lasted for 2 years (1 Kings 16:8).

4.3b. Third Empire. Emperor Julian was killed during a campaign in the East under uncertain circumstances. The next emperor is Jovian, who had been the commander-in-chief of Julian’s army ([579], page 472). Julian’s reign lasted for 2 years (361-363, see [767], Volume 2, page 793; also [579] and [327]). Reign durations coincide.

5a. Zimri (“Singer of hymns”).

5b. Jovian.

5.1a. Israel. Zimri was the commander-in-chief in the army of his predecessor Elah, whom he had killed (1 Kings 16:9-16:10). Zimri came to power in the 27th year of Asa (Jesus?), king of Judah (1 Kings 16:10).

5.1b. Third Empire. Jovian was the commander-in-chief in the army of Emperor Julian, his predecessor, and had accompanied him in the Persian campaign ([579], page 472). There are many legends about the murder of Julian. At any rate, Jovian had been Julian’s successor. One of the versions claims Julian to have been a victim of a plot. Jovian ascended to the throne in 363, in the 30th year of St. Basil the Great – possibly a duplicate of Asa (Jesus). Bear in mind that Basil is presumed to have been “incarnated” in 333, which gives us 30 = 363 – 333.

5.2a. Israel. Zimri followed Jeroboam’s heresy: “For his sins which he sinned in doing evil in the sight of the Lord, in walking in the way of Jeroboam, and in his sin which he did, to make Israel to sin.” (1 Kings 16:19). Also: “In the twenty and seventh year of Asa king of Judah did Zimri reign seven days in Tirzah.” (1 Kings 16:15). Thus, Zimri’s reign lasted 7 days.

5.2b. Third Empire. “Jovian was a Christian” ([579], page 472). This might be why the Bible mentions that he had “walked in the way of Jeroboam”. Jovian’s reign began in the East, near Turkey, during the campaign. He had reigned for less than one year ([767], Volume 2, page 793; also [327]). The entirety of this brief period was spent on the march when Jovian was returning to the imperial capital. According to some of the sources, he never reached it. Reign durations are similar.

6a. Omri (“The Head”).
6b. Valentinian I.

6.1a. Israel. Omri, the successor of Zimri, had been the commander-in-chief in the army of his predecessor (1 Kings 16:16). Omri’s reign began in the 31st year of Asa, King of Judah (Jesus?) (1 Kings 16:23).

6.1b. Third Empire. Valentinian I, who became emperor after Jovian, had been the commander-in-chief in the army of the latter ([327], page 441. Having ascended to the throne in 364, Valentinian I became emperor in the 31st year of St. Basil the Great, the reflection of Jesus Christ – or, possibly, Asa of Judah, considering how 364 – 333 = 31. In both cases we see that the ascension to the throne takes place in the 31st year.

6.2a. Israel. Omri waged a violent war against Tibni who had claimed his right to the throne of Israel (1 Kings 16:21-22). Omri ended up winning the war (1 Kings 16:22). Tibni the claimant was killed (1 Kings 16:22).

6.2b. Third Empire. Valentinian I battled against Procopius, a relation of Julian who had claimed his right for the Roman throne. Valentinian I won this war ([327] and [767], Volume 2). Procopius was killed ([327], page 442).

6.3a. Israel. Omri had transferred his residence to the city of Samaria located on a hill or near a hill (1 Kings 16:24). Omri had been renowned for cruelty: “But Omri wrought evil in the eyes of the Lord, and did worse than all that were before him” (1 Kings 16:25).

6.3b. Third Empire. Valentinian I transferred his residence to Rome in the west. One must bear in mind that there is a famous mountain near Rome – the volcano Vesuvius. Valentinian I was distrustful and cruel. Together with his brother Valens they created a very tense political climate in Rome, especially after the defeat of Procopius. Valentinian I had executed a large number of Romans ([327], page 442).

6.4a. Israel. Omri wasn’t killed, but rather “slept with his fathers” peacefully (1 Kings 16:26-28). His reign had lasted 12 years (1 Kings 16:23).

6.4b. Third Empire. Valentinian I may have died a natural death; it is however reported that “his death came suddenly” ([327]). His reign duration equals 11 years (364-375, qv in [327] and [767], Volume 2; also [76]).
7a. Ahab (“The Uncle”). Elijah, the great prophet, was active during his reign.

7b. Valens. The famous prophet and saint (Basil the Great) was active in his reign.

7.1a. Israel. King Ahab is described in the Bible at length (3 Kings 17-22). He is one of the most notorious kings of Israel, and one of the most rigorous ones as well (1 Kings 22). The Bible characterizes Ahab as a particularly “impious king”. Apart from following “Jeroboam’s heresy” he also “went and served Baal, and worshipped him” (1 Kings 16:31-33). The term “Ahab the impious” became denominative in later literature.

7.1b. Third Empire. Valens is one of the most notorious Roman emperors. In particular, he is presumed to have been one of the cruellest rulers of the Empire. Bear in mind that his duplicate from the Second Empire is another notorious and cruel ruler – Nero. Valens is described very negatively in Christian sources. He was a “devout Arian” – a heretic, as it were ([579], page 674). The wickedness of Valens and his duplicate Nero is reflected in Christian literature as a classical embodiment of all negative qualities.

7.2a. Israel. The famous Biblical prophet Elijah begins his career under Ahab (1 Kings 21:1 ff). The name Elijah translates as “God” ([544], Volume 7). The relations between Ahab and Elijah the prophet are hostile (1 Kings 21: 17-29). Opposition between them soon leads to direct confrontation (1 Kings 21:20-23).

7.2b. Third Empire. Basil the Great, the famous Christian Saint, is active in the reign of Valens. Legends about him are identical to the ones told about Jesus Christ. The relationship between Basil and Valens is a very strained one, and eventually leads to an open conflict, qv in the Menaion ([544], Volume 1).

7.3a. Israel. The “biography” of Ahab as related in the Bible is the story of his interactions with the prophet Elijah for the most part (1 Kings 21:17-29). The Bible, being a religious source, naturally pays attention to such facts. Ahab had been scared of Elijah, “and went softly” (1 Kings 21:27).

7.3b. Third Empire. Fragments of the biography of Valens as presented in the Menaion are covered as the story of opposition between Valens and St. Basil the Great. Valens had been “afraid of Basil”. Quotation given according to [544],
7.4a. Israel. Ahab wages war against “the King of Syria” (1 Kings 22). Ahab’s army is defeated. Ahab himself gets seriously wounded during his escape from the battlefield, and soon dies (1 Kings 22:37-38).

7.4b. Third Empire. Valens fights the Goths ([327]). Once again we see the Biblical Syrians, or Assyrians, identified as the mediaeval Goths. The troops of Valens are crushed; he gets killed as he flees the battlefield, likewise his double Nero from the Second Roman Empire ([327] and [767], Volume 2).

7.5a. Israel. The Bible portrays the notorious Jezebel, Ahab’s wife, in the most unfavourable manner: “the dogs shall eat Jezebel” (1 Kings 21:23). Ahab’s reign duration equals 22 years (1 Kings 16:29).

7.5b. Third Empire. Since Basil the Great is most likely to be a phantom reflection of Jesus Christ from the XII century, Valens can probably be identified as “King Herod” from the Gospels. The Gospels describe him very negatively, likewise his wife Herodias. Valens reigned for 14 years (364-378, qv in [327]). A propos, the pair of emperors (Valens + Valentinian I) had reigned for 25 years (14 + 11 = 25). Reign durations are similar in the second version.

8a. Ahaziah (“The Lord’s Owner”).

8b. Gratian.


8.1b. Third Empire. After the death of Valens in 378, his co-ruler Gratian remains regnant in the West of the empire until his death in 383 ([327]). Gratian rules in Rome; once again we see the city identified as the Biblical Samaria. Gratian’s reign duration equals 4 years (379-383) or 5 years (378-383, qv in [327], page 444). The reign durations of the two are similar. Let us point out that although formally Gratian remained the sole ruler of the empire from 378 and on, the entire year 378 was marked by embroilment after the death of Valens. Gratian’s stable reign begins in 379, after the end of the strife and the civil war, likewise the reign of Theodosius, who was appointed in 379.
9a. Jehoram ("The Lord's Archer").

9b. Valentinian II.

9.1a. Israel. Jehoram had reigned for 12 years (2 Kings 3:1).

9.1b. Third Empire. The reign of Valentinian II lasted 13 years after the death of Valens and the civil unrest of 379 (379-392, qv in [767], Volume 2, page 793). Reign durations are similar.

10a. Jehu and the prophet Elisha.

10b. Lacuna. No duplicate emperor here. One could think that the parallelism were interrupted here; however, it has to be pointed out that the gap instantly gets filled once we turn to the events of the alleged IV-V century that involve the famous warlord Alaric. Thus, we have Alaric and John Chrysostom the prophet.

10.1a. Israel. We see a troubled period in history of the Israelite kingdom – the invasion of Jehu. Elijah’s successor in ecclesiastical power is the famous Biblical prophet Elisha (2 Kings 2:9). He is the inspirer and the organizer of a great religious upheaval in the kingdom of Israel.

10.1b. Third Empire. The famous troubles in the Third Roman Empire – Alaric’s invasion. John Chrysostom inherits ecclesiastical power from Saint Basil the Great. He is a famous religious figure in the history of the Christian church of the alleged IV-V century and the initiator of a powerful religious movement in the Third Empire ([542]).

10.2a. Israel. Jehu the warlord is active in the epoch of the prophet Elisha (2 Kings 9). The name Jehu can be regarded as a distorted version of “Jehovah” ([544], Volume 7, page 344). The invasion of Jehu is described in the Bible as a barbaric invasion, likewise the rebellion that he leads. Jehu does not belong to the regnant dynasty of Israelite kings, and is summoned into the country by Elisha (2 Kings 9). Elisha and Jehu had ruled in the Kingdom of Israel together (2 Kings 9-10).

10.2b. Third Empire. The military leader Alaric is active in the epoch of St. John Chrysostom ([327]). Some sources inform us of his mediaeval alias “Wrath of Lord”. His invasion was regarded as the advent of Jehovah angered by the sins of the people ([544], Volume 7, page 345; also [64]). Alaric’s rebellion, as well as his invasion, are barbaric in nature. Alaric was the military commander of the Roman
Empire (likewise the Biblical Jehu), but not the formal leader of the empire ([327]). Apparently, the imperial policy was largely affected by John Chrysostom in 399-400; Emperor Arcadius is supposed to have acted in accordance with John’s advice ([544]).

10.3a. Israel. Elisha the prophet castigated Jezebel and finally destroyed her by proxy of Jehu (2 Kings 9). Jezebel was killed (2 Kings 9:30-33). She had been a king’s daughter (2 Kings 9:34). At the same time, several Christian authors (Eusebius, for instance) had used the word “wife” for referring to a confession. 

10.4a. Israel. According to the Bible, Jehu had “reigned over Israel” (2 Kings 10:36), anointed by Elisha the prophet (2 Kings 9:6). The allegedly pagan cult of Baal was overthrown under Elisha (2 Kings 10:28). “And they brought forth the images out of the house of Baal, and burned them. And they brake down the image of Baal, and brake down the house of Baal, and made it a draught house unto this day” (2 Kings 10:26-27). This is the passage where the Bible condemns and forbids the cult of Baal.

10.5a. Israel. Jehu took part in this religious struggle personally as the persecutor of Baal’s cult. Jehu’s reign duration equals 28 years (2 Kings 10:36).

10.3b. Third Empire. John Chrysostom had vehemently criticised the official church; however, the parallel here isn’t quite clear. 

10.4b. Third Empire. The invasion of Alaric had stunned the entire Roman Empire. He took Rome in 410. Alaric became King of the Goths in 396 ([327], page 446). The pagan cult becomes downtrodden in the empire under John Chrysostom. In the alleged year 391 the imperial edict comes out that forbids sacrifices. The last Olympic games take place in 393; all the Olympian temples are destroyed the same year ([327], page 444-445). The famous statue of Zeus is taken to Constantinople; pagan religious services are outlawed ([327]).
Chrysostom dies in the alleged year 403. Alaric becomes famous in the alleged year 385, and becomes King of the Goths in 398 ([327], p. 446). Alaric died in the alleged year 410 or 411. Thus, we get the 15 years as the period of 396-411 (Alaric), 32 years as the period of 378-410 (the Gothic rebellion followed by Alaric’s reign), or 30 years as the period of 378-407 (Chrysostom).

11a. Jehoash (“The Lord’s Property”)

11b. Theodosius I.

11.1a. Israel. Jehoash followed Jeroboam’s heresy, or “walked in the sins of Jeroboam” (2 Kings 13:2), likewise the previous kings of Israel excepting Jehu. His name can be translated as “the Lord’s own”. He may have been considered “son of God” (Jehu, or Jehovah?). See [544], Volume 4.

11.1b. Third Empire. Theodosius I was a fanatical Christian ([327], page 444). Furthermore, from the point of view of an ecclesiastical chronicler, he may have been called “the Lord’s own”, since the Goths led by Alaric (“Wrath of God”) attacked him when they first rebelled in 378.

11.2a. Israel. The reign of Jehoash is marked by a single, yet arduous, war against Hazael, king of Syria (2 Kings 13:3). The Bible describes Hazael’s invasion as barbaric (2 Kings 13). Jehoash lost the war (2 Kings 13:3), but signed a peace with Hazael (2 Kings 13:5). Jehoash reigned for 17 years (2 Kings 13:1).

11.2b. Third Empire. The war against the Goths accompanies the entire rule of Theodosius I. This war was violent, bloody, and arduous. Roman chronicles regarded the invasion of the Goths as a barbaric intrusion. In 386, Theodosius I manages to negotiate a truce with the Goths ([327]; also [767], Volume 2). We see another identification of the biblical Arameans with the mediaeval Goths. Theodosius I had reigned 16 years: 379-395 ([767], Volume 2, page 793). The reign durations are similar.

12a. Jehoash of Israel (God’s Fire).

12b. Arcadius.

12.1a. Israel. Jehoash is the son of Jehoahaz (2 Kings 13:10). Next to Jehoash we see the eminent prophet St. Elisha, whose orders were good as law for Jehoash (2
Kings 13:14-20). “Elisha had died… And now Moabite raiders invaded the country” (2 Kings 13:20).

12.1b. Third Empire. Arcadius is a son of Theodosius I ([327], page 445). Next to Arcadius we find a well-known saint, John Chrysostom, whose advice Emperor Arcadius allegedly followed in 400-401 ([542]). St. John Chrysostom died in 407. The next year, in 408, Alaric re-invaded the empire.


12.2b. Third Empire. Arcadius wages wars against two kings - Alaric and Radagaisius. Arcadius did not succeed in destroying Alaric’s troops completely ([327], page 447). Alaric and Radagaisius were the respective leaders of the Goths and the Germans [327]. Thus, we encounter another superimposition of the biblical Arameans over the medieval Goths and Germans – probably Prussians.

12.3a. Israel. Jehoash had continuously been at feud with the king of Judah, who ruled jointly with him (2 Kings 13). Eventually, a war between Jehoash and his co-ruler of Judah broke out (2 Kings 13:12). Jehoash died in the capital and not on the battlefield. His reign duration equals 16 years (2 Kings 13:10).

12.3b. Third Empire. Arcadius had been at feud with his co-ruler Honorius; he’d also had a hated private fiend by the name of Stilicho, the personal commander of Honorius ([327], pages 446-447). In the epoch of the co-rulers Arcadius and Honorius, “a war between Western and Eastern Rome began” ([579], page 478). Arcadius doesn’t die on the battlefield, but rather in the capital. His reign lasted for 13 years: 395-408 [327].

13a. Jeroboam II (Protector of People).

13b. Honorius.

13.1a. Israel. Jeroboam II rules in Samaria (2 Kings 14:23) and fights against the Arameans, who attack the kingdom of Israel ceaselessly (2 Kings 14).

13.1b. Third Empire. Honorius rules in Rome. Once again we see the already familiar identification of the biblical Samaria as the mediaeval Rome. The rule of
Honorius, likewise that of his co-ruler Arcadius, is accompanied by continuous wars against the Goths and Germans. We observe yet another superimposition of the biblical Arameans over the medieval Goths and Germans (possibly Prussians).


13.2b. Third Empire. Honorius manages to stop the invasion, arranging for a truce with Alaric in 395 ([327] and [767], Volume 2). In spite of the short duration of the ceasefire, it had led to an expansion of the state. Stilicho, the military commander of Honorius, drove the Goths back, away from the original boundaries of the Roman Empire ([327], pages 446-447). The troops of Honorius, led by Stilicho, defeated Alaric once again in the alleged year 402. Radagaisius is supposed to have been killed in 405 A.D. Thus, the defeat had been temporary for Alaric and final for Radagaisius ([327]).

13.3a. Israel. The “biography” of Jeroboam II mentions Hazaal, King of Aram, although, according to the 2nd Book of Kings 13:24, Hazaal had died in the times of Jehoash of Israel – the predecessor of Jeroboam II. This probably indicates that Jeroboam II and Jehoash of Israel were co-rulers.

13.3b. Third Empire. Honorius, the double of Jeroboam II, and Arcadius, the double of Jehoash the Israelite, are considered to have been co-rulers in Roman history. The reign of Arcadius covers the period of 395-408, and that of Honorius - 395-423 ([327] and [767], Volume 2).

13.4a. Israel. During the rule of Jeroboam II, the prophet St. Jonah gains prominence – an envoy of God who liberates the land from enemies (2 Kings 14:25-27). It is most likely that Jonah is a slightly distorted version of the name John. Jonah is one of the key figures in the reign of Jeroboam II. It is through Jonah that God helps the kingdom of Israel (2 Kings 14:25). The reign of Jeroboam II lasts for 41 years (2 Kings 14:23).

13.4b. Third Empire. St. John Chrysostom was active in the time of Honorius
and his co-ruler Arcadius. Let us point out that Radagaisius, the duplicate of the Biblical Ben-Hadad, had died in the alleged year 405 A.D. Furthermore, Alaric, the duplicate of the Biblical Hazael, had perished in 410 A.D. Since both Radagaisius and Alaric had died in the epoch of Honorius (The Biblical Jeroboam II), the year 407, when St. John Chrysostom, the duplicate of the Biblical Jonah, had ceased his activity, actually coincides with the end of the invasion as described in the Bible. Honorius had reigned for 28 years: 395-423. Reign durations differ considerably, but it does not appear to influence the correlation of entire dynasties.

14a. Zechariah (The Lord’s Memory).
   ■ 14b. Constantius II.

14.1a. Israel. Little is known of Zachariah. He is presumed to have reigned for 6 months (2 Kings 15:8).

   ■ 14.1b. Third Empire. There is virtually no information available about Constantius II. He had reigned for 7 months in either 421 or 423 A.D. ([767], Volume 2, page 793). He was proclaimed Augustus in 421, being a co-ruler of Honorius. Their respective reign durations are rather close.

15a. Shallum or Selom (Peaceful).
   ■ 15b. John.

15.1a. Israel. Very little is known of Shallum (2 Kings 15:10, 15:13). He had reigned for 1 month (2 Kings 15:13).

   ■ 15.1b. Third Empire. We know virtually nothing of John, who had reigned for 2 months in 423 ([579], page 482). Reign durations are similar.

   **Commentary:** Available sources reflect the downfall of the Western Roman Empire in a fragmentary and contradictory manner; this confusion is observable in contemporary monographs as well. For instance, [767], Volume 2, gives us the following years for Emperor John’s reign: 423-425 A.D., without any comments whatsoever. Therefore we have been using an older text that was nevertheless a great deal more complete [579], which relates the events of this period (albeit briefly) specifies the duration of John’s rule as equalling two months ([76]).
16a. Interregnum in the Kingdom of Israel.
16b. “Interregnum-guardianship” in the West of the Third Roman Empire.

16.1a. Israel. After the death of Jeroboam II, a 24-year long period of strife begins. Menahem accedes under unclear circumstances. The 2nd Book of Kings (15:17) indicates that Menahem had ascended the throne in the 39th year of Azariah, the king of Judah, and reigned for 10 years. On the other hand, Menahem is supposed to have “attacked Shallum, the son of Jabesh” (2 Kings 15:14). That is to say, Menahem replaced Shallum (Selom). Shallum had reigned for 1 month, and his predecessor Zechariah - for 6 months only, qv below. Thus, Menahem ascended the throne 7 months after Zachariah’s co-ruler or predecessor – Jeroboam II. In other words, no gap is indicated between any of these three kings. However, Jeroboam II had died in the 14th year of Azariah of Judah, as mentioned above, since: “In the twenty-seventh year of Jeroboam, king of Israel, Azariah, son of Amaziah, king of Judah, began his reign” (2 Kings 15:1). Moreover, Jeroboam II had reigned for 41 years, qv above. Thus, 24 years went missing between the end of Shallum’s rule and the beginning of Menahem’s rule. See also the “double entries” as described in Chron1, Annex 6.4. Chronologists have long ago noted this fact and called it an interregnum. See also the survey in [544], Volume 7. Thus, the interregnum had lasted for 24 years.

16.1b. Third Empire. As we have noted earlier, the period of 423-444 A.D. had been the time of guardianship-interregnum in the Roman Empire. Young Valentinian III was formally under the guardianship of his mother, Placidia, but actually Aetius ([64], page 33). The guardianship had lasted 21 years. Durations are similar.

17a. Menahem (Gift to People).
17b. Valentinian III.

17.1a. Israel. During Menahem’s rule, an important event takes place – the troops of Phul, king of Assyria, invade the Israeli kingdom (2 Kings 15:19) near the end of Menahem’s rule (2 Kings 15:19, 15:21-22).

Note: In the Russian Bible used here by A. T. Fomenko (and in several other Slavonic Bibles), king of Assyria is called FUL. In the NIV, however, this king’s name is PUL. Therefore, the next sentence is provided in two versions – translation of the
actual sentence by A.T. Fomenko and a suggestion on how to deal with the varying spelling. This difference influences some of the further paragraphs, qv below.

A.T. Fomenko: Since the sounds F (phita) and T were often subject to flexion, the name *Ful* might also have been pronounced as *Tul*.

**Suggestion:** Since the sounds P, F, and T were frequently subject to flexion, the name *Pul* might have also been pronounced as *Ful* or *Tul*.

- 17.1b. *Third Empire.* The rule of Valentinian III is marked by a major invasion. The troops of the famous *Attila* invade the Roman Empire ([64]) in the alleged year 452 – towards the end of the reign of Valentinian III. Let us recall that he had reigned between the alleged years 444 and 455. The name *Attila* is virtually identical with the biblical name Tul. What we get sans vocalizations is TTL – TL. Thus, by reporting the intrusion of Ful – Tul, the Bible explicitly indicates *Attila*. Attila is considered to have been the leader of the *Huns*.

**Commentary:** The fact is that whenever the Bible reports a Syrian (occasionally also *Aramean*) or *Assyrian* invasion, we immediately see either *Germans* (*Prussians*), or *Goths*, or *Huns* invade the Third Roman Empire from the north. As for the word Ashur or Ashr, (“Assyrian”) in [544], Volume 2, the following translation was offered: leader-mentor. *Ashur* and *Ashri* means “to walk straight”, “to lead others”, similar to the German form “Führer” – leader. In the Biblical Books of Kings, *Assyrians* are described as a powerful militant nation. In *Chron5* we have formulated the hypothesis that the country described in the Bible under the name of *Assyria* is the medieval Russia, providing argumentation in its support. Thus, the biblical names:

- *Assiria* or *Assur*, same as
- *Asur* or *Syria*, same as
- *Ashur* – being simply the reverse spelling of the three famous medieval names of the country:
  - *Rossiya* (modern name of Russia) = *Assiria* or *Assur*;
  - *Russ* (the archaic name of Russia) = *Asur* or *Syria*;
  - *Russia* = *Ashur*.

Let us point towards the fact that the English name for the country (Russia) is virtually identical to “Ashur” reversed phonetically. See also *Chron6*. 
17.2a. Israel. Under the threat of suffering a complete rout, Menahem gave Pul “a thousand silver talents… Menahem exacted this money from Israel. Every wealthy man had to contribute… to the king of Assyria. So the king of Assyria withdrew and stayed in the land no longer” (2 Kings 15:19-20). Menahem had reigned for 10 years (2 Kings 15:17).

17.2b. Third Empire. On the verge of a crushing military defeat, Valentinian III tempts Attila the Hun (Khan?) with a large sum of money, agreeing to pay a yearly levy. This event takes place in the alleged year 452 ([64], page 37). The sum of said levy is not specified, though it is said to have been large. Valentinian III had reigned for 14 years, qv above. Reign durations are similar.

18. Pekahiah (The Lord’s Watchful One).

18a. Pekahiah had replaced Menahem (2 Kings 15:23). He was murdered by his minions after a plot (2 Kings 15:25). He had reigned in Samaria (2 Kings 15:23). Menahem had reigned for 2 years (2 Kings 15:23).

18b. Petronius Maximus. Petronius Maximus had replaced Valentinian III and “got murdered during a flight by his own minions” ([579], page 487). He had reigned in Rome ([579]). We see another identification of the biblical Samaria as the mediaeval Rome. However, this does not imply the Italian Rome bears any relation to the events in question at all. Petronius Maximus had reigned for less than 1 year ([579], pages 487-488). Reign durations are similar.

19. Pekah or Thahash (The Watchful One).

19a. Pekah or Thahash. Under Thahash, the kingdom of Israel (Theomachist) was attacked by Tilgath-Pilneser, king of barbarians (2 Kings 15:29) – or king of Assyria (2 Kings 15:29). N. A. Morozov noted that his name (Tilgath-Pilneser), can be translated as “migrant monster” ([544], Volume 7, page 356).

19b. Recimer. Under Recimer the Roman Empire had suffered from the invasion of Genzeric, the leader of barbarians ([579], pages 487-488). In Scaligerian history, the invasion of Genzeric is considered to have been the beginning of the Volkswanderung [579], pp.487-488. Several years later, another barbarian
ruler, a “migrant monster”, will appear in the Third Empire – Theodoric king of Goths. He is believed to have performed massive relocations, shuffled the population of Italy and mixed it with Goths and Germans. We will see Theodoric described on the pages of the Bible as well, under the name “Tiglath-Pileser”.


19.2b. Third Empire. Recimer reigns in Rome. Again, we see that the biblical Samaria can be identified as the mediaeval Rome. We have already mentioned that Recimer was the actual ruler who had replaced several “short-term” emperors on the Roman throne. Recimer’s reign lasted for 16 years: 456-472, qv above. The reign durations of the two are similar.

20a. Anarchy in the kingdom of the Israelites.

20b. Anarchy in the Third Roman Empire in the West.

20.1a. Israel. Different researchers of the Bible estimate the duration of this anarchy in the kingdom of Israel in different ways, to be equal to some value between 6 and 9 years ([544], Volume 7, page 303, table XVII). Our analysis of the Bible yields two versions: 2 and 9 years (2 Kings 15:30). See the “double entry” method as described in Chron1, Appendix 6.4. We put all three versions down: 2, 6, 9 years.

20.1b. Third Empire. Recimer died in the alleged year 472 A.D. The country had been in anarchy until the alleged year 475, when, after a lengthy struggle, the patrician Orestes enthroned his son Romulus Augustulus in Rome ([579], page 490). The duration of the anarchy period equals 3 years.

21a. Uzziah (the Saviour, or Son of God).

21b. Romulus Augustulus.

21.1a. Israel. After the anarchy, Uzziah ascends the throne of Israel in Samaria (2 Kings 17:1). The sacred title of the Saviour, of the Son of God was possibly given to Uzziah as a mockery. Indeed, virtually from the very beginning of his rule, Uzziah had been under the influence of a foreign king called Shalmaneser, remaining de facto deprived of real power himself (2 Kings 17:1-4).

21.1b. Third Empire. After the anarchy (again we see a superimposition of the
biblical Samaria over the medieval Rome), the 15-year-old Romulus Augustulus ascends the Roman throne. His name “Augustulus” is derived from the famous name Augustus. Historians note: “The population of Italy gave to the adolescent “emperor” a mocking nickname ‘Augustulus’, which stands for ‘Little Augustus’ or ‘Augustus Junior’” [327], page 450.

21.2a. *Israel.* Almost immediately after the beginning of Uzziah’s rule, the state was attacked by Shalmaneser, a foreigner. “Uzziah had been his vassal and had paid him tribute” (2 Kings 17:3). Shalmaneser is a king of *Assyria* (2 Kings 17:3). Shalmaneser “had seized him [Uzziah - A. F.] … and put him into prison” (2 Kings 17:4).

■ 21.2b. *Third Empire.* In the alleged year 476, the foreigner Odoacer destroys the troops of Rome led by Orestes and claims the royal throne for himself, displacing Romulus Augustulus ([579]). This event concludes the “purely Roman” dynasty in the west of the Third Empire. Odoacer is a German military commander ([579], pages 490-491). Again we see the Assyrians identified as Germans (Prussians, or P-Russians). Odoacer *banishes* Romulus Augustulus to his estate in Campagnia, where the latter ends his days under house arrest ([579], pages 490-491).

21.3a. *Israel.* Uzziah had *reigned as an independent king for less than 1 year* (2 Kings 17). Although he formally *reigned* for 9 years (2 Kings 17:1), at the very beginning of Uzziah’s story (2 Kings 17:3) the Bible tells us that Uzziah became subject to a king of Assyria.

■ 21.3b. *Third Empire.* Romulus Augustulus had *reigned for a single year as an independent emperor* in the alleged years 475-476 ([579], pages 490-491). Reign durations coincide.

21.4a. *Israel.* Shalmaneser arranges for a mass migration of the Israelites (2 Kings 17:6). Then the Bible describes radical changes – not only in the state system of the theomachist kingdom under the rule of a foreign king, but the religious cult as well. Uzziah’s rule marks the end of the independent kingdom of Israel.

■ 21.4b. *Third Empire.* Odoacer had arranged for a major migration to Italy. German mercenaries settled throughout the country. They were given a third of the entire land. The Western Roman Empire ceased to exist as a “purely Roman” state; it was governed by two conqueror kings – the foreigners Odoacer and Theodoric. A
German-Gothic kingdom emerges, and the country receives an infusion of new customs and new religion. In Scaligerian history, the Third Empire in the west is considered to have finally collapsed after Theodoric as a result of the Gothic War of the alleged VI century.

Thus ends the biblical history of the kingdom of Israel and the “royal purity period” in the history of the Third Roman Empire in the west.
4.
Identifying the theocratic Kingdom of Judah as the Third Roman Empire in the East. A shift of circa 1230 years (short diagram)

Since the Kingdom of Israel of the alleged years 922-724 B.C. can be identified as the Third Roman Empire of the alleged years 306-476 A.D. in the west, it is a natural assumption that the kingdom of Judah of the alleged years 928-587 B.C. should be superimposed over the Eastern Empire of the alleged years 306-700 A.D. This assumption is confirmed by the method of dynastic parallelisms as described in Chapter 6 of *Chron1*. Let us reiterate that these parallelisms are actually of a secondary nature – that is, *they are but derivatives of the main* parallelisms with the German and the Roman coronations of the Sacred Empire of the X-XIII century A.D. and the empire of the Habsburgs (Nov-Gorod?) of the XIV-XVI century.

The Theomachist Kingdom of Israel duplicates the Roman coronation sequence of the Holy Roman Empire in the alleged X-XIII century A.D., qv in Chapter 6 of *Chron1*.

The Theocratic Kingdom of Judah duplicates the German coronations in the Holy Roman Empire of the alleged X-XIII century A.D., qv in Chapter 6 of *Chron1*. Ergo, both kingdoms of Israel and Judah are, to a substantial extent, phantom *reflections of the Habsburg Empire* of XIV-XVI century A.D., qv in *Chron1*, Chapter 6.

Thus, a general diagram of these triple reflections is as follows:

1 **duplicate**: The *Roman* coronation sequence of the Holy Roman Empire in the alleged X-XIII century A.D., which is a partial reflection of the XIV-XVI century Habsburg (Nov-Gorod?) Empire.

2 **duplicate**: The Biblical Theomachist (Israelite) kingdom of the alleged years 922-724 B.C. ([72], p. 192).

3 **duplicate**: The Third Roman Empire in the West (the alleged years 306-476 A.D.).

1 **duplicate**: The *German* coronation sequence of the Holy Roman Empire in the alleged X-XIII century A.D., which is a partial reflection of the XIV-XVI century Habsburg (Nov-Gorod?) Empire.
2 duplicate: The Biblical Theocratic = Judaic kingdom of the alleged years 928-587 B.C. ([72], page 192).

3 duplicate: Third Roman Empire in the East. The alleged years 306-700 A.D.

Biographical parallelisms between the Theocratic = Judaic kingdom of the alleged years 928-587 B.C. and the phantom Third Roman Empire in the east dating to the alleged years 306-700 A.D. are related in greater detail in *Chron2*, Chapter 4, as a part of our analysis of the Bible.
Let us relate an interesting parallelism between the respective biographies of Saint Basil the Great (The Great King), who had lived in the alleged IV century A.D., and Jesus Christ, who had lived in the alleged first century A.D. According to our research, qv in our book entitled The King of the Slavs, the Emperor Andronicus (Christ) is most likely to have lived in the XII century A.D. His reflection is Pope Gregory VII Hildebrand from the alleged XI century.

In Greek, the word “Christ” means “the anointed one”, or “the initiate” ([544], Volume 1, page 109). People initiated into the mysteries of sciences are presumed to have been named Christ after a ceremonial anointment with holy oil. The Hebraic translation of the Greek “Christ” is “Nazarene” ([544], Volume 1, page 109). The Gospel does occasionally refer to the Saviour as Jesus “the Nazarene” (Matthew 2:23). Joshua (Jesus) – allegedly Joshua, son of Nun ([240]), is buried upon the Beykos mountain near the outskirts of Istanbul, which is also named “Hazreti,” or “Holy” in Turkish ([1181]). The words “Nazarene” and “Hazreti” may have the same meaning, qv in Chron5.

A propos, let us recall that the famous Orthodox Apostolic Creed had first been adopted by the Nicaean Council in the alleged year 325 A.D. (the edicts of the council haven’t reached our age), but later edited and supplemented by the Constantinople Council in the alleged year 381 A.D. (the of that council did not survive until our day, either). This is exactly the epoch over which Jesus Christ of the XII century A.D. becomes superimposed, likewise his reflection – Gregory Hildebrand, (shift value equalling 820 years, qv in Chron1, Chapter 6).

Stories collected in The General Menaion (Monthly Readings hagiography) are of a certain interest if we study the history of the cult. We quote them after [544], Volume 1.

Let us recollect which saint’s holy day the European New Year begins with. The first page reads, “January 1st. Saint Basil the Great.” “Basil” is the Greek for “King” (“Basileus”). That is to say, the Christian year begins with a Saint Great King. Who is he? Why does he occupy this honorary position? Why is he considered to have been “the
great father of the church”? ([849], page 176.) Basil was born in the alleged year 333 A.D.; N. A. Morozov collected a vast body of intriguing materials to demonstrate parallels between St. Basil the Great and Jesus Christ ([544], Volume 1). We have composed a short table of this parallel’s form-codes.

1a. Jesus Christ. Jesus is the King of the Jews, according to the Gospels (Matthew 27:11) and (John 19:21). He is also the founder of a new religion. Christian crucifixes are often adorned with the letters INRI, which stand for “Iesus Nazarenus Rex Iudaeorum” (Jesus Nazarene, King of the Jews).

1b. St. Basil the Great. Basil the Great = The Great King. Basil, or Basileus, translates as “king”. He is one of the most important Christian saints. On fig. 1.9 we can see an image of St. Basil the Great on the iconostasis of the Annunciation Cathedral in the Muscovite Kremlin ([114], page 253). On fig. 1.10 we see an icon from the first half of the XVII century depicting St. Basil the Great.

---

Fig. 1.9. St. Basil the Great. Icon from the iconostasis of the Blagoveschensky Cathedral of the Muscovite Kremlin ([114], page 253).
2a. *Jesus Christ.* A famous legend from the Gospel according to Luke: “After three days they found Him in the temple courts, sitting among the teachers, listening to them and asking them questions. Everyone who heard Him was amazed at His understanding and His answers” (Luke 2:46-47).

2b. *St. Basil the Great.* At the age of 5, St. Basil could comprehend the entire body of philosophical works available at that epoch; since 12, he had been taught by scribes, amazing them with the profundity of his understanding. Quoted after [544], Volume 1.

---

*Fig. 1.10. St. Basil the Great. An icon. The Andrei Roublyov Central Museum of Art. First half of the XVII century ([114], page 460).*
3a. *Jesus Christ.* The wanderings of Jesus before He began his ministration. See, in particular, the time Jesus had spent in the desert (Matthew 4:1-11), (Mark 1:12).

■ 3b. *St. Basil the Great.* St. Basil had also left for Egypt and lived there, “feeding on water and vegetables.” Quoted according to [544], Volume 1.

4a. *Jesus Christ.* Jesus returns from his wanderings with a group of twelve followers known as the Apostles (Matthew 10:1-5).

■ 4b. *St. Basil the Great.* The Great King also returns from his travels surrounded by students. Quoted after [544], Volume 1.

5a. *Jesus Christ.* Jesus and his disciples (the Apostles) enter Jerusalem preaching asceticism and poverty, (Matthew 21:10).

■ 5b. *St. Basil the Great.* St. Basil and his disciples do likewise. They are said to have “given their property away to the indigent and gone to Jerusalem dressed in white”. Quoted after [544], Volume 1.

6a. *Jesus Christ.* The famous scene of Jesus baptized by his Precursor – Prophet St. John the Baptist (Matthew 3:13-16). In the Orthodox tradition, St. John the Baptist is usually called “Saint John the Great”.

■ 6b. *St. Basil the Great.* Here, Maximus, or “The Greatest” baptises St. Basil the Great = The Great King in the Jordan. This version may have called St. John the Baptist Maximus, or “the Greatest”. Quoted after [544], Volume 1.

7a. *Jesus Christ.* The scene of the baptism of Jesus is described as follows: “At that time Jesus came… and was baptized by John in the Jordan. As Jesus was coming up out of the water, he saw heaven being torn open and the Spirit descending on Him like a dove. And a voice came from heaven” (Mark 1:9-11).

■ 7b. *St. Basil the Great.* We see the exact same scenario repeated! During the baptism of The Great King, “a kind of fiery lightning came down on him, and a *dove* flew out of it, which descended upon the Jordan, troubled the water and flew back to heaven. And those standing on the shore, upon seeing this, were frightened with a great fear and glorifying God”. Quoted after [544], Volume 1. The lightning must have been accompanied by “a voice like thunder”.

8a. *Jesus Christ.* The key elements of the plot are as follows: baptism, the Jordan,
a dove and a voice from heaven.

8. St. Basil the Great. This myth is based on the same elements: baptism, the Jordan, a dove and a lightning (possibly, a voice from heaven).

9a. Jesus Christ. The scene of the transfiguration of Jesus: “After six days Jesus took with Him, Peter, James and John… and led them up a high mountain by themselves. There he was transfigured before them. His face shone like the sun… Just then there appeared before them Moses and Elijah, talking with Jesus… When the disciples heard this, they fell facedown to the ground, terrified” (Matthew 17:1-3, 17:6).

9b. St. Basil the Great. The scene of the transfiguration of the Great King is just the same: the King prayed the God to bestow His grace upon him. He had made a sacrifice: he was calling upon the Lord for six days, and “all the high clergy saw the celestial light shed upon the altar, and men in bright garments surrounding the Great King. Those who saw it fell facedown”. Quoted after [544], Volume 1, page 125.

10a. Jesus Christ. Thus, the essence of the myth is as follows: six days, prayer, transfiguration, celestial light, prophets appearing and the disciples in fear (“falling facedown”).

10b. St. Basil the Great. The essentials of the myth are absolutely the same: six days, prayer, celestial light, men appearing and spectators in fear (“falling facedown” as well).

11a. Jesus Christ. A close companion of Jesus is called Simon Peter; he is said to have been older than Jesus.

11b. St. Basil the Great. Next to the Great King we see his close companion Eubulus, whose name translates as “Good Advice”; he is the Great King’s senior. Quoted after [544], Volume 1.

12a. Jesus Christ. Next to Jesus we see St. Peter the Apostle. He is a married man (Mark 1:29), (Luke 4:38).

12b. St. Basil the Great. Next to the Great King, we also see Peter, a high priest. He is married and has children (possibly, a double of Eubulus). Quoted after [544], Volume 1. The names of the doubles coincide.
13a. *Jesus Christ.* Jesus performs many miracles (such as exorcising malignant spirits, healing lepers, and raising the dead.

■ 13b. *St. Basil the Great.* Virtually the same list of miracles is attributed to the Great King [544], Volume 1.


■ 14b. *St. Basil the Great.* We learn of a similar temptation of the Great King by the devil. Quoted after [544], Volume 1.

15a. *Jesus Christ.* The famous Mary Magdalene had been living a life of sin for a long time; however, when she had met Jesus, she was absolved of her sins and accompanied him as an ardent worshipper (Luke 7:36-50, 8:1-2).

■ 15b. *St. Basil the Great.* Here, a certain rich widow had been living a dissolute life for a long time - however, when she’d met the Great King, she begged him for an absolution. She received the absolution and became a worshipper of the King. Quoted after [544], Volume 1. The plot is very similar.

16a. *Jesus Christ.* Jesus is said to have known the secret thoughts of people: when he had met an unfamiliar Samaritan woman, he told her that she’d had five husbands, and that the man she had been with when they met wasn’t in fact her husband (John 4:15-19).

■ 16b. *St. Basil the Great.* An identical plot: upon meeting a stranger by the name of Theognia, the Great King had told her that the man who was accompanying her as a husband hadn’t been such. Quoted after [544], Volume 1.

17a. *Jesus Christ.* State authorities begin repressions against Jesus, willing to make him adhere to the previous cult. Jesus, aided by a number of the Apostles, heads an oppositional religious movement.

■ 17b. *St. Basil the Great.* Valens the Roman Emperor assaults the Great King, willing to make him adhere to Aryanism. The Great King resists and, accompanied by his followers, heads the opposition. Quoted after [544], Volume 1. We see an evident parallelism: both Jesus and the Great King step up against the Roman authorities.

18a. *Jesus Christ.* The Pharisees, sworn enemies of Jesus, form a group supported by the state (John 7:32).
18b. St. Basil the Great. Aryanists are sworn enemies of the Great King. They also enjoy the support of the emperor’s authority. Quoted after [544], Volume 1.

19a. Jesus Christ. The trial over Jesus and His Crucifixion (John 18-19).
19b. St. Basil the Great. In the alleged year 368 A.D. Valens initiates a trial over the Great King, willing to sentence him to exile. Quoted after [544], Volume 1.

20a. Jesus Christ. Jesus is crucified at the age of 33. His ministration began when he had been about thirty years of age (Luke 3:23).
20b. St. Basil the Great. The Great King was born in the alleged year 333 A.D.; therefore, at the time of Valens’ trial, in the alleged year 368, he had been 35 [544], Volume 1.

21a. Jesus Christ. Pontius Pilate, the chief Roman magistrate, refuses to judge Jesus and “washes his hands”. “When Pilate saw that he was getting nowhere, but that instead an uproar was starting, he took water and washed his hands in front of the crowd” (Matthew 27:24).
21b. St. Basil the Great. Roman emperor, Valens wants to sign the sentence, but the cane “breaks in his hand” and he, frightened, tears his decree to pieces. Quoted after [544], Volume 1.

22a. Jesus Christ. The trial over Jesus takes place at the place of Pontius Pilate, that is, Pilate of Pontus. The word “pilat” used to mean “hangman, tormentor”, in the old Russian language - hence Russian word “pilatit – to torture, tyrannize” (V. Dal – [223], see “pilatit”). Thus, Pontius Pilate is the Hangman from Pontus, or the Tormentor from Pontus. It is therefore possible that, rather than being a name, the word “Pilate” stands for occupation in the Gospels. Pilate of Pontus is merely the judge of Pontus, or the state official who administers justice and manages hangmen. According to the Gospels, there are two rulers on the historical scene: King Herod and the judge Pontius Pilate, a Roman governor.
22b. St. Basil the Great. The trial over the Great King takes place at the residence of the high priest of Pontus. Here we also see two influential rulers: Emperor Valens and a judge – the high priest of Pontus. Quoted after [544], Volume 1.
■ 23b. St. Basil the Great. Emperor Valens hands the Great King to the high priest of Pontus. Quoted after [544], Volume 1.

■ 24b. St. Basil the Great. The Great King is also sentenced to death according to [544], Volume 1.

25a. Jesus Christ. After the execution, or the Crucifixion, a miracle takes place, namely, the Resurrection of Jesus Christ (Matthew 28:5-20).
■ 25b. St. Basil the Great. A miracle saves the Great King from death (see [544], Volume 1). It is interesting that neither the “biography” of the Great King, nor that of Hildebrand (another reflection of Jesus Christ) should mention the execution itself – that is, the crucifixion is not actually described at all.

26a. Jesus Christ. After His Resurrection, Jesus “appears before many” - his disciples in particular (Matthew 28:16-17). The Gospel tells us nothing of the further fate of Jesus Christ.
■ 26b. St. Basil the Great. After the “resurrection” (having been on the verge of death, but not executed), the Great King had lived for 10 years and died in the alleged year 378 A.D., vested in the great authority of being a religious leader ([544], Volume 1).

27a. Jesus Christ. Before the “death”, or the Crucifixion, Jesus distinguishes his youngest and most beloved disciple during the Last Supper – St. John the Apostle (John 13:23 and on).
■ 27b. St. Basil the Great. Before his death, the Great King transfers his authority to his disciple John. He is said to have baptized his disciple and “communicated to him the divine Mysteries… Only then… has he committed his soul into the hands of God”. Quoted after [544], Volume 1.

28a. Jesus Christ. Jesus is considered the founder of Christianity.
■ 28b. St. Basil the Great. The Great King is the progenitor of the Christian mysteries ([544], Volume 1). The most important element of the cult is the so-called Liturgy of St. Basil the Great ([544], Volume 1).
29a. *Jesus Christ.* Jesus is the head of the Holy Family, a group of Christian saints.

■ 29b. *St. Basil the Great.* The Great King was canonized as a Christian saint together with his brothers and sisters.

30a. *Jesus Christ.* There are two traditional points of view on how old Jesus was at the moment of his “death”: 33 years, according to the most common version (Luke 3:23), and approaching 50 – “You are not yet fifty years of age” (John 8:57).

■ 30b. *St. Basil the Great.* The “ecclesiastical age” of the Great King, who was born in the alleged year 333 A.D., can calculated in two ways: 1) either 35 years, up to Valens’ trial that allegedly took place around 368 A.D., or 2) 45 years, up to his death allegedly in 378 A.D. [544], Volume 1. We see sufficient conformity.

31a. *Jesus Christ.* The feast of the Nativity of Christ (Christmas) is the most important Christian holy day.

■ 31b. *St. Basil the Great.* The feast of the Nativity of Christ is considered to have appeared among the followers of the famous Christian sect of *Basilidians* ([744], page 47). Today they are presumed to have been the followers of the notorious heretic Basilides ([744], page 47). It is however possible that the tale of “Basilides the Heretic” was just another version of the legend about St. Basil the Great.

Thus, St. Basil the Great appears to have been a phantom reflection of Jesus Christ, or Emperor Andronicus from the XII century A.D.
PART TWO

The famous reform of the Occidental Church in the XI century by “Pope Gregory Hildebrand” as the reflection of the XII century reforms of Andronicus (Christ). The Trojan War of the XIII century A.D.
6.
“Pope Gregory Hildebrand” from the XI century A.D. as a replica of Jesus Christ (Andronicus) from the XII century. A chronological shift of 100 years. The Scaligerite chronologists have subsequently moved the life of Christ 1050 years backwards, into the I century A.D.

The great ecclesiastical reform of the XI century, conceived and initiated by the famous Pope Gregory Hildebrand, is a well-known event in the history of Western Europe and the Occidental Christian Church. It is supposed to have radically altered the life of the Europeans. As we shall demonstrate in the present chapter, the XI century “Pope Gregory Hildebrand” is really a phantom reflection of Andronicus (Christ) from the XII century A.D.

Let us explain in more detail. The decomposition of the “Scaligerian history textbook” into the sum of four shorter chronicles shifted against each other implies the existence of an erroneous mediaeval tradition that dated Christ’s lifetime to the XI century A.D. This fact had initially been discovered by the author in his study of the global chronological map (the 1053-year shift that superimposes the phantom I century A.D. over the XI century A.D.). This erroneous point of view that the ancient chroniclers had adhered to was further rediscovered by G. V. Nosovskiy in his analysis of the Mediaeval calculations related to the Passover and the calendar, qv in Chron6 and Annex 4 to The Biblical Russia.

One should therefore expect a phantom reflection of Jesus Christ to manifest in the “Scaligerian XI century”. This prognosis is confirmed, and we shall demonstrate the facts that confirm it in the present chapter.

Our subsequent analysis of the ancient and mediaeval historical chronology demonstrated that the epoch of Christ, which is presumed to be at a distance of 2000 years from today, to have been 1100 years closer to us, falling over the XII century A.D. See our book entitled King of the Slavs for further reference. Apparently, despite the fact that the mediaeval chronologists have shifted Christ’s life as reflected in the chronicles into the I century A.D., having “removed” it from the XII century, an “intermediate reflection” of Emperor Andronicus (Christ) remained in the XI century as
the biography of “Pope Gregory VII Hildebrand”.

This statement, which is of a purely chronological nature, is often misunderstood by religious people. This stems from the false impression that the re-dating of the Evangelical events that we offer contradicts the Christian creed. This is not so. The re-dating of the years of Christ’s life that we offer taken together with the alternative datings for other events recorded in ancient and mediaeval history has got absolutely nothing to do with Christian theology.

The same can be said about the parallels between the Evangelical descriptions of Christ’s life and the biography of “Pope” Gregory Hildebrand. A parallelism doesn’t imply that Hildebrand’s biography is based on reality and the Gospels are a myth that duplicates it. On the contrary – in our works on chronology we demonstrate our discovery that the history of the Italian Rome (where Pope Hildebrand is supposed to have been active in the XI century, according to Scaligerian history) only commences from the XIV century. Also, up until the XVII century it had differed from the consensual version substantially. Ergo, real history tells us that there could have been no Roman Pontiff by the name of Hildebrand in the XI century Italy – if only due to the non-existence of Rome itself at that epoch.

What are the origins of “Pope Hildebrand’s” biography, and why does it contain duplicates of a number of Evangelical events? This issue requires a separate study. It is of great interest in itself, and remains rather contentious. In any case, if we are to assume a purely chronological stance, we shall certainly become interested in the fact that the Scaligerian history of the XI century contains a distinctive parallelism with the Evangelical events.

6.1 Astronomy in the Gospels

6.1.1 The true dating of the evangelical eclipse

The issue of dating the evangelical events through the study of the eclipse described in the Gospels and other early Christian sources (Phlegon, Africanus, Synkellos etc) has a long history – it has been repeatedly discussed by astronomers and chronologists alike. There is controversy in what concerns whether the eclipse in question was solar or lunar – we shall therefore consider both possibilities. Let us ponder the possibility of a lunar eclipse first. The Scaligerian chronology suggests 33 A.D. as a fitting solution – see Ginzel’s astronomical canon, for instance ([1154]). However, this solution doesn’t quite fit, since the lunar eclipse of 33 A.D. was all but unobservable in the Middle East. Apart from that, the eclipse’s phase was minute ([1154]). Nevertheless, the eclipse of
33 A.D. is still persistently claimed to confirm the Scaligerian dating of the Crucifixion – the alleged year 33 A.D.

N. A. Morozov suggested another solution: 24 March 368 A.D. ([544], Volume 1, page 96. However, if we are to consider the results of our research that had demonstrated the “Scaligerian History Textbook” to fall apart into four brief chronicles collated to each other, this solution is nowhere near recent enough to satisfy our requirements. Morozov considered the Scaligerian chronology to be basically correct in the new era; therefore, he only got to analyze the eclipses that “preceded the VIII century – that is, from the dawn of history to the second half of the Middle Ages – I decided going any further back would be futile [sic! – A. F.]” ([544], Volume 1, page 97).

We have thus extended the time interval to be searched for astronomical solutions into the epochs nearer to the present, having analyzed all the eclipses up until the XVI century A.D. It turns out that there is an eclipse that satisfies to the conditions – the one that occurred on Friday, 3 April 1075. The coordinates of the zenith point are as follows: + 10 degrees of longitude and – 8 degrees of latitude. See Oppolzer’s canon, for instance ([1315]). The eclipse was observable from the entire area of Europe and the Middle East that is of interest to us. According to the ecclesiastical tradition, the Crucifixion and the eclipse were simultaneous events that took place two days before the Easter. This could not have preceded the equinox. The eclipse dating to 3 April 1075 A.D. precedes Easter (which falls on Sunday, 5 April that year) by two days, as a matter of fact. The phase of the 1075 eclipse is 4"8 – not that great. Later on, in our analysis of Gregory Hildebrand’s “biography”, we shall see that the eclipse of 1075 A.D. corresponds well with other important events of the XI century which may have become reflected in the Gospels.

Let us now consider the solar eclipse version. According to the Gospels and the ecclesiastical tradition ([518]), a new star flared up in the East the year the Saviour was born (Matthew 2:2, 2:7, 2:9-10), and a total eclipse of the sun followed in 31 years, in the year of the Resurrection. The Gospel according to Luke (23:45) tells us explicitly that the sun “hath darkened” during the Crucifixion. Ecclesiastical sources also make direct references to the fact of the Resurrection being accompanied by a solar eclipse, and not necessarily on Good Friday. Let us point out that an eclipse, let alone a total eclipse, is a rare event in that part of the world. Although solar eclipses occur every year, one can only observe them from the narrow track of lunar shadow on the Earth (unlike lunar eclipses that one can observe from across an entire hemisphere). The Bible scholars of the XVIII-XIX century decided to consider the eclipse to have been a
lunar one, which didn’t help much, since no fitting lunar eclipse could be found, either (qv above). However, since then the consensual opinion has been that the Gospels describe a lunar eclipse and not a solar one. Let us adhere to the original point of view that is reflected in the sources, namely, that the eclipse was a solar one.

We learn that such combination of rarest astronomical events as a nova explosion and a full eclipse of the sun following it by roughly 33 years did actually occur – however, in the XII century A.D., and not the first! We are referring to the famous nova explosion roughly dated to 1150 and the total eclipse of the sun of the 1 May 1185. We relate it in detail in our book King of the Slavs.

Thus, astronomical evidence testifies to the fact that the Evangelical events are most likely to have taken place in the XII century A.D. – about 1100 later than the Scaligerian “dating” ([1154]), and 800 years later than the dating suggested by N. A. Morozov ([544], Volume 1).

However, later chronologists have shifted the supernova explosion (the Evangelical star of Bethlehem) 100 years backwards, declaring it to have taken place in 1054. What are the origins of this version? It is possible that the desperate attempts of the mediaeval chronologists to find a “fitting” eclipse in the XI century played some part here. A total eclipse of the sun took place on the 16 February 1086, on Monday ([1154]). The shadow track from this eclipse covered Italy and Byzantium. According to Ginzel’s astronomical canon ([1154]), the eclipse had the following characteristics: the coordinates of the beginning of the shadow track were – 76 degrees of longitude and + 14 degrees of latitude (these values are – 14 longitude and + 22 latitude for the track’s middle, and + 47 longitude with latitude equalling + 45 degrees for its end). The eclipse was total. Having erroneously declared this eclipse to have been the one that coincided with the Crucifixion, the XIV-XV century chronologists had apparently counted 33 years (Christ’s age) backwards from this date (approximately 1086 A.D.), dating the Nativity to the middle of the XI century. They were 100 years off the mark.

Let us linger on the ecclesiastical tradition that associated the Crucifixion with a solar eclipse.

6.1.2. The Gospels apparently reflect a sufficiently advanced level of astronomical eclipse theories, which contradicts the consensual evangelical history

The Bible scholars have long ago taken notice of the claim that the eclipse had lasted about three hours made by the authors of the Gospels.
Matthew tells us the following:

“Now from the sixth hour there was darkness all over the land unto the ninth hour” (Matthew 27:45).

According to Luke,

“… it was about the sixth hour, and there was a darkness all over the earth until the ninth hour. And the sun was darkened…” (Luke 23:44-45)

Mark informs us that

“… when the sixth hour was come, there was darkness all over the whole land until the ninth hour”.

John hasn’t got anything to say on the subject.

The numerous commentators of the Bible have often been puzzled by the fact that the evangelists report a solar eclipse (“the sun was darkened”) with its unnaturally long three-hour duration, since a regular solar eclipse is only observable for several minutes from each particular location. We consider the explanation offered by Andrei Nemoyevskiy, the author of the book Jesus the God ([576]) a while ago, to make perfect sense. He wrote: “we know that a solar eclipse could not have lasted for three hours and covered the entire country [it is usually assumed that the country in question is the diminutive area around Jerusalem – A. F.]. Its maximal duration could not have possibly exceed 4-8 minutes. The evangelists apparently were well familiar with astronomy and could not have uttered any such nonsense … Luke (XXIII, 44) … Mark (XV, 33) … and Matthew (XXVII, 45) … tell us that “there was darkness all over the land”, which really could have lasted for several hours. The duration of the entire solar eclipse that occurred on 6 May 1883 equalled 5 hours and 5 minutes; however, the full eclipse lasted for 3 hours and 5 minutes – exactly the time interval specified in the Gospels” ([576], page 23).

In other words, the three hours specified by the evangelists referred to the entire duration of the lunar shadow’s movement across the surface of the Earth and not the time a single observation point was obscured – that is, the duration of the eclipse from the moment of its beginning (in Britain, for instance) and until its end in some place like Iran. It took the lunar shadow three hours to cover the entire track that ran “all over the land”, inside which “there was darkness”. The phrase “all over the land” was thus used deliberately.

Naturally, such interpretation of the Gospels implies a sufficiently advanced level of their authors’ understanding of the eclipses, their mechanics et al. However, if the events in question took place in the XII century and were recorded and edited in the XII-
XIV century the earliest, possibly a lot later, there is hardly any wonder here. Mediaeval astronomers already understood the mechanism of solar eclipses well enough, as well as the fact that the lunar shadow slides across the surface of the Earth ("all over the land") for several hours.

Let us point out that this high a level of astronomical knowledge from the part of the evangelists is an absolute impossibility in the reality tunnel of the Scaligerian chronology. We are told that the evangelists were lay astronomers at best, and neither possessed nor used any special knowledge of astronomy.

We shall consider the issue of the "passover eclipse" that occurred during the Crucifixion once again. Many old ecclesiastical sources insist the eclipse to have been a solar one. This obviously contradicts the Gospels claiming that the Jesus Christ was crucified around the time of the Passover, which also implies a full moon. Now, it is common knowledge that no solar eclipse can occur when the moon is full, since the sun and the moon face opposite sides of the Earth. The sun is located "behind the back" of the terrestrial observer, which is the reason why the latter sees the entire sunlit part of the moon – a full moon, that is.

All of the above notwithstanding, we have discovered a total eclipse of the sun that took place on 1 May 1185 falling precisely on the year of the Crucifixion, qv in the King of the Slavs. Let us remind the reader that a full solar eclipse is an exceptionally rare event for this particular geographical area. Centuries may pass between two solar eclipses observed from this region. Therefore, the eclipse of 1185 could have been eventually linked to the moment of the Crucifixion. Hence the concept of the "passover eclipse". This shouldn’t surprise us since in the Middle Ages a clear understanding of how the locations of celestial bodies were related to one another had been a great rarity, even among scientists.

In fig. 2.1 we can see an ancient miniature of the Crucifixion taken from the famous Rhemish Missal. At the bottom of the miniature we see a solar eclipse that accompanies the Crucifixion (fig. 2.2). Modern commentary runs as follows: “the third scene in the bottom field depicts the apocryphal scene of the eclipse observed by Dionysius Areopagites and Apolloganes from Heliopolis” ([1485], page 54. We see the Sun is completely covered by the dark lunar disc, with the corona visible underneath. The sky is painted black, since “there was darkness all over the whole land”. Numerous spectators look at the sky in fear while the two sages point their fingers at the eclipse and the Crucifixion, qv near the top of the picture.
Fig. 2.1 A miniature from the *Rhemish Missal* (Missale remense. Missel à l’usage de Saint-Nicaise de Reims) dating to the alleged years 1285-1297. We see the Crucifixion accompanied by a total eclipse of the sun. Taken from [1485], ill. 25.

Fig. 2.2 A close-in of the fragment depicting a total solar eclipse on the miniature from the *Rhemish Missal* ([1485], ill. 25).
In fig. 2.3 we see the fragment of a New Testament frontispiece from *La Bible historiale*, a book by Guiart des Moulins ([1485], ill. 91). We see the Crucifixion accompanied by a total eclipse of the sun; we actually see a sequence of two events in the same miniature – on the left of the cross the sun is still shining bright, whereas on the right it is completely obscured by the blackness of the lunar disc. This method was often used by mediaeval artists for a more comprehensive visual representation of sequences of events – “proto-animation” of sorts.

![Crucifixion scene with solar eclipse](image)

Fig. 2.3. Frontispiece fragment from an edition of the New Testament that dates to the end of the alleged XIV century with a Crucifixion scene accompanied by a total solar eclipse. Taken from [1485], ill. 91.

Yet another miniature where we see the Crucifixion accompanied by a solar eclipse can be seen in fig. 2.4 – it dates to the end of the alleged XV century ([1485], ill. 209). We
see two events in a sequence once again. The sun is still bright on the left of the cross, and it is beginning to darken on the right where we see it obscured by the moon, which is about to hide the luminary from sight completely. We see a starlit sky, and that is something that only happens during a total eclipse of the sun.

Fig. 2.4. An ancient miniature from the book entitled *Heures de Rolin-Lévis. À l’usage de Paris*. We see the Crucifixion as well as a total eclipse (the visibility of stars being a unique characteristic of the latter). Taken from [1485], ill. 209.
It is interesting that the traces of references to Christ in mediaeval chronicles relating the XI century events have even reached our day. For instance, the 1680 Chronograph ([940]) informs us that Pope Leo IX (1049-1054) was visited by Christ himself: “It is said that Christ had visited him [Leo IX] in his abode of repose, disguised as a beggar” ([940], sheet 287). It is important that there are no similar references anywhere else in the Chronograph ([940]) except for the renditions of the Gospels. In the next section we shall discover evangelical parallels in the biography of Pope Gregory VII, who had died in 1085. It is possible that Gregory VII is a reflection of Jesus Christ, or Emperor Andronicus, due to the fact that the Romean history of Constantinople was relocated to Italy as reflected by historical records.

This is why the first “A.D.” year mentioned in a number of chronicles could have erroneously referred to 1054 A.D. This eventually gave birth to another chronological shift of 1053 years. In other words, some of the mediaeval chronologers were apparently accustomed to dating the Nativity to either 1054 or 1053 (instead of 1153, which is the correct dating).

A propos, the beginning of the first crusade – the one that had the “liberation of the Holy Sepulchre” as its objective – is erroneously dated to 1096 ([76]) instead of circa 1196. On the other hand, one should pay attention to the mediaeval ecclesiastical sources, such as The Tale of the Saviour’s Passions and Pilate’s Letter to Tiberius. They often relate the events involving Christ in greater detail than the Gospels. And so, according to these sources, Pilate had been summoned to Rome immediately after the Resurrection and executed there, and the Caesar’s troops marched towards Jerusalem and captured the city. Nowadays all of this mediaeval information is supposed to be of a figmental nature, since no Roman campaign against Jerusalem that took place in the third decade of the first century A.D. is recorded anywhere in the Scaligerian history. However, if we are to date the Resurrection to the end of the XII century, this statement that one encounters in mediaeval sources immediately assumes a literal meaning, being a reference to the crusades of the late XII – early XIII century, and particularly the so-called Fourth Crusade of 1204, which resulted in the fall of Czar-Grad.

Later chronologists, confused by the centenarian chronological shift, have moved the dates of the crusades of the late XII – early XIII century to the end of the XI century. This resulted in the phantom crusade of 1096, for instance, which is presumed to have led to the fall of Jerusalem ([76]).

6.2. The Roman John Crescentius of the alleged X century
A.D. as a reflection of the Evangelical John the Baptist from the XII century A.D. A biographical parallelism

As we demonstrate in our book *King of the Slavs*, John the Baptist had lived in the XII century A.D. In the present section we shall discuss the correlation between his two phantom reflections in the I and the X century A.D.

The chronicles that tell us about the origins of the Second Roman Empire dating from the alleged I century A.D. include a detailed description of the great ecclesiastical reform implemented by Jesus Christ and partially instigated by his precursor John the Baptist. This is what the Gospels tell us. As one can see in Chapter 6 of *Chron1*, most of these events can be linked to the dawn of the X-XIII century Roman Empire – namely, the XII century A.D. One has to bear in mind that these events took place in the New Rome, or Czar-Grad on the Bosporus. The identification of the Second Empire as that of the X-XIII century is a consequence of the chronological shift of roughly 1053 years. It can be represented as the formula \( P = T + 1053 \), where \( T \) is the Scaligerian B.C. or A.D. dating of the event, and \( P \) – the new one suggested by our conception. Thus, if \( T \) equals zero (being the first year of the new era), the \( P \) date becomes equal to 1053 A.D. In other words, the results related in Chapter 6 of *Chron1* formally imply the existence of a mediaeval tradition dating the beginning of the new to 1053 A.D. in modern chronology.

Thus, the initial dating of Christ’s lifetime to the XI century made by the mediaeval chronologists was 100 years off the mark. The real date of the Nativity falls on 1152, qv in our book entitled *King of the Slavs*.

We have observed the effects of the chronological shift (\( P = T + 1053 \)) on the millenarian Roman history. If we are to move forward in time along this parallelism, we shall eventually reach the “beginning of the new era”. What discoveries await us here? The answer is given below in numerous biographical collations and identifications. The “a” points of our table as presented below contain numerous references to the book of F. Gregorovius ([196], Volume 3).

In our relation of the parallelism we shall concentrate on its “mediaeval half”, since the content of the Gospels is known to most readers quite well, unlike the mediaeval version. From the point of view of the parallelism that we have discovered, the mediaeval version is important as yet another rendition of the evangelical events. One should also bear in mind that nowadays the events related to Crescentius and Hildebrand are supposed to have happened in the Italian Rome. This is most probably
untrue. The events described in the Gospels took place in Czar-Grad on the Bosporus, and got transferred to Italy on pages of later chronicles when the Italian Rome emerged as the new capital in the XIV century A.D. This young city had been in dire need of an “ancient history”, which was promptly created.

### Comparison table for the mediaeval John Crescentius and the “ancient” John the Baptist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>John Crescentius</th>
<th>John the Baptist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. The name is John Crescentius ([196], Volume 3).</td>
<td>The alleged I century A.D. See the Gospels for reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>The alleged X century Rome (possibly the XII century Czar-Grad).</td>
<td>The name is John the Baptist (Matthew 3:1). The Russian version of the name is Krestitel; we hardly need to be surprised by their phonetic proximity. Apparently, the tale of John Crescentius was imported to the Italian Rome from the New Rome as recently as approximately the XIV century A.D. In Chron7 one can find our definition of “Classical Latin”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a.</td>
<td>X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. John Crescentius is a hero of the secular mediaeval Rome and a fighter for freedom from the foreign German rule. He presided the National-Patriotic party of Rome, which was founded around 960 A.D. He is said to have been “an eminent Roman… for several years John Crescentius had managed to hold the seat of Roman power… as the head of the National party” ([196], Volume 3, pages 325-326). Crescentius is the most famous representative of the mediaeval Crescentii family. He was “the secular ruler of Rome, but in no way an independent monarch” ([196], Volume 3, pages 326-327).</td>
<td>John the Baptist is the famous prophet and extirpator who had fought against King Herod and his clan (Herod and his brother Philip – Mark 6:17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a.</td>
<td>X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. John Crescentius is a hero of the secular mediaeval Rome and a fighter for freedom from the foreign German rule. He presided the National-Patriotic party of Rome, which was founded around 960 A.D. He is said to have been “an eminent Roman… for several years John Crescentius had managed to hold the seat of Roman power… as the head of the National party” ([196], Volume 3, pages 325-326). Crescentius is the most famous representative of the mediaeval Crescentii family. He was “the secular ruler of Rome, but in no way an independent monarch” ([196], Volume 3, pages 326-327).</td>
<td>John the Baptist is the famous prophet and extirpator who had fought against King Herod and his clan (Herod and his brother Philip – Mark 6:17).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crescentius overthrows Pope John XV in Rome and thus seizes *ecclesiastical power* in Rome ([196], Volume 3, pages 325-343).

- 3b. *John the Baptist.* The leadership of the contemporary religious movement is his to a large extent. He is a greatly respected prophet and the precursor of Jesus Christ.

4a. *John Crescentius.* X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. John Crescentius is supposed to have taken vows in 972 or 981 ([196], Volume 3, page 335).

- 4b. John the Baptist. John the Baptist leads an ascetic monastic life. “And the same John had his raiment of camel’s hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins; and his meat was locusts and wild honey” (Matthew 3:4).

5a. *John Crescentius.* X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. John Crescentius is supposed to have ruled in Rome. Most possibly the city in question was really the New Rome, or Czar-Grad, qv in *Chron1*, Chapter 6. According to geographical identifications that we suggest in *Chron5*, the evangelical “Jordan river” could really have been Danube (R + DAN). The Czar-Grad region can thus prove to be the biblical “region round about Jordan”.

- 5b. *John the Baptist.* John’s sermons made a lot of people congregate around him: “Then went out to him … all the area round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins” (Matthew 3:5-6).

6a. *John Crescentius.* X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. As we have already pointed out, mediaeval chronicles would often identify Jerusalem as Rome or the New Rome.

- 6b. *John the Baptist.* John the Baptist also preaches in Jerusalem (Matthew 3:5) – Judea remains under the Roman rule all the while.

7a. *John Crescentius.* X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. The emperor Otho III is John’s main opponent. In 985 John Crescentius became the ruler of Rome in the absence of Otho III, who had been away from Rome at the time. Crescentius formally recognized the German rule as represented by Otho ([196], Volume 3, page 328). In 991, after the death of empress Theophano, John Crescentius “finally began to rule the city all by himself” ([196], Volume 3, page 342). Otho had
launched a campaign against Rome in 996 and conquered the city. Crescentius remained head of the party, but no longer an independent governor.

7b. John the Baptist. King Herod is the opponent of John the Baptist (Mark 6:27-28).

8a. John Crescentius. X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. Being a German emperor, Otho was crowned Emperor of Rome in 996. “This had brought an end to the patrician authority of Crescentius” ([196], Volume 3, page 346). “After a period of 13 years when there had been no one to bear the title of emperor, the walls of Rome finally saw the new Augustus” ([196], Volume 3, page 346).

8b. John the Baptist. King Herod is the ruler of the country (Matthew 2:1); John the Baptist has to recognize the secular power of King Herod.

9a. John Crescentius. X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. The relations between John Crescentius and Otho must have been neutral initially, despite their mutual political opposition. John remained head of the Roman National party ([196], Volume 3, page 346).

9b. John the Baptist. The relationships between John the Baptist and King Herod had been neutral initially. “… for Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man and an holy, and observed him; and when he heard him, he did many things, and heard him gladly” (Mark 6:20).

10a. John Crescentius. X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. The Pope’s name is Bruno, he’s the religious leader of Rome and a cousin of Emperor Otho. We learn that Otho had made his cousin Pope to replace Pope John XV, who was banished by Crescentius ([196], Volume 3, pages 343 and 346).

10b. John the Baptist. The name of the ruler is Philip, and he’s King Herod’s brother (Mark 6:17).


11b. John the Baptist. Philip the ruler is of royal blood, and he’s the King’s brother (Mark 6:17).
12a. John Crescentius. X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. Romans, especially members of the National party led by Crescentius, are hostile towards the Germans Otho and Bruno. On the contrary, Crescentius becomes a national hero of Rome and remains such for the next couple of centuries to follow ([196], Volume 3). “The Pope, likewise the Emperor… were relations, and both of German origin… Romans eyed these fair-haired Saxons who had come to rule their city and the entire Christian world with animosity, and the young tramontanes failed to instil due respect of their authority into the Romans” ([196], Volume 3, page 346).

12b. John the Baptist. The Gospels mention both Herod and his brother Philip in a negative light, and treat John the Baptist with exalted reverence. The Gospels made Herod’s name a derogatory denominative in many languages.


13b. John the Baptist. John the Baptist is a freedom fighter, a vehement opponent of Herod and Philip, and their clan in general.

14a. John Crescentius. X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. John Crescentius is arrested, brought to trial and sentenced to banishment at the order of Otho, the Roman Emperor. “After the ascension of the Pope [Bruno – A. F.], who had been of the same blood as the emperor, the city needed pacification… Renegade Romans who had banished John XV were tried… Some of the popular leaders [of the rebellion – A. F.] were sentenced to banishment, among their number Crescentius” ([196], Volume 3, page 347).

14b. John the Baptist. The arrest and incarceration of John the Baptist by King Herod. “For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John, and bound him in prison…” (Mark 6:17).


15b. John the Baptist. “Amnesty” given to John by Herod and Philip. Indeed, although John remains incarcerated, he isn’t executed – moreover, King Herod still respects him, after a manner (Mark 6:20 and 6:26).
16a. John Crescentius. X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. The “insult” to Pope Bruno credited to John Crescentius: John banishes Bruno from Rome ([196], Volume 3, page 351). The banishment of Pope Bruno, Otho’s placeman and cousin, was clearly an insult to their entire clan.

16b. John the Baptist. John the Baptist “insults” the clan of Philip, accusing Herod and Herodias, Philip’s wife, of being in an unlawful liaison: “For John had said unto Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother’s wife” (Mark 6:18).

17a. John Crescentius. X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. The name of John’s wife is Stephanie; however, according to several mediaeval legends, she was Otho’s concubine [Otho himself being a possible double of the Biblical King Herod] ([196], Volume 3, p. 404).

17b. John the Baptist. The daughter of Herodias (Mark 6:22) takes part in these events, being also a relation of King Herod (Mark, 6:17-22). Let us remind the reader that Herodias was the name of Herod’s wife.

18a. John Crescentius. X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. Stephanie is supposed to have “hexed” Otto (which is a legend of a latter mediaeval epoch). The chronicles of the Middle Ages tell us that after the death of John Crescentius Stephanie was given to mercenaries “as prey” – however, Gregorovius tells us that “this tale is nothing but pure fiction stemming from national pride and hatred of the Romans. There is another legend of an altogether different nature where Stephanie plays the fairylike role of the concubine of John’s conqueror [becomes Otto’s lover, that is – A. F.], qv in [196], Volume 3, page 404.

18b. John the Baptist. The daughter of Herodias “charms” King Herod with her dances: “Herod on his birthday made a supper to his lords … the daughter of Herodias came in, and danced, and pleased Herod… the king said unto the damsel, Ask of me whatsoever thou wilt, and I will give it thee” (Mark 6:21-22).

19a. John Crescentius. X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. The events in Rome take a turn that is to prove catastrophic for John Crescentius eventually, for he becomes the leader of an uprising ([196], Volume 3, page 352). “Having established his judicatory in the Eternal City, and having calmed the Romans by his amnesty, Otho III… had returned to Germany. His withdrawal had soon served
as a signal for the Romans to rebel: the National party had made another desperate attempt to rid the country from the German yoke… Crescentius plots against the German Pope and his minions. The folk had reasons to be discontent – these foreigners were unfamiliar with Roman laws and appointed judges who weren’t subsidized by the state and were corrupt and inequitable… there was an uprising, and the Pope had to flee on 29 September 996… the bold rebel [John Crescentius – A. F.] hurried to stabilize his position of power in Rome… when the Pope had fled, the Roman government was revolutionized completely… Crescentius declared himself a patrician and a consul of the Romans once again” ([196], Volume 3, pages 348-352).

In 998 Otho and his troops approached the Roman fortifications. The city had capitulated, except for the Castle of St. Angelus where John Crescentius and his supporters decided to “make their last stand to the bitter end… Otho had demanded that Crescentius lay down his weapons” ([196], Volume 3, page 355). Having received a defiant reply, Otho commanded to storm the castle, which was conquered on 29 April 998.

19b. John the Baptist. Events take a fatal turn for John: Herodias demands his execution. Her daughter “went forth and said unto her mother, What shall I ask? And she said, The head of John the Baptist. And she came in straightway with haste unto the king, and asked, saying, I will that thou give me by and by in a charger the head of John the Baptist” (Mark 6:24-25).


20b. John the Baptist. The execution of John the Baptist at the order of King Herod: “And immediately the king sent an executioner, and commanded his head to be brought: and he went and beheaded him in the prison, and brought his head in a charger, and gave it to the damsel: and the damsel gave it to her mother” (Mark 6:27-28).

21a. John Crescentius. X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. The severed head of John Crescentius became an important narrative element in the mediaeval chronicles of the X century. There were many legends about the death of Crescentius ([196], Volume 3, pages 358-359). “Crescentius was beheaded, thrown on the ground, and then hanged… Italian chroniclers tell us that prior to this Crescentius had been blinded with his every limb broken, and he was then dragged
across the streets of Rome on the hide of a cow” ([196], Volume 3, pages 358-359).

21b. John the Baptist. The severed head of John the Baptist became a popular mediaeval subject, which was extensively used in Christian paintings and mediaeval art (John’s head on a dish).

22a. John Crescentius. X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. “It is even said that he [John Crescentius – A. F.] became disillusioned in further resistance due to its futility, and took the vows” ([196], Volume 3, page 358).

22b. John the Baptist. “And the same John had his raiment of camel’s hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins” (Matthew 3:4). John the Baptist had led a monastic life.

23a. John Crescentius. X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. John Crescentius is a famous martyr in the Roman history of the X century A.D. “His [John’s – A. F.] demise after a brief but valiant stand served to cover his name in glory… the Romans had wept for the unfortunate Crescentius for a long time; in the municipal acts of the XI century we come across the name Crescentius extremely often [sic! – A. F.], which was for a good reason – many families called their sons after Crescentius. This must have been a tribute to the memory of the intrepid Roman freedom fighter. The epitaph on the grave of Crescentius has survived until our day, and it is one of the most remarkable mediaeval Roman epitaphs” ([196], Volume 3, page 360).

23b. John the Baptist. John the Baptist is a famous Christian saint and martyr of the alleged I century A.D. The chronological shift here equals about a thousand years.

24a. John Crescentius. X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. The Scaligerian chronology informs us of a great “evangelical upsurge” of the late X – early XI century A.D. It coincides with the beginning of the crusade epoch (in reality, all of this took place later – in the late XII – early XIII century). The Gospels are the main ideological weapon of the time. There is even a special term – “the evangelical Renaissance of the X-XI century A.D.”

24b. John the Baptist. The story of John the Baptist is one of the main evangelical legends. These texts served as a basis for the “evangelical” movement, or early Christianity of the alleged I century A.D. A chronological shift of 1053 years places this epoch exactly at the end of the X – beginning of the XI century. Thus, the
shift in question identifies the two main “evangelical upsurges” in the Scaligerian history as two doubles. This “peak” can really be dated to the end of the XII – beginning of the XIII century, qv in our book entitled *King of the Slavs*.

25a. *John Crescentius*. X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. The legend of treachery that resulted in the death of John Crescentius. In this mediaeval version we see “treachery” from the part of the emperor Otho (the evangelical King Herod?) himself: “there was no shortage in versions that ascribed the fall of Crescentius to despicable perfidy demonstrated by Otho” ([196], Volume 3, pages 358-359). It is said that Otho traitorously offered Crescentius a free pardon via Tammus the knight, and when John had trusted him and capitulated, Otho gave orders to execute him as a proditor. The execution of Crescentius proved a political event serious enough to tie the death of the emperor Otho that ensued in 1002 to the name of John Crescentius in legends ([196], Volume 3, page 404).

25b. *John the Baptist*. Above we have referred to the evangelical tale of perjury that led to the death of John the Baptist. According to the Gospels, John’s death was the result of treachery from the part of Herodias, who had used her cunning to get the prophet executed with the assistance of her daughter (Mark 6:21-28).

26a. *John Crescentius*. X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. Stephanie is blamed for the death of Otho, and considered to have been the wife of John Crescentius. Other versions of the story call her emperor Otho’s concubine. When we compare the Gospels to the mediaeval Roman chronicles, we see that they use the term “wife” in all the wrong places; there is definitely confusion in the plot. This must have led to the fact that the husband was confused for his opponent. “The death of Otho… soon took on the hues of a legend. It was told that the new Medea incarnate as the widow of Crescentius managed to get Otho under her spell [a parallel with the Gospels telling us about Herod charmed by the daughter of Herodias – A. F.]; she is supposed to have pretended that she wanted to heal the emperor, and, according to various sources, had either wrapped him up in a poisoned deer hide, poisoned his drink, or put a poison ring on his finger” ([196], Volume 3, page 404).

26b. *John the Baptist*. St. Mark the evangelist directly refers to Herodias as the one to blame for the death of John the Baptist (Mark 6:24-25). Let us remind the reader that Herodias had allegedly been the wife of King Herod (the double of Otho?).
27a. John Crescentius. X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. It is possible that Gregory Hildebrand was born in the time of John Crescentius. Below we shall demonstrate a very vivid parallelism between the mediaeval reports of the famous “Pope” Gregory VII Hildebrand and the evangelical story of Jesus Christ. The period when Hildebrand had been politically active in Rome falls on the epoch of 1049-1085 A.D. He is supposed to have been born in 1020 ([64], page 216), which is very close to the epoch of Crescentius (991-998 A.D.). One has to point out that there is another Crescentius in the Scaligerian history of Rome, namely, “John Crescentius the Second” ([196], Volume 3). He had allegedly been the son of “John Crescentius the First” whose biography we have studied above. This “son” is said to have ruled in Rome between 1002 and 1012. We know very little about him except for the fact that he “followed in his father’s footsteps”. This “John Crescentius Junior” may prove to be a second version of the same old legend about the first Crescentius, in which case the activities of Crescentius (the Baptist) precede the birth of Hildebrand immediately. Such a “duplication” of Crescentius shouldn’t really surprise us. Above we have demonstrated the two duplicates of the war that broke out in the XIII century A.D., which were placed in the X century A.D. by the chronologists. They are shown on the global chronological map in Chron1, Chapter 6, as the two black triangles that mark the X century A.D. This narrative duplication of the war could have duplicated John Crescentius as well.

27b. John the Baptist. Jesus Christ is said to have been born in the time of John the Baptist who had baptized Jesus (Matthew 3:1-3 and 3:13).

28a. John Crescentius. X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. Hildebrand’s death follows the death of John Crescentius. Hildebrand “carries the banner” of John. We shall return to this below (see [196], Volume 3).

28b. John the Baptist. The death of Jesus Christ follows the death of John the Baptist. Christ carries on with what was started by John the Baptist, who is therefore called his precursor. John used to preach “saying, There cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose. I indeed have baptized you with water: but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost” (Mark 1:7-8).

29a. John Crescentius. X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. The
epoch of John Crescentius falls on the end of the X century. He had been in a mature enough age when he died; his activity (political and religious reforms) had started substantially earlier than 990 – somewhere in the middle of the alleged X century ([196], Volume 3).

■ 29b. John the Baptist. Major religious events in the history of the mediaeval states were connected with the name of John the Baptist. Let us point towards the well-known baptism of Russia somewhere around 980-990 A.D.

30a. John Crescentius. X century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. If John the Baptist had something to do with the naissance of the rite of baptism, this rite must have had few “Jesus elements” around that time (allegedly the late X – early XI century; XII century in reality), since the epoch of Jesus Christ, or Andronicus (who became reflected in the Roman history as Hildebrand) was just dawning. It falls over the second half of the XII century.

■ 30b. John the Baptist. The main rite recorded in the chronicles telling us about the baptism of Russia refers to a water baptism. However, this rite had been introduced by John the Baptist before Jesus. By the way, this also implies that the baptism of Russia in the alleged X century (the XII century in reality), as well as the crusades of the alleged XI-XIII century (late XII – early XIII century really) didn’t “wait for a thousand years to happen”, but had rather proved a fast and immediate reaction to the principal religious events of that age.

6.3. “Pope” Gregory VII Hildebrand from the Roman chronicles dated to the XI century A.D. as the reflection of Jesus Christ (Andronicus) from the XI century A.D. A biographical parallelism

In the present section we demonstrate the famous “Pope Hildebrand” from the alleged XI century A.D. to be a phantom reflection of Andronicus (Christ) from the XII century A.D.

Scaligerian history considers “Pope” Hildebrand to have been the most eminent reformist of the mediaeval Christian church in the west. He is counted amongst the greatest European popes; his name is most commonly associated with the greatest reform of the mediaeval Christian church in the Western Europe that had made a tremendous political impact. “Contemporaries compare the renowned votary to Marius,
Hildebrand is considered to have been the author of the famous celibacy edict that led to large-scale upheavals all across Western Europe. He had been the first to conceive of the crusades and make this concept a reality, which had defined the style and character of the three centuries to follow ([196], Volume 4). These “reborn Gospels” were the official ideological documents to serve as foundations of this crucial XI century reform; Scaligerian history dates them to the I century A.D. which precedes this epoch by a millennium.

This reform was enforced *manu militari* and led to a violent struggle between the devotees of the old church and the supporters of the new confession (the so-called reformist or evangelical church in the West) that had raged across the Western Europe for fifty years on end. Despite the fact that influential strata of European society had opposed his actions vehemently, Hildebrand made both the ecclesial and secular authorities conform to the new doctrine. He is considered the first organizer of the church in its evangelical format ([196], Volume 4).

One mustn’t get the idea that Hildebrand’s “biography” really pertains to the XII century A.D. It had most probably been compiled a great deal later, around the XIV-XVI century A.D. – especially since the very foundation of the Italian Rome as a capital can be relatively safely dated to the XIV century. This consideration stems from our discovery that the First Roman Empire, or Livy’s “Imperian Rome”, can be identified as the Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century A.D. and the Habsburg (Nov-Gorod?) Empire of the XIV-XVI century A.D.

Let us relate in brief the parallels between the biographies of Jesus Christ (Andronicus) and “Pope Hildebrand”. They became identified as one and the same person by formal methods described in *Chron1*, Chapter 6. Let us point out that the name Hildebrand can be a derivative of “Ablaze with Gold” (“Hilde” being related to such words as “gilded”, “golden” etc; as for “Brand” – the igneous connotations of the word are obvious enough). Bear in mind that Christ would also be referred to as “The Sun”, qv in fig. 2.9. The name *Hilde-Brand* may also be a reference to the Slavic word *Kolyada* – another name of Christ, qv in our book entitled *King of the Slavs*.

---

**Comparison table**

for Hildebrand and Jesus Christ (Andronicus)

**b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus).** The alleged I century A.D. (the XII century in reality). Active in Jerusalem, or Czar-Grad.

1a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. The approximate date of Hildebrand’s birth is 1020 ([64], page 216) – the 12th year of the reign of Henry II the Holy, or Augustus, qv above – the emperor who is identified as none other but Octavian Augustus in the parallelism between the Roman Empire of the X-XIII century and the Second Roman Empire. Pope Octavian is another reflection of this character, qv below.

1b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). According to the Scaligerian chronology, Jesus Christ (Andronicus) was born on the 23rd reign year of Octavian Augustus in the Second Roman Empire (or the 27th year, according to another version – see [76]). The discrepancy between this date and the 12th year of Henry II the Holy equals a mere 5-10 years if we are to consider the 1053-year shift. We see a very good date correlation.

2a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. The death of Hildebrand in the alleged year 1085 ([196], Volume 4).

2b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). The death of Jesus Christ (Andronicus) in the alleged year 33 ([76]). We give a comparison of dates with the effects of the 1053 year shift taken into account. The latter can be expressed by the formula \( P = T + 1035 \). Thus, the death of Jesus Christ (Andronicus) in the alleged year 33 A.D. ([76]) occurs right in 1086, since 33 + 1053 = 1086. The death of both these characters occurs in the same year – 1085-1086 A.D. We must point out that Andronicus (Christ) was really crucified a century later, in 1185 (qv in our book entitled *King of the Slavs*).

3a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. Hildebrand arrives in Rome in 1049. This moment marks the beginning of his ecclesiastical reformist activity, and can therefore be considered the year of his making into the greatest reformer even seen in the ranks of the clergy ([196], Volume 4, page 57). Another important date in Hildebrand’s biography is 1053, qv below.

3b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). A 1053 shift forwards in time shall transpose the birth of Jesus Christ (Andronicus) to 1053 A.D. This date differs from 1049 A.D., the date of Hildebrand’s arrival to Rome, by a mere 4 years. The same shift moves the
date of Christ’s death (33 years later according to the Gospels) to 1086 A.D., whilst Hildebrand’s death is dated to 1085 A.D. We see that the discrepancy only equals one year. Therefore, *a 1053 year shift makes the principal dates virtually identical*. Let us point out that the main date related to Jesus Christ (Andronicus) is usually considered to be the date of his death (Crucifixion, or the Passions). The date of his birth was calculated somewhat later, with the date of the Crucifixion used as source information. It is said that a monk by the name of “Dionysius Exiguus” (Dionysius the Little) had first calculated the year of Christ’s death, and then subtracted 33 years to obtain the date of the Nativity according to the Gospels, qv above. Therefore the brilliant correlation between the dates of the Crucifixion and Hildebrand’s death with a shift of 1053 years is extremely important to us. We are led to the idea that the A.D. chronological scale only actually begins in the year referred to as 1053 A.D. nowadays. A deliberate or accidental 1053-year shift buried it under a load of many additional years. Thus, one gets the idea that, according to the erroneous mediaeval tradition, the “new era” had really been counted from the phantom year 1053 in modern chronology for some time. It was only in the XVI-XVII century that the phantom year 1053 “travelled backwards in time” as a result of another deliberate or accidental chronological shift of 1053 years. This is how “year zero” of the new era was calculated (with a 1100-year discrepancy).

4a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. 1053 is a famous date in global ecclesiastical history. The notorious schism between the Occident and the Orient, or the “ecclesial schism”, which exists to this day, took place in 1053 or 1054. This is considered to be the moment when a new epoch began for Western Europe ([196], Volume 4).

4b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). The “dawn of the new era” is the time the new church was born – the Christian (Evangelical) one. This “evangelical hue” of the epoch corresponds very well with the XI century “Evangelical Renaissance” if we are to consider the 1053-year shift. The crusades are of a particular interest to us since their ideological basis was defined by the Gospels.

5a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. Hildebrand is considered to have been “the son of a carpenter” ([196], Volume 4, page 139). Mediaeval chronicles give us a distinctly divine description of Hildebrand (Ablaze with Gold) as an infant: “there were flames of fire coming from his head” etc ([196],
Volume 4, page 179, comment 1). Chronicles mention no other pope who’d be the “son of a carpenter”. This is a characteristic as unique as its evangelical counterpart in the biography of Jesus.

■ 5b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). The Gospels tell us that Christ’s father had been a carpenter: “Is not this the carpenter’s son?” (Matthew 13:55). Mark calls Jesus himself a carpenter: “Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?” (Mark 6:3). The birth of Christ is described as an incarnation of God in the Gospels.

6a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. We didn’t manage to find any information about Hildebrand’s mother; however, his maternal uncle is supposed to have been the abbot of St. Mary’s monastery ([196], Volume 4, page 139). Moreover, Hildebrand is supposed to have lived in the monastery of St. Mary ([459], Volume 1, page 64). This may be a distorted reflection of the fact that Jesus had been the son of Mary. “Hildebrand’s biography” made Mary the mother disappear; however, a reference to living in St. Mary’s monastery has taken its place.

■ 6b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). The mother of Jesus was called Mary (Matthew 1:18) – thus, the name “accompanies” the birth of both characters in question. In figs. 2.5 and 2.6 we see some interesting mediaeval artwork – namely, a mediaeval relief depicting Our Lady with two long braids ([992], pages 20, 21 and 211). This is a XII-XIII century relief from the Liebfrauenkirche church in Halberstadt (Germany). “Likewise her close relation from Hildesheim, Our Lady of Halberstadt belongs to the well-known Romanesque iconographic type of Our Ladies with braids” ([992], page 23).
Fig. 2.5. A statue of Our Lady with two long braids. A relief from the Liebfrauenkirche church in Halberstadt, Germany. Taken from [992], page 20, ill. 15.

Fig. 2.6 Blessed Virgin Mary with braids. A fragment of the previous photograph. Taken from [992], pages 21 and 211.

7a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. The consensual opinion is that Hildebrand had been born in Italy ([196], Volume 4). There is a town
in Italy by the name of Palestrina – the name must date to XIV century or a later epoch, when the legends of Jesus Christ (Andronicus) (under the alias of Hildebrand) came to these parts. The evangelical Christ is said to have been active in Palestine (White Camp or Babylonian Camp?). Furthermore, ever since the XIII century the Catholic Church has been claiming that Archangel Gabriel came to Mary the Mother of Christ who had allegedly lived in the town of Loreto (or Loretto) in Italy ([444], page 198). Christ’s mother may have really lived in Italy – however, this legend is most probably a planted one and reflects the transposition of events that took place in the New Rome to the Italian Rome, founded rather recently (in the XIV century), an in urgent need of an “ancient history” at the time. An indirect proof of this can be found in the rather remarkable mediaeval tradition telling us that Mary’s house used to be in an altogether different place and was brought to Loreto later. This tradition is manifest in such works of art as the ancient painting by Cesare Nebbia (circa 1536-1614) and his apprentices, titled candidly and unequivocally “The Holy House of Our Lady Carried to Loreto” (The Geographical Card Gallery, Vatican – vaulting artwork detail). The picture shows angels carrying Mary’s house to Italy (fig. 2.8).

Fig. 2.7. “The Holy House of Our Lady Carried to Loreto” by Cesare Nebbia and apprentices, depicting angels carrying Mary’s house to Italy. This may be a reflection of the “paperwork migration” of Constantinople events to Rome in Italy during the epoch when the “ancient history” of this city was being created. Taken from [713], page 438, ill. 417.
7b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). “The angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, to a virgin... and the virgin’s name was Mary” (Luke 1:26-27). Let us remind the reader that Nazareth may well have the same meaning as the Turkish word Nazreti – “holy” ([1181]).

8a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. Hildebrand’s reforms were preceded by the endeavours of John Crescentius, qv above. Both were focussed on the same goal: the glorification of Rome and the foundation of a new church whose influence would spread across the entire Europe ([196], Volumes 3 and 4).

8b. Jesus Christ. Christ’s precursor is John the Baptist. Both of them have contributed to the creation of the new religion to some extent – see the comparison table for the biographies of Crescentius and John the Baptist above.

9a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. Hildebrand is the author of a radical ecclesiastical reform in the Middle Ages, as well as the organizer and supervisor of its implementation. He was a vehement antagonist of the old cult and its devotees ([196], Volume 4).
9b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). Jesus is the founder of a new religion that led to a radical reform in the old church. He had also opposed those who followed the Orthodox Judaic tradition. Some of the reforms implemented by Jesus and Hildebrand are very similar, qv below.

10a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. The well-known decree against simony, or the sale of ecclesial positions ([196], Volume 4.

10b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). Jesus banishing vendors from the temple. “And he went into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold therein, and them that bought” (Luke 19:45).

11a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. Hildebrand’s activity is allegedly confined to Rome for the most part, likewise that of his precursor John Crescentius ([196], Volume 4). We have already mentioned the identification of Rome as Jerusalem above – see Chron2, Chapter 1.

11b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). Christ preaches in the same geographical area as his predecessor John the Baptist – Jerusalem, Judea and Samaria. According to our reconstruction, the Jerusalem mentioned in the Gospels is really Czar-Grad on the Bosporus.

12a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. Hildebrand had “served” the church between 1049 (the year he first came to Rome) and 1085 (the year of his death – see [196], Volume 4). If we are to consider 1054, the year of the Great Schism, to have marked the beginning of his ministry, the correlation with the datings valid for Jesus (shifted by 1100 years) becomes ideal given the 1053-year shift, qv below.

12b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). Jesus had lived for 33 years – that is, between 0 and 33 A.D. in Scaligerian chronology ([76]). A 1053-year shift forward in time gives us the interval between 1053 and 1086 A.D. Theology differentiates between the two periods of Christ’s ministry: the first one starting from his birth and ending with his death, and the other covering the period between his 30th year and the Crucifixion.

13a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. Hildebrand initiated the ecclesial reform in 1049, when he had been 29 or 30 years
of age ([196], Volume 4). Let us remind the reader that he was born in the alleged year 1020 ([64], page 216).

13b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). Luke the Evangelist tells us that “Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age” (Luke 3:23). We see a perfect correlation with the “Hildebrand” dates.

14a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. Hildebrand was “born twice”: in 1020 de facto, with his initiation into priesthood occurring in either 1049 or 1053. This provides us with the following versions of his age: 32 or 36 as the age his ecclesial career began, or 65 years of actual age.

14b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). The Gospels also provide two versions of Christ’s age: 33 years and approaching 50. The former version is considered to have higher authority, qv above. The second is derived from St. John’s indication saying “Thou art not yet fifty years old” (John 8:57). A comparison with “Hildebrand” tells us that 33 years of Christ are very similar to “Hildebrand’s” 32, and “not yet fifty” may also refer to the age of 65.

15a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. The official beginning of Hildebrand’s reform and the ecclesiastical schism are usually dated to 1054 ([196], Volume 4). All of this is supposed to follow the death of the Roman emperor in 1039 by roughly 15 years – or in the 15th year of the autocracy of Henry III the Black in Rome. Let us remind the reader that he had been a co-ruler of Conrad II prior to that date, qv in Table 8, which is to be found in Chapter 6 of Chron1.

15b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). Christ’s reforms begin when he is 30 years of age (Luke 3:23) – right in the 15th year of the reign of Tiberius, the “Black Emperor” (see Table 8 in Chapter 6 of Chron1). Now, according to the Scaligerian chronology, Tiberius ascended the throne in 14 A.D. Thus, Christ’s 30th year falls exactly over the 15th year of Tiberius’ reign. Another important fact is that an independent dynastic superimposition of the Second Roman Empire over the Roman Empire of the X-XIII century identifies Tiberius as Henry the Black, no less! We see perfect date correlation for Christ and “Hildebrand”.

16a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. Roman chronicles dated to the XI century nowadays contain numerous references to a well-
known ally of Hildebrand – Countess Matilda, whose influence and finances had always been ready at hand whenever support was called for. She is said to have owned half of Italy [1]. All of her estate was at Hildebrand’s disposal ([196], Volume 4, pages 148 and 192.

16b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). The Gospels tell us a lot about the woman who had accompanied Jesus Christ (Andronicus) constantly – Mary Magdalene, the repentant sinner. She is always found by his side ready to support him: “and certain women… Mary, called Magdalene… and many others, which ministered unto him of their substance” (Luke 8:2-3).

17a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. We learn that Countess Matilda’s name is spelt MATHILDA ([196], Volume 4, page 180, comment 12. A slightly distorted reading could make this name sound like “Madgilda” (MDGLD without vocalizations), or “Magdalene”.

17b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). The name of Christ’s ally is Magdalene. MGDLN without vocalizations, which corresponds well with the MDGLD version offered above.

18a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. F. Gregorovius tells us there were no findings of coins from the Papal Rome that can be dated to the period between 984 A.D. and Leo IX (mid-XI century). F. Gregorovius points out specifically that “it is all the more surprising that not a single coin from the period of Gregory VII was to be found anywhere” ([196], Volume 4, page 74, comment 41). We shouldn’t be surprised - as we’re beginning to understand, there has never been any pope by the name of Hildebrand, since he is a mere reflection of the XII century figure of Jesus Christ (Andronicus). Hence the absence of “Pope Hildebrand’s” coins – no one ever minted them.

18b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). We learn that there are mediaeval coins with Jesus Christ (Andronicus) bearing respective inscriptions. One of them can be seen in fig. 2.9. Jesus Christ (Andronicus) has a halo around his head, and the reverse of the coins says “Jesus Christ (Andronicus) Basileus” (King). The coin is presumed to have been minted under John I Tsimisces (taken from [578], Volume 1, page 177, ill. 153). In fig. 2.10 we can see another such coin ([684], table 21). As V. M. Potin points our, images of Christ are “characteristic for mediaeval coins”. In this case we see Jesus Christ (Andronicus) at the bottom, and two mediaeval rulers on top of the
flip side. They are allegedly Leo VI and Constantine VII, and their portraits on the coin are those of “Christ’s legates” who had received their power from him.
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**Fig. 2.9** A mediaeval coin depicting Jesus Christ (with the words “Jesus Christ Basileus” on the flip side). Taken from [578], Volume 1, page 177, ill. 153.

![Image of coins depicting Jesus Christ](image2.png)

**Fig. 2.10** A mediaeval coin depicting Jesus Christ. Taken from [684], table 21.

19a. **Hildebrand.** XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. Hildebrand comes to Rome in 1049 with the party of Leo IX, which can be considered the beginning of “Hildebrand’s ministry” ([196], Volume 4). He was about 30 years of age at the time. Commentators compare this advent of the reformer-to-be to an apostolic advent, or the Evangelical “entry into Jerusalem”. According to Gregorovius, “in February 1049 the new pope [Leo IX – A. F.] arrived in Rome and proceeded along the streets barefoot, reading prayers in humility, accompanied by a very modest entourage. A sight as uncommon as this couldn’t fail to leave the Romans completely flabbergasted. It seemed as though an apostle… had entered the city… no aristocrat was seen in his party – this bishop came as a simple pilgrim who knocked on the doors of the Romans asking them whether they desired to accept him in the name of Christ… But one of his satellites had such spiritual power that its beacon had shone a great deal brighter than that of any royalty… it was Hildebrand” ([196], Volume 4, page 57).

19b. **Jesus Christ (Andronicus).** The entry of Jesus and his disciples into Jerusalem is the beginning of “Christ’s ministry”. He was about 30 at the time (Luke 3:23). As Jesus was entering Jerusalem, “many spread their garments in the way: and
others cut off branches off the trees, and strawed them in the way... And Jesus entered into Jerusalem” (Mark 11:8 and 11:11).

20a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. At the peak of the reforms, a certain Cencius tries to assassinate Hildebrand in 1075. We thus see an attempt to assassinate “Hildebrand” ([196], Volume 4, page 155).

■ 20b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). A plot against Christ is organized in Jerusalem by Judas Iscariot, one of the apostles. The plot results in the arrest of Jesus and his subsequent crucifixion.

21a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. Roman chronicles of the XI century refer to Cencius with the utmost scorn and distaste ([196], Volume 4, pages 126-127). According to Gregorovius, “the chronicles of the time [the ones dated to the XI century nowadays, if we are to be more precise – A.D.] portray Cencius as... a godless robber and philanderer... this unflattering characteristic of the head of Cadalus’ party might well be the furthest thing from exaggeration” ([196], Volume 4, pages 126-127).

■ 21b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). The Gospels characterize Judas in a very negative manner, and his name transformed into a negative denominative in the entire Christian tradition.

22a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. Cencius had initially participated in Hildebrand’s reformist activities, and been in a close bond with Hildebrand’s party ([196], Volume 4, page 126). Stefan, the father of Cencius, had been a Roman prefect and maintained good relationships with the allies of “Hildebrand” the reformist. Moreover, Cencius belonged to the family of Crescentii ([196], Volume 4) – that is, the same family as John the Baptist – the precursor of Christ, whose identification with the “Roman” John Crescentius is related above in detail.

■ 22b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). Judas was related to Jesus in the most direct manner possible, having been his disciple – one of the twelve Apostles.

23b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). A short while later, Judas betrays his teacher and joins the ranks of those in Jerusalem who are dissatisfied by the reforms of Jesus. Judas makes a deal with the high priests, or “Pharisees”.

24a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. The alleged chronicles of Rome relate further actions from the part of Cencius as a betrayal of Hildebrand. Cencius is portrayed as a detestable ingrate – as early as around the beginning of 1075 Cencius was plotting against Hildebrand. The plot had proved a failure, and the city prefect launched a process against Cencius – however, the latter had received the unexpected support of Hildebrand himself, likewise Countess Matilda (MDGLD). Only the protection of the great reformist had secured Cencius’ freedom ([196], Volume 4, page 155).

24b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). The Gospels describe the actions of the former Apostle Judas as a betrayal of Jesus and his cause. Judas treats Jesus with the utmost ingratitude, hence the numerous negative connotations of the name that is used as a denominative nowadays.

25a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. “For the meantime, he [Cencius – A. F.] was plotting his revenge. Seeing that a severance of relations between the Pope [Hildebrand – A. F.] and Henry was inevitable, Cencius had thought up a plan to dethrone Pope Gregory. He had made Henry [the emperor – A. F.] an offer on behalf of the Romans to seize Rome, promising to capture Gregory and hand him over to Henry as a captive” ([196], Volume 4, page 155).

25b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). “Then one of the twelve, called Judas Iscariot, went unto the chief priests, and said unto them, What will ye give me, and I will deliver him unto you?” (Matthew 26:14-16). “And he went his way, and communed with the chief priests and the captains, how he might betray him unto them” (Luke 22:4). See also (Mark 14:10-11).

26a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. “The scene that took place on Christmas Day in 1075 is one of the most gruesome episodes in the entire history of mediaeval Rome. On Christmas eve the Pope [Hildebrand – A. F.] had been preparing to say mass in the subterranean church of S. Maria Maggiore; suddenly, there were cries and weapon noises all over; the church was invaded by Cencius, who brandished a sword in his hands, surrounded by aristocratic intrigants”
26b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). “And immediately, while he [Jesus – A. F.] yet spake [bear in mind that Jesus was reading a sermon to his disciples, or saying mass in a way – A. F.], cometh Judas, one of the twelve, and with him a great multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders” (Mark 14:43). Let us re-emphasize that, likewise Hildebrand, Jesus was giving orders to his disciples when the enemy came.

27a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. “Having seized the bruised and battered Pope [Hildebrand – A. F.] by the locks, Cencius dragged him out of the church, heaved him onto a horse and hurried to his castle through the dormant streets of Rome” ([196], Volume 4, page 155). All of this happens at night.

27b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). “And they laid their hands on him, and took him (Mark 14:46). “And some began to spit on him, and to cover his face, and to buffet him, and to say unto him, Prophesy: and the servants did strike him with the palms of their hands” (Mark 14:65). All of the above also takes place at night.

28a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. “The whole city was immediately agitated – bells rang out in alarm, people grabbed their weapons, and priests locked up their altars in horror” ([196], Volume 4, pages 155-156). However, there is no direct military conflict. Hildebrand forgives Cencius (likewise Jesus who is supposed to have “forgiven” Judas the betrayal).

28b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). “When they which were about him saw what would follow, they said unto him, Lord, shall we smite with the sword? And one of them smote the servant of the high priest, and cut off his right ear. And Jesus answered and said, Suffer ye this far.” (Luke 22:49-51). There is no armed conflict.

29a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. “Roman” chronicles tell us nothing about either the trial of Hildebrand or his “crucifixion” ([196], Volume 4). Recently, in 2004, we discovered ancient data clearly demonstrating that at the end of Hildebrand’s “biography” one can find vivid Evangelical scenarios pertaining to the Crucifixion of 1185 A.D. We shall relate this in detail in our subsequent publications.

29b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). The Gospels describe the trial and crucifixion
of Jesus (his so-called Passions). The parallelism breaks out of synch here.

30a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. The following is told about the fate of Cencius the betrayer: “In his attempts to catch Gregory unawares, this vengeful Roman kept thinking up new plots until his sudden death in Pavia” ([196], Volume 4, page 170).

30b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). The following is said about Judas: “And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed, and went and hanged himself” (Matthew 27:5).

31a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. The second most important leader of the reformist (or Evangelical) movement of Hildebrand is the well-known Peter Damiani, Hildebrand’s right hand. He was born in 1007 and “had the reputation of an extraordinarily gifted individual” ([196], Volume 4, page 84). As we already understand, this Peter is most probably a reflection of Peter the Apostle, the closest ally of Jesus. Peter Damiani became head of the hermit army in the XI century - these hermits were just about as influential as Peter – their influence “was a mystery in what concerned the strength of its manifestation – they weren’t equalled by anyone in this respect, with the possible exception of the Old Testament prophets” ([196], Volume 4, pages 84-85).

This mystery is but a side effect of the Scaligerian chronology that transferred the Evangelical boom into the I century A.D. from the XII. F. Gregorovius proceeds to tell us that “Damiani had been the very heart of this church [the church of Hildebrand, that is – A. F.]” ([196], Volume 4, pages 88-89). Damiani’s banner was immediately picked up by Peter the Stylite: “he became a folk hero, a prophet of sorts – someone who received his authority of a crusade leader from Christ himself” ([196], Volume 4).

These two Peters are the only well-known characters in the XI century Rome bearing that name. They may have been reflected in the collective evangelical character by the name of “Peter Simon the Apostle”. The names Simon and Damian may have been interchangeable.

31b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). Peter Simon is considered the main figure among the apostles of Christ – he is called the founder of the new Roman church. The Papal throne is still referred to as the Throne of St. Peter. According to the official
formula, Peter had been the keystone of the Catholic Church.

32a. Hildebrand. XI century Rome, possibly the XII century Czar-Grad. According to some mediaeval Russian chronicles, Russia was baptized by Andrew the Apostle, an actual disciple of Jesus Christ (Andronicus) ([208], pages 121-122). At the same time, according to the Scaligerian-Romanovian chronology, Russia was baptised in late X – early XI century, that is, allegedly a thousand years later than Christ had lived. More details concerning the fact that Andrew the Apostle is really yet another reflection of the XII century Emperor Andronicus can be found in our book entitled King of the Slavs.

32b. Jesus Christ (Andronicus). One of the apostles of Jesus was called Andrew (Mark 1:16). As well as the other apostles, he had walked the Earth preaching the doctrine of Jesus. The Scaligerian chronology places him in the I century. How could he have baptized Russia in the XI century?

Commentary. The Scaligerian-Romanovian version tells us about Andrew the Apostle and his baptism of Russia in the X-XI century A.D., which contradicts the same Scaligerian dating of Andrew’s lifetime (I century A.D.). However, this baptism corresponds to our new chronology and the year 1053 (considering the 1153-year shift) perfectly. Indeed, when we transpose the evangelical events from the phantom I century into the real XII century, everything falls into place. We begin to understand why the “evangelical boom” falls on the XII-XIII century, as well as “the heyday of baptisms”. It becomes perfectly clear that Russia didn’t have to wait a whole millennium so that it could “finally” get baptized – the baptism followed the naissance of the new religion in the XII century almost immediately. The legend about Andrew the Apostle baptizing Russia also begins to make sense. By the way, the Scaligerian-Romanovian history shall doubtlessly assure us that the legend of Andrew the Apostle baptizing Russia is a “later addition” to the famous Povest Vremennyh Let ([208], page 121). Nevertheless, in the XVI century John IV the Terrible, being unaware of the Scaligerian chronology, which was introduced after his death, “used to point out that the Russians were baptized by Andrew the Apostle himself, and didn’t import Christianity from Greece. That was the very same thing that Hieromonk Arseniy Soukhanov, the emissary in Greece… had told the Greeks a century later” ([208], page 121).

Mind that a 720-year chronological shift backwards in time (its value equalling the subtraction residual of the two primary shifts: 720 = 1053 – 333) superimposes
Hildebrand over a well-known Christian saint – Basil the Great (or “The Great King” in translation). The year 1053 is shifted backwards and transforms into the year 333 A.D., since 1053 – 720 = 333. This happens to be precisely the year Basil the Great was born according to the Scaligerian chronology.

This fact instantly explains the vivid and explicit parallelism between Jesus Christ (Andronicus) and Basil the Great that was already pointed out by N. A. Morozov in [544], Volume 1. Thus, the XII century Jesus (Andronicus) became reflected in history twice – as “Pope Hildebrand” and St. Basil the Great.

As we have already mentioned, the hagiographies of St. Basil the Great devote plenty of attention to his conflict with the Roman emperor Valens “the Unholy” – the double of the Evangelical King Herod. In the alleged IV century A.D. St. Basil the Great “instilled horror into Valens” and broke his spirit in a way. We see another “secular trace” of this scenario in the alleged XI century – the well-known opposition between “Pope Hildebrand” and the Roman Emperor Henry. We are referring to the well-known scene that took place in Canossa in 1077 A.D., when Hildebrand had humiliated Henry.

We have to bear in mind that when the struggle against the secular authorities had reached its apogee in the alleged XI century, “Pope” Gregory had excommunicated Emperor Henry. “The clerical excommunication that Gregory sentenced the most powerful Christian monarch to had left the entire world amazed. Not a single excommunication that preceded it had ever made such a tremendous impact” ([196], Volume 4, page 162). Henry had to beg for absolution on his knees. “The poor king had to stand in front of the inner gate of the castle begging to open it, dressed in the clothes of a repentant sinner” ([196], Volume 4, page 168. “This bloodless victory of the coenobite [Hildebrand – A. F.] is more wonderful than all the victories of Alexander the Great” ([196], Volume 4, page 167). Henry would eventually revenge himself and his humiliation upon Gregory.

On fig. 2.11 we can see a mediaeval picture of “the scene in Canossa” which was painted in the alleged year 1114. Emperor Henry IV kneels before Margravess Matilda ([304], Volume 2, pages 184-185).
6.4. The Bethlehem Star of the alleged I century and the famous supernova explosion of circa 1150 (subsequently shifted to 1054 by the chronologists)

Let us turn to some fascinating astronomical data that prove our reconstruction according to which Jesus Christ (Andronicus) had lived in the XII century A.D. In our book entitled King of the Slavs we demonstrate that the famous supernova explosion dated to 1054 nowadays really took part a century later, in circa 1150, and became reflected in the Gospels as the Star of Bethlehem.

We shall proceed to cite the list of Scaligerian datings pertaining to the so-called nova and supernova flashes as reflected in “ancient” chronicles. The list was compiled by M. Zamaletdinov according to [978] and [703]. Let us emphasize that the list in question is a complete collection of all the flashes whose veracity isn’t doubted.

The datings are as follows: the alleged years 2296 B.C., 2241 B.C., 185 A.D., 393, 902, 1006, 1054, 1184 and 1230 A.D. followed by several XVI century flashes, qv in Kepler’s list. We shall point out the flash of 11 November 1572 that was mentioned by
Tycho Brahe – the so-called “Tychonian Supernova” ([395], pages 124-125). This list is usually complemented by the so-called “Christian Supernova”, or the famous Star of Bethlehem as described in the Gospels and allegedly dating to the I century A.D. This flash marked the birth of Jesus Christ (Andronicus). The Oriental Magi were asking: “Where is he that is born King of the Jews? For we have seen his star in the East… Then Herod, when he had privily called the wise men, enquired of them diligently what time the star appeared… and, lo, the star which they saw in the east, went before them… when they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding great joy” (Matthew 2:2, 2:7, 2:9-10). In fig. 2.12 we see a mediaeval picture of the Star of Bethlehem from the book by S. Lubienietski ([1257]).

Amongst the scientists who delved into the research of the astronomical environment as it had been in the I century A.D. was, amongst others, the eminent astronomer J. Kepler. The same “Star of the Magi” enjoyed a great deal of attention from the part of the chronologist Ludwig Ideler ([426], pages 128-129).

Let us now try a different approach to the issue. As we are beginning to understand, the list of nova and supernova flashes can (and must) contain duplicates. In other words, the number of flashes observed wasn’t that great – however, they were “multiplied” when some of the chronicles had to “travel backwards in time”. Let us compare the nova flash dates for the Second Roman Empire and the Roman Empire of the X-XIII century (see table below).

![A mediaeval picture of the Evangelical “Star of Bethlehem” from the Historia universalis omnium Cometarum by Stanislaw Lubienietski ([1257]). Taken from [543], page 13, ill. 4.](image-url)
The nova flash dates
for the Second Roman Empire and
the Roman Empire of the X-XIII century

1. Middle Ages (Roman Empire of the X-XIII century A.D.)
   ■ 2b. “Antiquity” (The Second Roman Empire of the I-III century A.D.)

1a. We give a complete list of all nova and supernova flashes reflected in the
documents of the X-XIII century empire epoch:

   1. The flash of 1006 A.D.
   2. The famous flash of 1054.
   3. The flash of 1184.
   4. The flash of 1230.

1b. Below find a complete list of all nova and supernova flashes reflected in the
documents of the Second Empire (the alleged I-III century A.D.):

   1. ?
   2. The evangelical flash of 1 A.D.
   3. ?
   4. The famous flash of 185 A.D.

Commentary. As we have already seen, a chronological shift of 1053 years leads to the
mutual superimposition of the events that took place in the Second Roman Empire over
those of the Holy Roman Empire that existed in the alleged X-XIII century, identifying
them as each other’s duplicates. It would be interesting to find out whether a shift of
1053 years should give a superimposition of star flash dates, or phantom reflections of
the flashes that were observed in the X-XIII century Roman Empire. The answer
happens to be in the positive (see fig. 2.13).

2a. The flash of the alleged year 1054 A.D.
   ■ 2b. The flash of the alleged year 1 A.D.

Commentary. The dates of these flashes correlate ideally if we’re to consider the
1053-year shift.
3a. The flash of 1054 was visible “in the eastern sky”, according to mediaeval chronicles. Quoting by [703].

■ 3b. The flash of 1 A.D. was visible “in the East”, according to the Gospels (Matthew 2:2 and 2:9). Concurs well with the data presented on the left.

4a. The flash of 1230.

■ 4b. The flash of 185.

**Commentary.** These flashes get superimposed over each other if we’re to consider a 1053-year shift, the difference being a mere 8 years.

5a. The flash of 1230 lasted for 6 months ([703]).

■ 5b. The flash of 185 lasted for 7 months ([703] and [978]).

**Commentary.** Thus, we discover that the entire list of flashes with their characteristics as given for the Second Roman Empire is derived from several flashes observed in the Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century shifted 1053 years backwards in time. Thus, half of mediaeval flashes observed in this epoch drifted backwards in time and ended up in the “antiquity” instead of the Middle Ages (see fig. 2.13)

![Nova and supernova flash chronology](image)

Fig. 2.13 Nova and supernova flash chronology according to the Scaligerian chronology. It is plainly visible that a 1053-year shift shall identify the Evangelical Star of Bethlehem as the famous supernova explosion dated to 1054 A.D., by the modern historians, for instance. The real explosion took place in mid-XII century, around 1152 A.D. It was subsequently misdated to 1053 A.D. by the mediaeval chronologists who were of the opinion that Christ wasn’t born in 1152 A.D., but rather 1052 A.D. (qv in our book entitled *King of the Slavs*. The Nativity date was then shifted by an additional 1000 years, transforming into 1 A.D. Taken from [395], [703] and [978].
The famous supernova flash of 1054 was observed in the Taurus constellation (The Great Soviet Encyclopaedia, 3rd edition, Volume 23, page 53). “A most amazing example of what supernova explosion remnants may look like is the Crab nebula which is located where the Chinese and Japanese chronicles reported a bright supernova explosion in 1054” (GSE).

6b. The famous flash – the Star of Bethlehem that could be observed when Jesus Christ (Andronicus) was born (Matthew 2). Representations of this star can often be found in Christian iconography, as well as mediaeval art and literature in general. Many chronologists tried to date the Nativity with the aid of this outstanding and scarce astronomical phenomenon, but to no avail, since they were looking for the star in the wrong century; as for the XI – there hardly is any point in looking for it here, it is known quite well already. In reality, this flash took place a century later, around 1150, qv above. Mediaeval chronologists have first misdated it to the XI century instead of the XII, and then aggravated the error, dating it to the I century A.D.

We have demonstrated the parallelism between the “biographies” of Jesus Christ (Andronicus) from the XII century and “Pope Gregory Hildebrand” from the XI. Let us reiterate that Italian Rome had apparently not been founded yet, and the events known as “Roman” nowadays really took place in the New Rome on the Bosporus, or Constantinople. Later on, when Byzantine events migrated westwards (on paper), Jesus Christ (Andronicus), who had preached in the New Rome in the XII century A.D. and suffered there, became reflected in Italian history as “Pope Hildebrand”.

Corollary. Jesus Christ, also known as the Byzantine emperor Andronicus who had lived in the XII century A.D., became reflected in the Scaligerian version of Roman history as “Pope Hildebrand” from the alleged XI century.

6.5. The Crucifixion of Jesus on Mount Beykos, or the evangelical Golgotha, which is located outside Constantinople, near the shore of the Bosporus

Where did the events described in the Gospels really take place? Let us point out a very interesting and important fact directly related to this issue.

The Turkish historian Jalal Assad in his book entitled Constantinople ([240]) tells us
that right outside Constantinople, on the Asian coast of Bosporus straits, one finds “the tallest hill of the Upper Bosporus. On top of this hill (180 metres above the sea level) there is the grave of Joshua son of Nun, or Ioushah” ([240], page 76).

However, according to our reconstruction, Joshua son of Nun is merely another name of Jesus Christ (Andronicus), qv below; one can thus suggest that this tallest hill of the Upper Bosporus might really be the famous Golgotha where they crucified Christ.

Since we doubt that all of our readers have heard or read about the “grave of Joshua son of Nun”, we shall tell its story in brief. Jalal Assad, the famous Muslim author of the XIX century tells us that “if one is to follow the Asian coast of the Bosporus, one comes to a small bunder by the name of Sutluge, which is where the path to the tallest hill of the Upper Bosporus. On top of this hill (180 metres above the sea level) there is the grave of Joshua son of Nun, or Ioushah… There are many different superstitions concerning this gigantic grave, which is four metres long and half a metre wide. According to one opinion, this used to be the bed of Heracles; some others deem this to be the grave of Amycus killed by Polydeuces [Polydes, or Pilates? – A. F.]. Muslims believe this to be the grave of Joshua, son of Nun. Many travel there… in hope of curing their ills.

One sees some Byzantine ruins on the top of this hill – possibly the ruins of the Church of St. Pantaleimon, as well as a holy spring… in the Byzantine epoch this place was called the Bed of Heracles… the renowned village of Beykos is located at the foot of this hill; this is where the Argonauts came to replenish their supply of food, and also the place where king Amycus was killed” ([240], pages 76-77).

Our reconstruction is as follows. Mount Beykos is most probably the famous Christian Golgotha. The “murder of king Amycus” at the foot of the hill would thus become identified as the crucifixion upon the Golgotha. The church, whose ruins we see on the hill, is none other but the famous Church of Resurrection that had been built on top of the Golgotha, according to the ecclesial tradition. It is well understood why the Argonauts – or, as we already understand, the crusaders – had to stop at this particular location.

This “grave” exists until the present day, and is considered a holy place. Locals call it the grave of saint Jushah, or Ioushah. That may well mean Jesus. What we see here nowadays is a flat 17 by 2 metre field. The graves of his kin are of a regular size and can be found all around this gigantic “sepulchre”. The plan of the “grave of Jesus” in its modern condition can be seen in fig. 2.14; one can also find the legends of St. Ioushah in [1181].
However, this account of ours is far from being exhaustive. Near the grave of St. Ioushah, or Jesus, one finds three more gigantic graves about 7 or 8 metres long. One of them is the grave of Kirklar Sultan, and it is concealed within a mausoleum of sorts, unlike the other two burial grounds, which one finds out in the open – the graves of the holy Uzun Elviya Leblebici Baba and Akbaba Sultan.

Apart from that, as some Beykos locals had told the author in 1995, there are 5 or 6 more of similar gigantic graves of saints on the other (European) side of the Bosporus. Could these “graves” be real or symbolic sepulchres of some of the Apostles of Jesus? We still know nothing of where most of them had been buried, after all.

So, could this “grave of St. Ioushah”, or Joshua, be the place where Jesus was crucified and the place where the Holy Sepulchre stood – the one sought by the crusaders?

It may be for some reason that “the main street of Constantinople led from the Forum of Arcadius and the first wall of the city to the Golden Gate, presently Isa-Kapusu, or the Gate of Jesus” ([240], page 67; see fig. 2.15). Could this be an indication that the evangelical events really took place in the New Rome? See more on the subject in Chron5 and Chron6.
In *Chron6* we analyze the description of Daniel’s voyage to the Golgotha in the Middle Ages. As we point out, in Daniel’s rendition the place is closer to “the scene of the events” than to a real grave of Jesus. He calls in the “spot of the Crucifixion”. Therefore, what we can find on Mount Beykos is a monument that tells us Jesus was crucified on *this very spot* – possibly rebuilt; its survival is truly a mystery. The exceptional size of the grave is also easily explained by the fact that the fenced area doesn’t surround the actual grave, but rather the place where the events took place. In this case, the 17 by 2 metre size is easily understood.

Our conception of evangelical events really taking place in the New Rome = Czar-Grad = Constantinople is confirmed by the established mediaeval tradition of painting the evangelical Jerusalem as a city with Ottoman crescents. In fig. 2.16, for instance, we see a mediaeval painting of Christ entering Jerusalem ([745], Volume 7, page 339 – The Aprakos Gospel, 1693). We see the city of Jerusalem in the background, with a distinct *Ottoman crescent* topping one of the spires, qv in fig. 2.17.
Fig. 2.16 Jesus Christ enters Jerusalem. One can clearly see the Ottoman crescent on the spire at the background. Taken from [745], Volume 7, page 339. A 1693 Aprakos Evangelium. BAS archive #339, page 568, reverse.
In fig. 2.18 we see a mediaeval picture of Pilate’s trial of Jesus ([745], Volume 7, page 356 – The Aprakos Gospel, 1693). We see a turban with an Ottoman crescent on Pilate’s head.
We shall keep coming across the fact that a crescent with a star used to be the ancient symbol of Czar-Grad, or Constantinople. It is possible that it symbolized the Moon, which had obscured the Sun in the year of the crucifixion, together with the Star of Bethlehem that had flared up around 1150 and was misdated to 1054 by later chronologists. The crescent could symbolize the moon, or, alternatively, partially obscured solar disc during the eclipse.

Let us mention another fact that is of interest to us. In figs. 2.20 ([745], Volume 7, page 155) and 2.21 ([745], Volume 8, page 326) we see two mediaeval pictures of the evangelical Jerusalem (the Aprakos Gospel, 1693). We see tall chimneys over the rooftops. This implies the existence of furnaces in the evangelical Jerusalem – most probably heaters used to keep houses warm, which doesn’t quite concur with the Scaligerian version that tells us Jerusalem was situated on the territory of modern Palestine, which is tropical enough to render heating unnecessary – however, it does occasionally snow in Istanbul, and it can get rather cold. At any case, smoke from chimneys indicates the evangelical Jerusalem to have been situated somewhat further to
the north than the Scaligerian version insists.

Fig. 2.20 A mediaeval illustration with a view of the Evangelical Jerusalem. The city has tall chimneys installed for heating purposes. Taken from [745], Volume 7, page 155. A 1693 Aprakos Evangelium. BAS archive # 339, page 241.
Let us conclude with a peculiar detail. Apparently, the true XII century dating of the Crucifixion had been recorded in various literary sources, which were later declared apocryphal and remained such for a considerable amount of time. In particular, the legend of Andrew the Apostle baptizing Russia near the end of the alleged X century (the XII century in reality) could be related to the recent Crucifixion. This tradition was reflected in the famous novel *Master and Margarita* by M. A. Bulgakov, who had
studied various apocryphal tales of Christ, which he had incorporated into his work. The fact that we are about to relate was pointed out to us by our readers, and it fits well into our reconstruction. The last 32nd chapter of Bulgakov’s novel entitled “Forgiveness and Eternal Abode” mentions Boland leaving Moscow accompanied by his entourage and paying a visit to the Roman Procurator of Judea Pontius Pilate, who was serving his penance as a hermit perched upon a rock in a desolate land; Margarita expressed her amazement at the long term of this amercement in the following words: “Isn’t twelve thousand moons for a single moon a little too much?” The events are supposed to take place in the late 1930’s – the novel itself was finished in 1940.

Moons have been well known to stand for the so-called lunar or synodal months, which have passed since a certain event. Such a month equals 29.5 calendar days ([797], page 792). However, in this case we find 12,000 moons counted backwards from 1940 to equal 970.8 years and give us 969 A.D. as the approximate dating of the Crucifixion. If we are to think that a “moon” really equals a stellar lunar month equalling 27.3 calendar days ([797], page 792), this date shall be 1043 A.D. One way or another, the tradition which was voiced by M. A. Bulgakov in a somewhat clandestine manner indicates the Crucifixion to have occurred in either the X or XI century. This mediaeval tradition is some 100-150 years off the mark, since it indicates the phantom XI-century dating instead of the real XII-century one. This circumstance proves nothing per se, but becomes understandable enough if we are to consider some of the facts that are known to us.
7.
Identifying Livy’s “ancient imperial Rome” as the Third Roman Empire after a 1053-year shift

In the preceding paragraphs we have given brief descriptions of several dynastic parallelisms that emerge from the “Scaligerian History Textbook”, which are really the manifestations of the chronological shifts with values equalling 333, 1230 and 1053 years. We shall carry on with our discussion of the 1053-year shift. We shall relate this method of restoring the correct datings in more detail below – a brief version can be found in Chapter 6 of Chron1.

Let us regard the history of “ancient” and mediaeval Rome. The parallelism that we are about to relate covers 1300 years, no less. It serves to “identify” the mediaeval Rome as its “ancient” double. We learn that one has to move the “ancient” dating of Rome’s foundation (around the alleged year 753 A.D.) forwards in time by 1053 years, which transposes it to approximately 300 A.D. This is how the 1053-year shift manifests itself; bear in mind that the hypothesis about Diocletian, who is supposed to have ruled in the alleged years 284-305 A.D., was already suggested by N. A. Morozov in [544]. However, this hypothesis had proved erroneous. Our hypothesis shows that this millenarian shift forward in time is far from sufficient. We shall have to move it even closer to our age – by a further 1000-1050 years. Therefore, the true dating of the foundation of Rome in Italy shall fall on the XIV century A.D. See Chron6 for more details. However, we aren’t concerned with this shift at the moment – let us just concentrate on the very first step, which is interesting by itself and deserves to be covered separately.

So as not to bind ourselves by any additional hypotheses, we shall be formal enough in the demonstration of the parallelism that we have discovered. We shall simply superimpose Livy’s ab urbe condita date (counted off the alleged foundation of Rome in Italy) over 300 A.D. (instead of the 753 B.C. dating prevalent in Scaligerian history). We shall then proceed forwards along the chronology of events as reflected in “ancient” and mediaeval sources, comparing them to one another with the aid of the same universal chronological formula that we shall abbreviate to \( T = X + 300 \). \( X \) stands for the ab urbe condita dating according to Titus Livy and other “ancient” sources, whereas \( T \) represents the Scaligerian A.D. dating. We thus suggest considering the date of
Rome’s foundation to be 300 A.D. This “uniform rigid formula” was discovered when we were processing form-codes and compiling the global chronological map.

In other words, the formula that we transcribe as $T = X + 300$ is a somewhat different representation of the same chronological shift of 1053 years.

It is extremely important that the superimposition of the “ancient” Roman history over its mediaeval original as suggested by this formula is confirmed by the discovered parallelism of compared events. That is, “ancient” and mediaeval Roman events that the “Scaligerian textbook” separates by a period of about 1053 years turn out to be extremely similar to each other. A more formal way of putting it would be to say that these events possess extremely similar form-codes; this ongoing parallelism turns out to cover a very long time interval very methodically – an interval of 1300 years, to be precise.

A) According to the $T + X + 300$ formula, all 244 years of Livy’s “Ancient Royal Rome” ([482]), or the First Roman Empire in our terminology, become identified as the interval that covers the alleged years 300-552 A.D. – that of the Third Roman Empire in the West.

B) The seven kings described by Titus Livy ([482]) are really a collection of generalized aliases, or terms used for referring to the seven consecutive epochs of the Third Roman Empire. We find out that every such epoch is represented in Livy’s work by a biography or two from the imperial history of the Third Empire. As we find out, Livy concentrates on these emperors and hardly mentions any other rulers from the epoch in question, either ignoring or being ignorant of them.

C) We learn that the form-codes of the First and the Third Roman Empire demonstrate a very obvious parallelism.

We shall present the seven epochs (Livy’s “kings”) below, also providing their “translations” into the terms of the Third Roman Empire, qv in figs. 2.24 and 2.25. See the discussion of dates and reign durations for the emperors of the Third Roman Empire in *Chron2*, Chapter 1.
Fig. 2.24 The parallelism between the “ancient” First Roman Empire (Regal Rome as described by Titus Livy) and the “ancient” Third Roman Empire.

Fig. 2.25 A superimposition of the “ancient” First Roman Empire and the “ancient” Third Roman Empire with a rigid shift of roughly 1050 years.

1a. Romulus Quirin: the alleged years 300-337 A.D. after a shift of 1053 years.
   ■ 1b. Constantine I the Great.

2a. Numa Pompilius: the alleged years 380-423 A.D. after a shift of 1053 years.
   ■ 2b. St. Basil the Great, or the Great King (since Basil = Basileus, or simply “King”).

3a. Tullus Hostilius: the alleged years 380-423 A.D. after a 1053-year shift.
   ■ 3b. Valentinian II + Honorius. Alternatively, we can take Theodosius I – the co-ruler of Valentinian.
■ 4b. Aetius.

5a. Tarquin the Ancient: the alleged years 444-476 A.D. after a 1053-year shift.
■ 5b. Valentinian III + Recimer.

6a. Servius Tullius: the alleged years 476-526 A.D. after a 1053-year shift.
■ 6b. Odoacer + Theodoric.

7a. Tarquin the Proud: the alleged years 526-552 A.D. after a 1053-year shift.
■ 7b. The royal Gothic dynasty: from Amalasuntha to Teia.

The comparison of reign durations with the numbers indicated by Titus Livy ([482], Book 1) shall give us the following: 37-37, 43-43, 32-43, 24-21, 38-32, 44-50 and 25-26. A calculation of proximity coefficients gives us 10–4. Let us compare the general duration of the “Regal Rome” epoch as described by Livy with the length of the Third Empire period that we are considering presently (300-552 A.D.). This duration equals 252 or 246 years if we are to begin counting from the first reign year of the first Emperor – Constantine I the Great. Livy indicates the duration of 244 years. Thus, the two durations – 244 according to Livy and 252 – differ from 246 by a mere 3%.

One cannot fail to notice that the special attention received from the part of Livy by some of the epochs we discovered correlates quite unequivocally with their division into intervals bordering on periods of great civil unrest. We have already considered these intervals in our comparison of the Second Empire with the Third. If we are to calculate the amount of years covered by the abovementioned emperors of the Third Empire in the epoch of 300-552, we shall get the duration of 242 years as a result! Titus Livy reckons the period to equal 244 years. The reign duration correlation is virtually ideal. We see that Livy had simply summed up the reign durations of the Third Empire’s rulers that we mention.

Let us now cite a brief table of this biographical parallelism, only pointing out its most important moments. See more details concerning the rulers of the Third Roman Empire as well as the kings of Israel and Judea above – in Chapter 1 of Chron2. We use the letter “a” to denote Livy’s “Regal Rome”, or the First Empire; “b” stands for the Third Roman Empire, and “c” – for the Biblical Israelite reign and the Kingdom of Judea.
1a. The First Roman Empire. The epoch of Romulus Quirin according to Livy.

1b. The Third Roman Empire. The alleged years 300-337 A.D. The main representative of the epoch is Constantine I the Great: the alleged years 306-337 A.D.

1c. Israel and Judea. The epoch of Jeroboam I and Rehoboam.

1.1a. The First Empire. Livy tells us that the founder of Rome was called Romulus ([482], Book 1:7, page 11). Eutropius the historian also writes that “having founded Rome, the city that he had named after himself, Romulus proceeded to do the following…” ([269], page 8). Thus, the capital is named after its founder: RM = RML sans vocalizations. Apart from that, Romulus had a brother by the name of Remus, whose name is virtually identical to the word “Rome”. We shall also mark that there were no other capital foundations in the history of the Regal Rome after Remus.

1.1b. The Third Empire. Constantine I founds the new capital that he calls New Rome (allegedly moving it to that site from elsewhere). This city is supposed to have been called Constantinople in the Middle Ages. Here we see another case of a capital named after its founder (Constantine). It is very noteworthy that mediaeval chronicles actually mention the parallelism between Constantine the Great and the “ancient” Romulus, calling the Temple of Constantine I in Rome the Temple of Romulus ([196]). See more details above in Chron1, Chapter 7. There were no other capitals founded in the Third Empire (300-552) after Constantine.

1.1c. Israel-Judea. Jeroboam I, the double of Constantine I, moves the capital of the state to the town of Sichem and thus becomes the founder of a new capital, qv above, in Chapter 1 of Chron2. No other capitals were founded in the Kingdom of Israel after Jeroboam I.

1.2a. The First Empire. Romulus rules jointly with his brother Remus ([482], Book 1:6-7). Romulus kills Remus subsequently ([482], Book 1:6-7, page 11). After the murder of Remus, Romulus remains the single head of state ([482]). Mark that the non-vocalized versions of the names of the two founders, Romulus and Remus, are rather similar: RML and RM.

1.2b. The Third Empire. Constantine I rules together with Licinius. Soon Constantine I makes Licinius suffer bitter defeat at Hellespont, and the Licinius is killed during his battle with Constantine the Great. After the death of Licinius
Constantine remains the sole ruler of the state, qv in *Chron2*, Chapter 1. The names of Constantine and Licinius bear no semblance to each other.

1.2c. *Israel-Judea*. Jeroboam I rules together with Rehoboam. They had been at war basically all the time of their joint rule, qv in *Chron2*, Chapter 1. Unvocalized names of Jeroboam and Rehoboam, the finders of the kingdoms of the Israelite and Judea are virtually the same: RBM and RBM.

1.3a. *First Empire*. The notorious “rape of the Sabines” happens under Romulus (the Romans were short of wives, and are thus forced to abduct women from a neighbouring tribe). This event occurs in the epoch of Rome’s foundation.

1.3b. *Third Empire*. We find no such event in the Third Empire.

1.3c. *Israel-Judea*. Right before the beginning of the Israelite reign the Bible contains the well-known legend of “the rape of the daughters of Shiloh (Judges 21:21-25). This event is perfectly analogous to the Roman “rape of the Sabine women”. The sons of Benjamin also had a shortage of wives; then this tribe of Israel carried off the women of another tribe. A more detailed comparison of the Biblical description of this event with the Roman shall be given below.

1.4a. *First Empire*. Romulus Quirin was deified alive ([482], Book 1:16). One should remember that “quirin” translates as “divine” ([544]). Quirin was rapt up into heaven when he died. Livy tells us “everybody praises Romulus as a divine entity and a son of a deity [sic! – A. F., King and Founder of Rome; he is often addressed in prayers” ([482], Book 1:16, page 27). This point of view is manifestly Christian and evangelical – suffice to remember Christ rapt into heaven, qv in the Gospels.

1.4b. *Third Empire*. Constantine the Great was also proclaimed divine while alive (see *Chron2*, Chapter 1). Christian church ranks him among its saints. Arianism, the Christian analogy of “Jeroboam’s heresy”, flowers in his lifetime, qv above. St. Basil the Great was born around 333 A.D., near the end of Constantine’s life (who is supposed to have died in 337 – see [544], Volume 1. Legends about him are virtually identical to what we know about Jesus Christ ([544], Volume 1). Therefore, the “phantom biographies” of St. Basil the Great and Constantine I cast an evangelical glow over each other.

1.4c. *Israel-Judea*. The Biblical “double entry” system (see *Chron1*, Annex 6.4) of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel allows us to estimate that the Judaic king Asa, the double of St. Basil the Great, began his reign two years before the rule of
Jeroboam I had ended. In other words, when Jeroboam I, the double of Romulus and Constantine I, was nearing death. Therefore, the Bible also tells us Asa (Jesus?) had lived in the epoch of the first “great king” Jeroboam I.

1.5a. First Empire. Sometime after his ascension into heaven, Romulus “comes down to Earth all of a sudden” ([482], Books 1:16 and 26) and appears before a Roman by the name of Proculus Julius. Romulus pronounces a hortation before his disciples, and then returns to heaven. Livy tells us that “he had uttered those words and ascended into the heavens” ([482], Book 1:16, page 27).

- 1.5b. Third Empire. No ascension into heavens is mentioned in St. Basil’s “biography”.
- 1.5c. Israel-Judea. Gospels tell us about Jesus returning to Earth after the Crucifixion. “After these things [the ascension, that is – A. F.] Jesus shewed himself again to the disciples” (John 21:1). Jesus, who has returned to Earth, converses with his disciples, and ascends into heavens again, this time for good. “And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven” (Luke 24:51).

Commentary. Thus, we see that the legends placed at the end of the biography of Romulus by Titus Livy are of an evangelical nature, and may contain references to both Jesus and Constantine the Great. Let us now give a more detailed comparison of the two stories: Livy’s, which tells us about the rape of the Sabines, and the Biblical legend of the daughters of Shiloh.

1.6a. First Empire. The events take place in the recently founded city of Rome, in the reign of King Romulus, the epoch of Regal Rome’s naissance (according to Livy), or the very beginning of the First Roman Empire in our terminology. There was a shortage of women in Rome, which had made the prospects of progeny and procreation look grim ([482], Volume 1, pages 15-16).

- 1.6c. Israel-Judea. The event precedes the formation of the Israelite Kingdom immediately: “In those days there was no king in Israel” (Judges 21:35). The tribe of Benjamin lost its women in a war, and was thus on the brink on extinction (Judges 21:16-25).

1.7a. First Empire. Romulus sends delegations to neighbouring tribes and asks
those to send some of their women to Rome ([482], Book 1). The ambassadors face a hostile reception; none of the nations in the vicinity of Rome concede to provide the Romans with wives ([482], Book 1).

■■ 1.7c. Israel-Judea. The Bible tells us that all the tribe’s elders had gathered together in order to decide what to do about wives for the tribe of Benjamin, having asked other tribes of Israel for help (Judges 21). Their pleas didn’t lead anywhere: “Then the elders of the congregation said… we may not give them wives of our daughters: for the children of Israel have sworn, saying, Cursed be he that giveth a wife to Benjamin” (Judges 21:16, 21:18).

1.8a. First Empire. The Romans proceeded to organize festivities and invite the inhabitants of nearby settlements together with their wives and children. Livy writes that “the entire Sabine tribe came together with their wives and their offspring” ([482], Volume 1, Book 1:9, page 16). The ulterior motivation behind the feast had been the abduction of women. There may be a proximity pattern between the unvocalized “Sabine” and “Benjamin” – SBN and BNMN without vocalizations, respectively.

■■ 1.8c. Israel-Judea. According to the Bible, “there is a feast of the Lord in Shiloh yearly… Therefore they commanded the children of Benjamin, saying, Go and lie in wait in the vineyards… and, behold, if the daughters of Shiloh come out to dance in dances… catch you every man his wife of the daughters of Shiloh” (Judges 21:19-21).

1.9a. First Empire. In the middle of the celebrations the Romans seize foreign women and abduct them. This is how they obtained wives and secured a legacy, and this is also the beginning of how the Romans began to dwell in their new City ([482], Book 1:9). According to Livy, the Rape of the Sabines took place in Italy ([482], Book 1). Furthermore, Livy is of the opinion that the founders of Rome were the offspring of the Trojans who had initially disembarked at Sicily after having fled Troy, which was destroyed by the Greeks ([482], Book 1:1, pages 3-4). Therefore, the founders of Rome could be referred to as “the sons of Sicily” or “Sicilians”. We should also bear in mind that the “ancient” authors Hellanicus and Damastes claimed Rome to have been founded by Odysseus and Aeneas ([579], page 23).

■■ 1.9c. Israel-Judea. The Bible tells us that “the sons of Benjamin did so, and took them wives, according to their number, of them that danced, whom they caught:
and they went and returned unto their inheritance, and repaired the cities, and dwelt in them” (Judges 21:23). N. A. Morozov suggests that it might be possible to identify the Biblical tribes as the mediæval European nations in [544]; his localization of said tribes differs from the Scaligerian to a large extent. The “sons of Benjamin” thus became identified as the inhabitants of Italy and Sicily; is it therefore possible that the “daughters of Shiloh” were really the “daughters of Sicily”.

2a. The First Roman Empire. The epoch of Numa Pompilius according to Livy. It is possible that “Pompilius” conceals the name of Julian or Elias and that Livy is really referring to Julian the Great.

2b. The Third Roman Empire. The epoch of the alleged years 337-380 A.D. The absolute protagonist of this epoch is St. Basil the Great, or the Great King (the alleged years 333-378). This happens in the reign of the Roman emperor Julian who allegedly reigned in 361-363. A biographical parallelism between Julian and St. Basil can be found in [544].

2c. The Bible. Here we have Asa, king of Judah (Jesus?) As we have already mentioned, he appears to be the double of Basil the Great. See more about the superimposition of the Kingdom of Judah over the Third Roman Empire in the East in Chron1, Chapter 6.

2.1a. First Empire. Livy characterizes Numa Pompilius as a just and pious ruler, and tells us that “Numa… was a man most experienced in laws secular as well as ecclesial” ([482], Book 1:18, pages 30-31). Numa became enthroned in Rome as a result of divine intervention from the part of Jupiter ([482], Book 1:18). Titus Livy relates Numa’s affairs of the state at length; all of them appear to be of a conspicuously ecclesiastical character ([482], Book 1).

2.1b. Third Empire. St. Basil the Great (or the Great King) is considered to be one of the central figures in Christian hagiography. He is said to have instigated the modern procedure of officiation – the so-called “Liturgy of St. Basil the Great”. As we already pointed out above, Basil is very likely to be a double of Jesus Christ who had lived in the XII century. Legends of Basil the Great usually mention his ecclesiastical activities and their impact on the history of the Third Empire.

2.1c. Israel-Judea. Jesus Christ is sent to Earth by the Allmighty Father with a mission of ministration. The Gospels are focused on Christ’s religious activities primarily; the tales of “Pope” Gregory VII Hildebrand (one of the XI century
reflections of the XII-century Jesus) are all of a similar nature.

2.2a. First Empire. Numa Pompilius manages to implement a major calendar reform. He divides the year into 12 months, having also introduced intermediate months so as to make the calendar conform to climatic changes and the solar year ([482], Book 1:19). What this reform resembles the most is the introduction of the Julian calendar with its leap year system. According to Livy, “it was he who had made the distinction between days when there was service, and those when there was none” ([482], Book 1:19). This may be a reference to the Sundays introduced into the week. “The death of Numa led to an interregnum” ([482], Book 1, page 36). It is peculiar that Livy tells us nothing of Numa’s death. The reason may be that Livy had already assigned these details (including the “ascension into heaven” to the final period of Romulus’ reign.

■ 2.2b. Third Empire. Scaligerian history is of the opinion that the Julian calendar was introduced by Julius Caesar in the alleged I century B.C., or at the very dawn of the Second Roman Empire. However, due to the parallelism between the Second Empire and the Third, the introduction of the Julian calendar falls onto the epoch of Constance I Chlorus, the double of Julius Caesar – the alleged years 305-306 A.D. This date is close to the epoch of the alleged years 333-378 – the “reign” of St. Basil the Great. We should also keep in mind the partial superimposition of Julian Caesar (the alleged years 361-363) over Julius Caesar. The death of Basil the Great in the alleged year 378 led to a period of interregnum – there was an upheaval that year, qv in Chron2, Chapter 1. What we see is a parallelism between the events contemporary to Numa as described by Livy, and the ones that were happening at the foundation of the Third Empire. We shall emphasize that none of these events could have happened before the XII century A.D., according to the global chronological map as presented in Chapter 6 of Chron1.

3a. The First Roman Empire. The epoch of Tullus Hostilius according to Livy.

■ 3b. The Third Roman Empire. The epoch of the alleged years 380-423 A.D. Valentinian II (378-392) or Theodosius I (379-395) and Honorius (395-423).

3.1a. First Empire. The beginning of Tullus’ reign is marked by a series of wars with the Alvanoi ([482], Book 1:23, page 37). The Alvanoi attack the Roman region with a great number of troops. Tullus launches a campaign against the “perfidious”
Alvanoi ([482], Book 1:23). The Alvanoi are then united by the dictator Mettius Fufetius ([482], Book 1:23, page 37).

3.1b. Third Empire. The parallelism between the Third Empire and the Second tells us that the double of Theodosius I in the Second Empire is Emperor Domitian. At the very beginning of his reign, Theodosius (Domician) enters his first large-scale military conflict with the “Albanians”. We learn that “the Roman provinces of the Balkan peninsula were under threat of invasion” ([327], page 314). The Albanians (or Dacians) rebelled. Under Theodosius I the Albanian Goths did likewise. The Dacian Goths unite under the leadership of Decebel. “Decebel”, or “Dacibel” might be derived from “Dacians” and the word “bellum”, or war.

3.2a. First Empire. The “ancient” Alvanoi soon sign a truce with Tullus ([482], Book 1:24-25, page 40). However, they break the pact soon enough, initiating a second war with Rome, which leads to a defeat of the Alvanoi ([482], Book 1:29-30, page 50).

3.2b. Third Empire. The Albanians, or the Dacian Goths, negotiate a truce with Theodosius-Domitian (under Valentinian II, qv in [327], page 444). A short while later, the Albanians (Dacians-Goths) denounce the truce, and another war with Rome begins under Honorius. This time the famous Alaric comes from the Balkans ([767], Volume 2, page 793).

3.3a. First Empire. Towards the end of Tullus’ reign – under Honorius, if we’re to bear the parallelism in mind, or in the alleged years 395-423 A.D. – “one would often observe stones hailing from the skies near the Alvanoi Mount… people were sent to study this miracle… indeed, there were rocks falling from the sky… they heard a terrifying voice from the grove that stood on top of the mountain that ordered the Alvanoi to occupy themselves with holy ceremonies… impressed by this miracle, the Romans themselves made sacrifices for nine days in a row” ([482], Book 1:31, pages 52-53). According to the Scaligerian version of the story, the Alvanoi Mountain is in Italy. Apparently, Livy refers to a volcanic eruption that took place somewhere upon that peninsula. There is indeed a volcano here, a single one on the mainland – the Vesuvius.

3.3b. Third Empire. One of the famous eruptions of the Vesuvius took place in the alleged year 79 A.D. The parallelism between the Second Empire and the Third places this eruption into the epoch of Honorius (395-423), making it cover the
interval between the alleged years 409 and 420 A.D. – most probably in 412 A.D. Vesuvius is the famous volcano in Italy that is located near Rome. This powerful eruption had led the town of Pompeii to an untimely demise. If we’re to count 79 years forwards starting from 333 A.D., or the “date of birth” of Basil the Great, the double of Jesus Christ (also known as the beginning of the “new era”), we shall come up with the year 412, or the very end of the epoch of king Tullus, according to Titus Livy. It is however necessary to state it explicitly that the eruptions of the alleged years 79 or 412 are really phantom reflections of a later eruption of Vesuvius. It is possible that the archetypal eruption had been the one that occurred in 1138-1139 A.D. The chronological shift here equals exactly 1053 years. However, the real prototype of the “Pompeian eruption” must have been the more recent eruption of the Vesuvius dating to either 1500 or even 1631, qv below.

4a. The First Roman Empire. The epoch of “Ancus Marcius” (according to Livy).

4b. The Third Roman Empire. The epoch of the alleged years 423-444 A.D. Aetius.

4.1a. First Empire. After King Tullus, the Roman throne is succeeded by Ancus Marcius ([482]). However, a short while later a certain Lucumon appears in Rome, who soon changes his name to L. Tarquin the Ancient, alias Tarquin Priscus ([269], page 9). He is reckoned to have been of “an Etruscan origin” ([269], page 319). Also see Livy, Book 1:34 Tarquin began to gather great influence in Rome ([482], Book 1:34, pages 58-59). One has to point out that the name of Ancus Marcius might be close to the name Aetius.

4.1b. Third Empire. Aetius becomes the de facto ruler in the West of the Third empire between the years of 423 and 444, qv in Chron2, Chapter 1. However, the balance of powers in Rome slowly but steadily shifts in favour of the young Valentinian III, who had been in custody of Aetius ([767], Volume 2; also [64]).

4.2a. First Empire. L. Tarquin the Ancient subsequently becomes king of the “ancient” Rome and succeeds Ancus Marcius on the throne, having successfully shifted the power balance in his own favour ([482], Book 1). We see two characters here: the Roman Ancus Marcius, and L. Tarquin the Ancient – an alien or a “barbarian”, since he came from another country far away ([482], Book 1:34).

4.2b. Third Empire. Valentinian III subsequently becomes the Emperor of Rome
and seizes power. He eventually pushes his custodian Aetius away from the throne. What we see here is another pair of political leaders whose destinies are twined: the first one is Aetius, a “barbarian by birth” ([64], pages 33 and 40). He came to Rome from a distant land. The other character is the Roman Valentinian III. When we compare this with Livy’s description, we notice that in this particular manifestation of the parallelism the terms “Roman” and “barbarian” are obviously swapped.

4.3a. First Empire. L. Tarquin the Ancient had been accompanied by his wife Tanaquil, “a patrician by birth” ([482], Book 1:34, page 59). She had a great influence on L. Tarquin the Ancient. Tanaquil was very eager to seize power in Rome, and kept impelling her husband to engage in this activity. Livy tells us that “his pride was constantly fuelled by his wife Tanaquil… who would not allow the position of her husband to be any lower than that of her own family” ([482], Book 1:34, page 59).

4.3b. Third Empire. We observe the same thing to happen in the Third Empire. Next to Valentinian III we see his mother and official custodian Placidia, who had herself been under the influence of Aetius. Placidia is the Emperor’s mother, her family is therefore aristocratic by definition, as Livy duly notes when he describes her as “Tanaquil”.

4.4a. First Empire. According to Livy, “he [L. Tarquin the Ancient – A. F.] soon transformed his acquaintance with the king into a strong friendship… being his advisor at meetings social as well as private, civil as well as military” ([482], Book 1:34, page 60). Also: “Tried and tested in every which way, he [L. Tarquin the Ancient – A. F.] even became… the custodian of the King’s children” ([482], Book 1:34, page 60).

4.4b. Third Empire. It is natural that the relationship between the young Valentinian III and his custodian Aetius had initially been very much like a family bond; Livy is correct to call him the custodian of the royal offspring since Valentinian III is the son of Placidia. Historians tell us that “until Valentinian III had reached the age of 27 years (in 444), no one ever doubted the right of Aetius to rule the state” ([64], page 35). If we are to compare this version with Livy’s, we shall see that the custodian and the child in custody have swapped places.

4.5a. First Empire. The very fact of such “custody” is unique for the history of the
“Regal Rome”. No other ruler of the First Roman Empire is characterized in this manner (according to Livy). Ancus Marcius had ruled for 24 years ([482]). This concurs perfectly with the Biblical information about his double, qv below.

■ 4.5b. Third Empire. The custody in question as described above is a unique occurrence in the history of the Third Roman Empire. No other emperor of the Third Empire is described in this manner – that is, no one had ever been in custody of his mother and her powerful ally. Aetius had reigned for 21 years, qv in Chron2, Chapter 1. However, the Bible actually reports a 24-year interregnum that falls on this epoch, qv in Chron2, Chapter 1, and the “double entry” system as related in Annex 6.4 to Chron1. In other words, the lengths of this period according to the Bible and Titus Livy coincide! We are beginning to understand that Titus Livy had been more familiar with the Biblical version of Rome’s history that its secular variety, and shall soon encounter more evidence to prove this.

4.6a. First Empire. Livy tells us that “at home as well as on the battlefield he [L. Tarquin the Ancient – A. F.] was accompanied by an experienced mentor, the king Ancus himself… and so he had studied Roman law and… had been emulous of everyone… including the king [sic! – A. F.]” ([482], Book 1:35, page 61).

■ 4.6b. Third Empire. Valentinian III continues to push Aetius aside, formally remaining in his custody. As Valentinian III grows older, the influence of Aetius diminishes.

4.7a. First Empire. L. Tarquin the Ancient finally seizes power in Rome. He addresses the Romans with a request [?] to elect him king instead of Ancus Marcius. Livy tells us that “the people voted in favour of vesting him with royal authority. This man… was pursued by the very same ambition when he came to the throne as had led him in his contest for the kingdom” ([482], Book 1:35, page 61).

■ 4.7b. Third Empire. Valentinian III finally seizes full power. In the alleged year 444 Aetius loses the last shreds of his influence after a series of military defeats. Valentinian III casts away the burden of custody ([64]). All of this happens while Aetius, or the “experienced mentor” (according to Livy) is still alive.

4.8a. First Empire. Titus Livy tells us nothing of how Ancus Marcius had lost his regal power. According to Livy, L. Tarquin the Ancient becomes emperor in a peaceful manner, with the consent of the people. For some reason, Livy tells us
nothing about the death of Ancus Marcius ([482]). Eutropius the historian tells us that Ancus Marcius had “expired of a disease on the 24th year of his rule” ([269], page 8).

4.8b. Third Empire. Valentinian III gets full power after a very peaceful procedure. There was no coup in 444, the year when the power of Aetius the custodian was no more. Having seized power, Valentinian III soon kills Aetius in Ravenna with his own hands ([579]). As we can see, Livy remained silent about this for some reason.

Commentary. It is supposed that Livy localizes all these events in Italy. On the other hand, when we begin to compare them to the ones that took place in the Third Roman Empire, we begin to find out that other chronicles reckon some of these events at least to have happened in the New Rome on the Bosporus, moving them to the East. This may be the aftermath of some confusion, or a deliberate distortion of history, when a lot of occurrences had migrated from Constantinople to Rome in Italy on paper.

5a. The First Roman Empire. The epoch of “Tarquin the Ancient” according to Livy.

5b. The Third Roman Empire. The epoch of the alleged years 444-476 A.D. Valentinian III (444-455) and Recimer (456-472).

5c. The Bible. Menahem + Pekahiah = Pekah, acting as a double of Recimer here, qv in Chron2, Chapter 1.

5.1a. First Empire. Tarquin the Ancient fights just one war with the Sabines, but it’s a hard and bloody one. The war progresses unevenly and ends in a truce ([482], Book 1).

5.1b. Third Empire. Valentinian III fights a single war with the notorious Attila the Hun, which proves a long and hard one. Success favours both parties erratically; finally, Rome signs a pact of peace with Attila, paying him a large tribute, qv in Chron2, Chapter 1.

5.1c. Israel-Judea. The Biblical double of Valentinian III, Menahem, has just one war to fight with the king Phul or Thul, but this war is long and violent. Peace comes when Menahem pays tribute to Phul or Thul – as we have already pointed out, this barbaric king is most probably a double of Attila the Hun.
5.2a. First Empire. The end of the epoch of “Tarquin the Ancient” is abundant in political turmoil, as Livy tells us. Power struggle flares up in Rome; Tarquin the Ancient is assassinated in a conspiracy ([482], Book 1:40, pages 67-68).

5.2b. Third Empire. In the Third Empire the end of this epoch (the alleged years 444-476) coincides with the reign of Recimer (456-472). This is one of the largest upheavals in the Third Empire. We see more power struggle, a series of temporary emperors on the throne shuffled by Recimer. After the death of Recimer (the alleged years 472-475), the Empire is shaken by a civil war, qv in Chron2, Chapter 1.

5.2c. Israel-Judea. According to the Bible, this epoch ends with Pekah. “And Hoshea the son of Elah made a conspiracy against Pekah the son of Remaliah, and smote him, and slew him” (II Kings 15:30). Once again we see Livy’s version to be closer to the Biblical version that to secular Roman history.

6a. The First Roman Empire. The epoch of “Servius Tullius” according to Livy.


6.1a. First Empire. Mark the name of this ancient king, which is “Servius”. It obviously resembles the name Severus, which we are about to encounter in the history of the Third Empire. Livy describes Servius Tullius as a very level-headed, intelligent and steadfast politician ([482]).

6.1b. Third Empire. The name of Odoacer’s double in the Second Empire is Septimus Severus, whose name is somewhat similar to that of Servius. Both Odoacer and Theodoric are known to have been prudent rulers, unlike the emperors of the preceding anarchical period. A propos, Severus (Servius?) had a co-ruler by the name of Geta in the Second Empire (209-212). In the Third Empire king Theodoric is a Goth. Geta and Goth sound very similar.

7a. The First Roman Empire. The epoch of “Tarquin the Great” according to Livy.

7b. The Third Roman Empire. The epoch of the alleged years 526-552 A.D. Gothic dynasty.

The parallelism between these two last epochs that we have discovered is an extremely vivid and obvious one, and it is of great enough importance for our analysis of the consensual global chronology to make us allocate a separate section for its discussion, qv below.
For the meantime, let us answer a question that one cannot evade under these circumstances. Which part of Livy’s book describes events with parallels in the Third Roman Empire? In other words, how much of the information related by Livy remains unperturbed by all of the superimpositions listed above? In terms of form-codes, this question can be formulated as follows: what is the volume of section AK-34? See Chron1, Chapter 5.

Let us point out that Livy’s texts consist primarily of isolated short stories. Each of those relates a single episode. Livy hardly ever returns to past episodes; ergo, the value of $X = A/B$ is relatively easy to calculate, $A$ being the volume (in pages, for instance) of the stories that contain parallelisms with the Third Empire, and $B$ – the general volume of the fragment of Livy’s History that we have been comparing to the Third Empire. We calculated the $X$ value, which turned out to equal 67 per cent. In other words, 67% of Livy’s text that describes the Regal Rome happens to be isomorphic with the history of the Third Empire. It is possible that we have failed to discover all of the parallels. Apart from that, it is possible that the events related in the remaining 33% of Livy’s text weren’t reflected in any other mediaeval chronicles that our conception of the Third Roman Empire relies upon.

On fig 2.26 one sees a page from Livy’s Ab urbe condita allegedly dating from the XV century ([1229], page 29). The illustrations look distinctly mediaeval, as well as the book in general. In the top left corner we see a battle between the “ancient” Romans, or the characters described by Titus Livy. All of them look like typical mediaeval knights in heavy armour and helmets with visors. Several mediaeval Christian coats of arms can be seen nearby, qv on the right and at the bottom. Historians are trying to convince us that mediaeval painters included these coats of arms into books with the sole objective of pandering to the tastes of their clients. However, these mediaeval coats of arms most probably reflect mediaeval reality – just like the pictures of mediaeval Roman knights found in the books of the mediaeval author Titus Livy.
Fig. 2.26 A page from an edition of Titus Livy’s *Ab urbe condita* dating to the alleged XV century. “Ancient” Romans are portrayed as mediaeval knights; the pages of the book are all covered with mediaeval coats of arms – possibly belonging to the participants of the events described by Livy or their contemporaries. Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Arch. Cap. S. Pietro, page 132, fol. 65v. Taken from [1229], page 29.
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