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

George Santayana,
American philosopher
(1863-1952)

Be wary of mathematiciens, particularly when they speak the truth.

St. Augustine

History repeats itself; that’s one of the things that’s wrong with history.

Clarence Darrow

Who controls the past controls the future. Who controls the present controls the past.

George Orwell, 1984
More in re the identification of Yaroslavl as the historical Novgorod the Great

In the previous books we relate our concept of the historical Novgorod the Great as mentioned in the Russian chronicles identifiable as the old Russian city of Yaroslavl and not the modern Novgorod-upon-Volkhov.

1.1. River Volga and River Volkhov

The modern city of Novgorod is situated upon River Volkhov. The name of the river is indeed mentioned in some of the chronicles alongside references to Novgorod the Great. However, one must enquire about whether or not the above can be regarded as proof of the fact that the city of Novgorod the Great from the chronicles really identifies as the modern Novgorod-upon-Volkhov.

The answer turns out to be in the negative. The chronicle references to Volkhov do not contradict the identification of Novgorod the Great as Yaroslavl. The name Volkhov turns out to be another version of the name Volga, which is the river that flows through the city of Yaroslavl to date.

Apparently, the “paper migration” of Yaroslavl (Novgorod) from the banks of the Volga to the West implemented by the politically aware historians resulted in the duplication of Volga’s name, which had transformed into Volkhov. The town of Novgorod on Volkhov became identified as the historical Novgorod the Great in the early XVII century the latest. The implication is that every chronicle that mentions Novgorod the Great, or Yaroslavl, as a city that stands on the banks of River Volkhov, was edited in the XVII century the earliest. This corollary concurs with our general observation that the available editions of the Russian chronicles appear to date from the XVII-XVIII century, and not
any earlier, as related above.

A propos, let us pay attention to the simple fact, which is however of great utility to the researcher. The word Volga had once translated as “water” or “watery,” and one can still recognize the respective Russian words (vlaga and vlazhniy). Another related word has always been typical for the Volga dialect and sounds even closer to the actual name of the river – volgliy, which translates as “wet” or “humid.” This word can be found in the dictionaries of Dahl ([223] and Fasmer [866]). In general, we can find its cousins in pretty much every Slavonic language ([866]).

Therefore, one should expect quite a few rivers to be named in a way that resembles the word vlaga, water. Fasmer cites the following examples: River Vlha, a tributary of Laba, Wilga, a tributary of Wisla, the same old Volkhov in the Pskov region, etc. (see [866]).

1.2. Excerpts from the history of Yaroslavl

As early as in the XVII century Yaroslavl had been the second largest city in Russia, only surpassed by Moscow in terms of population ([408], page 7).

By the way, the third largest city in Russia (after Moscow and Yaroslavl) had been Kostroma, which locates right next to Yaroslavl ([438], page 97). Bear in mind that, according to our reconstruction, Kostroma (known as the famous Khoresm in the Arabic sources) had been part of the conglomeration called Lord Novgorod the Great; thus, the two neighbouring cities, Kostroma and Yaroslavl, had been the largest Russian cities of the XVII century, with the exception of the capital.

Yaroslavl’s fortifications had consisted of a mighty citadel, known as the Kremlin, just like its larger namesake in Moscow ([408], page 122). Its disposition had been perfect: “The steep and tall banks of the Volga and Korostlya and a deep crevice in the north naturally transformed this triangle into a fortified island” ([408], pages 2-3; see fig. 14.1). The perimeter defence had been quite formidable, amounting to 20 battle towers.
Fig. 14.1. A XIX century watercolour with a view of the tall hill standing at the junction of the rivers Volga and Kotorosl, which is where the Yaroslavl Citadel had stood (destroyed in the Novgorod pogrom). According to our reconstruction, it can be identified as “Yaroslav’s Court of Novgorod the Great.” In the foreground we can see one of the surviving towers which had once been part of the mighty fortifications of Novgorod the Great, or Yaroslavl. Fragment of the watercolour of G. P. Sabaneyev entitled “A View over Yaroslavl as Seen from Tveritsy.” Reproduced in accordance with [996], pages 186-187.

This is the site of an ancient settlement. The Great Prince Yaroslav the Wise (the same historical personality as Ivan Kalita, or Caliph, according to our reconstruction) had then founded a city here, naming it after himself. Yaroslav himself is quite correctly referred to as the Great Prince of Rostov (and not Kiev) in the chronicles of Yaroslavl ([408]).

One must point our that the entire history of Yaroslavl up until the XVII century is shrouded by an impenetrable veil of darkness in the Romanovian and Millerian version of history. This should come as no surprise to us, since, according to our reconstruction, the entire ancient history of Yaroslavl had been artificially removed from its proper chronological and geographical context and transplanted to the marshy soil of the Pskov region, which is where we find River Volkhov and the town known as Novgorod nowadays.

Yaroslavl rather suddenly emerges from the obscurity of the XVI century as a large fortified city, second only to the capital of the country in
size. Its citadel had 24 towers upon a dam. Most of the towers were demolished in the XVIII – early XIX century ([408], page 123). Nevertheless, the few lucky survivors give us some idea of just how powerful the defence line of Yaroslavl had been in that faraway epoch.

Among the latter we find the gate towers named Volzhskaya, Znamenskaya and Ouglichskaya. The Znamenskaya Tower is truly gigantic – its size can compete the very towers of the Kremlin in the capital (see fig. 14.2). The size of the Yaroslavl towers demonstrates the facts that the city had possessed a defence line that could easily place the ancient Yaroslavl in the same category as the most heavily fortified Russian cities – Moscow, Kolomna, Nizhniy Novgorod and Kazan. All of this is to be expected from “Novgorod the Great,” an ancient Russian capital.

Fig. 14.2. The Vlassyevskaya, or Znamenskaya tower that had formerly been part of Yaroslavl’s sturdy fortifications, destroyed in the Novgorod pogrom (according to our reconstruction). A view from the west. Modern photograph. Reproduced in accordance with [996], page 73. In the left corner of the Znamenskaya Tower one can clearly see the remnants of a brick wall, which had once stood adjacent to the tower. The wall was destroyed – there is nothing left but uneven marks.

The famous “Czar’s Site” in the Ouspenskiy Cathedral of the Kremlin in Moscow must be emulating a similar spot in Yaroslavl, which exist until the present day. In fig. 14.3 one sees a photograph of the royal “Patriarch’s Site” in Yaroslavl, and in fig. 14.4 – one of the “Czar’s Site” in the
Ouspenskiy Cathedral of the Muscovite Kremlin. The similarity of the two is quite obvious.

Fig. 14.3. The main cathedral of Yaroslavl had special daises for the Czar and the Patriarch, likewise the Ouspenskiy Cathedral in Moscow. Nowadays they are kept in the Church of Ilya the Prophet in Yaroslavl. These daises are shown in the photograph. Reproduced in accordance with [996], pages 140-141.
The Romanovian viewpoint should make it rather odd that there should be no surviving military fortifications that would not undergo a complete renovation in the XVII century, despite the fact that many of the old churches and monasteries have remained intact ([408]). What could possibly be the matter here? Could the ancient residents of Yaroslavl have built monastery walls to last much longer than military fortifications?

The above is likely to be explained by our reconstruction, which identifies Yaroslavl as the historical Novgorod the Great. All the fortifications of the latter had been demolished during the very same “Novgorod pogrom” as mentioned above.

If we delve further into the history of the fortifications around Yaroslavl, we shall be confronted by an even greater number of oddities. See for yourselves. We are told that the sturdy fortifications that had protected Yaroslavl up until the XVII century were made of wood, which had led to their presumed incineration in 1658 ([408], page 123). The walls
and the towers have allegedly perished in flames.

The blaze is said to have been followed by reconstruction works – the oddest kind imaginable. The three gigantic stone towers of Rubleniy Fort and all of the 16 towers that had constituted the Zemlyanoy Fort were all rebuilt in stone. However, the walls have never been rebuilt! ([408], page 123; see figs. 14.5 and 14.6). It suffices to reflect for a moment in order to understand the futility of such a “reconstruction” – towers without walls can hardly be regarded as a fortification at all, since anyone can make their way past the towers – they need walls to be of any use for defence. Why would one build nineteen enormous towers and then stop and cease the restoration of the fortifications one and for all, which is the version modern historians insist on?

Fig. 14.5. The city of Yaroslavl in the early XVIII century. The painting is kept in the History Museum of Yaroslavl. The city fortifications leave one with an odd impression – we see many large towers of stone (several rows of them), but not a single wall anywhere! We are being told that the inhabitants of Yaroslavl had planted towers everywhere, intending to build walls later but never quite managing to. According to our reconstruction, the powerful military fortifications of Yaroslavl, including the walls, were demolished at the end of the XVI century during the “Novgorod pogrom.” The walls remained intact as potentially useful constructions. Most of them became dilapidated around the XIX century, and were taken down eventually. However, nearly all of them had still been intact in the XVIII century.
It isn’t hard to guess that the walls of brick fortifications should be built around the same time as the towers, both of them being components of a single fortification line. Towers of brick or stone cannot be erected separately from walls – this would result in the formation of hollow joints. Those would greatly reduce the strength of a military fortification.

Our reconstruction provides a simple explanation to this phenomenon – the “Novgorod pogrom” of the XVI century had pursued the obvious goal of voiding Yaroslavl’s status of a fortified city. This was easily achieved via the demolition of the walls. The towers have been kept as useful constructions that could serve a number of purposes – nothing to do with defence, though. In particular, this implies that the old fortifications of Yaroslavl had been made of stone or brick.

Indeed, let us consider the photograph of the Vlasyevskaya Tower of Yaroslavl, one of the survivors (also known as the Znamenskaya Tower, q.v. in fig. 14.2). In the left corner of the tower we can clearly see the remnants of a brick wall that had once been adjacent to the tower. The wall has been demolished completely, with nothing remaining but the torn trace in the corner of the tower.

Yaroslavl has been an important cultural centre of Russia since the very first days of its existence. Despite the fact that little is known about Yaroslavl before the XVII century, it is reported that in the early XIII century “the first seminary in the North opened here, one that had
possessed what was considered a lavish library in that epoch – 1000 books in Greek” ([408], page 5). The famous *Slovo o polku Igoreve*, which is an account of Prince Igor’s campaign considered one of the primary ancient Russian historical texts, had been kept in Yaroslavl, “where the bibliophile Moussin-Pushkin purchased it from the Archimandrite Ioil Bykovskiy … in 1792” ([408], page 113). Few cities were distinguished by such libraries back in the day. However, the very status of an old capital obliged Yaroslavl, or Novgorod, to own an extensive library.

An attentive study of Nikon’s chronicle as it tells us about the invasion of the Tartars and the Mongols reveals the following curious remark made by the chronicler. The Tartars and the Mongols capture Rostov and Yaroslavl, and then “the entire country, bringing their yoke over many a city” ([408], page 5). Rostov and Yaroslavl are thus pointed out as the cradle of the Great = “Mongolian” expansion, which is in perfect correspondence with our reconstruction.

1.3. The possible location of the famous library formerly owned by “Ivan the Terrible”

It is common knowledge that an enormous royal library had existed in Moscow in the epoch of Ivan the Terrible. It is presumed to have disappeared without a trace after that. Historians and archaeologists are still looking for it. They have looked in Moscow, possibly, in Novgorod (the modern town on River Volkhov, of course), and in Tver. No results so far. What could have become of it? Had it burned completely, down to the very last volume, this would become known – the consumption of a huge library by a fire in the Kremlin could hardly have gone unnoticed.

If it had been destroyed deliberately, individual “harmless” books, which it must have contained at any rate, would have surfaced somewhere by now – old books are usually very expensive. The same applies to the version about the theft of the library – individual books would have appeared on the market at the very least.
The fact that the library had disappeared in its entirety leads one to the thought that it might still be about, concealed somewhere, which is what historians are telling us. They conduct their search most meticulously, and to no avail. We are of the opinion that they are looking in the wrong place. Above we discuss the enthronement of Czar Simeon after the end of the oprichnina epoch in great detail. This monarch had attempted to transfer the capital to Novgorod, and gone so far as to transfer his treasury there. The construction of a powerful imperial citadel was commenced in Novgorod ([776], page 169).

Could Simeon have transferred the royal library to Novgorod as well? This shall explain the fact that it still hasn’t been found. As we already mentioned, the name “Novgorod the Great” had originally belonged to Yaroslavl. When the Romanovs came to power, they deprived Yaroslavl of its old name, which was “transferred” to a small provincial town on River Volkhov. This deed was forgotten, and later Romanovs have already been convinced that Novgorod the Great was located on River Volkhov – they had believed in quite a few stories of dubious veracity told by their royal ancestors in order to justify their enthronement after the palace revolution.

After the end of the confusion epoch in the dynastic history of the Romanovs (roughly the XVIII-XIX century), the Romanovian historians remembered the famous library of Ivan the Terrible and started to search for it – in Novgorod-upon-Volkhov, as one might guess. It is also obvious that no such search has ever been conducted in Yaroslavl. We would recommend the archaeologists to try searching for the famous library of Ivan the Terrible in Yaroslavl, which is where the abovementioned Slovo o polku Igoreve has been found, after all ([408], page 113).

On the other hand, the library of “Ivan the Terrible” may have been located in the town of Alexandrovskaya Sloboda, a former capital of the Horde. The library thus became known as the “Library of Alexandria,” and migrated to faraway Egypt in the official historical paradigm (in Chron6 we demonstrate the Biblical Egypt to be Russia, or the Horde, in the XIV-
XVI century). The Egyptian Library of Alexandria is said to have been burned to the ground, which makes it very likely that the library of “Ivan the Terrible,” aka the Library of Alexandria, had indeed been burnt by the first Romanovs, who were incinerating the old history of the Horde with enormous zeal.
The problem of the Kagans in general, and the famous “Kaganate of the Khazars” in particular, is one of the most intriguing and controversial issues of the old Russian history. Let us remind the reader that the Romanovian history presents the so-called Kaganate of the Khazars as a state hostile to Russia, which had even made the latter pay tribute to the Kagans at some point. The final defeat of the Khazars is said to have taken place in the reign of Svyatoslav and Vladimir; the victory had been a very hard one indeed, and brought about the complete removal of the Khazars from the historical arena.

Let us consider the titles of Vladimir, the Great Prince who is said to have defeated the “hostile Khazar Kaganate”? Is the formula Great Prince actually used in the chronicles, as we believe it to be nowadays? It may be – but hardly in all chronicles. Let us open the famous Word on the Law and Divine Grace ([312]) by Metropolitan Illarion, the first Russian Metropolitan who had lived in the alleged years 1051-1054, according to the Romanovian chronology. How does the Metropolitan refer to the Great Prince, who had almost been a contemporary of his, and a famed hero of the previous generation?

Let us delve into the original in Old Russian, which said “And the word of the Lord was translated into every language, as well as Russian. Blessed be Vladimir, our Kagan, who has baptised us” ([312], page 28). Thus, Great Prince Vladimir was also known as the Kagan, and it isn’t some barely literate scribe calling him that, but rather the head of the Russian Church.

In 1935 B. A. Rybakov copied the following inscription that he found in the Cathedral of St. Sophia in Kiev: “God Save our Kagan S …” ([752], page 49). The phrase was inscribed on one of the pillars in the northern
gallery (see fig. 14.7). Academician B. A. Rybakov writes the following: “The Byzantine title ['Czar', or 'Caesar' – Auth.] came to replace the Eastern title of the Great Princes of Kiev – the Kagan. In the very same temple of St. Sophia there was a pillar decorated by the lettering that said ‘our Kagan S …’ – the capital S might be the initial of either Svyatoslav Yaroslavich or Svyatopolk Izyaslavich, most probably, the former” ([752], page 49). Also: “The Prince of Kiev, whom the Oriental authors … called Kagan” ([752], page 10).

The principal part is by no means the attempt to guess a chronicle character by the single surviving initial, but rather the mind-boggling fact that the Orthodox rulers had been known as Kagans. Our reconstruction claims this to be perfectly normal.

According to L. N. Gumilev, “the Khans had ruled over the Avarians, Bulgarians, Hungarians and even Russians; this title was borne by Vladimir the Holy, Yaroslav the Wise, and Oleg Svyatoslavich, a grandson of the latter” ([211], page 435).

We are of the following opinion: Kagan is an Old Russian title equivalent to that of the Czar or the Khan. It is quite obvious that the word Kagan is closely related to the word Khan, and happens to be one of its archaic forms.

We shall also cover the issue of the word Khazars being an old form of the word Cossacks. This isn’t a mere hypothesis of ours, but rather a direct statement made by the Archbishop of Byelorussia in the early XIX century ([423]).

Thus, the “Oriental” title Kagan is most likely to be of a Russian origin.
It had once been borne by the Czars, or the Khans of the Russian (“Mongolian”) Empire. This isn’t the only such example. One should also consider the title of Caliph, applied to “rulers who also strived to become heads of religious communities” ([85], Volume 46, page 40). In other words, kings and head priests at the same time. This title had been known rather well in Russia – as Caliph and Kalifa ([786], Issue 6, page 37). We encounter the following passage in a Russian novel of the XVII century: “they revere the Pope like we do the Kalifa” (ibid.).

The readers are entitled to ask us why we believe the word Kalifa to be of a Russian origin. The answer is as follows. In Chron5 we use mediaeval sources to demonstrate the “mysterious” mediaeval king and priest known as Presbyter Johannes to be the very same historical personality as Ivan Kalita, the Russian Czar also known as Batu-Khan. One cannot fail to notice the similarity of the words Kalifa and Kalita; the frequent flexion of the sounds F and T (Thomas/ Foma, Theodor/Fyodor, etc.) makes them as one and the same word de facto.

This brings about the following chain of identifications: Ivan Kalita = Kalifa Ivan = Caliph Ivan, Czar and Head Priest = Presbyter Johannes.

It is little wonder that this title (or alias) of Ivan Kalita, aka Batu-Khan, had survived in many parts of the “Mongolian” = Great Empire as the name of the leader of the state and the Church. Apparently, Batu-Khan, or Ivan Kalita, had been such a leader.

The scholarly concept of the “Mongolian” Khans (whom we now understand to be Russian) as savage nomads is purely fictional, and an invention of the Romanovian historians. We have cited numerous examples of marriages between the “Mongolian” Khans and the Byzantine princesses. Historians are telling us that the refined Byzantine princesses left their luxurious palaces for the yurts of the nomadic savages, herded sheep, cooked pilaf and gathered wild berries. The Golden Horde had presumably left no buildings; hence the implication that its inhabitants had lived in cold tents and chew upon the meat of their sinewy horses.

We also know of many Byzantine emperors married to the daughters of
the Khazar Kagans: “Justinian II was married to the daughter of a Kagan, who was baptised Theodora. Tiberius II also married a Kagan’s daughter and returned from Khazaria to Constantinople in 708 with an army of the Khazars [the Cossacks, that is – Auth.]. The wife of Constantine V (741-775) had also been a Kagan’s daughter, baptised Irene as she converted to Christianity … In the IX century the Byzantine emperors formed a Khazar [Cossack – Auth.] court guard. Many of the Khazar warriors became distinguished and got promoted to high ranks in the imperial army and administration” ([823], page 139).

Thus, we are being told that the savage “Mongolian” nomads had been entering dynastic marriages with the royal house of Byzantium for centuries. The former had allegedly been illiterate and lived in the dusty steppe, while the latter wrote poems and historical tractates residing in luxurious palaces.

We believe the picture painted above to be nonsensical. Such a great amount of marriages a priori implies common religions and cultures. Indeed, it is known well that the religion and culture of the mediaeval Byzantium had been very similar to their Russian counterparts. All of the “Khazars” and “Mongols” in the chronicles were Orthodox Russians and neither savage, nor nomadic.

As for Islam – let us point out that the schism between the churches and the segregation of the Islamic tradition, which has led to its transformation into a separate religion, are dating from the epoch of the XV-XVI century, according to our reconstruction. The Orthodox faith and Islam had previously been united into a single religion.

It is common knowledge that Islam had been a Christian sect of the Nestorians initially. The difference between the respective creeds and ritual had been accumulating for a long time before the schism. These two branches of Christianity eventually ceased to resemble each other – however, this happened as late as in the XVII century.
3. The Horde as the Cossack council (rada)

One cannot fail to point out the obvious similarity between the word Horde ("Orda") and the word "rada" that means "council" or "row" ("order") in Russia and Ukrainian. Another related word is "rod", the Russian for "clan" or "family." All of these words share a single root and translate as "community." Other related words are "narod" ("people") and "rat" ("army").

The words "rada" and "rod" have been used in Russia for quite a long time. For instance, an elected council known as "Izbrannaya Rada" had been active during one of the periods that later became collated into the reign of "Ivan the Terrible."

In Ukrainian, the word "rada" means "council" or "gathering of the elders." It would be natural to assume that the words "orda," "rada" and "rod" all stem from the same Slavic root that translates as "council" or "government."

The Latin word ordo might be related as well, likewise the German Ordnung (“order”). Who borrowed from whom depends on the choice of chronology and nothing but.

According to the evidence given by Sigismund Herberstein, an author of the XVI century, “the word Horde … stands for “a gathering” or “a multitude” in their [the Tartar – Auth.] language” ([161], page 167).

Nowadays we are accustomed to using the word “horde” for referring to multitudes of wild nomads. However, as recently as in the XVII century this word had been used in a different meaning – a common synonym of the words “army,” “troops,” etc.

Indeed, let us open the Dictionary of the Russian Language in the XVI-XVII Century:
“Jagan the Third… His Swedish hordes had become accustomed to owning that kingdom as their very own” ([790], Issue 13, page 65).

Another example:

“He was gathering hordes of the Germans under his banners” (ibid.).

Thus, the word “orda,” or “horde,” had been used for referring to German and Swedish troops.

“They know nothing of the ancient customs of their service, neither the civilians, nor the Horde” ([790], issue 13, page 65).
4. Kiev as the capital of the Goths

“In 1850-1852 the Royal Community of Northern Antiquarians in Copenhagen … published the two volumes of ‘Antquités Russes’… These books contained sagas from Scandinavia and Iceland and passages therefrom, all of which were related to Russian history in one way or another… Among other famous publications found in ‘Antquités Russes’ is the famous ‘Hervarasaga’, which tells us about the son of … King Heidrek of Reidhgotaland whose capital was in Danpstadir (city on the Dnepr)… A. A. Kunik … voices the presumption that ‘the city on the Dnepr had been capital of the Gothic kingdom for a certain period’… The ancient song of Attila … mentions a similar word – Danpar: ‘The famous forest near the Dnepr’… The interpretation of the corrected verse of the ‘Hamdis-mal’ had led to the idea that the capital of the Goths locates somewhere in the Eastern Europe, over ‘Danpar’, which is likely to identify … as the Dnepr…”

As he was trying to locate the place on the coast of Dnepr where the events related in the ‘Hamdis-mal’ took place, Vigfusson had presumed that Danparstadir, the ancient central city on the Dnepr, doubtlessly identified as Kiev … which Vigfusson considers to be the primary centre of the Gothic empire and the capital of Ermanaric” ([364], pages 65-69).

Further also:

“Y. Koulakovskiy also recognized the existence of a Gothic capital on the Dnepr. He believed that Kiev had already been founded in the epoch of Ptolemy, indicated on his map as Metropolis [‘The Mother of Cities’, if we’re to make a word for word translation from the Greek – Auth.]… N. Zakrevskiy (‘Descibing Kiev’, Volume 1, Moscow, 1868, page 6) had believed that the Azagorium of Ptolemy (known as Zagorye among the locals) could be identified as Kiev… F. Braun, V. S. Ikonnikov, A. I. Sobolevskiy, S. Rozhnetskiy, A. Pogodin and I. Stelletskiy had all recognized Kiev as the Gothic capital on the Dnepr. Vigfusson’s theory about Kiev being the capital of the Goths had been in the guidebooks and on the pages of
numerous Ukrainian journals” ([364], pages 71-72).

Above we demonstrate the Goths to identify as the Cossacks. Therefore, there’s nothing surprising about the fact that Kiev had been the capital of the Cossacks. This is known well to everyone. Let us pay attention to the fact that Kiev had apparently been indicated on the “ancient” map of Ptolemy. This is also perfectly normal – the reverse would be surprising, since our reconstruction suggests the “ancient” maps to date from the XIII-XVI century A.D.
5. The destruction of inscriptions on the old Russian relics

5.1. The tomb of Yaroslav the Wise in the Cathedral of St. Sophia in Kiev

According to our hypothesis, Ivan Kalita, aka Yaroslav the Wise, aka Batu-Khan was buried in the famous Egyptian pyramid field, the former central imperial graveyard of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire, q.v. in Chron5.

However, it is common knowledge that the marble sarcophagus traditionally identified as the sarcophagus of Yaroslav the Wise is located in the famous Cathedral of St. Sophia in Kiev. It presumably dates from the XI century A.D., the very epoch of Yaroslav the Wise. Anyone who visits the cathedral can see it (figs. 14.8 and 14.9).

Fig. 14.8. “The Sarcophagus of Yaroslav the Wise” in the Kiev Cathedral of St. Sophia.

The photograph was taken in such a way that the side of the sarcophagus with the chiselled-off artwork cannot be seen. Taken from [663]. Photograph of the XX century.
The nature of the lettering on the sarcophagus is of the utmost interest. It turns out that none such exists. It is very peculiar that every surface of the sarcophagus but one is in a good condition, one can clearly see the lettering, the ornament and the anagram of Christ’s name. However, there is nothing written on any of the surviving surfaces. All the artwork on this part has been destroyed completely – chiselled off by someone, that is. We see vague traces of the ornament and letters or signs of some sort. Neither the guides nor the scientists working in the museum of the cathedral know anything about the vandals who are to be blamed for this.

What could possibly be written here? Who could have been angered by the lettering on the presumed tomb of Yaroslav the Wise to the extent of wanting to erase it forever? It is most likely that the writing had contradicted the Romanovian version of history and therefore been dealt with in the most ruthless manner possible.

A propos, it turns out that this sarcophagus of Yaroslav the Wise was “discovered in the XVII century” ([578], Book 1, page 253). This is perfectly amazing. Yaroslav the Wise is said to have died in 1054. Six hundred years pass since that time. Finally, in the XVII century, six hundred years later, when the Romanovs decided it was time to write a new version of the “ancient” Russian history, their archaeologists and
historians were quick enough to find a substantial number of “Russian antiquities,” including the “sarcophagus of Yaroslav the Wise” that bore no lettering of any sort. There is no marking upon it whatsoever to make one assume that this sepulchre had indeed belonged to Yaroslav the Wise, the famous historical character mentioned in the chronicles.

We see historians at their most arbitrary. The Romanovs needed a “body of evidence,” or visual aids to the recently written “new version” of the Old Russian history. For instance, they were in urgent need of finding the grave of “Yaroslav the Wise,” which was promptly “found” (apparently, with the method of taking an old sarcophagus, chiselling off the inscription that contradicted this version, possibly in Arabic, q.v. above, and declaring it to be the one). The photographs of the “relic” have soon found their way into school textbooks. Much later, already in our epoch, M. Gerasimov tried his best to reconstruct the appearance of Yaroslav; the result can be seen in fig. 14.10.

Fig. 14.10. A facial reconstruction of the man whose remains were found in the “Sepulchre of Yaroslav the Wise” in Kiev (made by M. Gerasimov). Taken from [847].

Let us reiterate: Romanovian historians have written a fable about Russian history in the XVII-XVIII century, which we have been mistaking for the truth ever since.

As the museum staff have told us in Kiev, several cartloads of headstones, icons, books and other artefacts were taken away from the
cathedral in the 1930’s. Their fate and destination remain a mystery to this day. Thus, we don’t even know about the artefacts that were kept in the cathedral’s museum in the 1920’s. It makes no sense to hope for a detailed catalogue of those items to be in existence and available to researchers.

We must point out that many odd legends are told about the “sarcophagus of Yaroslav the Wise” in Kiev generally. For instance, in 1995 the guides of the cathedral’s museum were telling the visitors that historians had considered the sarcophagus to be of a Byzantine origin and date from the IV century A.D., predating the death of Yaroslav the Wise by 700 years.

This remark of the guides made many of the visitors wonder about whether the Great Prince Yaroslav the Wise, one of Russia’s most famous rulers at the peak of its prosperity, could really be buried in an imported second hand sarcophagus, albeit a good one, which was bought in faraway Byzantium. The remnants of its previous owner were thrown away to make way for the body of the Great Prince of Kiev Russia. However, even in our cynical age such things are regarded as sacrilege.

The sepulchre must have been prepared as a family affair. One can quite bluntly see two crosses and two hearts tied together with a ribbon. Indeed, the museum staff told us in 1995 that the archaeologists discovered the skeletons of a male and a female in the sarcophagus, as well as the skeleton of a child – possibly, a close relation (a son, for instance).

5.2. The monasteries of Staro-Simonov and Bogoyavlenskiy in Moscow

A propos, there were precedents of the very same thing that had happened in the Cathedral of St. Sophia – in Moscow, as we mention above (bear in mind that the headstones from the Staro-Simonov monastery in Moscow were barbarically destroyed by sledgehammers in the 1960’s).

We mentioned that the Staro-Simonov monastery is likely to be the final
resting place of many warriors who fell in the Battle of Kulikovo. Moreover, old descriptions of this monastery ([646] and [844]) report that many Russian Czars and Great Princes were buried here, no less ([936], Volume 2, page 570). Unfortunately, we find only a single name of a Czar that is buried there in either book. It is Simeon Beckboulatovich ([844], page 50), a co-ruler of Ivan the Terrible. According to our reconstruction, he is one of the four Czars that later became collated into a single figure of Ivan the Terrible. Other famous persons buried in the Simonov monastery include Konstantin Dmitrievich, the son of Dmitriy Donskoi, Prince F. M. Mstislavskiy, princes of Cherkasskiy, Golitsyn, Souleshev, Yousoupov, etc., as well as representatives of the following aristocratic clans: Boutourlin, Tatishchev, Rostovskiy, Basmanov, Gryaznev, etc.. Below we shall tell the readers about the sepulchres of the Kremlin’s Arkhangelskiy Cathedral, where almost all of the Russian Czars are said to be buried. In certain cases, the lettering we find on the tombs looks dubious.

The destruction of headstones is by no means an exclusively modern trend. The archaeologist L. A. Belyaev reports the following about the excavations in the Bogoyavlenskiy monastery near the Kremlin: “The surviving sarcophagi are buried under a pile of white stone debris with fragments of covers and headstones. Some of the debris is constituted by pieces of actual sarcophagi, which were brought to a great deal of harm – possibly, in the end of the XVII century or later” ([62], page 181).

5.3. Why would the Romanovs need to chisel off the frescoes and put layers of bricks over the old Czars’ tombs in the cathedrals of the Kremlin?

There are three famous cathedrals at the very centre of the Kremlin in Moscow – the Ouspenskiy, the Arkhangelskiy and the Blagoveshchenskiy. The first of the three has always been regarded as Russia’s main cathedral: “The Ouspenskiy cathedral occupies a separate place in Russian history … for centuries on end it has been an important temporal and
ecclesiastic centre of Russia – this is where the Great Princes were inaugurated, and there vassals swore fealty to them. Czars and later Emperors received their blessings here as they ascended to the Russian throne” ([553], page 5). The first Ouspenskiy cathedral is presumed to have been founded here under Ivan Kalita and stood here until the alleged year 1472 (ibid., page 6). The cathedral we know under this name today was erected under Ivan III in 1472-1479: “Ivan III, the Great Prince and Ruler of All Russia, decided to erect a residence that would correspond to his position. The new Kremlin was to symbolise the greatness and might of the Russian empire … The works began with the construction of the Ouspenskiy Cathedral, whose size and appearance alluded to its majestic XII century namesake in Vladimir” (ibid.).

According to our reconstruction, Moscow only became the capital of the entire Russia in the reign of “Ivan the Terrible” – at the very end of the XVI century (see Chron6 for more details). A chronological shift of 100 years superimposes the epoch of “Ivan the Terrible” over the reign of Ivan III; thus, many of the events that date from the XVI century ended up in the late XV century courtesy of the Scaligerian and Millerian textbook on Russian history – the epoch of Ivan III, in other words. This makes it obvious why the foundation of a capital in Moscow was initiated by Ivan III, who is said to have constructed a new Kremlin and fashioned its main cathedral after the one in Vladimir – not the previously existing cathedral in Moscow that is supposed to have been standing at this site and serving as the main cathedral of Russia for some 250 years already. According to our conception, the capital of Russia had indeed been in Vladimir up until the XVI century, and before that – in Rostov and Kostroma (reflected in the Arabic sources as Khoresm). The transfer of the capital resulted in the “transfer” of the main cathedral – namely, the construction of its double in Moscow.

It would be apropos to cite the following claim made by the archaeologists: “There are no facts to indicate the existence of a royal court in the Kremlin before the construction works of 1460” ([62], page 86). In
particular, “the chronicle of the Troitse-Sergiyev Monastery compiled in 1560’s – 1570’s doesn’t mention its previous existence [the court in Kremlin] anywhere at all” ([62], page 86). In other words, the chroniclers of the Troitse-Sergiev Monastery had known nothing about the existence of a Great Prince’s court on the territory of the Kremlin in Moscow before 1460. This is in excellent concurrence with our reconstruction. Moscow was only founded after the Battle of Kulikovo at the end of the XIV century, and the capital of Russia doesn’t migrate here until the second half of the XVI century.

The Ouspenskiy Cathedral is presumed to have served as the main cathedral of the Russian Empire starting with Ivan III. The cathedral has always enjoyed a very special attention: “In 1481, Dionysius, the best artist of the epoch, had painted the three-tier altar piece and several large icons, accompanied by his apprentices … and in 1513-1515 the cathedral was decorated by frescoes” ([553], page 8).

Did anything remain of this artwork? Can we learn anything about the mediaeval Russia, or the Horde, as it had been before the Romanovs, if we visit the cathedral today? Unfortunately not. This is what we are told: “Precious little of the original artwork has remained intact until the present day: the dilapidated icons were replaced by new ones … the old frescoes were chiselled off in the beginning of the XVII century” ([553], page 8).

These frescoes of Dionysius, presumably “ancient,” had thus been some 100 or 150 years of age when they got chiselled off. Not really that great an age for frescoes; the icons are also rather unlikely to have reached a “dilapidated” state over this short a period. It might be that the cathedral was unfortunate enough to leak, which had made the frescoes short-lived and so on. However, why do we learn of the same fate befalling the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral nearby, built in 1505-1508? This is what we’re told: “The decorations on the walls of the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral date from 1652-1666, the reign of Alexei Mikhailovich, who had given the following orders: ‘… the Church of Archangel Michael is to be redecorated completely. The old frescoes are to be chiselled off”, since the
XVI century murals dating from the reign of Czar Ivan IV had become rather dilapidated by the middle of the XVII century” ([552], page 8).

We must note that the frescoes painted under the Romanovs in the XVII century have never been chiselled off again in the XVIII, the XIX or the XX century. Why would they need to destroy the relatively new frescoes in the XVII century – masterpieces painted by the best XVI century artists? Let us emphasise that the frescoes were actually chiselled off and not covered by a layer of new artwork. In other words, two largest cathedrals of the Kremlin had simultaneously been subjected to the laborious procedure of chiselling the plaster off the walls, which were then covered by another layer of plaster that was further decorated by new frescoes. A mere redecoration wouldn’t require the destruction of the old artwork. New murals could be painted over the old ones, the way it was usually done (in the nearby Blagoveshchenskiy Cathedral, which is also part of the Kremlin ensemble, for instance). Could the Romanovs have wanted to destroy every trace of what was painted on the walls of the Kremlin cathedrals in the reign of the previous Horde dynasty? If one paints new frescoes over old ones, the old layer can be seen after the removal of the later artwork. This is often done today, when scientists uncover the frescoes of the XVI, XV or even the XIV century. However, the chiselled-off frescoes are beyond recovery or restoration.

We are being assured that before the plaster in the cathedrals had been chiselled off, “a description of the initial compositions was made … which had helped to preserve the ideological conception and the composition scheme of the XVI century artwork” ([552], page 8). This is how the modern researchers admit the loss of the old murals, which had vanished without a trace, leaving nothing but the “composition” intact. The Romanovs may indeed have kept the original composition. It had affected nothing of substance.

A propos, the frescoes of the Blagoveshchenskiy Cathedral had not been chiselled off, but rather painted over with a new layer of artwork in the epoch of the first Romanovs. They were uncovered recently, and this
brought about many oddities. For instance, the murals depict the genealogy of Jesus Christ that includes many Russian Great Princes (Dmitriy Donskoi, Vassily Dmitrievich, Ivan III and Vassily III, as well as a number of the “ancient” philosophers and poets – Plato, Plutarch, Aristotle, Virgil, Xeno, Thucydides, etc.. All of them have been relations of Christ, according to the old artwork on the walls of the cathedral. This is in perfect correspondence with our reconstruction; all of these people must indeed have been the offspring of Augustus = Constantine the Great, who had indeed been related to Christ. The inclusion of the “ancient” philosophers and authors into “Christ’s family tree,” the artists who painted the murals in the Blagoveshchenskiy Cathedral had strongly contradicted the Scaligerian chronology. However, according to our conception, they were perfectly right.

Apparently, the old artwork in the Blagoveshchenskiy cathedral had struck the first Romanovs as relatively harmless, and so they decided to cover it by a new layer of murals instead of using the chisel. What could have been painted on the walls and the domes of the Arkhangelskiy and Ouspenskiy cathedrals that should make Czar Alexei Mikhailovich give orders to destroy the frescoes mercilessly? The modern “explanation” about disintegration over the course of a century doesn’t hold water.

Apparently, the altar pieces of the Ouspenskiy and Arkhangelskiy cathedral were replaced by completely new ones in the XVII century ([553], page 34; see also [552], page 33). It would be apropos to recollect the fact that many stone sarcophagi in Moscow had suffered substantial damage in the very same epoch ([62], page 81). Also due to “dilapidation,” perhaps?

Furthermore, let us recollect the fact that the old genealogical records were burnt by the Romanovs around the very same time. Those contained the family trees of every noble family in Russia, q.v. above. The ecclesiastical reform of Patriarch Nikon served as pretext for purging every Russian library from books that failed to conform to the dominant ideology. It turns out that “old books had undergone a correction” ([372],
Nowadays it is assumed that only ecclesiastic books have been affected; is it true, though?

Let us return to the cathedrals of Kremlin. Apparently, the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral could have proved a priceless source of information, seeing as how it is the official resting place of Russian Great Princes and Czars, including the first Romanovs. There are about 50 tombs in the cathedral today. It is presumed that every Muscovite Great Prince was buried here, starting with Ivan Kalita. According to the XVII century lettering on the headstones that dates to the epoch of the first Romanovs, the particular characters we find here are as follows:

1. The Pious Great Prince Ivan Danilovich (Kalita). We must point out that the epitaph on his tomb was seriously damaged, and then crudely re-written, q.v. in fig. 14.11.

Fig. 14.11. The headstone of the Romanovian epoch (XVII century), presumably a replica of an older headstone. It rests against the sepulchre ascribed to Ivan Kalita (Caliph) in the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral of the Muscovite Kremlin. It is perfectly visible that even this Romanovian replica was heavily edited. Part of the lettering was destroyed, and the rest obviously underwent a transformation, and a very rough one at that. Photograph taken in 1997.

2. The Pious Great Prince Simeon the Proud.
3. The Pious Great Prince Ivan Ivanovich.
4. The Pious Prince Dmitriy Donskoi.
5. The Pious Prince Afanasiy Yaroslav Vladimirovich Donskogo (!). The sepulchre is dated to 1426.

6. Pious Prince Vassily Vassilyevich (Tyomniy, or “The Dark”).

7. Great Prince and Lord of All Russia Ivan III.

8. Great Prince and Lord of All Russia Vassily III.

9. A separate crypt that is closed for visitors today contains the tombs of “Ivan the Terrible” and his sons Ivan Ivanovich and Fyodor Ivanovich; it had also once contained the body of Boris Fyodorovich “Godunov.”

10. The sarcophagus of Prince Mikhail Vassilyevich Skopin-Shouyskiy is separated from the rest; we find it in side-chapel of John the Baptist. Access to that area is also denied.

11. The sarcophagus of Prince Vassily Yaroslavich stands separately, on the left of the altar. It is said to date from the XV century (the alleged year 1469).

12. The sarcophagus that stands out very explicitly (it is twice as large as any of the other sarcophagi) is that of Pious Prince Andrei Staritskiy.

13. Prince Dmitriy of Ouglich, the youngest son of “Ivan the Terrible.”


15. Prince Pyotr, son of Ibreim, son of Mamatak, Czar of Kazan (!). Sarcophagus dates from the XVI century.

16. The first Romanovs – Mikhail Fyodorovich, Alexei Mikhailovich and Fyodor Alexeyevich.

“There are forty-six sarcophagi in the cathedral altogether” ([552], page 24).

Visits to the Arkhangelskiy cathedral had remained forbidden for the public for a long time. It was opened recently; even a brief acquaintance with its interior demonstrates a great number of remarkable phenomena.

Apparently, the tombs one sees in the cathedral today were made of brick in the XVII century under the first Romanovs ([552], page 24). This is the very time that the old frescoes were chiselled off the cathedral’s
domes and walls, with new artwork taking their place. It is presumed that “the dead were buried in sarcophagi of white stone buried in the ground. In the first half of the XVII century, brick sarcophagi with headstones of white stone … with Slavic lettering upon them. In the beginning of the XX century, copper and glass casing for the sarcophagi was installed” ([552], pages 25-26). See fig. 14.12.

Fig. 14.12. “White sarcophagi of the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral. 1636-1637. One side of every sarcophagus contains the name of the deceased, as well as the dates of his demise and burial, whereas the other side is decorated with a floral ornament carved in stone” ([107], page 118).

Thus, the old headstones that should obviously be above the bodies were covered by a layer of bricks. It is said that the inscriptions on the old headstones were accurately reproduced on the new brick headstones made by the Romanovs. Unfortunately, it is very difficult to check it nowadays. The tall and massive Romanovian simulacra made of brick cover the old headstones completely. After learning about the barbaric destructions of the old frescoes by the Romanovs, it would be natural to enquire whether the inscriptions on the old headstones could be chiselled off as well. It would be interesting to check this.

Modern researchers write that the history of the royal necropolis “contains many mysteries. Several old graves were lost – possibly, they had been this way before the construction of the building in the early XVI century. One of the perished graves should date from the second half of
the XVI century and belong to Prince Vassily, son of Ivan the Terrible, and Maria Temryukovna. It is very noteworthy that the lost graves are children’s for the most part” ([768], page 88). All of the above vividly demonstrates the graves in the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral to be in utter chaos.

The museum’s scientific staff told us that the basement of the Arkhangelskiy cathedral also housed the stone sarcophagi of the Russian Czarinas that were transferred there from a special Kremlin graveyard, which was destroyed already in the XX century, during the construction of the modern buildings. Unfortunately, access to this basement is extremely limited today. It would be very edifying to study the ancient inscriptions upon these sarcophagi, if any of them survived (see the next section for more details).

Let us return to the issue of how precisely the Romanovs reproduced the old lettering from the headstones covered in bricks. It would be interesting to see how precisely the inscriptions on these brick replicas are reproduced on the copper screens with glass panels, which were introduced by the Romanovian historians in the early XX century. This is easy enough to estimate, since the Slavic lettering of the XVII century can be seen through the glass. One does need a torch, though, since the screens cast a shadow over many of the inscriptions, making the latter all but illegible.

Firstly, let us point out that the brick headstones use different titles for referring to different Russian princes – “Pious,” “Pious Great Prince,” and so on. Only starting with Ivan III the title transformed into “Great Prince and Lord of All Russia.” The difference is hardly of an arbitrary nature, and must reflect certain political realities of the epoch.

However, more recent inscriptions on the copper casing uses the uniform title “Great Princes” in every case, which can be regarded as concealment and slight distortion of information.

Secondly, we see a number of blatant inconsistencies. For instance, the Romanovs wrote the following on the abovementioned largest
sarcophagus in the cathedral: “In December 7045, on the 11th day, Pious Prince Andrei Ivanovich Staritskoy died.” The copper casing has an altogether different legend upon it: “The grave of Princes Staritskiy – Vladimir (died in 1569) and Vassily (died in 1574). Thus, not only does the legend on the Romanovian brick differ from what we see upon the even more recent copper casing – the very information about the number of the people buried here is vague. Are there two graves here, or is it a single grave? Which is lying to us – the brick, the copper or both? Let us reiterate that this contradiction concerns secondary inscriptions of the Romanovian epoch, since nowadays we don’t know what was written on the ancient headstone, which is covered by the brick layer completely. A propos, the fresco next to the grave of Andrei Staritskiy depicts Andrew the Apostle, who is said to have baptised Russia.

The commentary of a modern historian is as follows: “Out of the three graves, only that of A. I. Staritskiy had the obligatory ornamental inset in white stone on its Western side, but even in the latter case it was removed in 1780 the latest [why would that be? – Auth.]. The only thing that we know is that this inset was discovered in the course of the floor renovation works in 1835 next to the coffin… It was then made part of the eastern wall of the sepulchre that houses Vladimir and Vassily Staritskiy” ([768], pages 89-90).

Coming back to the frescoes, one has to point out that the ones we find in the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral are dedicated to Russian history to a large extent; they portray the Russian princes, and not just the holy ones. Even the frescoes on Biblical topics have often been considered to represent scenes from the Russian history. There is some commentary that goes alongside the artwork, which can be considered an illustrated version of the Russian dynasty’s history – unfortunately, in the Romanovian interpretation of the XVII century and not the original version.

For instance, “the third layer section of the southern wall depicts the victory of the Israelites led by Gideon over the Madian troops. This Biblical scene was usually associated with the victories of Ivan IV over the
kingdoms of Kazan and Astrakhan” ([552], pages 12-13). Could this mean that the Biblical scene was painted by the Romanovs over the place where there used to be a scene depicting the victory of Ivan IV over Kazan and Astrakhan, which they had themselves ordered to chisel off together with the very plaster it was painted on. Since the visitors had already been accustomed to seeing the picture of Ivan’s victory here, the freshly painted Biblical scene naturally became “associated with the victories of Ivan IV.” One should also mark the fact that the name Gideon resembles “GD Ioann,” a form of “Gosudar Ioann,” or Lord Ivan.

Alternatively, the Bible might be referring to the history of Russia, also known as the Horde in that epoch, in the XIV-XVI century. In this case, the authors of the Bible included a description of Dmitriy Donskoi's victory over Mamai-Khan in 1380 into the Bible as the victories of Gideon, King of Israel, over the Median troops. See our book entitled “Regal Rome in Mesopotamia: between the Oka and the Volga.”

The restoration procedures conducted in the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral in 1953-1956 have revealed a single pre-Romanovian that managed to remain intact quite miraculously; it is dated to the XVI century nowadays ([552], pages 22-23). The inscription upon it has not survived. The fresco is located in the burial-vault of Ivan IV “the Terrible”; the vault itself can be seen in fig. 14.13. “The dying prince hugs his elder sun, who stands at the head of his bed. The prince’s spouse is sitting at his feet together with the youngest son… This scene resembles the description of the last hour of Vassily III, the father of Ivan IV” ([552], page 22). Isn’t it odd that the fresco that depicts Vassily III is at a considerable distance from his actual grave, and inside the burial-vault of Ivan IV on top of that?
We consider the explanation to be rather simple – the fresco depicts the dying “Ivan the Terrible,” or Simeon, who is handing the state over to his son Fyodor. The young Czarina is holding his grandson Boris on her knees – the future Czar Boris “Godunov.” According to our reconstruction, Simeon had been the founder of a new royal dynasty in Russia; therefore, his grave, as well as the graves of his sons and his grandson Boris were buried in a separate vault of the Arkhангelskiy Cathedral. This must also be the reason why the grave of Mikhail Skopin-Shouyskiy, who had died during the reign of Vassily Shouyskiy, is also placed separately, in the side-chapel of John the Baptist. Apparently, Shouyskiy had been preparing the burial-vault for the new dynasty of his – however, his deposition prevented him from being buried here. His remains were brought over from Poland by the Romanovs much later, and buried in the Arkhангelskiy Cathedral.

**Corollary:** We are of the opinion that the burials in the Arkhангelskiy Cathedral need to be studied once again with the utmost attention. What is written on the ancient stones covered by layers of bricks? Could the
lettering upon them be chiselled off? Also, what could possibly be written on the sarcophagi of the Russian Czarinas?
6.
The fake sarcophagi of the pre-Romanovian czarinas made by the Romanovs in the XVII century

One of the Muscovite newspapers was kind enough to send several rather surprising and rare photographs of the burial-vaults where the Russian Czarinas are buried and the plan of their disposition in the basement of the Muscovite Kremlin. This material has struck us as exceptionally interesting; it serves as the basis for a number of important corollaries. In December 1997 we have visited all the tombs in the basement of the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral for a detailed study of all the sepulchres and their comparison to the photographs that we have at our disposal.

There are about 56 stone sarcophagi in the basement; a plan of their disposition is presented in fig. 14.14. Quite a few have no inscriptions upon them whatsoever (18, to be precise). The rest presumably belong to famous women of the royal lineage that were buried there in the XV-XVII century (in particular, Czarinas, their daughters and other female relations of the Czar). There are several children’s graves, but not many. The sarcophagi are of different types, and we shall relate more details concerning this below. Most of the sarcophagi are anthropomorphic, possess a special head compartment and actually serve in lieu of a coffin – in other words, this type of sarcophagus required no additional wooden coffins. The other type, which is of a more recent origin, is rectangular and contains a wooden coffin. In some cases, the remains of these coffins are still intact.
Fig. 14.14. A scheme that shows the disposition of the sepulchres ascribed to the Russian Czarinasa and Great Princesses on the ground floor of the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral of the Muscovite Kremlin. The sepulchres were transferred here from the Voznesenskiy Nunnery in the Kremlin ([803], Volume 1, page 121).

The information about the identity of people buried in one grave or another must have initially come from the inscriptions upon the actual headstones, which were collected in the basement of the Arkhangelskiy monastery after the transfer from the Voznesenskiy monastery of the Kremlin, destroyed by the Soviet authorities in 1929 ([803], Volume 1, pages 121 and 125). Oddly enough, there is nothing written on some of the sarcophagi, and they are referred to as “nameless” in the inventory lists. The identity of their occupants is therefore unknown. Had the data come from other sources apart from the abovementioned inscriptions, such as records kept in the Voznesenskiy monastery, there must be some information about a few of the nameless graves in existence. In fig. 14.15 we reproduce a very rare photograph where we see the sarcophagus of Natalya Kirillovna Naryshkina carried out of the Voznesenskiy monastery’s cathedral before the demolition of the latter in 1929.
There is a list of the sarcophagi kept in the basement of the Arkhangelskiy cathedral that contains the names of the deceased, some of which ring rather dubious to our ears today. The numbers correspond to those on the plan in fig. 14.14:

1. Nameless sarcophagus.
2. Nameless sarcophagus.
3. Yevdokiya, the widow of Dmitriy Donskoi, 1407.
4. Maria Borisovna, the first wife of Czar Ivan III, 1467, see fig. 14.16.
5. Sofia Vitovtivna, the wife of Czar Vassily II, 1453, see fig. 14.17.
Fig. 14.17. The sarcophagus ascribed to Sofía Vitovtovna, the wife of Vassily II Tyomniy. Presumed to date from the XV century. There is a very roughly carved epitaph on the lid of the sarcophagus that reads as “Sophia the Nun.”

6. Sofía Palaiologos, the second wife of Czar Ivan III, 1503, see fig. 14.18.

Fig. 14.18. The sarcophagus ascribed to “Sofía Palaiologos,” wife of Ivan III. Photograph taken from the head side.

7. Yelena Glinskaya, the second wife of Czar Vassily III, 1538, see fig. 14.19.
Fig. 14.19. The sarcophagus ascribed to Yelena Glinskaya: “… The deceased Great Princes Yelena, wife of Vassily Ivanovich, Great Prince of the entire Russia.”

8. Anastasia Romanovna, the first wife of Czar Ivan IV (“The Terrible”), 1560.

9. Maria Temryukovna, the second wife of Czar Ivan IV (“The Terrible”), also known as Maria Cherkeshenka (“The Cherkassian”), see fig. 14.20.

Fig. 14.20. The sarcophagus ascribed to Maria the Cherkassian, wife of Ivan IV “The Terrible.”

Fig. 14.21. The sarcophagus ascribed to Marfa Sobakina, wife of Ivan IV “The Terrible.”

11. Maria Nagaya, the sixth wife of Czar Ivan IV (“The Terrible”), 1608.
12. Irina Godunova, the wife of Czar Fyodor Ivanovich, 1603.
14. Maria Vladimirovna Dolgoroukaya, first wife of Czar Mikhail Fyodorovich Romanov, 1625.
15. Yevdokia Loukianovna, the second wife of Czar Mikhail Fyodorovich Romanov, 1645.
17. Paraskyeva, the daughter of Czar Mikhail Fyodorovich, 1620.
18. Pelageya, the daughter of Czar Mikhail Fyodorovich, 1620.
19. Maria, the daughter of Czar Ivan V Alexeyevich, 1692.
20. Fyodor Ivanovich Belskiy, 1568.
22. Yevdokiya Fyodorovna Mstislavskaya, 1600.
23. Nameless sarcophagus.
24. Feodosiya, daughter of Czar Fyodor Ivanovich and Irina Godunova, 1594.
25. Anastasia, daughter of Vladimir Staritskiy, 1568.
27. Nameless sarcophagus.
28. Anna, daughter of Czar Alexei Mikhailovich, 1659.
29. Theodora, daughter of Czar Alexei Mikhailovich, 1678.
30-36. Nameless sarcophagi.
37. Sofia, daughter of Czar Mikhail Fyodorovich, 1636.
38. Marfa, daughter of Czar Mikhail Fyodorovich, 1632.
39. Yevdokiya, daughter of Czar Mikhail Fyodorovich, 1637.
40. Theodosia, daughter of Czar Ivan V Alexeyevich, 1691.
41. Anna, daughter of Czar Vassily Shouyskiy, 1610.
42. Nameless sarcophagus.
43. Yevdokiya, second wife of Vladimir Staritskiy, 1570.
49. Yevdokiya, daughter of Vladimir Staritskiy, 1570.
50. Yefrosinya, mother of Vladimir Staritskiy, 1569, see fig. 14.22.

Fig. 14.22. The sarcophagus ascribed to Staristskaya. Made of headstone fragments held together by copper brackets.

51. Maria, daughter of Vladimir Staritskiy, 1569.
52. Anna, daughter of Czar Mikhail Fyodorovich, 1692.
53. Tatiana, daughter of Czar Mikhail Fyodorovich, 1706.
54. Natalia Kirillovna Naryshkina, second wife of Czar Alexei Mikhailovich, mother of Peter the Great, 1694.
55. Agafia Semyonovna Groushetskaya, wife of Czar Fyodor Alexeyevich, 1681.
56. Maria Ilyinichna Miloslavskaya, first wife of Czar Alexei
Mikhailovich, 1669.

The general disposition of the sarcophagi alongside one of the basement’s walls can be seen in fig. 14.23. This is where we presumably find the graves of the famous Russian Czarinas of the XV-XVI century.

![Fig. 14.23. The rows of sarcophagi ascribed to the Russian Czarinas from the ground floor of the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral. In the foreground we see the sarcophagus ascribed to Yelena Glinskaya, with the alleged sarcophagus of Sofia Palaiologos on the right of it. The sarcophagi we see in the photograph are numbered 7-15 in the scheme. In the distance we see the sarcophagi of the Romanovian epoch, which are much larger and apparently authentic. They are numbered 55 and 56 in the scheme.](image)

Nevertheless, the consensual attribution of some of the sarcophagi is very dubious indeed. This concerns the pre-Romanovian graves; the Romanovian sarcophagi are all bona fide.

We notice the following oddities:

1) It is perfectly unclear just why Sarcophagus 6, q.v. on the plan in figs. 14.14 and 14.18 should be attributed to Sofia Palaiologos, wife of Ivan III. This is a partially demolished sarcophagus; its lid is completely intact, albeit shattered. It has no inscriptions upon it, except for the roughly-scratched word sofea (see fig. 14.24). Could this “inscription” have sufficed for attributing the sarcophagus in question to the famous Sofia Palaiologos? The rough and sketchy character of the inscription is also emphasised by its slanted alignment in relation to the sides of the lid;
the scratches are shallow, and it takes an effort to make them out upon the surface of the stone. A brief glance leaves us with the impression that the lid is altogether void of lettering, it looks just the same as the lids of the nameless coffin. How could this unseemly, slanted piece of graffiti, scratched with a nail or something similar, have appeared on a royal sarcophagus? Also, the poor quality of this so-called “royal sarcophagus” (as well as of other pre-Romanovian sarcophagi housed in the cathedral’s basement) is confusing at the very least.

Fig. 14.24. The sarcophagus ascribed to “Sophia Palaiologos,” wife of Ivan III. Part of the lid near the head. As we can see, there is a shallow and rough inscription scratched on the stone right next to the edge. It reads as “Sophia the Nun.” There is nothing else written anywhere on the sarcophagus. The letters were scratched so shallow that one can hardly make them out in the photograph. However, we can clearly see that the sarcophagus was neither carved out from a single block of stone, nor assembled of whole slabs of stone. It is made of odd stone fragments held together by copper brackets and then whitewashed over in order to make the surface smooth.

2) The very same question can be asked in reference to Sarcophagus 5, q.v. on the scheme in figs. 14.14, 14.17 and 14.23. This sarcophagus is ascribed to Sofia Vitovtovna, the wife of Vassily II (XV century) nowadays. There are no inscriptions anywhere on the lid apart from another rough, sketchy and slanted inscription that is very shallow and may have been made with a nail: “Sofe[a] inoka”, or “Sofia the Nun,” q.v. in fig. 14.17. In fig. 14.25 one sees a drawn copy of this inscription, which is very hard to make out. We have used a very high-quality photograph for this purpose, where the letters were as distinct as they could get. Could this
simple and cheap stone coffin with a piece of graffiti scratched thereupon in an unhandy manner be a sarcophagus of a Czarina as well? Could it be true that the two famous Czarinas, Sofia Palaiologos and Sofia Vitovtvna, did not get so much as an accurately carved lettering on the coffin lid? Are we being told that these famous Russian Czarinas were buried ceremonially, with their relations, the entire court and a great many visitors present, in these primitive and cheap coffins with clumsily-scratched letters on the lid? For some reason, upon the sarcophagi of the Romanovian epoch we find long and detailed epitaphs, carved in stone skilfully and deeply. Other old nameless sarcophagi are also covered in beautiful carved ornaments.

![Fig. 14.25. Our drawn copy of the inscription on the lid of the sarcophagus that reads “Sophia the Nun”; nowadays the grave is ascribed to Sophia Vitovtvna, the wife of Vassily II Tyomniy.](image)

3) Moreover, how could the name “Sofia the Nun” have appeared upon the sarcophagus of Sofia Vitovtvna? This is simply an impossibility. If Sofia had indeed taken the vows, she should have received a new name as a nun, one that had to differ from her old name, Sofia. However, the graffiti on the sarcophagus tells us that Sofia had been the monastic name of the deceased, which can only mean that before taking the vows she had been known under a different name than Sofia, whereas Sofia Vitovtvna was definitely called Sofia. This implies that what we see is an outright hoax. This grave can by no means contain the remains of Sofia Vitovtvna, the famous Russian Czarina. We are being lied to.

4) A careful study demonstrates that the overwhelming majority of the
sarcophagi attributed to the Russian Czarinas of the XV-XVI century nowadays weren’t made of individual stone slabs, but rather bits and pieces of stone held together by copper rods or brackets. This rather frail construction would then be covered in a layer of plaster, which made it look like a sarcophagus. It is natural that the transportation of these “composite sarcophagi” from the Voznesenskiy monastery to the basement of the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral had not been performed with sufficient care, which has resulted in some of the plaster coming off the sarcophagi, and the subsequent collapse of the latter. However, the Romanovian sarcophagi made of whole stones did not come apart, unlike their “composite” counterparts. Some of the sarcophagi (those belonging to “Sofia Palaiologos” and the relation of Staritskiy, for instance) are in a very poor condition – almost completely in pieces, the lid as well as the actual sarcophagus (see figs. 14.18, 14.23, 14.24 and 14.22). The cracks reveal the brackets, apparently copper ones, seeing as how they’re green and not rusty. These brackets had served for holding various parts of the “composite sarcophagi” together. Some of the brackets have fallen out, and now lie alongside the bones of the deceased, q.v. in fig. 14.18, for instance.

We can clearly see that the coffins had not been made of whole limestone slabs, but rather fragments, or trash, which can only mean that the coffins in question belonged to common folk and not the XVI century members of the royal family. It is obvious enough that stone or concrete sarcophagi must have been expensive, and few could afford them; a “composite sarcophagus” would be much easier to make.

Thus, the Romanovs must have simply used a number of anonymous sarcophagi in the middle of the XVII century, or chiselled the lettering off a few coffins in order to have some body of evidence required for proving the veracity of their fallacious history. The authentic sarcophagi of the Russian Czarinas must have simply been destroyed by the Romanovs, if they had indeed been in Moscow and not the royal cemetery in Egypt, Africa – Giza valley or the famous Luxor. However, the Romanovs needed
some artefacts to support the historical credibility of their artificial “Old Russian history.” We see how the Romanovian historians and archaeologists concocted their “successful discoveries” of allegedly authentic ancient sepulchres of Yaroslav the Wise, Vladimir the Holy and so on around the same time as their colleagues in Moscow were diligently stocking up on sarcophagi for the “royal necropolis of the XI-XVI century.”

The “ancient royal coffins” were made in haste; their construction was ordered by the Romanovs. It has to be said that the sarcophagi were constructed rather clumsily – it could be that they simply decided to convert the old graveyard of the monastery into the allegedly ancient “final resting place of the old pre-Romanovian Czarinas.” The names of the nuns were chiselled off the lids, and covered by headstones with “apropos inscriptions.” The old sarcophagi were thus concealed by the headstones, and so the actual perpetrators hadn’t been too careful about the lettering on the sarcophagi, which is understandable, since the latter were to be buried in the ground right away, at any rate. Some of the sarcophagi were left without any inscriptions whatsoever; in two cases, the names of simple nuns, scribbled with a sharp objects, weren’t obliterated in time. This is how unscrupulously the Romanovs had created the false “royal necropolis” of the Muscovite Kremlin. We are beginning to realise that there must have been no royal necropolis in existence before the Romanovs. The Great Czars (Khans) of Russia, or the Horde, as well as their wives, were buried in the imperial royal burial ground – the famous pyramid field or Luxor in Egypt, Africa.

Less distinguished persons would be buried in Russia. However, the Romanovs had been striving to destroy all the really old sarcophagi that could have told us about the true history of the pre-Romanovian Russia, or the Horde, ever since their enthronement in the XVII century. What we are demonstrated nowadays as “authentic ancient artefacts” is nothing but Romanovian simulacra or sarcophagi of the common folk, which the Romanovian historians have declared royal without bothering about such
trifles as proof.

Ancient Russian sarcophagi of white stone were used as construction material in the Romanovian epoch, which reflects the attitude of the Romanovs towards the ancient history of Russia. Let us ponder this for a moment. Would any construction workers we know vandalise a nearby cemetery in order to procure stone for building a residential house? Would any of the readers feel like inhabiting a house like that? Such actions have always been considered sacrilege or signs of scorn and hatred directed at the deceased. This is precisely what we see in the behaviour of the Romanovian usurpers. Let us quote a passage from the book written by L. A. Belyaev, a modern archaeologist ([62]). He reports the following as he tells us about the excavations conducted in the cathedral of the Muscovite Bogoyavlenskiy monastery: “The ornamented headstones dating from the early XIV century [?] used as filling material in one of the dining-room’s walls” ([62], page 297). Thus, the old pre-Romanovian headstones were used as construction material for a dining room (see fig. 14.26).

Fig. 14.26. Ancient pre-Romanovian headstones of white stone decorated with carvings
and used as construction materials for the dining hall of the Bogoyavlenskiy Monastery in Moscow. Taken from [62], table 30.

We must also pay attention to the fact that the headstones that L. A. Belyaev refers to in [62] look very much like the headstone from the Old Simonov monastery (see fig. 6.28), as well as the old child’s sarcophagus from the basement of the Arkhangelskiy cathedral (see fig. 6.30). They are all made of individual limestone slabs and covered in the same kind of deep ornamental engraving; this must have been the standard appearance of the pre-Romanovian headstones, which had all been destroyed and pointedly used as construction material.

Let us return to the graves from the basement of the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral that presumably belong to the Russian Czarinas. We must remind the reader that all of the sarcophagi, with the exception of the ones installed in the Romanovian epoch, were made of a very cheap material – stone shards held together by copper brackets and plastered over. Our opponents might declare this to be an ancient Russian custom, claiming that before the Romanovs even the Czars were buried in such cheap and unsophisticated coffins, citing Russian poverty, primitive rituals of the Asian nomads and so on.

However, this isn’t true. The numerous remnants of the limestone sarcophagi dating from the pre-Romanovian epoch were all made of individual stone slabs and decorated with deep and accurate carvings. You can still see similar stone slabs or their debris in many of the old monasteries in Russia. No plaster here. Why would Russian Czarinas be buried in cheap sarcophagi made of plastered-over flotsam and jetsam, then? We are of the opinion that there’s just one answer to this – the Romanovs had replaced real sarcophagi by cheap unsophisticated imitations, which were instantly buried and removed from anyone’s sight, and so no special effort was invented into their production. The Romanovian hoaxers did not use any limestone or cover it with carvings, deciding that plaster should do the trick.
5) Let us now turn to the sarcophagi of the Romanovian epoch, starting with the XVII century and on. Those appear to be authentic. Bear in mind that there are two types of these sarcophagi – the anthropomorphic stone coffins with a head compartment, and the rectangular sarcophagi of stone with a wooden coffin inside of them. The sarcophagi in question are numbered 24, 28, 29, 37, 39, 40 and 52-56 in fig. 14.14. All of them date from the Romanovian epoch, except number 24, which must make them authentic.

A more careful study reveals a fascinating detail. It turns out that all of the Romanovian anthropomorphic sarcophagi date from before 1632, which is the dating that we find on the last of them (number 38). All the other Romanovian sarcophagi of this type date from earlier epochs, or the beginning of the XVII century.

On the other hand, all the Romanovian sarcophagi of the second type (rectangular with a coffin inside) date from 1636 and on. This is very interesting indeed – apparently, the Russian burial rituals were reformed between 1632 and 1636 (insofar as royal burials were concerned, at least). We see that before 1632 the first Romanovs had still adhered to the old burial customs of the Horde. However, they have subsequently decided to abandon this practice in a very abrupt way – starting from 1636, they have been doing it differently. This detail might be of great importance; a reform such as this one would naturally have to be a large-scale event, ecclesiastical as well as secular. It must have taken place in the middle of the XVII century, namely, in 1632-1637.

It is all the more amazing that nothing is told about this important event in Russian history nowadays. For instance, A. V. Kartashov’s *Essays on the History of the Russian Church* ([372], Volume 2, pages 110-112) refers to the period between 1634 and 1640 as to the epoch of Patriarch Ioasaf I, who must have taken part in the preparation and the implementation of the reform. However, A. V. Kartashov, famous scientist and the author of a fundamental work ([372]) does not utter a single word about it. He discusses other reforms of lesser importance credited to the
same patriarch in great detail; however, burial rituals, which are much more important, aren’t mentioned anywhere.

Let us turn to another fundamental multi-volume oeuvre of Makariy, Metropolitan of Moscow and Kolomna, entitled *History of the Russian Church* ([500]). The patriarchy of Ioasaf is discussed on pages 314-325 of Volume 6; however, not a single word is uttered about the burial reform. However, we do find what must be a trace of this reform. Makariy writes the following about the ritual of burying priests as described in the Prayer-Book of Patriarch Filaret: “Ioasaph’s prayer-book of 1639 abolishes this ritual as presumable heritage of ‘Yeremey, the heretic Bulgarian priest’” ([500], Volume 6, page 322).

This discovery of ours – namely, the change of the Russian burial ritual around 1632-1637, instantly allows us to discover the forgery among the sarcophagi kept in the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral of the Muscovite Kremlin. Let us consider Sarcophagus 24. It is ascribed to Theodosia, the daughter of Fyodor Ioannovich and Irina Godunova, q.v. in fig. 6.30 and the list above. The actual sarcophagus is void of lettering; the inscription must have come from some external headstone in the Voznesenskiy monastery that was lifted in order to transfer the sarcophagus to the basement of the Arkhangelskiy cathedral. However, it is obviously a forgery. If it had indeed been a pre-Romanovian sarcophagus, it would belong to the old anthropomorphic type, which is not the case with Sarcophagus 24; it is of the new type, and therefore cannot predate 1632. We catch the falsifiers of the Russian history red-handed once again.

It becomes obvious why the Russian history textbooks of the Romanovian epoch don’t mention the reform of the burial ritual in the 1630s – one of the reasons must be that the historians are very eager to date some of the XVII century sarcophagi (of the new type) to older, pre-Romanovian epochs. This is why they remain taciturn about Ioasaf’s reform (if it isn’t out of ignorance).
7.
In the second part of the XVII century the Romanovs removed old headstones from the Russian cemeteries and either destroyed them or used them as construction material. The excavations of 1999-2000 conducted in the Louzhetskiy Monastery of Mozhaysk

One of the oldest Russian monasteries, the Bogoroditse-Rozhdestvenskiy Louzhetskiy friary, is located in Mozhaysk. The friary is presumed to have been “founded by St. Ferapont in 1408 at the request of Andrei Dmitrievich of Mozhaysk, son of Great Prince Dmitriy Donskoi” ([536], page 100). The monastery exists until this day, although it has been reconstructed (see fig. 14.27).

Fig. 14.27. The Louzhetskiy Monastery of Our Lady’s Nativity in Mozhaysk. View from the north. Photograph taken in 2000.

In 1999-2000, the archaeological and restoration works in Louzhetskiy friary resulted in the removal of two-meter layers of the ground. In fig. 14.28 we cite a photograph of 2000 made in Louzhetskiy monastery after
the top layers of the ground were removed. The dark strip at the bottom of the cathedral corresponds to the thickness of the removed layers – it was painted with dark paint after exposure. These excavations in the friary courtyard revealed an amazing picture, which we shall relate in the present section. We are very grateful to Y. P. Streltsov, who had pointed out to us the facts that we shall be referring to herein.

![Image of Louzhetskiy Monastery](image)

Fig. 14.28. The Louzhetskiy Monastery in Mozhaysk. We see the courtyard. In 1999, some two metres of the turf were removed. The former level of soil can be judged by the dark strip at the bottom of the monastery’s cathedral. One can also see that the windows of the cathedral have been elevated except for one window, which had been at ground level when the excavations were conducted. In the foreground we see a few sarcophagi of the XVII-XIX century, unearthed during excavations and arranged in accurate rows. The level of soil in the courtyard now corresponds to that of the XVII century. Photograph taken in 2000.

It turned out that extensive construction works were conducted in the friary in the second half of the XVII century. The old headstones from the Russian cemeteries were walled up into the fundaments of the XVII century constructions. The amount of headstones used as construction material is so tremendous that one gets the impression local cemeteries were completely stripped of headstones at some point in time. One must note that the old headstones that were hidden from sight as a result of this operation were considerably different from the ones presented as
“specimens of the Old Russian style” nowadays. Almost all of the old headstones found in Louzhetskiy monastery during the excavations are covered in the exact same kind of ornamental carving as the ones from the Old Simonov monastery – a forked cross with three points, q.v. in fig. 14.29.

Fig. 14.29. One of the ancient Russian headstones unearthed from the XVII century foundation of the Louzhetskiy Monastery during the excavations of 1999-2000. It was used as construction material during the epoch of the first Romanovs. Photograph taken in 2000.

After the top layer of ground from the site next to the northern wall of the monastery’s main Cathedral of Our Lady’s Nativity had been removed, the foundation of a small church was found. It was built in the XVII century (see fig. 14.30). The time of its construction can even be indicated with more precision as postdating 1669. Apparently, the builders have used the old headstones alongside some of the “fresh” slabs of stone in a number of cases. There aren’t many such slabs in the foundation, but a few are present. In the summer of 2000 we have seen two of those – one dating from 7159, or 1651 A.D. in modern chronology, and the other, from 7177, or 1669 A.D. (see figs. 14.31 and 14.32). Thus, the construction works
must have been carried out after 1669, since we find a stone with that dating in the foundation.

Fig. 14.30. Louzhetskiy Monastery in Mozhaysk. The foundation of a destroyed XVII century church with old Russian headstones used as construction material. According to the writings on the headstones, we see the remains of construction works conducted in 1669 or later. Photograph taken in 2000.

Fig. 14.31. A XVII century headstone immured in the foundation of the demolished church of the Louzhetskiy Monastery, which was uncovered during the excavations of 1999. The epitaph reads: “Our Lord’s servant, Sister Taiseya, formerly Tatiana Danilovna, died on the 5th day of January in the year of 7159.” The year corresponds to 1651 A.D. Photograph taken in 2000.
Fig. 14.32. A XVII century headstone immured in the foundation of the demolished church of the Louzhetskii Monastery, which was uncovered during the excavations of 1999. The epitaph reads: “Our Lord’s servant, Brother Savatey Fyodorov, son of Poznyak, died on the 7th day of February in the year of 7177.” The year corresponds to 1669 A.D. Photograph taken in 2000.

The general impression that one gets after familiarizing oneself with the results of the excavations conducted in the Louzhetskii monastery is as follows. Apparently, in the XVII century the old headstones were removed from cemeteries en masse, and used as construction material (in particular, for the abovementioned foundation of a small church in the XVII century, which contains several dozen old headstones. Many of them became chipped or were broken so as to fit into the construction (see figs. 14.33-14.39). The numerous fragments of the old headstones became unstuck during the excavations. Some of them have been cleaned from the dirt and arranged in a pile in the courtyard of the friary (see fig. 14.40).
Fig. 14.33. Ancient headstone of white stone with a triangular cross engraved upon it, which was used as construction material in the foundation of the XVII century church of the Louzhetskiy Monastery in Mozhaysk. The foundation was unearthed after the excavations of 1999. Photograph taken in 2000.

Fig. 14.34. Headstones of white stone with engraved triangular crosses. Immured in the foundation of a XVII century church. Louzhetskiy Monastery, Mozhaysk. Photograph taken in 2000.

Fig. 14.35. Headstones of white stone with engraved triangular crosses. Used as construction material in the foundation of a XVII century church. Louzhetskiy Monastery, Mozhaysk. Photograph taken in 2000.
Fig. 14.36. Headstone of white stone with a triangular cross engraved upon it. Immured in the foundation of a XVII century church. Louzhetskiy Monastery, Mozhaysk. Photograph taken in 2000.

Fig. 14.37. Headstone of white stone with a triangular cross engraved upon it. Used as construction material in the foundation of a XVII century church. Louzhetskiy Monastery, Mozhaysk. Photograph taken in 2000.

Fig. 14.38. Headstones of white stone with triangular crosses immured in the foundation of a XVII century church. One of them is marked “7 February 7191.” The dating converts into the modern chronological system as 1683 A. D. Louzhetskiy Monastery, Mozhaysk. Photograph taken in 2000.
Fig. 14.39. Fragment of a headstone with an exceptionally large triangular cross engraved upon it. We see the central part of the cross, which has remained intact. Apart from that, on the side of the headstone we see the remnants of an ornament that one often sees on other old Russian headstones. From the masonry of the XVII century church at the Louzhetskiy Monastery in Mozhaysk. Photograph taken in 2000.

Fig. 14.40. Fragments of the ancient Russian headstones used in the XVII century masonry of the Louzhetskiy Monastery in Mozhaysk. Photograph taken in 2000.

Most of these old headstones bear the symbol of a three-point forked cross; however, there are several exceptions. For instance, one of the fragments found in the Louzhetskiy monastery is decorated with a four-point cross, but the shape is different from that of the modern crosses – this one resembles the footprint of a bird (see fig. 14.41).
Fig. 14.41. The four-pointed cross on the ancient Russian headstone looks like a bird’s footprint or a triangular forked cross with an extra branch at the top. It differs greatly from the four-pointed crosses commonly found on Christian graves. The Louzhetskiy Monastery, Mozhaysk. Photograph taken in 2000.

Another rare specimen is a five-point forked cross. A slab with such a cross was discovered by Y. P. Streltsov and G. V. Nosovskiy, one of the authors, in the summer of 2000, in the foundation of the stone staircase that had once led to the gate of Our Lady’s Nativity Cathedral from the west. The staircase is in ruins nowadays, and has been replaced by modern metallic stairs. However, a part of the foundation remained intact. This is where this rare old headstone was discovered (see figs. 14.42 and 14.43).

Fig. 14.42. Ancient Russian headstone with a five-pointed forked cross uncovered from the XVII century masonry of the Louzhetskiy Monastery in Mozhaysk. Photograph taken in 2000.
Fig. 14.43. Headstone of the intermediate variety – with old-fashioned ornamentation, but sans forked crosses. Manufactured during the epoch of the first Romanovs. We see two epitaphs with dates: “On 6 August of the year 7149, the Servant of our Lord, infant Andrei, son of Pavel Fyodorovich Klementyev, rested in peace” on the left and “On 5 February of the year 7149, the Servant of our Lord, infant Pyotr, son of Pavel Fyodorovich Klementyev, rested in peace.” The years convert into the modern chronological system as 1641 and 1643. The lettering was done by a professional carver, likewise the ornamental pattern at the edges of the stone. The epitaphs are authentic. The Louzetskiy Monastery of Mozhaysk. Photograph taken in 2000.

All the frescoes in the monastery’s Cathedral of Our Lady’s Nativity were chiselled off. We are familiar with such displays of all-out demolition from what we found in the cathedrals of the Muscovite Kremlin, q.v. in Chron4, Chapter 14:5. The pre-Romanovian frescoes there have also been chiselled off, and they were anything but “ancient and dilapidated” when they got destroyed – not even a hundred years old. Something of this sort must have taken place in the Louzhetskiy monastery, Mozhaysk. Many small fragments of chiselled-off plaster covered in dots of bright paint from the old frescoes were piled up right in the yard of the monastery. They were discovered in the course of the excavations in 1999. We have seen them in the summer of 2000 (see fig. 14.44). Apparently, the old frescoes of the Russian cathedrals had failed to correlate with the reality
tunnel of the Romanovian historians and contradicted the Romanovian version of the Russian history, and therefore became destroyed – first in the Muscovite Kremlin, and later throughout all of Russia.
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**Fig. 14.44.** This is all that remains of the ancient frescoes from the Cathedral of Our Lady’s Nativity at the Louzhetskiy Monastery. The frescoes were chiselled off together with the plaster in the epoch of the XVIII-XIX century and piled up at the southern wall of the monastery, right next to the gate. Piles of rubble and plaster fragments were discovered here after the excavations of 1999. Photograph taken in 2000.

The destruction of the frescoes on the walls of the ancient Russian churches and cathedral is rather typical. Sometimes historians manage to blame it on the “intervention forces of the Poles and the Lithuanians running rampant in the epoch of the Great Strife,” who appear to have possessed a certain inexplicable penchant for the destruction of monastery libraries, ancient artwork and any artefact that might provide us with information concerning the old Russian history in general. Sometimes we are told that an ancient cathedral “has never been decorated” – presumably, there was enough money for the construction of this cathedral, but the artwork had fallen prey to the lack of funds, so the walls were simply whitewashed. However, occasionally, as is the case with the Louzhetskiy monastery of Mozhaysk, it is admitted that the frescoes were destroyed by the Romanovian authorities. Why was that done? No explanations are ever given by the representatives of historical science; however, our reconstruction explains everything perfectly well.
Let us return to the Russian headstones of the old kind found in the Louzhetskiy monastery. The inscriptions upon them are of the utmost interest – especially the opportunity of finding a pre-Romanovian inscription. Unfortunately, it turns out that there are either no inscriptions on the stones whatsoever (as one sees in fig. 14.29, for instance), or there is some lettering that is presumed to date from the XVI century, but appears to be counterfeit (alternatively, it is genuine and dates from the epoch of the Romanovs). We shall discuss this in more detail below. For the meantime, let us just reiterate that we haven’t managed to find a single authentic inscription dating from the pre-Romanovian epoch on these stones – it appears that all the old headstones with such inscriptions were destroyed, or subjected to the chisel at least. However, even after this procedure the silent stones must have remained a nuisance for the Romanovian historians, and were thus taken away from the cemeteries and buried underground, where no one could see them. After the religious reform (q.v. described in Chapter 6 above) the Russian cemeteries became outfitted with a new kind of headstone, the Romanovian model, quite unlike its predecessor. Later it all became conveniently forgotten.

However, below we shall see that the Romanovs haven’t come up with this radical method at once. They had initially tried to correct the inscriptions on some of the old headstones at least. And so they had launched a campaign for the erasure of inscriptions found upon some of the ancient headstones and the complete destruction of the rest. The old stones or the old texts were replaced by new ones and given fresh pre-Romanovian datings. As we shall see in case of the Louzhetskiy monastery, this replacement was made so carelessly that it is instantly obvious to a modern researcher. Apparently, the XVII century officials who were checking the replacement works in the Russian cemeteries weren’t too pleased with the quality, and decided to have all the headstones removed and replaced by a completely new variety. This may also have pursued the objective of facilitating the location and destruction of the pre-Romanovian headstones with “irregular” symbols and
Let us therefore turn to the epitaphs. All the ones that we have seen upon the old headstones in the Louzhetskiy monastery begin with words “In the year … such-and-such was buried here.” Thus, the date is always indicated in the very beginning of the epitaph. The old stones discovered in the Louzhetskiy monastery appear to be referring to the XVI century, or the pre-Romanovian epoch. However, we have found other stones of the exact same type with XVII datings, already from the Romanovian epoch. There is nothing surprising about this fact; we have already mentioned that the burial customs, including the headstone type, were only reformed in the second half of the XVII century; therefore, the old headstones had still been used in Russia during the first few decades of the Romanovian epoch. The technique and the quality of the artwork (the forked cross and the perimeter strip) are completely the same on both the Romanovian and the pre-Romanovian stones; the carvers of the XVII century were therefore at the same technical level as their XVI century predecessors, and worked in the same manner.

The truly amazing fact is as follows. On the stones with Romanovian datings, all the inscriptions are of the same high quality as the artwork. The lettering and the artwork are carved deep into the stone by a professional craftsman (see figs. 14.43, 14.45, 14.46 and 14.47). The craftsman paid attention to the shading of the letters, tried to use lines of different thickness, which made the lettering look more dynamic. The same technique was used in the artwork of the forked cross and the perimeter ornament. Also, the inscriptions of the Romanovian epoch always fit into the place between the two top lines of the cross and the perimeter artwork. The space of this field would differ from headstone to headstone; this would be achieved via different angles of the cross lines and different locations of its centre. It is perfectly obvious that the craftsmen would always know the size of the space they needed for the epitaph and arrange the artwork accordingly.
Fig. 14.45. Headstone of the old fashion with a forked cross manufactured in the epoch of the first Romanovs. The epitaph is as follows: “On 10 July of 7142, the servant of our Lord, U … avlov … rovich … Kle … rested in peace.” The dots mark obliterated or illegible letters. The year translates into the modern chronological system as 1634. The quality of the lettering is just as high as that of the border ornament. The epitaph is authentic. The Louzhetskiy Monastery of Mozhaysk. Photograph taken in 2000.
Fig. 14.46. Headstone of the old fashion with a forked cross manufactured in the epoch of the Romanovs (1631). Found broken during the excavations of 1999-2000 underneath the belfry of the Louzhetskiy Monastery. Put together from pieces and placed in the newly constructed belfry. Photograph taken in 2000.

Fig. 14.47. Lettering on a headstone dating from 1631, found underneath the bell-tower of the Louzhetskiy Monastery: “The year of 7139 (1631 A.D.), in the 15th day of June, in memory of St. … Maximovich Vaneyko, known to the monks of as Brother Arkadiy the Hermit.” The lettering is authentic. Louzhetskiy Monastery, Mozhaysk. Photograph taken in 2000.

However, this is not the case with the pre-Romanovian headstones. The quality of the lettering is considerably lower than that of the ornaments found on the same headstone. At best, the epitaphs are scratched upon the stone with some sharp stylus (see fig. 14.48). Many of such inscriptions have guiding lines (fig. 14.49). Those naturally disfigure the epitaphs and make them look crude and clumsy, while the perimeter artwork is still distinct and professional. Moreover, some of the lettering that is said to date from the XVI century also fails to correspond to the size of the field, proving too short – for instance, in fig. 14.50 the inscription clearly says 7076, or 1568 A.D. See also figs. 14.51 and 14.52. We also discovered an obviously mutilated epitaph, where the artwork on the headstone is
perfect, and the epitaph is simply scratched upon the stone with a rough stylus and very clumsily (figs. 14.53 and 14.54). This inscription is obviously false; it contains a dating – “Зпи,” or 7088 since Adam (1580 A.D.). It appears as though the hoaxers put a new inscription with a XVI century dating onto an old headstone.

Fig. 14.48. Lettering on a headstone with a forked cross – apparently, a forgery. The stone itself, as well as the ornamentation and cross, were performed by a professional carver. The lettering was simply scratched on the stone with some sharp object. One doesn’t need to be a carver in order to match in – a simple nail shall suffice. The Louzhetskiy Monastery of Mozhaysk. Photograph taken in 2000.
Fig. 14.49. Explicitly counterfeit lettering on a headstone with a forked cross. In the top right we see a scratched date – presumably, a XVI century one (the letters stand for the 7050’s or the 7080’s; one needs to subtract 5508 to end up with a modern dating falling over the middle or the end of the XVI century. One sees the crude guiding lines – however, they didn’t make the letters any less clumsy. The ornaments look older than the lettering – time has almost obliterated them. Nevertheless, it is obvious that, unlike the lettering, the ornaments were carved by a professional. Photograph of 2000, taken in the Louzhetskiy Monastery of Mozhaysk.
Fig. 14.50. Lettering of the alleged XVI century on an old headstone with a forked cross; obviously done by a lay carver, and obviously fails to correspond to the place reserved for it. The dating reads perfectly unambiguously: “Orina Grigoryeva, died on 1 October 7076.” The lettering is thus dated to 1568 A.D. (7076 – 5508 = 1568). It is most likely to be a forgery. Photograph of 2000, taken in the Louzhetskiy Monastery of Mozhaysk.
Fig. 14.51. Lettering upon an old headstone with a forked cross, presumably dating from the pre-Romanovian epoch. The lettering is extremely crude, unprofessional and does not correspond to the size of the space reserved for it. The dating is all but obliterated; however, we can still read its second half as “16”; it must have stood for either 7016 or 7116, which translates as 1508 or 1608, making the date pre-Romanovian. The entire lettering consists of 4 or 5 words and only occupies a small part of the available space. However, the border ornamentation and the forked cross were carved professionally and accurately. The lettering is most likely a forgery. Photograph of 2000, taken in the Louzhetskiy Monastery of Mozhaysk.

Fig. 14.52. Fragment of the previous photograph with the lettering. Photograph taken in 2000.
Fig. 14.53. Lettering on an old headstone, presumably dating from the XVI century. Photograph of 2000, taken in the Louzhetskiy Monastery of Mozhaysk.

Fig. 14.54. A close-in of the lettering from an old headstone allegedly dating from the XVI century. Right next to the excellent ornamentation we see an uneven lettering that looks as though it were scratched upon the stone by a child: “7088 … month … on the 12th day in memory of … the martyr … Servant of Our Lord.” The date translates as 1580 A.D. It is most likely a typical example of outright negligence typical for the authors of counterfeit epitaphs in the XVI century. The Louzhetskiy Monastery of Mozhaysk. Photograph taken in 2000.

In general, we notice the following strange phenomena:
a. The headstones with dates pertaining to the Romanovian epoch have epitaph lettering of as high a quality as the artwork of the perimeter ornaments and the forked crosses.

b. The headstones with alleged pre-Romanovian datings upon them are covered in high quality artwork for as long as the cross and the ornaments are concerned; however, the epitaphs are all immature and rough. The contrast between the ornaments and the lettering is hard not to notice at once.

The “pre-Romanovian” epitaphs are scribbled in stone rather primitively – they lettering has no rectangular edges from the chisel, and all the lines are of the same width. In other words, no professional carving methods were used when these inscriptions were made, anyone can write a similar epitaph with a simple nail. Some of these inscriptions were unfinished and end abruptly, q.v. in figs. 14.50, 14.51 and 14.52. However, their content does not make them any different from the epitaphs of the Romanovian epoch. The formulae used in the text are the same.

Our opponents might want to suggest that the XVI century craftsmen had still found it hard to carve letters upon stone surfaces with any degree of skill. However, we cannot agree with this version – the elaborate perimeter ornament and the cross are carved immaculately!

The more persistent of our opponents might want to make another suggestion, namely, that a common practice of “recycling the headstones” had existed in the XVI century – that is to say, people would grab old headstones, chisel the epitaphs off them, scribble new ones and put the stones onto fresh graves. This mysterious practise would cease in the XVII century for some reason. Let us ponder the discovery once again. Every single headstone from the Loužhnetskiy monastery that is said to date from the XVI century has a crude epitaph and a very fine ornament, while in case of the XVII century headstones the ornaments and the epitaphs both look perfect. There isn’t a single XVI century headstone with an original epitaph in existence – the only ones that we have at our disposal shall
prove to be “recycled” stones in this case. This would be very odd indeed – after all, some of the XVI century headstones should have survived in their original condition, if we are to assume that a part of them was used for the second time. This isn’t the case.

The most probable explanation of the discrepancy between the finesse of the artwork and the sketchy crudeness of the epitaphs in case of the XVI century headstones is altogether different. Every epitaph on every pre-Romanovian headstone was destroyed in the second half of the XVII century. The Romanovs ordered for a number of replicas to be manufactured so as to make the absence of headstones less conspicuous. Some of the old stones were covered in new inscriptions with counterfeit pre-Romanovian dates; the actual formula used in the epitaph had remained identical to the one commonly used in the Romanovian epoch. The objective had been to “prove” that no burial custom reform ever took place, and that the pre-Romanovian epitaphs had generally been just the same as the ones used in the time of the Romanovs. Their content, alphabet, language, etc., had presumably remained the same as they had been before the ascension of the Romanovs.

Counterfeit epitaphs of the alleged XVI century had however proved too crude, which is easy to understand. In case of a real headstone, the relations of the deceased that pay the carver for his work are very meticulous about the quality of the latter, and control the quality of the lettering. But if the authors of the false lettering were following orders from the faraway Moscow or St. Petersburg, they would hardly be bothered about anything else but the “correct” text. No one would require quality artwork from those. The actual headstones had been old and authentic, with ornaments and forked crosses; the perpetrators would hastily scribble epitaphs thereupon. We aren’t talking professional carvers here – it doesn’t seem plausible that the order to write false epitaphs on the headstone had been accompanied by money to hire professional carvers.

The next order had been to remove all the old-fashioned headstones from cemeteries and to make new one to a different standard, pretending it
had “always existed.” The old headstones, with both the authentic epitaphs of the Romanovian epoch and the counterfeit ones that had been supposed to play the part of authentic pre-Romanovian headstones inscribed upon them, were utilised as construction stone.

The excavations at the Louzhetskiy Monastery reveal all these numerous distortions of the ancient Russian history.

We are confronted with several issues of the greatest interest. What could have been written on the authentic Russian headstones of the pre-Romanovian epoch? What language were the epitaphs in – Church Slavonic, Arabic, Turkic, or some other language, forgotten nowadays? It would be expedient to remind the reader that inscriptions upon Russian weapons had been in Arabic up to the XVI and even the XVII century, q.v. in Chron4, Chapter 13. Could the same be the case with the Russian epitaphs? It is possible that before the Romanovs the Arabic language had been considered holy in Russia, alongside Church Slavonic and Greek.

All of the above requires a very careful study. Without answering these questions, we cannot really reconstruct the true realities of life in Russia before the Romanovs. Russian archaeologists have a tremendous scope of work here.

In May 2001 we visited Louzhetskiy monastery once again, after the passage of roughly a year since our first visit. What have we seen? It turns out that the excavated foundation of an old church that we mentioned above has changed its appearance. Parts of several ancient headstones of the XVI-XVII century that had formerly protruded from the fundament have been broken off or covered in cement. Some of the surviving fragments containing ancient artwork and lettering have been lost as a result. We are of the opinion that it would be better to preserve the uncovered ruins in their original condition as an important historical artefact and have them visited by tourists and schoolchildren. These authentic historical artefacts that were unearthed quite miraculously are in poor correspondence with the consensual version of history. Some of the individual headstone fragments put up for exhibition at some distance
from the foundation remain intact, but not all of them. We didn’t many of the ones that had been here in 2000.
8.
Geography according to a map of Great Tartary that dates from 1670

In fig. 14.55 one sees a map that was manufactured in Paris in 1670 and whose full title runs as follows: “La Grande Tartarie. Par le Sr. Sanson. A Paris. Chez l’Auteur aux Galleries du Louvre Avec Privilege pour Vingt Angs. 1670.”

![Map of Great Tartary](image)


The map is very interesting indeed, and corresponds well to our reconstruction. Let us begin with the observation that the map in question is one the Great Tartary, or the Mongol Tartary (bearing in mind that the word “Mongol” translates as “Great”). According to the map, Great Tartary
didn’t just include the Russian Empire in the modern sense of the term, but also China and India.

The map rather spectacularly gives us several versions of the same geographical name. For instance, the names Moal, Mongal and Magog are synonyms, according to the map. Then we have Ieka-Moal, Iagog and Gog, which all mean the same things. Actually, the reflections of the Biblical nations of Gog and Magog identified as the Goths and the Mongols, or the Cossacks, have survived in Scaligerian history until the present day, q.v. in *Chron5*. We see India referred to “Mogol Inde,” or the word “Mongol” with the Old Russian word *inde*, which translates as “far away.” In other words, the name translates as “the faraway Mongols,” or “the faraway Great Ones.”

In Siberia we see the “Alchai” mountains also known as “Belgian Mountains.” A little further to the west we also find the name Germa, or Germany. What we see here must reflect an interesting historical process. After the fragmentation of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire, which had spanned a large part of Eurasia, Africa and America, many of the old “Mongolian” names began to travel Eastwards from the West. This process was captured by the numerous freshly compiled maps of the Western Europe. The former Great Tartary was thus declared to have spanned the territories that lay to the east of the Volga and nothing else. Therefore, the former geography of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire became compressed in a way; the scribes and cartographers of the Western Europe have been laborious enough to wipe out the Horde terminology from their own territory. As a result, some of the “Mongolian” imperial geographical names travelled to the east, beyond Ural. Indeed, the map of 1670 that we have under study contains the European names Germa(ny) and Belgium. These blunders were naturally corrected later, and nowadays we don’t see any traces of Germany or Belgium in Siberia. All we have are Mongolia and India, greatly reduced in size, since in the XIV-XVI century the names Mongolia and India had been used by the Westerners for referring to the entire Horde, or Russia. See *Chron5* for more in re the application of the
name India to Russia in the Middle Ages.

Let us return to the map of 1670, q.v. in fig. 14.55. We see the town of Bulgar in Moscovia, right next to Kazan, upon River Volga. The river Don is called Tana. Another city whose name rings very interesting to us is Wasilgorod, which is located on River Volga, between Nizhniy Novgorod and Kazan – the name translates as “City of Vassily” or “Czar Ciry.” There is no such city here nowadays. Could it be the XVII century name of Cheboksary? The root SAR in the name of the city is really one of the numerous versions of the word Czar. The modern River Lena in Siberia is called “Tartar river,” whereas the entire north-eastern Siberia bears the name “Su-Moal ats Tartar.”

We can therefore see that in the XVII century the West Europeans had still used the old Horde names for many geographical locations on the territory of Russia; those were subsequently erased by the Scaligerian and Romanovian historians and cartographers.
A. I. Soulakadzev and his famous collection of books and chronicles

Alexander Ivanovich Soulakadzev had lived in 1771-1832 ([407], pages 155-156). He is a famous collector of old books and chronicles, including those concerned with Russian history. Over the years, he had collected an enormous amount of books and chronicles that amounted to several thousand units. Towards the end of his life, he published a catalogue of books and chronicles that he had collected. There were many heated debates concerning his activities in the XVIII-XIX century. Modern historians believe him to be a malicious and “one of the most notorious Russian falsifiers of historical works, whose activities are reflected in dozens of special works… He had specialised in large-scale counterfeit propagation … It is truly baffling just how boldly he had manufactured and advertised the counterfeits. The amount and “genre scope” of his creations are also quite amazing” ([407], page 155).

The heated interest of the Russian XIX century intelligentsia in the historical materials collected by Soulakadzev was combined with active accusations of Soulakadzev’s alleged proneness for “collecting the ancient chronicles and disfiguring them with his own amendments and subscripts to make them seem more ancient,” according to A. K. Vostokov’s sentiment of 1850 (quotation given according to [407], page 160). P. M. Stroyev wrote the following in 1832: “When he [Soulakadzev – Auth.] … had still been alive, I have studied his treasure vaults of literature, which Count Tolstoy was intending to purchase in those days… The rather crude corrections that nearly every chronicle appeared to have been afflicted by haunt me until this day” (quotation given according to [407], pages 160-161).
Nevertheless, the situation appears to have a lot more facets to it than we can see nowadays. Historians themselves admit the following: “These harsh and sceptically patronising assessments of Soulakadzev’s collection had proved unjust in many cases. Over his life he had indeed managed to collect a large and valuable collection of printed and handwritten materials. The collection had been based … on the library and chronicle collection of his father and grandfather [it is assumed that Soulakadzev had been the descendant of the Georgian prince G. M. Soulakidze – Auth.]. It later became complemented by the items he had bought, received as presents, and possibly also purloined from ecclesiastical and secular collections and libraries… A number of truly unique documents mysteriously ended up as part of his collection, in particular – the lists of chronicles that were sent to the Synod at the end of the XVIII century on the orders of Catherine the Great (they had been kept in the archives of the Synod up until the beginning of the XIX century). Nowadays we know of a chronicle numbered 4967” ([407], page 161).

This number demonstrates that Soulakadzev’s collection had included 4967 books and chronicles at least! “Upon one of the chronicles Soulakadzev has written about his ownership of ‘over 2 thousand chronicles of different kinds, excepting the ones written on parchment.’ It is difficult to check the veracity of this evidence – surviving library catalogues name 62 to 294 Slavic and Western European chronicles… Nowadays we know the locations of more than 100 chronicles that had formerly been owned by Soulakadzev” ([407], page 161).

It was Soulakadzev’s collection that gave us such famous Russian sources as “the History of the Kazan Kingdom in its XVII century copy, the Chronographical Palea of the XVI century, the Chronicle of A. Palitsyn [one of the primary sources on the history of the Great Strife of the early XVII century – Auth.], the Southern edition of the Chronographer, and a fragment of Nicon’s chronicle as a XVII century copy” ([407], page 162). These sources are not considered counterfeit by modern historians – on the contrary, they study them diligently and use
them as basis for dissertations and scientific monographs. Thus, the
collection of Soulakadzev is divided in two parts: the “correct sources”
and the “incorrect sources,” or alleged forgeries. It would be interesting to
learn about the basis of these allegations.

Let us state right away that we do not intend to act as judges insofar as
the issue of whether or not Soulakadzev had been a hoaxter is concerned.
We haven’t had the opportunity to study the history of his collection in
detail, and we haven’t held any of the chronicles or the books that he had
purchased in our hands. Moreover, most of them are presumed lost or
have been destroyed deliberately, as we shall mention below. However,
our analysis of the Russian history makes the entire picture of
Soulakadzev’s collection serving as the apple of discord and instigating a
struggle in the ranks of the historians and the intelligentsia a great deal
clearer.

Let us consider the argumentation used by the historians that accuse a
large part of Soulakadzev’s collection of being “counterfeit” and
“bastardising Russian history.” We learn that “this ‘passion’ of
Soulakadzev’s was rooted in the social and scientific atmosphere of the
first decades of the XIX century. The century began with many great
discoveries made in the field of the Slavic and Russian literature and
literacy: in 1800, the first publication of the ‘Slovo o polku Igoreve’ came
out … Periodicals published sensational news about the library of Anna
Yaroslavna, the runic “Chronicles of the Drevlyane,” a Slavic codex of the
VIII century A.D. discovered in Italy and so on” ([407], pages 163-164).

In 1807 Soulakadzev “told Derzhavin about the ‘Novgorod runes’ that
he had had at his disposal” ([407], page 164). Shortly after that,
Soulakadzev purchased “Boyan’s Song of the Slavs” or the “Hymn to
Boyan.” This text is presumed to be one of Soulakadzev’s falsifications
nowadays. Historian V. P. Kozlov writes that “the present specimen of a
‘runic’ text obviously demonstrates that this agglomeration of pseudo-
anachronisms derived from Slavic roots of words is quite unlikely to have
any meaning” (ibid.).
V. Kozlov proceeds to cite what he must consider the “most absurd fragment” of the “Hymn to Boyan,” alongside Soulakadzev’s translation. However, we find nothing manifestly absurd here. A propos, this text appears to resemble the Etruscan texts that we consider in Chron5. Their language, which appears to be of a Slavic origin, has got a number of idiosyncrasies uncharacteristic for the Old Russian language that we’re accustomed to. There are thus authentic ancient texts in existence, whose language resembles that of the “Hymn to Boyan.” This naturally doesn’t imply that the “Hymn” is authentic; however, one would have to prove it a forgery first. We find no such proof anywhere in [407], for instance.

Let us point out a certain peculiarity that concerns the system of accusations against Soulakadzev. For instance, V. P. Kozlov’s book entitled The Mysteries of Falsification. Manual for University Professors and Students ([407]) devotes a whole chapter to Soulakadzev, which begins with the phrase “The Khlestakov of Russian ‘archaeology’.” Nevertheless, we haven’t found a single straightforward accusation of falsification based on any actual information anywhere on the thirty pages occupied by this chapter. There isn’t a single proven case of forgery – all the accusations are based on vague pontificating about the alleged vices of Soulakadzev. His interest in theatrical art is called “fanatical” by Kozlov ([407], page 156), who also hints that Soulakadzev may have invented his princely Georgian origins, without bothering to give us any proof of the above ([407], page 155). Historians are particularly irate about the unpublished historical play of Soulakadzev entitled “Ioann, the Muscovite Warlord,” whose characters are said to “inhabit … a fantasy world” ([407], page 158). Kozlov cites a whole list of Soulakadzev’s vices – “unsystematic curiosity, romantic propensity for fantasising accompanied by a dilettante’s approach, wishful thinking, and the solution of problems with the aid of self-assured stubbornness and bons mots instead of actual knowledge” ([407], page 155). It goes on like this, without a single sign of evidence or example.

Why would this be? What could explain the vitriol that obviously
betrays an innate hatred for Soulakadzev harboured by the author?

It is rather difficult to find a single answer to this question. We believe the reason to be formulated in the following passage. Apparently, Soulakadzev “in his patriotic inspiration … gives a blow-by-blow account of the Slavic history as a chain of victorious campaigns of the Slavs… He had clearly been searching for evidence in favour of the viewpoint that had made the Slavs all but the direct heirs of the Ancient Rome who had also been the most highly-evolved nation in Europe” ([407], page 168). The analysis that we provide in *Chron5* makes it obvious that Soulakadzev’s point of view had been correct for the most part – at least, the theory about the Slavic Great = “Mongolian” Empire, or the Horde, being the actual successor of the Byzantine kingdom whose heyday had been in the XI-XIII century. Apart from that, in *Chron7* we demonstrate that the Horde Empire of the XIV-XVI century became reflected in the “ancient” history as the “ancient” Roman Empire. The Romanovian historians had already been introducing another chronology of the ancient history, largely imported from the Western Europe, where the Slavs had been considered the most backward nation in existence. The primary documents that had contained the history of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire, had been destroyed during the first two centuries of the Romanovian reign in Russia. The surviving historical evidence had amounted to a collection of assorted odds and ends, indirect references, and individual documents. But even those had been regarded as a menace by the sentinels of the official Romanovian history. Soulakadzev must have gathered a collection of such surviving individual documents. Since he had not been a professional historian, he did not possess the motivation to either confirm or disprove the Romanovian version of history. He appears to have been driven by a sincere desire to understand the ancient history of Russia, which had been his major fault and the reason for all the accusations of insufficient professionalisms coming from the part of the Romanovian (and therefore also modern) historians. From their point of view, a professional is someone who works towards supporting the
Scaligerian and Romanovian version of history. Anyone who dares to oppose it must be destroyed. The destruction can manifest as the attachment of labels – one of “malicious hoaxter” in case of Soulakadzev. The name of the heretical collector can then be demonized in any which way – he can be declared a fanatic, an amateur and a myth-monger. The school and university schoolbooks can ruin his reputation post mortem, casually referring to the collector as to a major hoaxter. The students hardly have any other option but believing it.

Let us return to the “Hymn to Boyan” that Soulakadzev is supposed to have written himself. The commentators pour their utmost loathing and scorn upon this “pseudo-literary work”; on the other hand, historians themselves admit that the Hymn had “initially made a very strong impression on Soulakadzev’s contemporaries … this can be clearly seen from Derzhavin’s translation of the Hymn, likewise the fact that … [the ‘Hymn to Boyan’ – Auth.] had been used as a veracious historical source for the biography of Boyan published by the Syn Otechestva (‘Son of the Fatherland’) periodical in 1821” ([407], page 168).

Thus, the XIX century Russian society, likewise the writers, who had been educated people and connoisseurs of the Old Russian literature, did not have any complaints about the “Hymn to Boyan.” However, a short while later the professional historians of the XIX century had “instantly adopted a doubtful and even all-out sceptical stance towards the ‘Hymn to Boyan’” ([407], page 168). The “explanation” offered by the learned historians is as follows: “Some parties … had boasted about … finding what they assume to be the Runic alphabet of the ancient Slavs … which was used for writing the ‘Hymn to Boyan’ … These runes resemble … the letters of the Slavic alphabet to an enormous extent, and therefore conclusions were made about the Slavs’ very own … Runic alphabet that had existed before the Christianity, and that when Cyril and Mefodiy were inventing the modern Russian alphabet, they had taken the existing Slavic runes and added a few Greek and other letters thereto!” ([407], pages 168-169).
Indeed, how could a historian of the Scaligerian and Romanovian school possibly tolerate the heretical theory (which, as we are beginning to realise, might very well be a true one) that the Cyrillic alphabet is but a slight modification of the Slavic runes, with the addition of several symbols from the Western alphabets? After all, this is the very alphabet that we found all across the Western Europe (also under the name of the “Etruscan alphabet”). Since we already understand what the real events behind this smokescreen had really been like (q.v. in *Chron5*), it becomes obvious why the commentators should be in this great a distress about the whole affair. It is a heavy blow to the entire edifice of the Scaligerian chronology. The Russian society of the XIX century must have still possessed a distant memory of its own history, namely, that of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire. However, the Romanovian historians must have been very well aware of what had been going on, hence the relentlessness of their stance. The reaction of these venerable scholars to all such phenomena had always been very quick and to the point, demonstrating good education and absolute ruthlessness. All the runic texts written by the ancient Slavs have been declared fake; Soulakadzev had gathered the reputation of a malicious hoaxer, with all kinds of vices attached so as to discredit his collection, which must have contained a great number of truly interesting objects, to as great an extent as possible.

We can judge about it by one single catalogue of books and chronicles that were part of this collection made by Soulakadzev himself. The very name of the catalogue is rather conspicuous: “An inventory, or a catalogue of ancient books, handwritten as well as printed, many of which were anathematised by ecclesiastic councils, and others burnt by numbers, even though they would only concern history; many of them were written upon parchment, and others upon leather, beech planks, pieces of birch bark, thick saturated canvas, etc.” (quoting according to [407], page 176). Here are some of the most interesting sections that this inventory had contained: ““Banned books forbidden for reading and keeping,’ ‘Books called heretical,’ ‘Apostate literature’ ” (*ibid.*).
Historians admit that “the ‘Inventory’ had contained several real works of Russian and Slavic literary art whose originals had never been seen; scientists were anxious to locate them” ([4-7], pages 176-177). Wherefore the anxiety? Some of the scientists must have wanted to read and study the books in question, whereas the others had been after reading and destroying them. One must admit that, sadly, the latter party appears to have succeeded, since the fate of the enormous, and apparently priceless collection of Soulakadzev had been quite tragic. It had been destroyed de facto, and in a very sly manner.

According to V. P. Kozlov, “Soulakadzev’s collection of books and manuscripts … ceased to exist as a single entity after the death of its collector. A large part of it appears to be altogether lost” ([407], pages 161-162). Historians believe this to be Soulakadzev’s “own fault.” Apparently, he is to be blamed for leaving his wife with the false impression of the collection’s great value. Therefore, the widow who had been “deceived by her husband” did not want to separate the collection into lesser portions or individual books, and had initially wanted to sell it all to a single buyer. It is reported further that “the collectors from Moscow and St. Petersburg, who had initially been very interested in the purchase of Soulakadzev’s collection, soon all but boycotted the widow” ([407], page 162).

“The bibliographer Y. F. Berezin-Shiryaev reports … the sad fate that appears to have befallen … the majority of the manuscripts and the books. In December 1870 he walked into a bookshop at Apraksin Court in St. Petersburg, and saw ‘a multitude of books tied into gigantic bundles and laying around on the floor. Almost all of the books had been in ancient leather bindings, and some of them even in white sheep leather… The next day I found out that the books I saw in Shapkin’s shop had once belonged to the famous bibliophile Soulakadzev, and had been kept for several years tied into bundles up at someone’s attic. Shapkin had purchased them cheaply’” ([407], page 162). Berezin-Shiryaev had bought “all the foreign books that had been at Shapkin’s disposal – over 100 volumes, as well as a number of books in Russian” ([407], page 162). The great value of
Soulakadzev’s collection is rather eloquently confirmed by the very fact that among the books strewn all over the floor of Shapkin’s shop there were a few mid-XVI century editions.

The following circumstance cannot fail to attract our attention – the first book purchases were made from Soulakadzev’s wife by P. Y. Aktov and A. N. Kasterin, the famed collectors from St. Petersburg. One must think that they had purchased the most valuable items from Soulakadzev’s collection. What do we see? It had been these very books that had for some reason failed to survive ([407], page 162). Kasterin, for instance, was already selling Soulakadzev’s books in 1847. He had destroyed the “banned books,” and was selling all the “extra” ones that he had been forced to buy from the allegedly avaricious widow of Soulakadzev and didn’t really need. It is characteristic that those of Soulakadzev’s books that were bought from Shapkin later by Berezin-Shiryaev and Dourov have remained intact and retained their integrity ([407], page 173). The obvious reason for this would be that both Berezin-Shiryaev and Dourov were buying their books after the collection had been subjected to a “censor’s purge” – all the really dangerous sources must have already been effectively destroyed.

By the way, Soulakadzev himself had been prone of accusing some of the sources favoured by the Romanovian and Scaligerian historians of being counterfeit. For instance, he wrote that he believed “the ancient songs of Kirsha Danilov to have been written recently, in the XVII century. There is nothing ancient about either their style or their story; even the names are partially figmental, and partially thought up in such a manner that they should sound like the old ones” ([407], page 173). Historians cannot refrain from making the irate comment about “the aplomb and the assurance of the author’s [Soulakadzev’s – Auth.] judgements and assessments being truly amazing” ([407], page 173).

Historians are also very irritated by Soulakadzev’s research into the history of the Valaam monastery, the so-called “Opoved” (the name translates as “account” or “introduction”). Soulakadzev gives a synopsis of
all the evidence that concerns the voyage of Andrew the Apostle from Jerusalem to Valaam. We see the situation with the “Hymn to Boyan” recur. Initially, the Russian society had treated Soulakadzev’s research as a bona fide historical work. Indeed, “the four first editions of the ‘Description of the Valaam Monastery’ (starting with 1864 and on until 1904) … had used the ‘Opoved’ as a bona fide historical source” ([407], page 175). However, nowadays historians never tire of repeating that Soulakadzev’s sources as used in the “Opoved” were “counterfeits.” V. P. Kozlov is rather self-assured in the following passage, yet he doesn’t cite any actual evidence: “Soulakadzev uses counterfeited sources in order to prove it in his work that Valaam had been inhabited by Slavs since times immemorial, and not the Karelians and the Finns. The Slavs are supposed to have founded a state here, after the Novgorod fashion, which had even maintained a relation with the Roman emperor Caracalla” ([407], page 175). Even this quotation alone proves that Soulakadzev had not used any counterfeited sources. According to Chron5, Valaam had indeed belonged to Novgorod the Great, or Yaroslavl, which had maintained close ties with Czar-Grad, or the New Rome on the Bosporus. The actual Novgorod the Great had been referred to as Rome or New Rome in a number of sources, q.v. in Chron5. Andrew the Apostle must also have visited these parts.

Thus, our reconstruction makes a great many things fall into place, and pours an altogether different light over the activity of Soulakadzev, likewise the parties that have tried, and are still trying to do everything within their power to make the surviving evidence collected by Soulakadzev disappear forever.
10.
The name of the victor in the battle of 1241 between the Tartars and the Czechs

According to the Scaligerian history, in 1241 the “Mongolian” troops (or the troops of the Great Empire) invaded the Western Europe ([770], page 127). However, it is presumed that, after having conquered Hungary and Poland, they could not manage to make it to Germany and were defeated by the army of the Czech king. The entire tableau we are presented with is one of a conflict between the “righteous” West Europeans and the “villainous Mongols,” who had suffered a well-deserved defeat in the Czech kingdom and were forced to turn back Eastwards. Our reconstruction makes the history of this conquest look substantially different – as a series of civil wars that had ended with the propagation of imperial power over the vast territories of Eurasia and Africa – in particular, Germany and the Czech kingdom. The “Tartars and Mongols” did not leave these territories. It would therefore be expedient to learn more about the victorious party, one that had one the battle for the Czech kingdom, which is presumed to mark the end of the Great = “Mongolian” Conquest of the Western Europe. As we already know, the “Mongolian,” or imperial troops were marching west led by the Czar, or Khan, known as Batu-Khan (or Batya), Yaroslav and Ivan Kalita, or Ivan the Caliph, q.v. above.

What do we learn? The old documents have preserved the name of the victor – his name turns out to be Yaroslav ([770], page 127). Scaligerian historians obviously claim that he had not been a “Mongol,” but rather a “Czech warlord.” Nowadays, when we have already become accustomed to the largely distorted consensual version of world history, no one shall ever get the idea that the character in question can be identified as a
“Mongol,” the great Batu-Khan, also known as Great Prince Yaroslav. However, this is precisely how it should be according to our reconstruction, since Yaroslav happens to be another name of Czar Batu, or Batu-Khan, also known as Ivan the Caliph. He had been a warlord of the Czechs, among other things, since the Czechs were part of his “Mongolian” imperial army. Modern historians are correct, in a way – Yaroslav had been the ruler of the Czechs, among other things.

This is how these events are described by V. D. Sipovskiy, a XIX century historian: “In the spring of 1241 Batu-Khan crossed the Carpathian mountain ridge and defeated the Hungarian king, then two more Polish princes. The Tartars had then invaded Silesia, where they defeated the troops of the Silesian duke. The way to Germany was open; however, the country was saved by the army of the Czech king. The first defeat of the Tartars took place during the siege of Olmütz; they were defeated by Yaroslav of Sternberg, military leader of the Czechs” ([770], page 127).

Obviously, this passage is all about the XVII-XIX century interpretation of the events, when the true history of the faraway XIII-XIV century had already been forgotten or falsified. However, the victor’s name has fortunately reached our age. It is Yaroslav. We can identify the same character as Batu-Khan = Ivan Kalita, also known as Caliph John and Presbyter Johannes. Could this be the real reason why neither the Czechs or the Germans have any memory of being conquered by the Great “Mongolian” army, namely, that their ancestors had been the actual “Mongols” marching westwards under the banners of the Horde, or Russia?

In Chron5 we cite a number of facts that can be interpreted as clear evidence of the German populace having formerly consisted of ethnic Slavs for the most part. We learn about this from the surviving historical documents as well as evidence provided by contemporaries.
11. The location of Mongolia as visited by the famous traveller Plano Carpini

11.1. The “correct” book of Carpini as we have at our disposal today versus the “incorrect” book, which has vanished mysteriously

In the present section we shall comment on the famous mediaeval book by Plano Carpini that deals with his voyage to the court of the Great Mongolian Khan ([656]). Carpini went to Mongolia as a Papal envoy; his book is presumed to be one of the primary original sources of information about the Mongolian Empire in the alleged XIII century. In reality, according to the New Chronology, the book in question refers to the epoch of the XIV-XV century.

Let us begin with the final fragment of Carpini’s book, which is very remarkable indeed: “We plead unto the readers to alter nothing in our narration and to add no further facts thereto… However, since the inhabitants of the lands that we visited en route, Poland, Bohemia, Teutonia, Leodia and Campania, had wanted to read this book as soon as they could, they copied it before we had a chance to finish writing and proofreading it in our spare time. Let it therefore come as no surprise to anyone that the present work contains more details and is edited better [sic! – Auth.] than the other one, since we have quite … managed to correct the present book” ([656], page 85).

What does the above tell us? Firstly, the fact that apart from Carpini’s text that we have at our disposal today there were other “unedited” versions of his books, against which Carpini (in reality, an editor from the XVII century or an even later epoch writing on his behalf) forewarns the
reader. The “old” texts are therefore presumed “utterly erroneous” and unworthy of the reader’s attention; we should all read the corrected and therefore veracious version.

It would be very interesting to read the old versions of Carpini’s book that had presumably been “erroneous.” Unfortunately, this is unlikely to ever happen – the true text of Carpini’s book must have been destroyed without a trace in the XVII century. Even if it does exist in some archive to this day, the chances of its ever getting published are nil – it shall instantly be labelled “incorrect a priori.” Why would one publish the “incorrect” text if we have the “correct” one at our disposal? After all, didn’t Carpini himself strongly advise against reading the incorrect versions of his book.

We are of the following opinion. What we have at our disposal today is a very late edition of Carpini’s old text, which is likely to have been made in the XVII or even the XVIII century in order to make Carpini’s book correspond to the Scaligerian version of history. Someone must have re-written the initial work of Carpini, wiping out every single trace of the real history of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire, or Russia (The Horde). The European scene of events travelled to the vicinity of the faraway Gobi Desert, which lies to the south of Lake Baikal. The everyday realities of Russian life were transferred to the “distant Mongolian steppes.” It is also possible that the editor, who had lived in a more recent epoch, did not understand many of the references made by old original.

11.2. The return route of Carpini

As we have seen, Carpini had travelled through the following countries as he was returning from “Mongolia”: Poland, Bohemia, Teutonia and Leodia. By the way, could the mediaeval Leodia be identified as the “ancient” Lydia, aka Lithuania or Italy = Latinia? After that, Carpini reaches Campania in Italy.

It is amazing (from the Scaligerian viewpoint) that Carpini doesn’t mention a single country that would lay to the west of Poland as part of his itinerary on the way back from the Great Khan’s capital, or the environs of
Caracorum. He appears to have left Caracorum, which modern historians locate somewhere in the Gobi desert, thousands of miles away from the Polish borders, and arrived in Poland immediately. However, Carpini doesn’t utter a word about the numerous lands that he must have travelled through en route from the distant Gobi Desert to Western Europe.

Could he have mentioned these lands in the account of his journey from Europe to Caracorum, and therefore decided to withhold from mentioning them twice? This isn’t the case. Upon reaching Volga from Europe he immediately came to Caracorum. However, where could the true location of the city really be? We are of the opinion that Carpini didn’t go to any distant deserts – he came to Russia, or the Horde, immediately; its central regions began right after Poland. Carpini’s description only allows us to trace his journey to Volga. Then it is said that the party of the travellers had “travelled very fast” and swiftly reached the Great Khan’s capital. We are told that Carpini went East right from Volga – however, there’s nothing to suggest this in his text; we could just as well come to the conclusion that he travelled North, up the Volga, and soon reached Yaroslavl, or Novgorod the Great – Caracorum, that is, or simply “tsarskiye khoromy” – “The Czar’s Abode,” which is the most likely origin of the name. One must remember that nothing remotely resembling an old capital has ever been found anywhere near the stony Gobi Desert ([1078], Volume 1, pages 227-228). Archaeologists cannot find so much as an equivalent of a regular mediaeval town.

11.3. The geography of Mongolia according to Carpini

Our opponents might recollect that Carpini made a geographical description of the Khan’s land. We see the section entitled “On the Geography of the Land” (Mongolia) at the very beginning of Chapter 1. This is what Carpini tells us:

“The land in question lays in the part of the East where, as we presume, the East connects with the North. To the East [of the Mongols’ – Auth.] lays land of China” ([656], page 31). If we are to adopt the Scaligerian
viewpoint and presume that Caracorum is located in the Gobi desert or somewhere around that area, China shall lay to the South and not the East; this contradicts the information provided by Carpini. However, if the Czar’s Abode, or Caracorum, can be identified as Yaroslavl, or Novgorod the Great, everything becomes instantly clear – we have Siberia to the East of Yaroslavl, and then Scythia, or China; the modern China lays even further to the East. However, in *Chron5* we demonstrate that China, or Scythia, had been the mediaeval name for the Eastern Russia – possibly, the lands beyond Volga and Ural.

Let us proceed. According to Carpini, “the land of the Saracens lays to the South” ([656], page 31). If we are to presume that Caracorum is located in the Gobi Desert, we shall find China to the South, which can by no means be referred to as the “land of the Saracens,” the mediaeval name of the Middle East, Arabia and a part of Africa, but never modern China. Once again, a miss. But if we’re to assume that Caracorum, or the Czar’s Abode, identifies as Yaroslavl, or Novgorod the Great, everything falls into place immediately. To the South of Yaroslavl we have the Black Sea, Arabia, the Middle East and other veritable Saracen regions of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire of the XIV-XVI century.

Further Carpini reports that “the land of the Naimans lays to the west” ([656], page 31). If we are to assume that Caracorum had indeed been located somewhere in the dusty environs of the Gobi Desert, we are forced to make another assumption together with the modern commentators, who identify the Naimans as “one of the largest Mongolian tribes that had led a nomadic existence upon the vast territories … adjacent to the valley of the Black Irtysh” ([656], page 381). However, this large Mongolian tribe mysteriously disappeared – we shall find nothing remotely resembling “the republic of Naimania” anywhere upon this territory nowadays; no such state has left any trace in history.

However, identifying Caracorum, or the Czar’s Abode, as Yaroslavl, or Novgorod the Great, shall instantly make us recognise the Naimans as the famous European Normans. It is presumed that the Normans had been the
mediaeval residents of Scandinavia, Germany, France and Southern Italy. One must also recollect Normandy in France. How would a mediaeval traveller describe the comparative location of the Normans and Russia, or the Horde? The former had resided to the West from the latter, which is precisely what we learn from Carpini.

What does Carpini tell us about the northern neighbours of the Mongols? “The land of the Tartars is washed by an ocean from the north” ([656], page 31). Is there any ocean to wash the northern coast of China? The very concept is preposterous. To the north from the modern Mongolia we find the vast Siberian lands – the Arctic Ocean is thousands of miles away. Once again, the attempts of the modern commentators to identify Carpini’s Mongolia as the modern Mongolia are doomed from the very start.

Carpini’s account begins to make sense once we assume Russia, or the Horde, to be the very Mongolia that we described. Indeed, Russia is washed by the Arctic Ocean from the North. The Russian lands had been inhabited all the way up to the Arctic Ocean, and the Horde had always had seaports there (Arkhangelsk, for instance). Therefore, Carpini had every right to say that Russia, or the Horde, which had been known as the “Land of the Tartars” in the West, is washed by an ocean from the North.

11.4. In re the name of the Tartars

Carpini’s book had originally been entitled as follows: “History of the Mongols, that we Know as the Tartars, by Giovanni da Plano Carpini, Archbishop of Antivari” ([656], page 30). The very title suggests that the word Tartars had served as the “external” name of the “Mongols,” or the “Great Ones.” This is how they were known in the Western Europe. Sometimes they would also be referred to as the Turks – the latter is likely to be a derivative of the name Tartars (from the Russian word “torit,” which translates as “to lay a path,” “to move forward,” etc.).

11.5. Mongolian climate
Carpini proceeds to surprise us with his description of the Mongolian climate, which leaves one with the impression that its author had never actually left his study. The editor of Carpini’s text had clearly been completely ignorant of the climate in the country that he was supposed to “describe” as an eyewitness.

An excellent example is as follows. Carpini relates the following story, which is most edifying indeed: “Heavy hail often falls there… When we had been visiting the court, there was a hailstorm so fierce that the melted hail made 160 people drown right there, at the court, as we learned from trustworthy sources, and a lot of property and houses perished” ([656], page 32). Has anyone ever seen hailstorms that would bring great floods in their wake, with people drowning in the water from the melted hail, which would also destroy houses and property? This picture becomes quite preposterous if we try to apply the above description to the environs of the stony and dry Desert Gobi.

However, the very same fragment becomes perfectly realistic once we try to cast away the misleading information planted in the text by the editors of the XVII-XVIII century and reconstruct the original, which must have referred to a mere flood brought about by an overflowing river. Indeed, such catastrophes often wipe out entire towns and villages, and lead to many casualties. Everything is clear.

11.6. The Imperial Mongolian graveyard

Next Carpini tells us the following about the Mongols: “Their land has two graveyards. One of them is used by the emperors, the princes and all the nobility; they are carried there from wherever they happen to die … and buried alongside large amounts of gold and silver” ([656], page 39). We would very much like to ask the archaeologists about the location of this famous “Mongolian” graveyard. Could it be in Mongolia, or the Gobi Desert, perhaps? Archaeologists tell us nothing of the kind. There isn’t anything that would remotely resemble an imperial graveyard with heaps of silver and gold anywhere near the gloomy desert Gobi. But our
reconstruction allows us to point out this graveyard instantly (see *Chron5* for more details). It is quite famous - the Valley of the Dead and Luxor in Egypt. This is where we find gigantic pyramids and hundreds of royal tombs, some of which are indeed filled with gold and other precious metals and gems. Let us recollect the luxurious tomb of Pharaoh Tutankhamen, for instance, and the vast amount of gold used in its construction – not a speck of silver anywhere, just gold and gemstones. According to our reconstruction, this is where the “Mongolian” = Great Empire had buried its kings, some of the top ranking officials, and, possibly, some of their relatives. The corpses would be mummified before their last journey to Egypt.

11.7. The second graveyard of the Mongols

The second Mongolian graveyard is of an equal interest to us. Carpini reports the following: “The second graveyard is the final resting place of the multitudes slain in Hungary” ([656], page 39).

We are therefore supposed to believe that the vast steppes of Mongolia conceal a gigantic graveyards where multitudes of Mongolian warriors were buried after having fallen in Hungary. Let us study the map in order to estimate the distance between Hungary and the modern Mongolia. It’s a long way indeed – over five thousand kilometres as the crow flies, and much more if one is to travel the actual roads. It is therefore assumed that the bodies of many thousands of fallen Mongolian warriors were loaded onto carts and sent to the distant steppes of the modern Mongolia, over rivers, forests and hills. How many months did this voyage take? Why would one have to carry the bodies this far, and what would become of them after such lengthy transportation?

We believe this picture painted by the Scaligerian history to be completely implausible. The bodies of the deceased could only have travelled a short distance, which means that the homeland of the “Mongols,” or the land of the Tartars, had bordered with Hungary, which is completely at odds with the Scaligerian history. However, this
corresponds to our reconstruction perfectly well, since the Great = “Mongolian” Empire identifies as Russia, or the Horde, which had indeed bordered with Hungary. It is also true that there are thousands of burial mounds in the Ukraine, for instance, and some three thousand of them in the region of Smolensk ([566], page 151). Those are the so-called “burial mounds of Gnezdovo,” which lay to the south from Smolensk and are concentrated around the village of Gnezdovo ([797], page 314). The burial mounds of Gnezdovo constitute “the largest group of burial mounds in the Slavic lands, which counts up to three thousand mounds nowadays” ([566], page 151). These burial mounds are very likely to be the graves of the “Mongolian” = Great Empire’s warriors who had been killed in Hungary.

11.8. Cannons in the army of Presbyter Johannes Carpini, or, rather, the editor of the XVII-XVIII century who impersonates him, wants to make us believe the following preposterous picture to be true. In one of the battles, Presbyter Johannes had “made copper effigies of people and mounted them on horses, having lit a fire inside them; behind the copper effigies there were riders carrying bellows … When they army came to the battlefield, these horses were sent forward side by side. As they were approaching the enemy formations, the riders in the back put something in the fire [sic! – Auth.] that was burning inside the abovementioned copper effigies, and then they started to blow the bellows hard. Thus they invoked the Greek Fire, which was incinerating horses and people alike, and the air went black for the smoke” ([656], page 46).

We are of the opinion that the original text contained a description of copper cannons in the “Mongolian” troops, or the army of the Great Empire. As a matter of fact, cannons were often decorated with cast figures of animals and people, q.v. in Chron6, Chapter 4:16. The strange fable-like descriptions like the one quoted above result from the editorial intervention of the XVII-XVIII century, whose objective had been define
as complete obliteration of all obvious references to late mediaeval events in Russia, or the Horde.

See *Chron5* for more on Presbyter Johannes.

11.9. The language of the Mongols

Carpini reports that when he had brought a papal epistle to the emperor of the “Mongols,” the document needed to be translated. What language was it translated into? According to Caprino, “We have brought the epistle to the Czar and asked for people who could translate it… Together with them, we have made a word-for-word translation into the Russian, Saracen and Tartar languages; this translation was then presented to Batu, who read it very attentively, taking notes” ([656], page 73).

On another occasion, already at the court of the Mongolian emperor, Carpini and his companions were asked the following question: “Does His Holiness the Pope have any translators who understand the written language of the Russians, the Saracens or the Tartars?” ([656], page 80). Carpini replied in the negative, and so the reply of the Mongols had to be translated into a language that the Pope would understand. It turns out that the initial Mongolian missive to the Pope had been written in “the language of the Russians, the Saracens and the Tartars.” Could this imply that the three were really a single language? Let us recollect Carpini’s statement about Tartars being the Western European name of the “Mongols,” or “The Great Ones.” This appears to be why he specifically refers to the Tartar language here. We must emphasise that Carpini does not utter a single word about the “Mongolian” language; all the Mongolian khans turn out to be literate and capable of reading Russian; moreover, they know nothing about any “Mongolian” language of any sort – at least, Carpini doesn’t mention it once in the account of his voyage to “Mongolia.”

11.10. The real nature of the Mongolian tents, presumed to have made of red and white felt
According to Carpini, the Mongolians live in tents. This appears obvious to everyone today – after all, the Mongols are said to have been poorly-educated savages who never mastered the fine art of architecture, and whose way of living had been utterly primitive. However, it turns out that the “Mongolian” tents had been of the most peculiar kind. For instance, one of these tents was “made of white felt,” and could house “over two thousand people,” no less ([656], 76). A strange tent, isn’t it then? The size is closer towards that of a stadium.

The inauguration ceremonies of the Mongolian emperors were also held in tents – the only residential constructions known to Mongolians. Carpini was present at one such ceremony. This is what he tells us: “Another tent, which they called the Golden Horde, was prepared for him in a beautiful valley among the hills, next to some river. This is where Kouiouk was supposed to become enthroned on the day of Our Lady’s Assumption… This tent stood on poles covered with thin sheets of gold, which were nailed to the trees with golden nails” ([656], pages 77-78).

However, not all of the Mongolian “tents” were made of white felt; some were also red. This is what Carpini reports: “We have arrived to another place, where there stood a magnificent tent of fiery red felt” ([656], page 79). Also: “The three tents that we were referring to above had been enormous; other tents of white felt, which were quite large and also beautiful, had belonged to his wife” ([656], page 79).

What did the original text say before having been edited tendentiously in the XVII-XVIII century.

As for the inauguration in a tent of white tent on gilded poles of wood, and on the day of the Assumption at that, the situation is perfectly clear. A comparison with the consensual version of the Russian history reveals that the inauguration ceremony as mentioned above was held in the Ouspenskiy Cathedral of white stone; its name translates as “Cathedral of the Assumption,” which is where the Russian Czars got inaugurated. The dome of the building was indeed covered with sheets of gold. Carpini didn’t quite understand the principle of their construction; no nails could
be seen anywhere, hence his assumption that the nails were made of gold as well. His mistake is perfectly understandable – he had been from a country where there were no gilded domes, which is why he didn’t know the construction principle of the golden domes, and was surprised at having noticed no nails.

Let us also make the following remark about the Russian word for “tent” – “shatyor.” The French word for “castle” is “chateau,” for instance; it is read as shato, which sounds very similar to the word “shatyor”; also cf. the Turkish word “chadyr”, which translates similarly ([955], Volume 2, page 405). Therefore, whenever we see Carpini refer to a “tent,” the last thing we should think of is a frail construction of rods covered with cloth, or even leather or felt. We believe that the author was really referring to a castle, or palace, of the Russian Czars, or the Khans of the Horde, made of white stone. They were reverently titled emperors by the West Europeans, who had ruled over the entire Great = “Mongolian” Empire, and not just its individual provinces, such as France, Germany or England. Local rulers bore more modest titles of kings, dukes and so on; however, there had just been one Empire and one Emperor, an autocrat.

Let us return to the description of the Mongolian tents and enquire about the references to felt in Carpini’s text, where the author should really be describing stone buildings. There can be several reasons for it. A possible explanation is that the editor of the XVII-XVIII century had tried to emphasise the primitive nature of the savages from the Far East. Another possibility is the transformation of the Russian word for “felt” ("voylok"), which rings very similar to the word “block,” which may have been used by Carpini to refer to either red bricks or blocks of white stone. This is how the editors of the XVII-XVIII century transformed palaces of white stone and castles of red brick into eerie tents of white and red felt, fluttering in the wind yet capable of housing two thousand people ([656], page 76). One must also recollect the words “palatka” and “palata” – “tent” and “chamber,” respectively, and the words “palace,” “palacio,” “palazzo” and “palais” that still exist in English, Spanish, Italian and
French and all mean the same thing. The word in question is likely to be a derivative of “palata”, which is how the chambers of the Russian Czars were called.

Real history of the XIV-XVI century became obliterated from human memory in the XVII-XVIII century. As a result, the gigantic “Mongolian” cathedrals and palaces with gilded domes in Moscow and elsewhere had been artificially transferred to the Far East in the documents, having turned into primitive and dusty felt tents of the Khans, open to every wind. For instance, there is a fantasy engraving that presumably depicts the tent of a Mongolian Khan – on wheels, drawn by a herd of bulls (see fig. 14.56). Such unbelievable luxury and comfort!

Fig. 14.56. Engraving depicting the yurt, or tent, belonging to the Great Khan of “Mongolia.” Such absurdities have been drawn ever since the XVII-XVIII century, which is when the true history of the XIV-XVI century became forgotten – for instance, the fact that the Great = “Mongolian” Czar, or Khan, had lived in a palace of white stone and prayed in huge churches with gilded domes. Neither the palaces, nor the cathedrals had any wheels. Taken from [1264], Volume 1, cover illustration.

11.11. The throne of the Mongolian Emperor

Carpini reports the construction of a “tall dais made of wood [presumably, imported wood, since it would have to come a long way to the rocky Gobi
desert – Auth.], upon which there had stood the Emperor’s throne. It was made of ivory, beautifully carved and adorned with gold, gemstones, and pearls, if our memory errs us not” ([656], page 79).

It is most curious indeed that the “Mongolian” throne, likewise the seal of the “Mongolian” Emperor, were forged by Kozma, a Russian craftsman. Carpini describes “a Russian named Kozma, the Emperor’s very own and favourite goldsmith… Kozma has shown us another throne, which he had made for the Emperor before his inauguration, as well as the imperial seal, also of his own making, and translated to us the text of the inscription on the seal” ([656], page 80).

We know nothing of whether this luxurious throne made by a Russian craftsman has been found by anyone in the environs of the Gobi Desert. The answer is certain to be in the negative, given reasons being wars, sandstorms, the passage of many centuries and so on. No throne in Gobi, that is.

However, the throne of Ivan IV “The Terrible” exists until this day, and is in a perfect condition. It is kept in the Muscovite Armoury – the royal chambers (“tsarskiye khoromy”), or Caracorum. It is indeed completely covered in ivory carvings, q.v. in fig. 14.57. The throne leaves one with the impression of being made of ivory entirely. We are by no means suggesting it to be the very same throne of the “Mongols,” or the Great Ones, that Carpini describes. He may have been referring to a similar throne; however, he gives us evidence of the custom that had existed in Russia, or the Horde, namely, the use of ivory for decorating thrones. At least one such throne has reached our day and age.
Fig. 14.57. Throne ascribed to Ivan IV “The Terrible.” Kept in the Armoury of the Muscovite Kremlin. A propos, this throne “used to be ascribed to Ivan III” ([96], page 56, ill. 35). Everything is perfectly clear – according to our reconstruction, Ivan III is largely a phantom reflection of Ivan IV, which is why historians regularly confuse the identities of “the two Ivans.” Taken from [187], page 365.

The counter-argumentation of learned historians is known to us perfectly well. It runs along the lines of the Russian Czars importing their customs from the distant land of Mongolia in the Far East, the Muscovites tending to slavishly emulate the customs of their former conquerors, the savage and cruel “Mongolian” Khans, even after the stifling “Mongolian” yoke had been lifted, and so forth. However, the question remains very poignant – why is it that there are no traces of anything described by Carpini anywhere in the vicinity of Gobi Desert, the presumed centre of the “Mongolian” Empire, and plenty of such traces and relics in Russia?

11.12. The priests from the entourage of the Mongolian Emperor
Carpini uses the word “clerics” several times in his narration. It is odd that in almost every case they are mentioned as “Russian clerics” or “Christian clerics” ([656], page 81).

We can thus see that the “Mongolian” = Great Emperor had been surrounded by Christian clerics. This is in total contradiction with the Scaligerian history, and perfectly normal within the framework of our reconstruction. The Great, or “Mongolian,” Czar (also known as Khan) of Russia (or the Horde) had naturally been surrounded by Orthodox Russian priests.

When Carpini and his companions were leaving the Mongolian court, the emperor’s mother gave each of them a coat of fox fur as a present. Carpini makes the satisfied remark that the fur was “facing outwards” ([656], page 82).

Once again, it is easy enough to recognise the customs of the Russian court. Even in the XVI century, the foreign envoys had been very proud of fur coats and other ceremonial attire that they would receive as presents from the Czar. Such presents were considered special tokens of royal sympathy. For instance, the Austrian ambassador, Baron Sigismund Herberstein, included a portrait of himself dressed in the Russian clothes that he had received from the Czar ([161], page 283). He had certainly considered himself honoured (see fig. 14.58). In fig. 14.59 we reproduce another portrait of Herberstein, where he is drawn wearing the clothes that he had received as a present from the “Turkish Sultan” ([90], page 48).
Fig. 14.58. “The imperial envoy S. Herberstein wearing the luxurious Russian attire received from Vassily III as a present. Engraving of the XVI century” ([550], page 82).
11.13. The Mongolian worship of Genghis-Khans effigy

Carpini reports that the “Mongolians” had worshipped an effigy of Genghis-Khan ([656], page 36). This is in perfect correspondence with our reconstruction, which suggests that Genghis-Khan had also been known as St. George. Russians are indeed known to worship the famous icon of St. George (known as “The Victorious” in Russia). There are many versions of this icon in existence. As for the icon, or the effigy of Genghis-Khan, it hasn’t left a single trace in the consensual history of the land known as Mongolia nowadays – likewise luxurious ivory thrones, felt tents on gilded poles, etc. We are of the opinion that most of them exist until the present day – it is just that the location of the “Mongolian” imperial capital is indicated incorrectly. It had stood on River Volga, which is a far cry from the Gobi desert, and been known as Yaroslavl, or Novgorod the Great, and was subsequently moved to Moscow.
The book that we have under study is extremely interesting. It is entitled *Notes of a Janissary. Written by Konstantin Mikhailovich from Ostrovitsa* ([424]). Let us consider the end of the book first. It is concluded by the following phrase: “This chronicle was initially set in Russian letters in the year 1400 A.D.” ([424], page 116). The Polish copy puts it as follows: “*Tha Kroynika pyszana naprzod litera Ryska latha Narodzenia Bozego 1400*” ([424], page 29).

This phrase obviously irritates the modern commentators to a great extent, since nowadays it is “common knowledge” that no Russian letters could be used outside Russia by default – everyone is supposed to have used the Romanic alphabet. A. I. Rogov comments thusly: “The very phrase contains a large number of errata insofar as the correct XVI century orthography of the Polish language is concerned. The nature of these ‘Russian letters’ remains quite mysterious. It is possible that the author implies the use of the Cyrillic alphabet – Serbian, perhaps” ([424], page 29). Amazing, isn’t it? A modern commentator who writes in Russian finds the nature of Russian letters mysterious.

The language of the original is presumed unknown ([424], page 9). However, since contemporary commentators still cannot completely ignore the reference to “Russian letters,” they cautiously voice hypotheses about whether or not Constantine could have written “in Old Serbian or Church Slavonic – after all, the numerous Orthodox Christians that had resided in the Great Principality of Lithuania had used a similar language as an acrolect, and must have been capable of understanding the language of the ‘Notes’… One must be equally cautious about the evidence given by M.
Malinovsky, who reports the existence of a Cyrillic copy of the ‘Notes’ in the Derechin library or Sapeg, referring to the words of Jan Zakrevski, a gymnasium teacher from Vilna. One must remember that alphabets and languages had been used very eclectically in the Great Principality of Lithuania, to the extent of using the Arabic alphabet in Byelorussian books [sic! – Auth.]” (424, page 31).

The fact that certain Byelorussian books were set in the Arabic script is most remarkable, and our reconstruction explains it very well indeed.

The Notes of a Janissary were translated into Czech under the following title, which is also of interest to our research: “These deeds and chronicles were described and compiled by a Serb, or a Raz, from the former Raz Kingdom, also known as the Serbian Kingdom, named Konstantin, son of Mikhail Konstantinovich from Ostrovitsa, who was taken to the court to Mehmed, the Turkish Sultan, by the Turks and the Janissaries. He had been known as the Ketaya of Zvechay in Turkish, and at the court of the French King they knew him as Charles” (424, page 30).

It is thus obvious that Raz, the old name of the Serbs, all but coincides with that of Russians (Russ). The old name of the Serbian Kingdom gives the latter away as the Russian Kingdom. This makes the author of the “Notes” Russian, or a Serbian. Also, the Turks had called him a “Ketaya” – Chinese, or Scythian (Kitian), as we already know. Konstantin had therefore been a Russian, or a Serbian Scythian. He had therefore obviously written in the Russian language and used the Cyrillic alphabet. Everything falls into place yet again.

Modern commentators tell us further that the dating of “1400” is incorrect and must be replaced by 1500 (424, page 29). The 100-year error is well familiar to us as yet another manifestation of the centenarian chronological shift, which had very visibly affected the history of Russia and Western Europe.

Historians are confused by many of the facts described in the “Notes.” They believe the text to contain a great number of contradiction. On the one hand, Konstantin hates the Turks; on the other, he often portrays them
favourably. Also, he appears to be a Christian (see [424], page 14). “The book [Notes of a Janissary – Auth.] does not utter a word about the conversion of the author to Islam. On the contrary – Konstantin emphasises the strength of his Christian faith. This is obvious the most in the introduction and the fourth chapter of the ‘Notes’” ([424], page 15).

And yet Konstantin is familiar with Islam perfectly well – from firsthand experience and not by proxy. The modern commentator makes the following confused remark: “Could he have visited the mosques this freely without being a Muslim himself? Moreover, Konstantin reports having much lot more firsthand knowledge of the Muslim rites – such as the dances of the dervishes, for example, who would normally forbid entrance not just to the representatives of other creeds, but even to those of the Muslims who hadn’t been initiated into the dervish cult. Even the ‘born-again’ dervishes were forbidden from attendance. Finally, it is perfectly impossible to imagine that the Sultan could have put a Christian in charge of the garrison quartered in one of the important fortresses – Zvechay in Bosnia, making him the commander of fifty janissaries and thirty more regular Turkish soldiers” ([424], page 15).

That which seems strange from the viewpoint of Scaligerian history becomes natural and even inevitable within the framework of our reconstruction. The discrepancies between Christianity and Islam had not been as gigantic in the epoch described by the author as it is normally presumed – the schism became more profound later.

The Notes of a Janissary contradict the consensual Scaligerian history quite often. Modern commentators are forced to point out these contradictions, and they naturally don’t interpret them in Konstantin’s favour. He is accused of making mistakes, being confused and “ignorant of the true history.” Several such passages are quoted below.

“The author collates several historical characters into one, Murad II (who is also falsely named Murad III), such as Sultan Suleiman, Musa and Mehmet I (see Chapter XIX, example 1). This explains the numerous errors in the biographies of the Turkish Sultans, as well as the despots and
rulers of Serbia and Bosnia, such as confusing of Sultan Murad for Orkhan (Chapter XIII), naming Urosh I the first King of the Serbs instead of Stefan the First-Crowned (Chapter XV)… This is the very same reason why the author can confuse the date of a city’s foundation for the date of fortification construction (Chapter XVII, remark 7). There is also a number of scandalous geographical blunders whose nature is just the same, for instance, the claim that River Euphrates flows into the Black Sea (Chapter XXXII)” ([424], page 26).

By the way, we see Constantine report the first Serbian, or Russian, king, to have been Urosh – that is, “a Rosh,” or “a Russian.” This is once again perfectly natural from the viewpoint of our reconstruction.

As for the “scandalous” flowing of the Euphrates into the Black Sea, it suffices to say that it is only scandalous in Scaligerian history. There is no scandal in our reconstruction – one might recollect that the name Euphrates may be the old version of Prut, a tributary of the Danube, which does flow into the Black Sea. The sounds F and P were often subject to flexion, and so Prut and Euphrates can be two different versions of the same name.
The crypt of the Godunovs in the Troitse-Sergiev Monastery. The Ipatyevskiy Monastery in Kostroma

The crypt of the Godunovs is located in the town of Sergiev Posad. It is comprised of four graves (see fig. 14.60); the crypt is rather modest. It is presumed that Boris Godunov himself is buried here. A guide told us in 1997 that the sarcophagi had initially been covered by gravestones that lay on the ground, remaining underground themselves. In the early XVIII century this burial site was afflicted by the same disaster as the graves of all the other Russian Czars in the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral of the Kremlin in Moscow – namely, the burial site had been hidden from sight by a massive parallelepiped of brick. The four old gravestones are presumed to have been removed prior to that and made part of the newer construction’s rear wall mounted vertically. Nowadays one can indeed see the top parts of four very small tombstones; the bottom part of a few is beneath the ground, rendering the respective epitaphs illegible (see figs. 14.61, 14.62 and 14.63). By the way, the epitaphs are ostensibly damaged; also, the tombstones are truly minute, nothing remotely resembling massive sarcophagus lids. What was written on the authentic large sarcophagus lids that are presumably buried under the Romanovian construction? Are they still intact?
Fig. 14.60. Sepulchre declared to be the last resting place of the Godunov family. The Troitse-Sergiyev Monastery, town of Sergiyev Posad. Taken from [304], Volume 3, p. 248.

Fig. 14.61. The first two headstones from the alleged sepulchre of the Godunovs. Photograph taken in 1997.

This burial ground is rather bizarre in a number of ways. Today the “Crypt of the Godunovs” is located outside the Ouspenskiy Cathedral, at a considerable distance from the cathedral’s walls. The guide explained to us that the crypt had formerly been part of the cathedral’s ground floor, and then “mysteriously ended up” far away from it after the alleged reconstruction of the Ouspenskiy Cathedral. Our opponents might try to accuse the guide of being mistaken – this is possible, but not very likely, since guides in places like the Troitse-Sergiyev monastery are qualified specialists as a rule. We have unfortunately had no opportunity of verifying this information with any written source.

The above implies that the cathedral has somehow “shrunk” or “relocated.” Also, the ground floor of the Ouspenskiy cathedral is located notably higher than the “Godunovian crypt.” In order to enter the Ouspenskiy cathedral nowadays, one must ascend a rather long staircase. How can it be that the “Crypt of the Godunovs,” which had allegedly been situated on the first floor of the cathedral, could have sunk a few metres and still remained above the ground?

We are of the opinion that all these fantasy explanations date from the XVIII century, when the Romanovs were removing the traces of some shady activity around the crypt of the Godunovs. Our hypothesis is simple – the cathedral certainly didn’t shrink or move; it remains in its initial
condition, apart from several minor changes. As for the real crypt that had once been inside the cathedral and belonged to the Godunovs or someone else, it appears to have been destroyed by the Romanovs, or walled over so as to hide it from sight. Then a simulacrum “Crypt of the Godunovs” was built on a plot of land nearby, which isn’t quite as elevated as the basement of the cathedral due to certain idiosyncrasies of the local terrain. Someone may even be buried underneath to make the crypt look real; should any researchers ever want to conduct excavations here, they’ll find “authentic bones of the Godunovs.”

In August 2001 A. T. Fomenko and T. N. Fomenko visited the Ipatyevskiy monastery of Kostroma. According to the official version as carried across by the guide, the monastery had belonged to the Godunovs initially, and the Romanovs only got hold of it after the Great Strife, when their usurpation attempts had finally succeeded, making it their very own dynastic holy place. It is also for this very reason that the construction of the memorial complex designed to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the Romanovian dynasty, complete with 18 bronze figures of the Czars that had actually comprised the dynasty. This memorial has never been erected, although a large number of test castings in bronze have been made. Many representatives of the Godunovs were buried in the Ipatyevskiy monastery – sixty males; furthermore, there have also been females buried here. However, modern guides tell us that in the XVII century the main cathedral of the Ipatyevskiy Monastery “suddenly exploded” – it is presumed that gunpowder had been stored in its basements for a long time, and that the gigantic cathedral blew up as a result of somebody’s criminal negligence. The Romanovs have then erected a new cathedral upon that site as a token of deference. This is the official version that the guides tell to the visitors, also trying to convey implicitly that the Godunovs themselves may be to blame for leaving the gunpowder in the basement. The explosion that destroyed the cathedral many decades later, under the Romanovs, must have been purely accidental. In general, the visitors are advised against putting too much
effort into the attempts to find out the truth – they are presumably bound
to be futile from the very start due to the passage of too many centuries.

Nowadays there are less than a dozen graves left in the Ipatyevskiy
monastery that date from the Godunovian epoch. Some of them aren’t
attributed to anyone in particular, since the epitaphs on the cracked
tombstones are damaged beyond legibility in most cases (see figs. 14.63a,
14.63b and 14.63c. It is interesting that one of the stone sarcophagi is
anthropomorphic, or has the shape of a human body (see fig. 14.63d) –
the same shape as used in Egypt. However, we see no inscriptions on the
sarcophagus; the lid is also missing.

Fig. 14.63a. Lettering on a headstone of the Godunovian epoch; its condition is very
poor indeed. The Troitskiy Cathedral of the Ipatyevskiy Monastery in Kostroma.
Photograph taken by T. N. Fomenko in August 2001.

Fig. 14.63b. Semi-obliterated lettering on a headstone of the Godunovian epoch. The

Fig. 14.63c. Headstone of the Godunovian epoch. Sans artwork; no lettering has survived, either. The Troitskiy Cathedral of the Ipatyevskiy Monastery in Kostroma. Photograph taken by the authors in August 2001.

Fig. 14.63d. Anthropomorphic stone sarcophagus of the Godunovian epoch. The Troitskiy Cathedral of the Ipatyevskiy Monastery in Kostroma. These sarcophagi greatly resemble the ones discovered in Egypt. Photograph taken by the authors in August 2001.

This fact fits perfectly well into the series of other “oddities” that accompany the entire history of the Romanovian “restoration” and “renovation works” wreaked upon the ancient Russian cathedrals in the XVII century. Above, in Chapter 5, we mentioned the Muscovite churches that were completely gutted at the order of the Romanovs – this devastation didn’t spare the cathedrals of the Muscovite Kremlin, either. As we can see, a similar process had taken place in other Russian towns
and cities. Some of the “Mongolian” cathedrals dating back from the epoch of the Horde were blown up – presumably accidentally. New cathedrals were then built on the old sites; those were said to emulate their predecessors. The realisation that the Romanovs had really accomplished a large-scale destruction and falsification campaign, replacing the true history of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire with the fictitious version of Miller and Scaliger, is only dawning upon us today. Apparently, the making of “correct history” had necessitated gunpowder kegs as a primary ingredient. A similar disaster befell the remaining authentic artefacts from the epoch of the Horde in the 1930’s (this time learned historians used dynamite).

A propos, it is most spectacular how the explosion of the cathedral under the Romanovs was referred to in the official museum guidebook of the “Crypt of the Boyars Godunov in the Ipatyevskiy Monastery of Kostroma” that was hanging on a wall of the crypt in August 2001. The guidebook said the following: “In 1650-1652 the Troitskiy Cathedral was reconstructed and made much larger.” Destruction via explosion most aptly transforms into a “reconstruction.”

We can once again sense the very same temporal boundary as we have already encountered – the epoch of the XVII century that separates Romanovian history from the ancient “Mongolian” history of Russia as the Horde. It is exceptionally difficult to penetrate the barrier of the XVII century, since very few true archaeological artefacts that would date from the XVI century and earlier have survived until our day and age. Old imperial cathedrals and buildings have been destroyed in most of the Empire’s former Western colonies as well. However, the reformers that came to power in the Western Europe around the XVII-XVIII century decided to keep the old architectural style of the “Mongolian” temples, merely proclaiming it to be mind-bogglingly old and theirs originally, q.v. in Chapter 6. Nowadays the visitors from abroad compassionately remark about how few truly old historical artefacts survived in Russia – there must never have been anything truly monumental over here, unlike the
enlightened and ancient Western Europe.
14.
The modern location of Astrakhan differs from that of the old Tartar Astrakhan, which the Romanovs appear to have razed out of existence.

Let us consider the *City-Building in the Muscovite State of the XVI-XVII Century* ([190]). In particular, this book relates the history of Astrakhan. We learn of an amazing fact that isn’t really known to the general public. The old city of Astrakhan (formerly known as the Tartar Tsitrakhan) had been a famous city of traders on the right bank of the Volga ([190], page 87). “In the XV century the location of the city at the crossroads of nautical trading routes and roads favoured by the caravan made Astrakhan grow into a trade centre of great prominence” ([190], page 87). The modern city of Astrakhan, or the alleged heir of the Tartar Astrakhan, is usually presumed to stand on the same site as its historical predecessor. However, this is wrong – modern Astrakhan lies nine verst further down the Volga; moreover, it is on the left bank and not the right. Why would this be?

When did the Tartar city of Astrakhan relocate to a new site on the opposite coast of the Volga, transforming into the Russian Astrakhan, and how did it happen? The history of this transfer is perfectly amazing, and reveals a few interesting historical facts.

It is presumed that in 1556 the Russian troops took the Tartar city of Astrakhan by storm. The Romanovian version of the Russian history suggests that Astrakhan was joined to the Kingdom of Moscow as a result. Presumably, the military leader I. S. Cheremisinov “was finding it hard to be in control of a city that stands in the middle of an open steppe” ([190], page 87). One wonders about the Tartars, who had presumably retained the city in their hands for centuries before that. Cheremisinov made arrangements with the Muscovite authorities for a transfer of the city to its
current location on the other bank of the Volga, nine verst downstream, no
less. In 1558 a citadel was erected here, and a new city was built around it
in a relatively short time, also called Astrakhan. It is further reported that
after Cheremisinov had settled on the new site, “he gave orders for the
etire Tartar Tsitrakhan to be demolished” ([190], page 87).

And so, the old Tartar city of Astrakhan simply became demolished.
The name has been used for referring to a new city built in a different
location ever since. One might wonder whether these events could indeed
have taken place in the XVI century and not the XVII, when the
Romanovs were busy re-writing history and crushing all those who
identified themselves with the Horde in one way or another. The
Astrakhan episode reveals the scale of their activities – as we see it isn’t
just artwork in the old cathedrals of the Kremlin that became destroyed;
the Romanovs would wipe out whole cities, stopping at nothing.

In fig. 14.64 one sees the drawing of the Citadel and the White Castle of
Astrakhan made in the XVII century by A. Olearius.

Fig. 14.64. A view of the Astrakhan citadel and the Byeliy Gorod on an old engraving
of the XVII century from the book of A. Olearius. Taken from [190], page 91; see also
[615].
15.
The reasons why the Romanovian administration would have to destroy hundreds of maps compiled by the Russian cartographer Ivan Kirillov

One wonders whether the name of Ivan Kirillov, the Russian cartographer of the XVIII century, is known to many people nowadays. This is highly unlikely. However, it would be very apropos to mention him now, as well as certain rather unexpected facts that concern him and Russian history. The fate of the maps compiled by Ivan Kirillov is most illustrative indeed, and we’re only beginning to understand its real meaning nowadays. We shall use the reference to Ivan Kirillov contained in the fundamental work ([1459]).

This book describes 282 mediaeval maps from the exposition of 1952 (Baltimore Museum of Art, USA), many of which have also been photographed.

Among others, there was a Russian map of Ivan Kirillov up for exhibition: “Imperii Russici tabula generalis quo ad fieri potuit accuratissime descripta opera e studio Inoannis Kyrillow. Supremi Senatus Imperii Russici Primi Secretarii Petropoli. Anno MDCCXXXIV. St. Petersburg, 1734.”

One must note that the map in question wasn’t reproduced anywhere in [1459]. This fact alone wouldn’t be worthy of mentioning it explicitly, since the book ([1459]) does by no means reproduce all the maps that it describes – only 59 of 282 come with photographs. Yet the history of this map is so odd that its absence from [1459] becomes conspicuous; such a map would definitely be worthy of reproducing it. We shall explain why.

The American authors and organisers of the exhibition report the following amazing facts about the map in question:
“This is the first general map of Russia that had been engraved and printed, but apparently banned. Ivan Kirillov … made a career in the State Chancellery, where he had occupied the position of an ‘expert in [topographical] terrain reconnaissance.’ When Peter the Great decided to compile an exhaustive map of his domain, he put Kirillov in charge of the project. The latter had soon made the discovery that the people around them were recruited from abroad (France and Germany) for their knowledge of astronomy and ability to apply it to geodesic descriptions. Due to the governmental resistance that his plans invariably met and the fact that the authorities had clearly favoured the foreigners, Kirillov had to be particularly insistent about the compilation and publication of a detailed series of maps. The entire work contained three volumes of 120 pages each and included the abovementioned general map of the empire. The Imperial Academy banned Kirillov’s atlas, mysteriously managed to get rid of the printing plates and published an atlas of its own in 1745… Only two copies of Kirillov’s atlas are known, one of them with defects. All prints made from the original plates are extremely rare” ([1459], page 174).

In the next section the authors of [1459] describe the atlas published by the Imperial Academy, making the following satisfied remark: “Although this atlas had not been the first Russian atlas in existence, it was much more exhaustive and scientifically accurate than the atlas of Ivan Kirillov” ([1459], page 175). This official “Romanovian atlas” was published in 1745, eleven years later than the atlas of Kirillov – more than a decade of hard work.

We haven’t seen all of the surviving maps of Ivan Kirillov, and therefore cannot judge their quality or the “scientific inaccuracies” that they presumably contained. The sly word “inaccuracies” is most likely to indicate that Kirillov’s atlas had retained some geographical traces of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire, which had precluded the Romanovian historians from erecting their edifice of “authorised history.” This strange destruction leads us to some thoughts. At any rate, it is obvious that the 360 maps made by Ivan Kirillov must have really irritated the foreign and imperial cartographers of the Romanovs, because the entire volume of
work was wiped out of existence. Were they destroying the last traces of Russia as the Horde?

The reasons are perfectly clear – the maps must have explicitly depicted Muscovite Tartary with a capital in Tobolsk, and the Romanovs must have wanted to eliminate every chance of their publication by anyone. According to our reconstruction, the gigantic Muscovite Tartary had remained an independent Russian state that had remained the heir of the Horde up until the defeat of “Pougachev,” and a hostile one at that.

One must point out that Ivan Kirillov had by no means been an obscure cartographer. He had occupied the position of the Senate’s Ober-Secretary ([90], page 172), or one of the highest government offices in the Romanovian administration.

Historians report that in 1727 “I. K. Kirillov became the Ober-Secretary of the Senate and the Secretary of the Commerce Commission, having thus become one of the leading government officials in Russia … He had possessed extensive knowledge of geography, mathematics, physics, history and astronomy” ([90], page 202). One must think that the decision to destroy the work of his lifetime, a collection of 360 maps, had required a direct order of the Imperial court. This is by no means a case of “negligence” – the Romanovs must have really been unsettled with something, if they even destroyed the printing plates.

The modern author of [90] makes a passing reference to the 360 maps of Kirillov and his Atlas as he tells us about Russian works on geography; however, for some reason he totally fails to mention that these maps have been destroyed by the Romanovs, several hundred of them altogether, and only makes the cautious observation that “Kirillov managed to publish, or at least prepare for publication, 37 maps or more, 28 of which have reached our day” ([90], page 202). He is either unaware of the destruction, reluctant to mention it or trying to imply that Kirillov had “really strived” to compile his main maps, but didn’t live long enough.

Only several printed copies of maps from Kirillov’s Atlas survived, quite by chance; however, it becomes perfectly unclear nowadays whether
these maps are in fact authentic.

The only map that we can see nowadays bears the proud name of the “General Map of the Russian Empire” and is presumed to be the original of 1734 ([1160], page 217); see fig. 14.65. Let us doubt its authenticity for the simple reason that all the names in the map are in Latin, q.v. in fig. 14.66 (apart from the explanations in the top left and the bottom left corner, which are both in Russian).

Fig. 14.65. Map ascribed to the Russian cartographer Ivan Kirillov entitled “The General Map of the Russian Empire.” It is presented as a 1734 original to us today. Taken from [1160], page 217.
Our opponents might suggest that the Russians had always possessed a slavish mentality, hence the custom to use Latin for the maps of the Russian Empire drawn for the Russian Emperors, who are said to have been in utter awe of the enlightened Europe, despising their own language. Indeed, after the usurpation of the Russian throne by the pro-Western Romanovian dynasty in XVII, Russia fell under a great foreign influence (see more details in Chron7). On the other hand, the world map compiled by the Russian cartographer Vassily Kiprianov had been made for Peter the Great as well, and all the names upon it are in Russian ([90], pages 206-207). It is therefore highly unlikely that Kirillov’s General Map of the Russian Empire had been in Latin – the cartographer must have used the Russian language; however, the hoaxers of a later epoch who had destroyed the authentic Russian maps of Kirillov to hide all traces of their criminal activity simply took some Western map of Russia in Latin and proclaimed it to have been compiled by Kirillov.

One must note that the state of Muscovite Tartary is altogether missing from the General Map of the Russian Empire with Latin names, allegedly compiled by Ivan Kirillov in 1734 – there is no such name anywhere on the map (see fig. 14.65). Nevertheless, the world map compiled by the
cartographers of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in 1771, 37 years later than “Kirillov’s map,” doesn’t simply contain a map of the Muscovite Tartary with a capital in Tobolsk, but also claims it to be the largest state in the world ([1118], Volume 2, page 683).
16. Braids worn by all inhabitants of Novgorod regardless of sex

The famous icon entitled “The Praying People of Novgorod” dating from the XV century depicts a large number of Novgorod’s populace, male and female, dressed in traditional Russian clothing. It is quite spectacular that all of them wear their hair in braids (see fig. 14.67 and 14.68). Men are depicted with beards and braided hair; we also see the names of the people.

Fig. 14.67. Fragment of an old Russian icon portraying the people of Novgorod. They all wear their hair in braids. Taken from [636], flyleaf.
Fig. 14.68. Fragment of the icon; a close-in. Ioakov and Stefan of Novgorod, with braided hair. Their names are written on the icon. Taken from [636], flyleaf.

This icon tells us unequivocally that all the Russians had once customarily worn braids, women as well as men.
What mainstream historians say about the New Chronology?

They do say quite a lot with innumerable learned words. Alas and alack, they have not produced a single refutation with verifiable proofs of mistakes in astronomical, statistical, physical and logical theories and developed and applied methods of New Chronology. They say they couldn’t, wouldn’t and shouldn’t because they are not mathematicians, statisticians, ingeneers, etc., etc., but historians. Well, ignorance is not a proof per se. Read on.

The **New Chronology** is a fringe theory regarded by the academic community as pseudohistory, which argues that the conventional chronology of Middle Eastern and European history is fundamentally flawed, and that events attributed to the civilizations of the Roman Empire, Ancient Greece and Ancient Egypt actually occurred during the Middle Ages, more than a thousand years later. The central concepts of the New Chronology are derived from the ideas of Russian scholar Nikolai Morozov (1854-1946), although work by French scholar Jean Hardouin (1646-1729) can be viewed as an earlier predecessor. However, the New Chronology is most commonly associated with Russian mathematician Anatoly Fomenko (b. 1945), although published works on the subject are actually a collaboration between Fomenko and several other mathematicians. The concept is most fully explained in *History: Fiction or Science?* book series, originally published in Russian.

The New Chronology also contains *a reconstruction*, an alternative chronology, radically shorter than the standard historical timeline, because all ancient history is “folded” onto the Middle Ages. According to Fomenko’s claims, the written history of humankind goes only as far back as AD 800, there is almost no information about events between AD 800–
1000, and most known historical events took place in AD 1000–1500. The New Chronology is rejected by mainstream historians and is inconsistent with absolute and relative dating techniques used in the wider scholarly community. The majority of scientific commentators consider the New Chronology to be pseudoscientific.

**History of New Chronology**

The idea of chronologies that differ from the conventional chronology can be traced back to at least the early XVII century. Jean Hardouin then suggested that many ancient historical documents were much younger than commonly believed to be. In 1685 he published a version of Pliny the Elder’s *Natural History* in which he claimed that most Greek and Roman texts had been forged by Benedictine monks. When later questioned on these results, Hardouin stated that he would reveal the monks’ reasons in a letter to be revealed only after his death. The executors of his estate were unable to find such a document among his posthumous papers. In the XVII century, Sir Isaac Newton, examining the current chronology of Ancient Greece, Ancient Egypt and the Ancient Near East, expressed discontent with prevailing theories and proposed one of his own, which, basing its study on Apollonius of Rhodes’s *Argonautica*, changed the traditional dating of the Argonautic Expedition, the Trojan War, and the Founding of Rome.

In 1887, Edwin Johnson expressed the opinion that early Christian history was largely invented or corrupted in the II and III centuries. In 1909, Otto Rank made note of duplications in literary history of a variety of cultures:

“… almost all important civilized peoples have early woven myths around and glorified in poetry their heroes, mythical kings and princes, founders of religions, of dynasties, empires and cities—in short, their national heroes. Especially the history of their birth and of their early years is furnished with phantastic [sic] traits; the amazing similarity, nay literal identity, of those tales, even if they refer to
different, completely independent peoples, sometimes geographically far removed from one another, is well known and has struck many an investigator.” (Rank, Otto. Der Mythos von der Geburt des Helden.)

Fomenko became interested in Morozov’s theories in 1973. In 1980, together with a few colleagues from the mathematics department of Moscow State University, he published several articles on “new mathematical methods in history” in peer-reviewed journals. The articles stirred a lot of controversy, but ultimately Fomenko failed to win any respected historians to his side. By the early 1990s, Fomenko shifted his focus from trying to convince the scientific community via peer-reviewed publications to publishing books. Beam writes that Fomenko and his colleagues were discovered by the Soviet scientific press in the early 1980s, leading to “a brief period of renown”; a contemporary review from the journal Questions of History complained, “Their constructions have nothing in common with Marxist historical science.” (Alex Beam. “A shorter history of civilization.” Boston Globe, 16 September 1991.)

By 1996, his theory had grown to cover Russia, Turkey, China, Europe, and Egypt [Emp:1].

**Fomenko’s claims**

According to New Chronology, the traditional chronology consists of four overlapping copies of the “true” chronology shifted back in time by significant intervals with some further revisions. Fomenko claims all events and characters conventionally dated earlier than XI century are fictional, and represent “phantom reflections” of actual Middle Ages events and characters, brought about by intentional or accidental misdatings of historical documents. Before the invention of printing, accounts of the same events by different eyewitnesses were sometimes retold several times before being written down, then often went through multiple rounds of translating and copyediting. Names were translated, mispronounced and misspelled to the point where they bore little
resemblance to originals.

According to Fomenko, this led early chronologists to believe or choose to believe that those accounts described different events and even different countries and time periods. Fomenko justifies this approach by the fact that, in many cases, the original documents are simply not available. Fomenko claims that all the history of the ancient world is known to us from manuscripts that date from the XV century to the XVIII century, but describe events that allegedly happened thousands of years before, the originals regrettably and conveniently lost.

For example, the oldest extant manuscripts of monumental treatises on Ancient Roman and Greek history, such as *Annals* and *Histories*, are conventionally dated c. AD 1100, more than a full millennium after the events they describe, and they did not come to scholars’ attention until the XV century. According to Fomenko, the XV century is probably when these documents were first written.

Central to Fomenko’s New Chronology is his claim of the existence of a vast Slav-Turk empire, which he called the “Russian Horde”, which he says played the dominant role in Eurasian history before the XVII century. The various peoples identified in ancient and medieval history, from the Scythians, Huns, Goths and Bulgars, through the Polyanes, Duleby, Drevliane, Pechenegs, to in more recent times, the Cossacks, Ukrainians, and Belarusians, are nothing but elements of the single Russian Horde. For the New Chronologists, peoples such as the Ukrainians, Belarusians, Mongols, and others who assert their national independence from Russia, are suffering from a historical delusion.

Fomenko claims that the most probable prototype of the historical Jesus was Andronikos I Komnenos (allegedly AD 1152 to 1185), the emperor of Byzantium, known for his failed reforms; his traits and deeds reflected in ‘biographies’ of many real and imaginary persons (A. T. Fomenko, G. V. Nosovskiy. *Czar of the Slavs* (in Russian). St. Petersburg: Neva, 2004.). The historical Jesus is a composite figure and reflection of the Old Testament prophet Elisha (850-800 BC?), Pope Gregory VII (1020?-1085),
Saint Basil of Caesarea (330-379), and even Li Yuanhao (also known as Emperor Jingzong, or “Son of Heaven”, emperor of Western Xia, who reigned in 1032-1048), Euclides, Bacchus and Dionysius. Fomenko explains the seemingly vast differences in the biographies of these figures as resulting from difference in languages, points of view and time frame of the authors of said accounts and biographies.


Fomenko claims the Hagia Sophia is actually the biblical Temple of Solomon. He identifies Solomon as sultan Suleiman the Magnificent (1494–1566). He claims that historical Jesus may have been born in 1152 and was crucified around AD 1185 on the hill overlooking the Bosphorus.

On the other hand, according to Fomenko the word “Rome” is a placeholder and can signify any one of several different cities and kingdoms. He claims the “First Rome”, or “Ancient Rome”, or “Mizraim”, is an ancient Egyptian kingdom in the delta of the Nile with its capital in Alexandria. The second and most famous “New Rome” is Constantinople. The third “Rome” is constituted by three different cities: Constantinople (again), Rome in Italy, and Moscow. According to his claims, Rome in Italy was founded around AD 1380 by Aeneas, and Moscow as the third Rome was the capital of the great “Russian Horde.” Similarly, the word “Jerusalem” is actually a placeholder rather than a physical location and can refer to different cities at different times and the word “Israel” did not define a state, even not a territory, but people fighting for God, for example, French St. Louis and English Elizabeth called themselves the King/Queen of Israel.

He claims that parallelism between John the Baptist, Jesus, and Old Testament prophets implies that the New Testament was written before the
Old Testament. Fomenko claims that the Bible was being written until the Council of Trent (1545–1563), when the list of canonical books was established, and all apocryphal books were ordered to be destroyed. Fomenko also claims that Plato, Plotinus and Gemistus Pletho are one and the same person; according to him, some texts by or about Pletho were misdated and today believed to be texts by or about Plotinus or Plato. He claims similar duplicates Dionysius the Areopagite, Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, and Dionysius Petavius. He claims Florence and the House of Medici bankrolled and played an important role in creation of the magnificent ‘Roman’ and ‘Greek’ past.

Specific claims

In volumes 1, 2, 3 and 4 of *History: Fiction or Science?*, Fomenko and his colleagues make numerous claims:

- Historians and translators often “assign” different dates and locations to different accounts of the same historical events, creating multiple “phantom copies” of these events. These “phantom copies” are often misdated by centuries or even millennia and end up incorporated into conventional chronology.

- This chronology was largely manufactured by Joseph Justus Scaliger in *Opus Novum de emendatione temporum* (1583) and *Thesaurum temporum* (1606), and represents a vast array of dates produced without any justification whatsoever, containing the repeating sequences of dates with shifts equal to multiples of the major cabbalistic numbers 333 and 360. The Jesuit Dionysius Petavius completed this chronology in *De Doctrina Temporum*, 1627 (v.1) and 1632 (v.2).

- Archaeological dating, dendrochronological dating, paleographical dating, numismatic dating, carbon dating, and other methods of dating of ancient sources and artifacts known today are erroneous, non-exact or dependent on traditional chronology.
• No single document in existence can be reliably dated earlier than the XI century. Most “ancient” artifacts may find other than consensual explanation.
• Histories of Ancient Rome, Greece and Egypt were crafted during the Renaissance by humanists and clergy - mostly on the basis of documents of their own making.
• The Old Testament represents a rendition of events of the XIV to XVI centuries AD in Europe and Byzantium, containing “prophecies” about “future” events related in the New Testament, a rendition of events of AD 1152 to 1185.
• The history of religions runs as follows: the pre-Christian period (before the XI century and the birth of Jesus), Bacchic Christianity (XI and XII centuries, before and after the life of Jesus), Christianity (XII to XVI centuries) and its subsequent mutations into Orthodox Christianity, Catholicism, Judaism, and Islam.
• The *Almagest* of Claudius Ptolemy, traditionally dated to around AD 150 and considered the cornerstone of classical history, was compiled in XVI and XVII centuries from astronomical data of the IX to XVI centuries.
• 37 complete Egyptian horoscopes found in Denderah, Esna, and other temples have unique valid astronomical solutions with dates ranging from AD 1000 and up to as late as AD 1700.
• The Book of Revelation, as we know it, contains a horoscope, dated to 25 September - 10 October 1486, compiled by cabbalist Johannes Reuchlin.
• The horoscopes found in Sumerian/Babylonian tablets do not contain sufficient astronomical data; consequently, they have solutions every 30–50 years on the time axis and are therefore useless for purposes of dating.
• The Chinese tables of eclipses are useless for dating, as they contain too many eclipses that did not take place astronomically. Chinese tables of comets, even if true, cannot be used for dating.
• All major inventions like powder and guns, paper and print occurred in Europe in the period between the X and the XVI centuries.
• Ancient Roman and Greek statues, showing perfect command of the human anatomy, are fakes crafted in the Renaissance, when artists attained such command for the first time.
• There was no such thing as the Tartar and Mongol invasion followed by over two centuries of yoke and slavery, because the so-called “Tartars and Mongols” were the actual ancestors of the modern Russians, living in a bilingual state with Turkic spoken as freely as Russian. So, Russia and Turkey once formed parts of the same empire. This ancient Russian state was governed by a double structure of civil and military authorities and the hordes were actually professional armies with a tradition of lifelong conscription (the recruitment being the so-called “blood tax”). The Mongol “invasions” were punitive operations against the regions of the empire that attempted tax evasion. Tamerlane was probably a Russian warlord.
• Official Russian history is a blatant forgery concocted by a host of German scholars brought to Russia to legitimize the usurping Romanov dynasty (1613-1917).
• Moscow was founded as late as the mid-XIV century. The battle of Kulikovo took place in Moscow.
• The tsar Ivan the Terrible represents a collation of no fewer than four rulers, representing two rival dynasties: the legitimate Godunov rulers and the ambitious Romanov upstarts.
• English history of AD 640–1040 and Byzantine history of AD 378–830 are reflections of the same late-medieval original.

Fomenko’s methods

Statistical correlation of texts

One of Fomenko’s simplest methods is statistical correlation of texts. His basic assumption is that a text which describes a sequence of events will
devote more space to more important events (for example, a period of war or an unrest will have much more space devoted to than a period of peaceful, non-eventful years), and that this irregularity will remain visible in other descriptions of the period. For each analysed text, a function is devised which maps each year mentioned in the text with the number of pages (lines, letters) devoted in the text to its description (which could be zero). The function of the two texts are then compared. (Chron1, pp. 187–194.)

For example, Fomenko compares the contemporary history of Rome written by Titus Livius with a modern history of Rome written by Russian historian V. S. Sergeev, calculating that the two have high correlation, and thus that they describe the same period of history, which is undisputed. (Chron1, pp. 194–196.) He also compares modern texts, which describe different periods, and calculates low correlation, as expected. (Chron1, pp. 194–196.) However, when he compares, for example, the ancient history of Rome and the medieval history of Rome, he calculates a high correlation, and concludes that ancient history of Rome is a copy of medieval history of Rome, thus clashing with mainstream accounts.

Statistical correlation of dynasties

In a somewhat similar manner, Fomenko compares two dynasties of rulers using statistical methods. First, he creates a database of rulers, containing relevant information on each of them. Then, he creates “survey codes” for each pair of the rulers, which contain a number which describes degree of the match of each considered property of two rulers. For example, one of the properties is the way of death: if two rulers were both poisoned, they get value of +1 in their property of the way of death; if one ruler was poisoned and another killed in combat, they get -1; and if one was poisoned, and another died of illness, they get 0 (Fomenko claims there is possibility that chroniclers were not impartial and that different descriptions nonetheless describe the same person). An important property
is the length of the rule. (*Chron1*, pp. 215–223.)

Fomenko lists a number of pairs of unrelated dynasties – for example, dynasties of kings of Israel and emperors of late Western Roman Empire (AD 300-476) – and claims that this method demonstrates correlations between their reigns. (Graphs which show just the length of the rule in the two dynasties are the most widely known; however, Fomenko’s conclusions are also based on other parameters, as described above.) He
also claims that the regnal history from the XVII to XX centuries never shows correlation of “dynastic flows” with each other, therefore Fomenko insists history was multiplied and outstretched into imaginary antiquity to justify this or other “royal” pretensions.

Fomenko uses for the demonstration of correlation between the reigns exclusively the data from the *Chronological Tables* of J. Blair (Moscow, 1808-1809). Fomenko says that Blair’s tables are all the more valuable to us since they were compiled in an epoch adjacent to the time of Scaligerian chronology. According to Fomenko these tables contain clearer signs of “Scaligerite activity” which were subsequently buried under layers of paint and plaster by historians of the XIX and XX centuries.

**Astronomical evidence**

Fomenko examines astronomical events described in ancient texts and claims that the chronology is actually medieval. For example:

- He says the mysterious drop in the value of the lunar acceleration parameter D” (“a linear combination of the [angular] accelerations of the Earth and Moon”) between the years AD 700–1300, which the American astronomer Robert Newton had explained in terms of “non-gravitational” (i.e., tidal) forces. By eliminating those anomalous early eclipses the New Chronology produces a constant value of D” beginning around AD 1000. (*Chron1*, pp. pp.93-94, 105-6.)
- He associates initially the Star of Bethlehem with the AD 1140 (±20) supernova (now Crab Nebula) and the Crucifixion Eclipse with the total solar eclipse of AD 1170 (±20). He also believes that Crab Nebula supernova could not have exploded in AD 1054, but probably in AD 1153. He connects it with total eclipse of AD 1186. Moreover he holds in strong doubt the veracity of ancient Chinese astronomical data.
- He argues that the star catalog in the *Almagest*, ascribed to the Hellenistic astronomer Claudius Ptolemy, was compiled in the XV to XVI centuries AD. With this objective in sight he develops new
methods of dating old stellar catalogues and claims that the *Almagest* is based on data collected between AD 600 and 1300, whereby the telluric obliquity is well taken into account.

- He refines and completes Morozov’s analysis of some ancient horoscopes, most notably, the so-called Dendera Zodiacs—two horoscopes drawn on the ceiling of the temple of Hathor—and comes to the conclusion that they correspond to either the XI or the XIII century AD. Moreover, in his *History: Fiction or Science?* series finale, he makes computer-aided dating of all 37 Egyptian horoscopes that contain sufficient astronomical data, and claims they all fit into XI to XIX century timeframe. Traditional history usually either interprets these horoscopes as belonging to the I century BC or suggests that they weren’t meant to match any date at all.

- In his final analysis of an eclipse triad described by the ancient Greek Thucydides in *History of the Peloponnesian War*, Fomenko dates the eclipses to AD 1039, 1046 and 1057. Because of the layered structure of the manuscript, he claims that Thucydides actually lived in medieval times and in describing the Peloponnesian War between the Spartans and Athenians he was actually describing the conflict between the medieval Navarrans and Catalans in Spain from AD 1374 to 1387.

- Fomenko claims that the abundance of dated astronomical records in cuneiform texts from Mesopotamia is of little use for dating of events, as the astronomical phenomena they describe recur cyclically every 30–40 years.

**Rejection of common dating methods**

On archaeological dating methods, Fomenko claims:

“Archaeological, dendrochronological, paleographical and carbon methods of dating of ancient sources and artifacts are both non-exact and contradictory, therefore there is not a single piece of firm written evidence or artifact that could
be reliably and independently dated earlier than the XI century.” (Chron1.)

Dendrochronology is rejected with a claim that, for dating of objects much older than the oldest still living trees, it isn’t an absolute, but a relative dating method, and thus dependent on traditional chronology. Fomenko specifically points to a break of dendrochronological scales around AD 1000.

Fomenko also cites a number of cases where carbon dating of a series of objects of known age gave significantly different dates. He also alleges undue cooperation between physicists and archaeologists in obtaining the dates, since most radiocarbon dating labs only accept samples with an age estimate suggested by historians or archaeologists. Fomenko also claims that carbon dating over the range of AD 1 to 2000 is inaccurate because it has too many sources of error that are either guessed at or completely ignored, and that calibration is done with a statistically meaningless number of samples. Consequently, Fomenko concludes that carbon dating is not accurate enough to be used on historical scale.

Fomenko rejects numismatic dating as circular, being based on the traditional chronology, and points to cases of similar coins being minted in distant periods, unexplained long periods with no coins minted and cases of mismatch of numismatic dating with historical accounts. (Chron1, pp. 90-92.)

He fully agrees with absolute dating methods for clay tablets or coins like thermoluminescence dating, optically stimulated luminescence dating, archaeomagnetic, metallographic dating, but claims that their precision does not allow for comprehensive pinpointing on the time axis either.

Fomenko also condemns the common archaeological practice of submitting samples for dating accompanied with an estimate of the expected age. He claims that convergence of uncertainty in archaeological dating methods proves strictly nothing per se. Even if the sum S of probabilities of the veracity of event produced by N dating methods exceeds 1.00 it does not mean that the event has taken place with 100%
probability.

Reception

Fomenko’s historical ideas have been universally rejected by mainstream scholars, who brand them as pseudoscience, but were popularized by former world chess champion Garry Kasparov. Billington writes that the theory “might have quietly blown away in the wind tunnels of academia” if not for Kasparov’s writing in support of it in the magazine *Ogoniok*. Kasparov met Fomenko during the 1990s, and found that Fomenko’s conclusions concerning certain subjects were identical to his own regarding the popular view (which is not the view of academics) that art and culture died during the Dark Ages and were not revived until the Renaissance. Kasparov also felt it illogical that the Romans and the Greeks living under the banner of Byzantium could fail to use the mounds of scientific knowledge left them by Ancient Greece and Rome, especially when it was of urgent military use. However, Kasparov does not support the reconstruction part of the New Chronology. Russian critics tended to see Fomenko’s New Chronology as “an embarrassment and a potent symbol of the depths to which the Russian academy and society have generally sunk … since the fall of Communism.” Western critics see his views as part of a renewed Russian imperial ideology, “keeping alive an imperial consciousness and secular messianism in Russia.”

In 2004 Anatoly Fomenko with his coauthor Gleb Nosovsky were awarded for their books on “New Chronology” the anti-prize of the Moscow International Book Fair called “Abzatz” (literally ‘paragraph’, a euphemism for a vulgar Russian word meaning disaster or fiasco) in the category “Esteemed nonsense” (“Pochotnaya bezgramota”) awarded for the worst book published in Russia.

Critics have accused Fomenko of altering the data to improve the fit with his ideas and have noted that he violates a key rule of statistics by selecting matches from the historical record which support his chronology, while ignoring those which do not, creating artificial, better-than-chance
correlations, and that these practices undermine Fomenko’s statistical arguments. The new chronology was given a comprehensive critical analysis in a round table on “The ‘Myths’ of New Chronology” chaired by the dean of the department of history of Moscow State University in December 1999. One of the participants in that round table, the distinguished Russian archaeologist, Valentin Yanin, compared Fomenko’s work to “the sleight of hand trickery of a David Copperfield.” Linguist Andrey Zaliznyak argued that by using the Fomenko’s approaches one can “prove” any historical correspondence, for example, between Ancient Egyptian pharaohs and French kings.

James Billington, formerly professor of Russian history at Harvard and Princeton and currently the Librarian of Congress placed Fomenko’s work within the context of the political movement of Eurasianism, which sought to tie Russian history closely to that of its Asian neighbors. Billington describes Fomenko as ascribing the belief in past hostility between Russia and the Mongols to the influence of Western historians. Thus, by Fomenko’s chronology, “Russia and Turkey are parts of a previously single empire.” A French reviewer of Billington’s book noted approvingly his concern with the phantasmagorical conceptions of Fomenko about the global “new chronology.”

H.G. van Bueren, professor emeritus of astronomy at the University of Utrecht, concluded his scathing review of Fomenko’s work on the application of mathematics and astronomy to historical data as follows:

“It is surprising, to say the least, that a well-known (Dutch) publisher could produce an expensive book of such doubtful intellectual value, of which the only good word that can be said is that it contains an enormous amount of factual historical material, untidily ordered, true; badly written, yes; mixed-up with conjectural nonsense, sure; but still, much useful stuff. For the rest of the book is absolutely worthless. It reminds one of the early Soviet attempts to produce tendentious science (Lysenko!), of polywater, of cold fusion, and of modern creationism. In brief: a useless and misleading book.” (H. G. van Bueren, Mathematics and Logic.)
Convergence of methods in archaeological dating

While Fomenko rejects commonly accepted dating methods, archaeologists, conservators and other scientists make extensive use of such techniques which have been rigorously examined and refined during decades of use.

In the specific case of dendrochronology, Fomenko claims that this fails as an absolute dating method because of gaps in the record. However, independent dendrochronological sequences beginning with living trees from various parts of North America and Europe extend back 12,400 years into the past. Furthermore, the mutual consistency of these independent dendrochronological sequences has been confirmed by comparing their radiocarbon and dendrochronological ages. These and other data have provided a calibration curve for radiocarbon dating whose internal error does not exceed ±163 years over the entire 26,000 years of the curve.

In fact, archaeologists have developed a fully anchored dendrochronology series going back past 10,000 BCE. “The absolutely dated tree-ring chronology now extends back to 12,410 cal BP (10,461 BC).”

Misuse of historical sources and forced pattern matching

Critics of Fomenko’s theory claim that his use of historical sources is highly selective and ignores the basic principles of sound historical scholarship.

“Fomenko … provides no fair-minded review of the historical literature about a topic with which he deals, quotes only those sources that serve his purposes, uses evidence in ways that seem strange to professionally-trained historians and asserts the wildest speculation as if it has the same status as the information common to the conventional historical literature.”

They also note that his method of statistically correlating of texts is very rough, because it does not take into account the many possible sources of
variation in length outside of “importance.” They maintain that differences in language, style, and scope, as well as the frequently differing views and focuses of historians, which are manifested in a different notion of “important events”, make quantifying historical writings a dubious proposition at best. What’s more, Fomenko’s critics allege that the parallelisms he reports are often derived by alleged forcing by Fomenko of the data – rearranging, merging, and removing monarchs as needed to fit the pattern.

For example, on the one hand Fomenko asserts that the vast majority of ancient sources are either irreparably distorted duplicate accounts of the same events or later forgeries. In his identification of Jesus with Pope Gregory VII (Chron2, p. 51) he ignores the otherwise vast dissimilarities between their reported lives and focuses on the similarity of their appointment to religious office by baptism. (The evangelical Jesus is traditionally believed to have lived for 33 years, and he was an adult at the time of his encounter with John the Baptist. In contrast, according to the available primary sources, Pope Gregory VII lived for at least 60 years and was born 8 years after the death of Fomenko’s John-the-Baptist equivalent John Crescentius.)

Critics allege that many of the supposed correlations of regnal durations are the product of the selective parsing and blending of the dates, events, and individuals mentioned in the original text. Another point raised by critics is that Fomenko does not explain his altering the data (changing the order of rulers, dropping rulers, combining rulers, treating interregna as rulers, switching between theologians and emperors, etc.) preventing a duplication of the effort and effectively making this whole theory an ad hoc hypothesis.

**Selectivity in reference to astronomical phenomena**

Critics point out that Fomenko’s discussion of astronomical phenomena tends to be selective, choosing isolated examples that support the New
Chronology and ignoring the large bodies of data that provide statistically supported evidence for the conventional dating. For his dating of the Almagest star catalog, Fomenko arbitrarily selected eight stars from the more than 1000 stars in the catalog, one of which (Arcturus) has a large systematic error. This star has a dominant effect on Fomenko’s dating. Statistical analysis using the same method for all “fast” stars points to the antiquity of the Almagest star catalog. Rawlins points out further that Fomenko’s statistical analysis got the wrong date for the Almagest because he took as constant Earth’s obliquity when it is a variable that changes at a very slow, but known, rate.

Fomenko’s studies ignore the abundance of dated astronomical records in cuneiform texts from Mesopotamia. Among these texts is a series of Babylonian astronomical diaries, which records precise astronomical observations of the Moon and planets, often dated in terms of the reigns of known historical figures extending back to the VI century BCE. Astronomical retrocalculations for all these moving objects allow us to date these observations, and consequently the rulers’ reigns, to within a single day. The observations are sufficiently redundant that only a small portion of them are sufficient to date a text to a unique year in the period 750 BCE to 100 CE. The dates obtained agree with the accepted chronology. In addition, F. R. Stephenson has demonstrated through a systematic study of a large number of Babylonian, Ancient and Medieval European, and Chinese records of eclipse observations that they can be dated consistently with conventional chronology at least as far back as 600 BCE. In contrast to Fomenko’s missing centuries, Stephenson’s studies of eclipse observations find an accumulated uncertainty in the timing of the rotation of the earth of 420 seconds at 400 BCE, and only 80 seconds at 1000 CE.

**Magnitude and consistency of conspiracy theory**

Fomenko claims that world history prior to 1600 was deliberately falsified
for political reasons. The consequences of this conspiracy theory are twofold. Documents that conflict with New Chronology are said to have been edited or fabricated by conspirators (mostly Western European historians and humanists of late XVI to XVII centuries). The lack of documents directly supporting New Chronology and conflicting traditional history is said to be thanks to the majority of such documents being destroyed by the same conspirators.

Consequently, there are many thousands of documents that are considered authentic in traditional history, but not in New Chronology. Fomenko often uses “falsified” documents, which he dismisses in other contexts, to prove a point. For example, he analyzes the Tartar Relation and arrives at the conclusion that Mongolian capital of Karakorum was located in Central Russia (equated with present-day Yaroslavl). However, the Tartar Relation makes several statements that are at odds with New Chronology (such as that Batu Khan and Russian duke Yaroslav are two distinct people). Those are said by Fomenko to have been introduced into the original text by later editors.

Many of the rulers that Fomenko claims are medieval doppelgangers moved in the imaginary past have left behind vast numbers of coins. Numismatists have made innumerable identifications of coins to rulers known from ancient sources. For instance, several Roman emperors issued coinage featuring at least three of their names, consistent with those found in written sources, and there are frequent examples of joint coinage between known royal family members, as well as overstrikes by kings who were known enemies.

Ancient coins in Greek and Latin are unearthed to this day in vast quantities from Britain to India. For Fomenko’s theories to be correct, this could only be explained by counterfeit on a very grand and consistent scale, as well as a complete dismissal of all numismatic analyses of hoard findings, coin styles etc.

*Popularity in forums and amongst Russian imperialists*
Despite criticism, Fomenko has published and sold over one million copies of his books in his native Russia. Many internet forums have appeared which aim to supplement his work with additional amateur research. His critics have suggested that Fomenko’s version of history appealed to the Russian reading public by keeping alive an imperial consciousness to replace their disillusionment with the failures of Communism and post-Communist corporate oligarchies.

Alexander Zinoviev called the New Chronology “one of the major scientific breakthroughs of the XX century.”

(Wikipedia text retrieved on 2nd August, 2015.)

Dr. Fomenko et al as scientists are ready to recognize their mistakes, to repent and to retract on the condition that:

- radiocarbon dating methods or dendrochronology stand the black box tests, or
- astronomy refutes their results on eclipses, or
- that US astrophysicist Robert Newton was wrong accusing Ptolemy of his swindle.

At present, historians do not, can not, and will not. The radiocarbon dating labs run their very costly tests only if the sample to be dated is accompanied with the idea of age pronounced by historians on basis of … subjective … mmm … gutfeeling and the history books they have been writing for the last 400 years. Radiocarbon labs politely bill for their fiddling and finetuning to get the dates “to order” of historians. Circulus vitiosus is perfect. Long live Consensual Chronology!
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Separate books on the New Chronology

Prior to the publication of the seven-volume *Chronology*, we published a number of books on the same topic. If we are to disregard the paperbacks and the concise versions, as well as new re-editions, there are seven such books. Shortened versions of their names appear below:

1. *Introduction*.
3. *Methods 3*.
4. *The New Chronology of Russia, Britain and Rome*.
5. *The Empire*.
7. *Reconstruction*.

**BOOK ONE* Introduction.**


- **BOOK TWO, PART ONE: Methods-1.**


  [Meth1]: 7. A revised version of the book was published as two volumes (the first two in a series of three) in 1999 in the USA (in Russian) by the Edwin Mellen Press. Fomenko, A. T. *New Methods of Statistical Analysis of Historical Texts. Applications to Chronology*, Vols. 1 and 2. The publication is part of the series titled *Scholarly Monographs in the Russian Language*, Vols. 6-7. Lewiston,

- **Book Two, Part Two: Methods-2.**


[Meth2]:3. A revised version of the book was published as the last volume in a series of three in the USA (in Russian) under the title: Fomenko A. T. *Antiquity in the Middle Ages (Greek and Bible History)*, the trilogy bearing the general name: Fomenko A. T. *New Methods of the Statistical Analysis of Historical Texts and their Chronological Application*. The publication is part of the series titled *Scholarly Monographs in the Russian Language*. Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter, The Edwin Mellen Press, 1999. 578 p.

- **Book Three: Methods-3.**


• Book Four: Russia, Britain and Rome.


• Book Five: The Empire.


• Book Six: The Biblical Russia.


**Book seven: Reconstruction.**


We have to point out that the publication of our books on the New Chronology has influenced a number of authors and their works where the new chronological concepts are discussed or developed. Some of these are: L. I. Bocharov, N. N. Yefimov, I. M. Chachukh, and I. Y. Chernyshov ([93]), Jordan Tabov ([827], [828]), A. Goutz ([220]), M. M. Postnikov ([680]), V. A. Nikerov ([579:1]), Heribert Illig ([1208]), Christian Blöss
and Hans-Ulrich Niemitz ([1038], [1039]), Gunnar Heinsohn ([1185]),
Gunnar Heinsohn and Heribert Illig ([1186]), Uwe Topper ([1462],
[1463]).

Our research attracted sufficient attention to chronological issues for the
Muscovite publishing house Kraft to print a new edition of the
fundamental work of N. A. Morozov titled Christ, first published in 1924-
1932.
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