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From the publisher

The Issue with British History, from the series History: Fiction or Science?, contains data, illustrations, charts and formulae containing irrefutable evidence of mathematical, statistical and astronomical nature. You may as well skip all of it during your first reading. Feel free to use them in your eventual discussions with the avid devotees of classical chronology. In fact, before reading this book, you have most probably been one of such devotees.

After reading History: Fiction or Science? you will develop a more critical attitude to the dominating historical discourse or even become its antagonist. You will be confronted with natural disbelief when you share what you’ve learned with others. Now you are very well armed in face of inevitable scepticism. This book contains enough solid evidence to silence any historian by the sheer power of facts and argumentation.

History: Fiction or Science? is the most explosive tractate on history ever written – however, every theory it contains, no matter how unorthodox, is backed by solid scientific data.

The dominating historical discourse in its current state was essentially crafted in the XVI century from a rather contradictory jumble of sources such as innumerable copies of ancient Latin and Greek manuscripts whose originals had vanished in the Dark Ages and the allegedly irrefutable proof offered by late mediaeval astronomers, resting upon the power of ecclesial authorities. Nearly all of its components are blatantly untrue!

For some of us, it shall possibly be quite disturbing to see the magnificent edifice of classical history to turn into an ominous simulacrum brooding over the snake pit of mediaeval politics. Twice so, in fact: the first seeing the legendary millenarian dust on the ancient marble turn into a mere layer of dirt – one that meticulous unprejudiced research can eventually remove. The second, and greater, attack of unease comes with
the awareness of just how many areas of human knowledge still trust the elephants, turtles and whales of the consensual chronology to support them. Nothing can remedy that except for an individual chronological revolution happening in the minds of a large enough number of people.
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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
Introduction

This book is concerned with analysing the Scaligerian version of the “ancient” and mediaeval chronology of Britain. The results of our research demonstrate that British history is most likely to have been extended arbitrarily by the mediaeval chronologists of the XVI-XVII century, and quite substantially so. The real documented history of England is a great deal shorter; the same applies to the real history of all the other countries.

“Ancient” and mediaeval British events described in the historical sources that have reached our day need to be transposed from the “antiquity” to the epoch that begins with the X-XI century A.D. Many of said events appear to be real, but pertain to the history of Byzantium or the Great = “Mongolian” Empire in the epoch of the XI-XVI century.

Furthermore, the new conception of history that we propose makes the position of England among the Western European countries of the XVI century a great deal more important than it is usually assumed.

We are beginning to realise why the mediaeval English kings listed a number of continental European countries as part of their title apart from England – France, for instance, which is common knowledge, as well as Spain, according to a number of sources: “Queen of England, France and Iberia = Spain (?)” ([639], page 122).

The reconstruction of the English history that we suggest concurs well with a similar “shortening of history” of a number of other countries – Italy, Greece, Egypt, etc., q.v. in our previous publications on the topic. Further research can naturally introduce a number of alterations in the history of England, but they should not affect the main idea, as related below.
PART ONE

A brief scheme of the English history in its Scaligerian version
1. The Oldest English chronicles

1.1. The Anglo-Saxon chronicle

We believe the readers to be more or less familiar with the Scaligerian version of Roman and Byzantine history – within the confines of the average university course at least. On the other hand, we are aware of the fact that the Scaligerian version of the “ancient” English history might not be known quite as well to some of the readers. Therefore, in the present paragraph we shall provide a brief structural description of the Scaligerian textbook on the “ancient” history of England.

We could naturally refer to some XX century textbook; however, all of them are in fact texts of a secondary nature, namely, renditions of earlier books on English history – often of poor quality. Therefore, we are more interested in the mediaeval documents of the XVI-XVII century, which these textbooks are based upon. These chronicles are chronologically closer to the period when the Scaligerian version of global chronology was created and solidified – the XVI-XVII century. This makes them a lot more valuable insofar as the reconstruction of real history is concerned, notwithstanding the fact that the texts in question were heavily edited by the Scaligerite historians.

The primary chronicles that we have chosen as basis of our analysis are as follows: the famous Anglo-Saxon Chronicle ([1442]), as well as the History of the Brits by Nennius ([577]) and the book under the same title written by Galfridus Monmutensis ([155]). In fig. 15.1 we reproduce a photograph of a page from the manuscript of Nennius’ book. We believe this manuscript to date from the XVII century A.D. the earliest.
The abovementioned works de facto serve as the foundation that supports the entire modern conception of the “ancient” and mediaeval English history. Let us reiterate that this conception is strongly dependent on the Scaligerian chronology. An altered chronology shall radically alter our perception of the chronicles.

Finally, we have also used the famous Chronological Tables of J. Blair ([76]), which were compiled in the late XVIII – early XIX century, and comprise all the primary historical epochs as perceived by the European chronologists at the end of the XVIII century.

It is presumed that the so-called legendary history of England begins with the Trojan war, or the alleged XII-XIII century B.C. However, the millennium that is presumed to have passed between the Trojan War and the epoch of Julius Caesar, or the alleged I century B.C., is usually regarded as a “dark age.” In the chronological version of Scaliger and Petavius, which was created in the XVI-XVII century and serves as the basis of every modern textbook on the “ancient” and mediaeval history,
the documented history of England begins around 60 B.C., which is presumed to be the year when the British Isles were conquered by Julius Caesar. Historians themselves recognise the fact that the first written evidence dates to circa 1 A.D., or the reign of Octavian Augustus. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* begins its narration with this very year – the alleged 1st year of the new era ([1442](#), page 4). The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is in fact a collation of several separate manuscripts, namely:

- **Manuscript A** – The Parker Chronicle, which spans the epoch between the alleged years 60 B.C. and 1070 A.D.
- **Manuscript B** – The Abigdon Chronicle I, which covers the epoch of the alleged years 1-977 A.D.
- **Manuscript C** – The Abigdon Chronicle II, which covers the epoch between the alleged years 60 B.C. and 1066 A.D.
- **Manuscript D** – The Worcester Chronicle, which spans the epoch of the alleged years 1-1079 A.D. It is followed by an addendum that is presumed to date from the XII century; it covers the alleged years 1080-1130 A.D.
- **Manuscript E** – The Laud (Peterborough) Chronicle, spanning the alleged years of 1-1153 A.D.
- **Manuscript F** – The Bilingual Canterbury Epitome, which spans the alleged years 1-1058 A.D.

Historians believe all of these chronicles to be duplicates of a single original. In other words, they are all presumed to cover the same sequence of events, differing only in the amount of detail they contain. This is why they were arranged parallel to each other in [1442](#), which is very convenient, and gives us the opportunity to compare different reports of events that date from the same year. It is also possible that all the abovementioned manuscripts are merely different versions of the same chronicles – different copies, as it were.

Thus, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* spans the epoch between the alleged year 60 B.C. and the XII century A.D. Manuscript E ends abruptly with the
description of events that took place in the alleged year 1153 A.D. 
Scaligerian history assures us that all of these chronicles were written 
around the XI-XII century A.D. However, a critical study demonstrates it 
to be a mere hypothesis, which is based on the Scaligerian chronology, 
presumably known a priori. For instance, Manuscript A only exists in two 
“copies,” both of which were made in the XVI century A.D. ([1442], page xxxiii). An earlier copy of the manuscript (the original of both) is said to 
have perished in a blaze. The history of all the other manuscripts that 
comprise the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is related in [1442] – and rather 
vaguely, at that. For instance, we learn of no reasons why they were dated 
in this particular manner.

One gets the impression that historians employed the following method 
of dating the chronicles in question: if the chronicles end their narration 
with the events of the alleged XI-XII century, the existing copies of these 
chronicles must date from the same epoch. However, this “simple 
consideration” implies all the events described in the chronicles to be 
dated correctly. If this fails to be the case, the dating of the chronicles shall 
change automatically.

We must point out that the problems with reconstructing the true origins 
of said Old English chronicles are known quite well, and British historians 
speak of them openly. For instance, the historian Dom David Knowles 
was forced to make the following statement: “The issue of the origins and 
respective dependencies between the different versions [of the Chronicle] 
is so complex that any sort of discussion on the topic implies the use of 
advanced mathematics” ([1442], page xxxi; see also Comment 1 at the end 
of Part 2). We must add that the historian has voiced a perfectly valid 
consideration – involuntarily, perhaps. Modern scientific research in the 
field of chronology is impossible without the use of mathematics.

G. N. Garmonsway reports further that every modern analysis of the 
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is invariably based on the revision of its initial 
publishation (John Earle, 1865) made by Charles Plummer in 1892-1899. 
According to Garmonsway’s cautious remark, the manuscripts A and E are
“associated” with the names of XVI century figures, namely, Archbishop Parker (1504-1575) and Archbishop Laud (1573-1645). It turns out that other manuscripts of the Chronicle “had once belonged to Sir Robert Cotton (1571-1631), and are nowadays part of Cotton’s manuscript collection kept in the British Museum” ([1442], page xxxi; see Comment 2).

Thus, we arrive at the hypothesis that the manuscripts of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle that we have at our disposal today were actually written in the XV-XVI century the earliest. Why are they dated to the XI-XII century nowadays? As we mentioned it earlier, the answer must be quite simple. The Chronicle ends its narration with the events of the XI-XII century in Scaligerian dating, hence the presumption that the authors of the Chronicle had lived in the XI-XII century. However, firstly, the events of the XI-XII century may well have been described by a much later author, who had lived in the XV, XVI or even the XVII century. Secondly, the Scaligerian dating of the Chronicle’s text depends on the dating of the events it relates. If it turns out that said events really took place in a different epoch, the dating of the text that we have today shall also need to be altered.

The fact that these chronicles use B.C./A.D. datings speaks volumes of their rather late origin. It is common knowledge, even among the Scaligerites, that the chronology was only introduced in the late Middle Ages ([76]). Below we shall be citing a number of facts proving that the authors of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle had already been familiar with the Scaligerian version of the global chronology of the antiquity. This version was created in the XV-XVII century A.D., which is yet another piece of evidence telling us that the version of the Chronicle known to us today is of a rather late origin.

Why do researchers pay so much attention to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in their reconstruction of the English history? The explanation is very simple – the chronicle in question is presumed to be the first historical text written in English and using the “Years of Grace”
chronology (see [1442], page xxiv; also Comment 3). We must make the following comment in re the transcription of dates used in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. It is presumed that the Anno Domini dates were known as “Years from the Incarnation of Our Lord” in mediaeval England; another presumption is for the above to be equivalent to the “Years of Grace.” This alleged equivalence of the two ancient eras requires a special analysis, and we shall revert to this below. For the meantime, let us point out the phonetic similarity between the words “grace” and Greece.

It is possible that “Years of Grace” really translates as “Greek years,” implying a chronology that is somehow related to Greece or the Greek faith. It is also possible that the words “grace,” “Greece” and “Christ” are all related in some way – the association may be lost today. Should the above prove veracious, the Greek faith shall be another alias of the Christian religion. Let us remind the reader that, according to our reconstruction, Christ had lived in Czar-Grad on the Bosporus, or the Byzantine capital; this is also where he was crucified, q.v. in the table below ([517]).

Let us instantly make a disclaimer: we do not consider phonetic and linguistic parallels to be independent proof of anything at all. They can only serve as auxiliary considerations, becoming meaningful inside a parallelism, or superimposition, that covers a period of several centuries. When similar names manifest in both currents under comparison simultaneously inside a rigid superimposition, it lends some credulity to linguistic parallels as well.

The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is written in a rather arid language. It is separated into chapters that correspond to individual years. It goes without saying that there are gaps and omissions. It is presumed that the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* describes the events that took place between the I century A.D. and the XI-XII century A.D. (see figs. 15.2 and 15.3). The dryness of the text and the lack of literary embellishments is likely to indicate that the document in question is indeed an important one – possibly edited in the XVII century, but based on real ancient evidence nevertheless. The
correctness of the datings ascribed to the events related in the Chronicle by later chronologists of the XVII-XVIII century is an altogether different issue.

Fig. 15.2. Scaligerian dating of the events described by the famous mediaeval English chroniclers – Galfridus Monemutensis and Nennius. See [577] and [155].
1.2. **History of the Brits** by Nennius

This chronicle is relatively brief, comprising 24 pages of [577]. More than 30 manuscripts of this work are known to us today [577]. Modern commentators report: “The earliest manuscripts date from the IX or the X century A.D., and the latest ones – from the XIII or even the XIV century. The authorship of certain manuscripts is attributed to Gildas. Nennius is seldom mentioned as the author of the oeuvre. What we have at our disposal is most likely to be a compilation… The original text has not survived, but we have an Irish translation of the XI century” ([577], page 269). The text is given according to the publication entitled *Nennius et l’Historia brittonum* (Paris, 1934). Some of the manuscripts are concluded with pages from the “Annales Cambriae,” a manuscript that is presumed to
date from around 954 A.D. The work of Nennius does not have any annual separation or indeed any chronological indication whatsoever, with the exception of the following two fragments. At the beginning of the chronicle there is a brief table entitled “On the Six Ages of the World,” which indicates intervals between a number of Biblical events in years – in accordance with the version of Scaliger and Petavius, which is highly remarkable. Chapter 16 contains a “chronological validation” with approximate intervals between certain events of English history, characterised by extreme brevity.

Thus, the authorship of the text is dubious, and no original had survived. The translation dates from the alleged XI century. The text itself contains no independent chronological scale, which makes the issue of whether or not the manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* are dated correctly all the more poignant. A propos, the text of Nennius is written in an unconstrained literary manner, with many rhetorical embellishments. This fact alone betrays the text to belong to a well-developed literary tradition, which had required time and literary experience. It is a possible indication of the chronicle’s late origin – the XVI-XVII or even the XVIII century.

It is presumed that Nennius describes events distributed across the historical interval beginning with the Trojan War (the alleged XII or XIII century B.C.) and ending with the IX or the X century A.D. Scaligerian historians have stretched the rather compendious text of Nennius over the gigantic interval of two thousand years. This has led to great lacunae in his narration as regarded from the Scaligerian point of view. In figs. 15.2 and 15.3 we provide a schematic representation of the epoch allegedly described by Nennius as a dotted line. If we are to believe the Scaligerian chronology, Nennius offhandedly omits entire centuries, making gigantic leaps, without even being aware and carrying on with his narration quite unperturbed.

1.3. *Historia Britonum* by Galfridus Monmutensis
The chronicle in question is presumed to date from the 1130s or the 1140s ([155], page 196). Galfridus is said to have based his work on the text of Nennius, to the extent of repeating the “mistakes” of the latter ([155], page 231, comments to Chapter 17; also page 244). The book of Galfridus is a voluminous oeuvre that comprises some 130 pages of [155]. Unlike the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, the text contains no annual chronological division. The language of Galfridus is a highly evolved acrolect with a great number of rhetorical embellishments and much moralising. It is even presumed that Galfridus had not only been a historian, but also a poet. His book indeed appears to supersede the work of Nennius, which is precisely what the English tradition claims. Galfridus is also said to have based his work on the “Ecclesiastical History of the Angles” by St. Bede the Venerable ([155], page 244).

It is noteworthy that modern historians point out “the distinctly manifest orientation of Galfridus towards the ancient tradition” ([155], page 207). He doesn’t merely refer to the “ancient” themes, but also emulates the style of the “ancient” authors ([155], page 207). It is as though Galfridus was completely immersed in the atmosphere of the “antiquity” as he was writing his book. Modern specialists presume Galfridus to have borrowed some of his stories from the “ancient” authors – Stacius, for instance, without mentioning it openly ([155], page 236).

Modern commentators write that the work of Galfridus had been extremely popular in the Middle Ages: “There are about two hundred [sic! – Auth.] copies of the Historia in existence … made in scriptoria between the XII and the XV century, which is when the first printed edition came out” ([155], page 228). The first printed edition came out in Paris in the alleged year 1508 – the XVI century the earliest, that is.

In figs. 15.2 and 15.3 we provide a schematic representation of the historical epoch allegedly described by Nennius in Scaligerian datings. It virtually covers the same historical interval as the work of Nennius, between the Trojan War of the alleged XII or XIII century B.C. and the alleged VIII century A.D. Although the book of Galfridus is much more
detailed than that of Nennius, it cannot cover this long a period completely, and contains huge lacunae. However, Galfridus doesn’t appear to notice this, either – he carries on with his narration smoothly and without haste, without being aware that he skips over entire historical epochs, according to the Scaligerites.

1.4. Several other “ancient” English chronicles

We have used other English chronicles of the alleged IX-XIII century in our research, including the ones collected by V. I. Matouzova in her compilation entitled *The Mediaeval English Sources* ([517]). We shall refrain from giving a detailed characteristic of these chronicles. Instead, we shall present to the reader a most remarkable table that we have compiled in accordance with the materials collected in Matouzova’s book, which are based on her analysis of the English chronicles (see the next section).

1.5. The names of the cities, ethnic groups and countries known to us today as reflected in mediaeval English chronicles

Some of the readers might think that mediaeval chronicles refer to London as London, Kiev as Kiev, Russia as Russia and so on. This is occasionally the case in relatively recent texts dating from the XVIII-XIX century. However, this is an exception rather than a rule for the early and primordial chronicles of the XV-XVI century. Ancient chronicle often use completely different names; in this case, one requires a special research, which is often far from easy, in order to understand the real identity of the names in question. Mediaeval texts often use thoroughly different names for referring to the same countries and nations, which usually have nothing in common with the names used today. In other words, the names of the ancient cities and nations known to us today are the ones that became immortalised by the Scaligerian history in the XVII-XVIII century.

However, it turns out that other opinions on these matters were rather
common in the Middle Ages, and they often differ from the consensual ones drastically. It would be very interesting to see how the mediaeval English sources referred to the cities and nations that we believe to be familiar nowadays. Apparently, mediaeval authors had oftentimes adhered to completely different conceptions of the ancient and mediaeval history. It is for this very reason that the modern historians are forever accusing mediaeval chroniclers of ignorance, confusing different historical epochs, collating the “antiquity” with the Middle Ages and so on. We provide several typical examples of how the mediaeval artists saw the “antiquity” in figs. 15.4-15.7. It is perfectly obvious that the “antiquity” in their rendition is the mediaeval epoch of the XIV-XVI century.

Fig. 15.4. Painting from the Museum of Vatican. Approximately dates from 1425 A. D. We see the Annunciation, which is consensually dated to the alleged I century A.D. However, the setting and the clothes are obviously mediaeval. Taken from [713], page 96.
Fig. 15.5-6. Painting by Piero della Francesca, a mediaeval Italian artist (allegedly dating from 1420-1492 A.D.). The title is as follows: “Battle of Emperor Constantine and Maxentius.” Famous “ancient” theme from the history of the “ancient” Roman Empire (the alleged IV century A.D.). The characters and the setting look typically mediaeval – and hailing from the late Middle Ages to boot. The “ancient” Roman rider looks like a typical mediaeval knight of the XV-XVI century wearing heavy plate armour that covers his entire body. Taken from [16], page 39.

Fig. 15.7. Fragment of Piero della Francesca’s painting entitled “Battle of Emperor Heraclius and Chosroes (allegedly dating from 1420-1492). The theme is said to date
from the VII century A.D. What we really see is a group of late mediaeval knights wearing heavy plate armour; there are helmets with visors on their heads. Taken from [16], page 43.

The table that we have compiled demonstrates the geographical names used by the ancient English chronicles in lieu of their alleged modern equivalents. The identification of these mediaeval names has been made by V. I. Matouzova ([517]).

**THE TABLE OF NAMES AND THEIR MEDIAEVAL EQUIVALENCE**

*In accordance with the ancient English chronicles*

- **The Azov Sea** = Maeotian Lakes, Meotedisc fen, Maeotidi lacus, Maeotidi paludes, palus Maeotis, paludes Maeotidae and Paluz Meotidienes.
- **Alania** = Valana, Alania, Valves, Polovtsy [*sic! – see below*] and Albania.
- **Albanians** = Liubene, Albani, Alania, Albion = Britain and Albania on the shores of the Caspian Sea (modern Iran?); also Albania as a province of the Great Asia, washed by the Caspian Sea in the East [*sic!*] and the Arctic Ocean in the North.
- **Amazonia** = Maegda Land, Maegda londe and Amazonia.
- **Bulgarians** = Wlgari, Bulgari, Bougreis and the Volga Bulgars.
- **River Bug** = Armilla.
- **The Vandals** = Wandali, Baltic Slavs.
- **Hungary** = Hungaria, Hunia, Ungaria and Minor Ungaria.
- **Byzantium** = Greece or Graecia; Constantinople = Constantinopolis.
- **The Valachians** = Coralli, Blachi, Ilac, Blac, and the Turks [*sic! – see below*].
- **Valachia** = Balchia.
- **Volga** = Ethilia, or Ithil.
- **The Gauls** = Galichi.
• The Galitsk and Volynsk Russia = Galacia, Gallacia and Galicia.
• Germany = Gothia, Mesia, Theutonia, Germania, Allemania and Jermaine.
• The Hibernian Ocean = The English Channel and Hibernicum oceanum.
• Hibernia = Ireland [sic!]
• Gothia = Germany, Gotland Isle, Scandinavia and Tauris.
• The Dacians = Danes, Dani, Daneis, Dacians, Deni [denizens of the Danube region?].
• Denmark = Denemearc, Dacia, Dania and Desemone.
• The Danish = Daci, Dani, Norddene and Denen.
• The Dardanelles Strait = Strait of St. George (branchium Sancti Georgii).
• The Derbent Strait = Alexander’s Gate, Alexandres herga, Porta ferrea Alexandri and claustra Alexandri.
• Dnepr = Aper.
• The Dogi = the Russians, q.v. below.
• Don = Danai, Thanais and Tanais.
• The ancient Russia = Susie, Russie, Ruissie, Rusia, Russia, Ruthenia, Rutenia, Ruthia, Ruthena, Ruscia, Russcia, Russya and Rosie.
• Danube = Danubius, Hister, Danuvius, Damaius, Deinphirus, Don, Danai and Thanais.
• The Iron Gate (see Derbent).
• Ireland = Hibernia or Hybernia.
• Iceland = Ysolandia.
• Caucasus = Tauris, beorg Taurus and Caucasus.
• Caspian Sea = Caspia garsecege and mare Caspium.
• Cassaria = Khazaria [sic! – see below].
• Kiev = Chyo [sic!], Cleva [sic!] and Riona [sic!].
• The Chinese = Cathaii.
• The Coralli = Valachians, q.v. above, and Turks, q.v. below.
• Red Sea = mare Rubrum.
- **The English Channel** = Hibernicum occeanum.
- **Marburg** = Merseburg.
- **Moesia** = Germany, q.v. above.
- **Narva** = Armilla.
- **The Germans** = Germanici, Germani, Teutonici, Theutonici and Allemanni.
- **The Netherlands** = Friesia, Frisia and Frise.
- **The Normans** = Nordmenn.
- **Ocean** = garsecg, Oceano, Oceanus, Occeanus and Ocean.
- **The Pechenegi** = Getae.
- **The Polovtsy** = Planeti, Captac, Cumani, Comanii, Alani, Values and Valani.
- **Prussia** = Prutenia [sic!] – P-Ruthenia = P-Russia.
- **The Prussians** = Prateni, Pruteni, Pructeni, Prusceni, Praceni and Pruceni.
- **Riona** = Kiev, q.v. above.
- **The Rugi** = Russians and Baltic Slavs, q.v. below.
- **The Ruhr Mountains** = Rithean, or Ural (Hyperborean) Mountains.
- **The Russians** = Russii, Dogi [sic!], Rugi [sic!], Rutheni [sic!] and Rusceni.
- **The Ruteni** = Russians, q.v. above.
- **Arctic Ocean** = Scythian Ocean, Sciffia garsecg, Oceanus Septentriionalis and mare Scythium.
- **Sithia** = Scythia, q.v. below.
- **The Scandinavians** = the Goths (Gothi).
- **Scythia** = Sithia.
- **The Scythians** = Scithes, Scythaes, Cit [sic!], Scithia, Scythia, Sice [sic!] and Barbaria (barbarians).
- **The Baltic Slavs**, or **Sclavi** = Winedas, Wandali and Roge.
- **Taurus** = Caucasus, q.v. above.
- **Tauris** = Gothia [sic!].
- **Tanais** = Don, q.v. above.
• The Tartars (and the Mongols) = Tartareori, gens Tartarins, Tartari, Tartariti, Tartarii, Tattari, Tatari, Tartarei and Thartarei.
• Tyrrenian Sea = mare Tyrene.
• The Turks = Coralli, Thurki, Turci, Blachi, Ilac and Blac [sic!].
• The Ural Mountains = Riffeng beorgum, Hyberborei montes, montes Riph(a)eis, Hyperborei montes.
• France = Gallia and Francia.
• Friesia = The Netherlands, q.v. above.
• Khazaria = Cassaria and Cessaria [sic!].
• The Khazars = Chazari.
• Chyo = Kiev, q.v. above.
• The Black Sea = Euxinus, Pontius, mare Ponticum, the Great Sea, or mare, and Majus.
• Scotland = Scotia and Gutlonde.
• Genghis-Khan = Cingis, Churchitan, Zingiton, Chirkam, Cliyram, Gurgatan, Cecarcarus, Inghischem, Tharsis [sic!], David [sic!] and Presbyter Johannes [sic!].
• Yaroslav Vladimirovich the Wise, Great Prince of Kiev = Malesclodus, Malescoludus, Julius Clodius and Jurius Georgius.

We have the following to say in re the identity of Yaroslav the Wise. As we can see, mediaeval English chronicles refer to him as to Malescoldus. However, M. P. Alexeyev quotes other names of this monarch used in the historiographical tradition of the Western Europe in [14]. One of these names is Juriscloht; it obviously contains the name Youri (Juris, or Jurius). Another name of Yaroslav is Julius Claudius, or Juliusclodius, no less. This is the name that Guillom of Jumiege, a chronicler from Normandy of the alleged XII century, uses for referring to Yaroslav the Wise. The English author Orderic Vitalius uses the same name for Yaroslav – Julius Claudius ([14]).

This is what we find written in some of the Old English texts: “He fled to the Kingdom of the Dogi, which we prefer to call Russia. When
Malescoldus, the king of this land, had found out who he was, he received him with honour” ([1068] and [1010]). The Latin original is as follows: “Aufugit ad regnum Dogorum, quod nos melius vocamus Russiam. Quem rex terrae Malescoldus nomine, ut cognovit quis esset, honeste retinuit” ([1068]).

Now let us imagine the same text without the comment of the chronicler that the Kingdom of the Dogi was in fact Russia. It would read as follows: “He fled to the Kingdom of the Dogi. When Malescoldus, the king of this land, had found out who he was, he received him with honour.”

Since we are accustomed to the Scaligerian version of history, we would probably interpret this passage as a description of British events, the Dogi being some nation in England and Scotland, and Malescoldus – the king of either Scotland or England. This interpretation would initially strike us as perfectly logical. In reality, the English chronicle uses the name Dogi for referring to the Russians.

One is confronted with another issue of great interest. Who were the famous Scottish kings bearing the name of Malcolm? We have Malcolm I (the alleged years 943-958), Malcolm II (the alleged years 1004-1034), and Malcolm III (the alleged years 1057-1093). Could these names hide the identities of the Scythian Czars (Khans) or their European representatives from the epoch of the “Mongolian” Empire?

The glossary of synonyms, or duplicates, as presented above, shall prove extremely useful in our analysis of the English history.
2.
The Scaligerian chronology of British history

2.1. Scotland and England: two parallel dynastic currents

In figs. 15.2 and 15.3 we see a rough scheme of the British history in its consensual version. It begins with the alleged I century A.D., or the conquest of Britain by Julius Caesar. The English chronicles proceed with what is de facto a rendition of the Scaligerian history of Rome, occasionally mentioning this or the other Roman emperor visiting England. According to these chronicles, no independent English monarchs had yet existed in the epoch of the alleged years 1-400 A.D. (the British Isles appear to have been part of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire for the first four centuries, or in the XIII-XVI century A.D.). For the sake of simplicity, we shall now consider the Scaligerian chronology of Britain as rendered in the work of J. Blair dating from the end of the XVIII century ([76]). The “amendments” made by the historians of the XIX-XX century do not affect the general picture, and are thus of little importance to us. We use quotation marks around the word “amendments” to point out that minor alterations of a blatantly incorrect picture make no sense whatsoever.

In the alleged V century A.D. Rome loses power over Britain, and the first independent monarchs emerge there. From this moment on, British history becomes divided in two – the history of England and the history of Scotland.

In other words, the alleged V century A.D. marks the naissance of two dynastic currents – the English and the Scottish. Both currents appear to be moving in parallel along the time axis, merging in 1603 and becoming the single dynastic current of Great Britain.

In the alleged year 404 A.D. Fergus I, King of Scotland, founds a long
dynasty of Scottish rulers, which continues uninterrupted until 1603 A.D. In 1603, under Jacob I (1603-1625), the United Kingdom of Great Britain comes to existence. One must note that the sequence of the Scottish rulers is well ordered and has virtually no co-rulers. The royal dynasty of Scotland covers the entire interval of 1200 years between the alleged years 404 and 1603 evenly and without superimpositions. This is an example of a “well-written history,” where each king occupies a separate place on the time axis (see the dotted line in figs. 15.2 and 15.3).

Actual English history looks completely different.

2.2. English history of the alleged years 1-445 A.D. England as a Roman colony

The period between the alleged year 60 B.C. and the first years of the new era is considered to be the epoch of the conquest of Britain, started by the Roman troops of Julius Caesar (see fig. 15.3).

The period between the alleged I century A.D. and 445 A.D. is considered to be the epoch of the Roman rule in England, which is ruled by the Roman emperors “remotely.” There are no independent English monarchs or local governors. This period of English history in the rendition of the “Anglo-Saxon Chronicles” is basically a rendition of the Roman imperial history between the alleged I century A.D. and the middle of the V century A.D. in the Scaligerian version.

In the section covering the events of the alleged year 409 A.D., the “Chronicle” reports that the Romans were defeated by the Goths, fleeing from England and never ruling over it again ([1442, page 11). See Comment 4.

2.3. The epoch between the alleged years 445 and 830 A.D.
Six kingdoms and their unification

Starting with the alleged year 445, several kingdoms emerge in England, each of them possessing a dynastic current of its own. We are referring to
the following six kingdoms (heptarchies):

- Brittany = Britain,
- Saxons = Kent,
- Sussex = South Saxons,
- Wessex = West Saxons,
- Essex = East Saxons,
- Mercia = Mercia.

These six kingdoms coexist until the alleged year 828 A.D., which is when they merge into a single kingdom of England in the course of a war. This takes place under Egbert, who becomes the first ruler of the united England. According to [76] and [64], the period of circa 830 A.D. can be called the end of the heptarchy: “Under Egbert, King of Wessex, all the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms united into a single state of the early feudal period” ([334], page 172).

2.4. The epoch of the alleged years 830-1040 A.D. ends with the Danish conquest and the decline of the Danish Empire

Starting with the alleged year 830, the English chronicles only refer to a single dynastic current of rulers in the united kingdom of England. The alleged years 1016-1040 mark a watershed in the history of England. In 1016, Knut (Canute the Great, King of the Danes) conquers England and becomes the monarch of England, Denmark and Norway. An old portrait of Canute the Great and his spouse Emma can be seen in fig. 15.8.

This reign is reported to have been rather unstable. After the death of Canute in the alleged year 1035, the Danish Empire falls apart. In the alleged year 1042, the English throne is re-captured by Edward the Confessor, a representative of the old Anglo-Saxon dynasty (1042-1066). An old portrait of his can be seen in fig. 15.9. In fig. 15.3 we mark 1040 as one of the most important breakpoints in the Scaligerian history of England.
2.5. The epoch of the alleged years 1040-1066 A.D. The rule of the old Anglo-Saxon dynasty and its end
The reign of Edward the Confessor ends in 1066, which is another famous
breakpoint. According to the Scaligerian chronology, the following important events happened that year – the death of Edward the Confessor, the Norman conquest of England by William I the Conqueror (the Bastard), and the famous Battle of Hastings, wherein William defeats the Anglo-Saxon king Harold and becomes William I, King of England (1066-1087). This important date (1066) is also marked in fig. 15.3.

2.6. The epoch between the alleged years 1066 and 1327 A.D. The Norman dynasty followed by the dynasty of Anjou. The two Edwards

This epoch begins with the Norman reign. The entire first part of the historical period between the alleged years 1066 and 1327 is comprised by the reign of the Norman dynasty ([64], page 357) – the alleged years 1066-1153 (or 1154). The dynasty of Anjou comes to power right after that and reigns between the alleged years 1154 and 1272 ([64], page 357). In 1263-1267 a civil war breaks out in England ([334], page 260). In the late XIII – early XIV century, an oligarchic monarchy emerges in England under the two kings of the new dynasty – Edward I (1272-1307) and Edward II (1307-1327). The end of this epoch is marked by the expansion wars with Wales, Scotland and Ireland. The war ended in 1314, the Scots being the victorious party. As we have estimated, this epoch (the early XIV century) was the epoch of the Great = “Mongolian” conquest. In Chron5 we demonstrate that this conquest also reached England.

Therefore, the fact that a new dynasty came to rule over England around this time is perfectly natural. One must also note that the first three kings of this dynasty all bore the name Edward; the name sounds similar to the word “Horde.”

2.7. The epoch between 1327 and 1602

This period begins with the reign of Edward III (1327-1377), and ends with the formation of Great Britain as a result of the unification of England
and Scotland. The following period (1600 and on) shall not be considered in the present analysis, since it is of no relevance to our analysis of the “ancient” English history.

**Summary:** We have therefore discovered that the Scaligerian history of England contains a number of remarkable breakpoints, which provide for a natural division of this history into several historical epochs. We shall soon witness this division to be anything but random, and explained by the existence of phantom duplicates and chronological shifts inside the history of England.

**NB:** It has to be pointed out that Ruthenia or Ruthia as aliases of Russia are perfectly understandable – they derive from the Russian words for “army” (“orda” or “rat”), as well as “rada,” or “council.”
Parallels between the history of England and Byzantium, Rome and the Horde
3.
A rough comparison of the dynastic currents of England and Rome (Byzantium)

As we already know, the “ancient” English chronicles claim that England had remained a Roman colony for approximately the first four hundred years. Moreover, chronicles that relate the English history of this period refer to Rome and Byzantium more often than to England. One therefore comes up with the obvious idea of comparing the respective dynastic currents of England and Rome (Byzantium). This comparison was made somewhat easier to us, since the global chronological map as compiled by A. T. Fomenko and presented in Chron1 and Chron2 already depicts all the primary dynastic currents of Europe and the Mediterranean region as distributed along the time axis, including the emperors of Rome, Byzantium and England. A cursory glance thrown at these two currents of rulers reveals an amazing fact – the reign densities are distributed across both currents with exceptional similarity. Moreover, the dynastic currents of England and Rome (Byzantium) are unique in this respect. There are no other dynastic currents with similar characteristics. Let us explain just what we mean.

Let us divide the period of English history that is of interest to us (the alleged years 1-1700 A.D.) into decades and then count the kings regnant within each decade. For instance, if there was just one monarch within a given decade, the decade in question shall be marked as 1. If there were two kings – either in succession, or as co-rulers, the decade shall be marked as 2, and so on. We shall thus come up with a certain graph that demonstrates the density of a given dynastic current, or the quantity of kings per decade.

Since there were no independent rulers in England between the alleged
years of 1 and 400 A.D., q.v. above, the graph corresponding to the English rulers of this period shall have zero density. Starting with the alleged year 440 A.D. we see six independent dynastic currents in England, q.v. above, existing up until the alleged year of 830, marking the unification of the country. After that we have a single dynastic current that continues until the present day (1442).

We have performed the same operation for the dynastic current of Rome, or Byzantium, of the period between the alleged years 1 and 1500 A.D. Here we have collected all the data concerning the emperors of Rome and Byzantium regnant between the alleged I and XV century A.D. In the Scaligerian version, this dynastic current is concentrated around Rome and its colonies on the interval of the alleged I-IV century A.D. After the alleged year 330, it is adjoined by the independent dynastic current of Byzantium with the capital in New Rome, or Constantinople. Both currents coexist and are intertwined to a great extent up until the middle of the alleged VI century A.D. It is presumed that in the VI century Western Rome had lost its imperial dynasty after the famous Gothic War, erroneously dated to the VI century A.D. by Scaliger. From this moment on we only have a single Roman dynastic current – the Byzantine. It ends in 1453 with the fall of Constantinople and the entire Byzantine Empire.

The results of density calculation are presented in figs. 16.1 and 16.2. The bottom graph corresponds to the density of the Roman and Byzantine dynastic current, and the top one – to the English. We have shifted the Scaligerian dates pertaining to the history of England backwards by some 275 years in this comparison.
Fig. 16.1. Comparative density distribution on the time axis (representing the quantity of kings regnant in every decade) in the dynastic currents of England and Rome, or Byzantium. The two graphs concur with each other very well. First part of the graphs.

Fig. 16.2. Comparative dynastic current densities for England and Rome, or Byzantium. Continued.

One doesn’t need to study the two graphs (figs. 16.1 and 16.2) for too long in order to notice the extreme similarity of the rough characteristics of both dynastic currents under comparison. Indeed, the initial reign densities of both currents are rather low; then we observe the numeric characteristics of both currents soaring simultaneously. Then we see similar density
amplitudes of both currents – the English and the Roman, or Byzantine.

Next we see both density characteristics plummet – once again, almost simultaneously, without any substantial changes to follow. They oscillate around the values of 1 and 2 for the next couple of centuries.

The zone of high dynastic frequency for England covers the period between the alleged years 445-830 A.D., whereas for Rome and Byzantium it falls over the alleged years 170-550 A.D. The length of these dense dynastic intervals is equal for both currents and amounts to circa 380 years. The general duration of the historical intervals under comparison (English and Roman, or Byzantine) equals some 1500 years in both cases.

As we have already mentioned, this pair of graphs is unique. We managed to find no similar dynastic currents in any other country or epoch.

In fig. 16.3 the same data are represented more roughly. We have highlighted the two zones of high dynastic frequency, corresponding to the number of rulers, on the time axis. We can see the chronological shift that combines the two zones roughly equals 275 years. This fact leads one to the following considerations.

Fig. 16.3. A rough comparison of density graphs drawn for the dynastic currents of England and Rome (Byzantium). In the previous illustration they are drawn in greater detail.
The quantitative comparison that we have just made is very rough, and allows no definite claims; however, the information that we already know leads us to a serious suspicion. Could this strange similarity be explained by the fact that one of these dynastic currents is a mere copy of the other? Alternatively, can both of them be copies of a single original? As soon as we formulate the “heretical” question, we start to discover the facts that make the situation look even stranger. For instance, we are told that the old name of the English is Angles ([1442], pages 12-13), whereas the country itself was known as Angel, Anglia or Angeln ([1442], page 189). “Angles” as the name of a nation is first encountered in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (section corresponding to the alleged year 443 A.D.). This term runs through the entire history of England. It is also presumed that the first ruler to call himself the king of England, or Anglia, was called Ethelstan (925-940) – see [64], page 340.

On the other hand, we know of the famous imperial dynasty of the Angeli in Byzantium – a distinguished feudal clan active in the alleged years 1185-1204 A.D. ([729], page 166). Is it really so strange? Could the dynasty of the Angles in the West of Europe and the dynasty of the Angeli in the East have emerged simultaneously in a random way?

This makes sense so far – after all, we have no data to arrive at any radical conclusions so far. However, let us see whether a more in-depth analysis should reveal new facts.

Let us make the following observation to evade confusion. When we refer to a dynasty of the English rulers, for instance, we merely mean the sequence of rulers arranged in succession along the time axis by the Scaligerian chronology. We are not interested in kinship, which is taken into account in studies of dynastic heritage.
4.
The dynastic parallelism between the history of England and Byzantium. A general superimposition scheme of the two

We claim that there is a distinct parallelism between the reign durations of the English kings regnant between the alleged years of 640 and 1327 A.D. and those of the Byzantine emperors between the alleged years of 378 and 830 A.D., and then 1143-1453 A.D. The parallelism is represented schematically in fig. 15.3. In particular, we claim the following to be true.

1) The dynastic history of England between the alleged years of 640 and 1040 A.D. (400 years altogether) duplicates the dynastic history of Byzantium between the alleged years 378 and 830 A.D. (452 years all in all). The two dynastic currents superimpose over each other after a shift of 210 years.

More specifically, we have discovered a separate dynastic current within the saturated dynastic current of England that duplicates the Byzantine in the specified epoch. This “Byzantine current”, duplicated in the English history, is part of the dynastic current of Rome and Byzantium saturated with jointly ruling emperors.

2) The next period in the dynastic history of England (the alleged years 1040-1327), whose duration equals 287 years, duplicates the dynastic history of Byzantium of the alleged years 1143-1453 (a sequence of 310 years). These two dynastic currents superimpose after a shift of 120 years.

3) The period of the Byzantine dynastic history between the alleged years of 830 and 1143 also identifies as the same English dynasty of the alleged years 1040-1327. There is nothing surprising about this fact, since the history of Byzantium contains duplicates of its own. In particular, Byzantine history of the alleged years 830-1143 is a phantom reflection of
the subsequent period in Byzantine history, namely, the alleged years 1143-1453. See more on this topic in Chron1 and Chron2.

4) The boundaries of the English historical periods that duplicate Byzantine history correspond to the periods of English history discovered above.

5) The boundaries of the Byzantine historical periods that duplicate the respective periods in the history of England are also of a natural character, and divide the Byzantine history into four segments, which we shall name Byzantium 0, Byzantium 1, Byzantium 2 and Byzantium 3.
5. The dynastic parallelism table

5.1. The English history of the alleged years 640-830 A.D. and the Byzantine history of the alleged years 378-553 A.D. as reflections of the same late mediaeval original. A shift of 275 years

---

*a. English epoch* of the alleged years 640-830 A.D. The royal dynasty of Wessex. This is one of the six dynastic current of the early English history (the alleged years 400-830). This dynastic current moves within the period of the “early” English history saturated with rulers, q.v. in figs. 16.1, 16.2 and 16.3. The names and the reign durations are taken from [1442] and [76].

*b. Byzantine epoch* of the alleged years 378-553 A.D. The dynasty of Byzantine emperors that actually begins with the foundation of the New Rome, or Constantinople, around the alleged year 330 A.D. This dynastic current moves within the period that is saturated with other Roman emperors. Depicted as Byzantium 0 in fig. 15.3. The reign durations are taken from [76].

---

**Commentary.** The chronological data were taken from Blair’s tables [76] and complemented by the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle ([1442]). We must point out that there are certain discrepancies between the reign durations indicated in different chronological tables; however, these fluctuations do not affect the general picture of the parallelism. Sections marked “a” contain the full sequence of the English kings, whereas the “b” sections list the Byzantine emperors identified as their doubles, or prototypes. This list
appears to contain nearly every emperor of Byzantium. It is very significant that only a very small number of short-term rulers and co-rulers of England and Byzantium were left outside the discovered parallel.

1a. England. Cenwalh, reigned in 643-673 as King of Wessex, and in 643-647 as King of Sussex. The summary reign duration equals 29 years, or 25 years if we are to consider his Wessex reign after 647 exclusively.

   1b. Byzantium. Theodosius I, reigned since 378 or 379 and until 395 (16 years).


   2b. Byzantium. No corresponding duplicate here.

3a. England. Cens, reigned for 12 years between 674 and 686 according to Blair ([76]). The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle ([1442]) names two kings, Escwine and Centwine, whose summary reign duration equals 9 years.

   3b. Byzantium. Arcadius, reigned for 13 years between 395 and 408.


   4b. Byzantium. No corresponding duplicate.

5a. England. Ine, reigned for 39 years between 686 and 727 according to Blair, and 37 years according to [1442].

   5b. Byzantium. Theodosius II, reigned for 42 years between 408 and 450.

indicates the duration of his reign as 14 years.

■ 6b. Byzantium. Leo I, reigned for 17 years between 457 and 474.

7a. England. Cuthred, reigned for 14 years between 740 and 754 according to Blair ([76]), and for 17 years according to [1442].

■ 7b. Byzantium. Zeno, 474-491, reigned for 17 years. This monarch was regnant twice.


■ 8b. Byzantium. No corresponding duplicate.

9a. England. Cynewulf, 754-784. Reigned for 30 years according to Blair, and for 31 years according to [1442].


11a. England. Egbert, reigned for 38 years between 800 and 838. In 828, the 28th year of his reign, he united six kingdoms into one. This is how England is supposed to have come to existence. He ruled as the king of England for the last ten years of his reign. Egbert is considered to be a prominent ruler in English history.

■ 11b. Byzantium. Justinian I the Great, reigned for 38 years between 527 and 565. In 553, the 26th year of his reign, he defeats the Goths in the course of the famous Gothic War of the alleged VI century. After that, Justinian becomes the sole ruler of Rome and Byzantium. The last 12 years of his reign are marked by the absence of co-rulers in the West of the empire. He is one of the most famous Byzantine emperors. We see a good concurrence of dates: fundamental events taking place in the 28th and the 26th year of reign, and equal durations of total rule (38
5.2. English history of the alleged years 830-1040 A.D. and the Byzantine history of the alleged years 553-830 A.D. as two reflections of the same late mediaeval original. A shift of 275 years

\[ a. \textit{England} \text{ of the alleged years 830-1040. England is already a united kingdom in this period ([76]). } \\
\text{b. } \textit{Byzantium} \text{ of the alleged years 553-830 A.D. Marked as Byzantium 1 in fig. 15.3.} \]

\[ 12a. \textit{England}. \text{ Aethelberth, 860-866. Reigned for 6 years.} \\
\text{12b. } \textit{Byzantium}. \text{ Justin II, 565-578. Reigned for 13 years.} \]

\[ 13a. \textit{England}. \text{ Aethelbald, 857-860. Reigned for 3 years.} \\
\text{13b. } \textit{Byzantium}. \text{ Tiberius Constantine, 578-582. Reigned for 4 years.} \]

\[ 14a. \textit{England}. \text{ Aethelwulf, 838-857. Reigned for 19 years.} \\
\text{14b. } \textit{Byzantium}. \text{ Mauritius, 582-602. Reigned for 20 years.} \]

\[ 15a. \textit{England}. \text{ Aethelred, 866-872. Reigned for 6 years.} \\
\text{15b. } \textit{Byzantium}. \text{ Phocas, 602-610. Reigned for 8 years.} \]

\textbf{Commentary.} Let us point out that the English chroniclers swapped the respective places of Aethelwulf and Aethelbert ([334]). Their Byzantine doubles, Justin II and Mauritius, are arranged in the opposite order. This confusion is easy to explain – all four English kings of this periods have similar names beginning with “Aethel”.

16a. England. Alfred I the Great, Singer of Psalms. Reigned for 28 years between 871 and 901 according to [76], or for 30 years between 871 and 901 according to [64], page 340.


18a. England. Athelstan, 925-941. Reigned for 16 years. Presumably, the first monarch to have titled himself King of England ([64], page 340).


19a. England. Period of strife; a war with Northumbria. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle mentions three kings of this period – Edmund I, regnant for 7 years between 941 and 948, Eadred, regnant for 7 years between 948 and 955, and Eadwig, regnant for 4 years between 955 and 959. All of their reigns were short.


Thus, the two periods of turmoil in English and Byzantine history, superimpose well over each other, which makes them simultaneous after the superimposition of the English and the Byzantine history. We have refrained from delving deeper into this period, due to the fact that the respective chronicles are extremely confused.
20a. England. Edgar, 959-975, reigned for 16 years, and Edward the Martyr, 975-978, reigned for 3 years. The sum of their reigns equals 19 years. Their names are similar, and the chroniclers may have collated them into a single monarch.

20b. Byzantium. Leo III the Isaurian (or Syrian), reigned for 24 years.

21a. England. Aethelred II the Unready, 978-1013, reigned for 35 years. An ancient coin depicting this monarch can be seen in fig. 16.4.

![Fig. 16.4. An old coin portraying Ethelred II, King of England (the alleged years 978-1016). Kept in the Hermitage. Taken from [990], table 42.](image)

21b. Byzantium. Constantine V the Copronymus, 741-775, reigned for 34 years.

22a. England. Canute the Great (the Dane), 1017-1036, reigned for 19 years. His death brings forth the dissolution of the Danish Empire. Thus, the epoch in question ends with another breakpoint in the history of England. Let us note that the fragment of the English history that we have under consideration can be identified as the respective period in Byzantine history after a shift of circa 210-275 years.

22b. Byzantium. Constantine VI Porphyrogenetus, 780-797, reigned for 17 years. We have come to the end of the period marked in Chron1 as the First Byzantine Empire of the alleged years 527-840. We have also
approached a natural breakpoint in Byzantine history.

English chronicles conclude this epoch with two short-term rulers: Harold I the Dane, regnant for 3 years between 1036 and 1039, and Harthacnut, regnant for 2 years between 1039 and 1041. We have found no Byzantine duplicate for Harthacnut, but there is one for Harold I, which shall be discussed below. One must also note that the name Hartha is very similar to the word “Horde”. It is possible that Harthacnut isn’t a name in the modern sense of the word, but rather an alias – Horde-Khan, Khan of the Horde, or something along those lines. Since the name Cnut resembles Can-T, or Khan-T, it is possible that the last letter was added later as a suffix. Alternatively, the name may translate as “The Horde’s Whip”, or “The Scourge from the Horde”, “knot” being the Russian word for “whip”. There were many similar aliases in the middle ages – for instance, Attila was known as “the Lord’s Scourge”. In fig. 16.5 one sees an ancient coin portraying Harthacnut ([990], table 42).

Fig. 16.5. An old coin portraying King Harthacnute (the alleged years 1035-1042). Kept in the Hermitage. Taken from [990], table 42.

We continue our uninterrupted motion forward along the timeline of the English history. The discovered parallelism with Byzantium continues; however, it becomes all the more vivid if we are to skip the following epoch of Byzantium 2 (see fig. 15.3) and proceed directly with Byzantium 3 (1143-1452). As we have already explained, the two epochs duplicate each other in Scaligerian history. The duplication isn’t exact; therefore, the sections marked as “b”, which contain the emperors of the Third Byzantine
Empire, shall also be complemented by their duplicates from the Second Byzantine Empire. We shall thus consider our motion forward along the respective timelines of England and Byzantium. It turns out that the parallelism that we have discovered continues, up until the fall of Constantinople in 1453.

5.3. English history of 1040-1327 A.D. and Byzantine history of 1143-1453 A.D. A shift of 120 years

a. England of the alleged years 1040-1327.

b. Byzantium of the alleged years 1143-1453 A.D. Marked in fig. 15.3 and Byzantium 3. The epoch of Byzantium 2 is its phantom reflection.

23a. England. Edward the “Confessor”, 1041-1066, reigned for 25 years. The death of Edward signifies the beginning of the so-called Norman invasion, which must be the reflection of the Great = “Mongolian” conquest of the XIV century as reflected in the English chronicles. Some of the old chronicles used the term “Normans” for referring to the Slavs; the Slavic origins of the Normans were also pointed out by the XVI century historian Mauro Orbini ([617], page 111). Normans were called Russes in the old Arabic and Greek texts ([866], Volume 3, page 522).

Commentary. It is presumed that after the death of Edward (of the Horde?) the Confessor, the throne went to Harold II Godwinson. He only reigned for one year, and got killed in the Battle of Hastings in the alleged year 1066. However, it is known that he had de facto acquired great power as early as in 1054, when Edward was still alive ([64], page 343). At the same time, the English chronicles place another “short-term” Harold before the reign of Edward the Confessor, namely, Harold I the Dane (“Harefoot”), who had reigned for three years between 1036 and 1039. It is possible that this Harold I is merely a reflection of Harold II.
23b. Byzantium. Manuel I Comnenus, 1143-1180, reigned for 37 years. A period of turmoil begins in Byzantium after his death. The famous crusade and the conquest of Constantinople in 1204 is considered to be its culmination.

24a. England. The “double Harold”, or Harold I the Dane, 1036-1039, followed by Harold II, 1066. Harold II reigned for a mere 9 months. Apparently, this “double Harold” is a reflection of the “double Isaac Angelus” of Byzantium, who had reign twice – his second reign lasted less than a year.

24b. Byzantium. Isaac II Angelus, 1185-1195. He lost the throne in 1195, and ascended to the Byzantine throne for the second time in 1203. His reign lasts for less than a year; his final dethronement results from the conquest of Constantinople by the crusaders in 1204.


25b. Byzantium. The conquest of Byzantium by the crusaders. The famous Fourth Crusade of the alleged years 1199-1204. We shall consider the parallelism between these events in more detail below.

26a. England. William I the Conqueror (“the Bastard”), also known as William I of Normandy, 1066-1087, reigned for 21 years. He founded the new Norman dynasty in England (see fig. 16.6).

27a. England. William II Rufus, or “the Red”, 1087-1101. Reigned for 14 years (see fig. 16.7). We have a 14-year reign here; his Byzantine duplicate reigned for 11 or 12 years, q.v. below.
Fig. 16.7. A sculpture that is presumed to represent William II The Red nowadays (the alleged years 1087-1100). However, there appears to be no old lettering anywhere on the statue. Taken from [1221].

27b. Byzantium. Apparently, there is another confusion in the chronicles that describe the early days of the Norman dynasty in England and the Nicaean Empire in Byzantium. The duplicate of William II is either omitted, or identifies as the same Isaac II Angelus, with his full reign counted this time – 1185-1195 and then 1203-1204, or 11-12 years in total. The chroniclers may have been confused by the double reign of Isaac II.

28a. England. Henry I Boclerc, 1101-1135, reigned for 34 or 35 years (see fig. 16.8). We reproduce a photograph of an old coin minted under Henry I. The inscription on the coin instantly draws our attention – it is set in some unusual script, which has got nothing in common with the Romanic characters. It would be interesting to decipher the writing on the coin. However, the commentary given in the modern publication ([1221]) doesn’t utter a word about the lettering, which can nevertheless be read and translated. The inscription begins to make sense if we are to read it using the Old Russian alphabet, which is forgotten today.
Nevertheless, several specimens of this alphabet have survived (see fig. 3.23 in Chapter 3 of *Chron4*), and it was deciphered by N. Konstantinov ([425]). Let us reproduce this table once again (see fig. 16.9). If we are to use this alphabet, we shall come up with a coherent Russian text: “Avva + Or Ianoviche (or Iakoviche)” – Avva Uar Ivanocich (or Yakovich). The first word was commonly used for addressing the nobility in the Middle Ages, and Uar is either a Christian name or the word “Czar”. The last word is a patronymic. The letter for N or K is the only one that wasn’t included in N. Konstantinov’s table; we reconstructed it contextually.

![Figure 16.8](image)

Fig. 16.8. A mediaeval English coin with “illegible” lettering. Presumably minted by Henry I, King of England (the alleged years 1100-1135). It is most noteworthy that the application of N. Konstantinov’s table ([425]) to the decipherment of the lettering upon the coin leaves one with a coherent Slavic (Russian) text: “Avva Or Ianoviche (or Iakoviche)”. Taken from [1221].
Fig. 16.9. Table for converting the Russian letters that strike us as uncanny nowadays as found in a number of Russian texts dating from the XVII century into modern Cyrillic characters. Compiled by N. Konstantinov. See fig. 3.23 in Chapter 3 of Chron4 for an example of such a text. Taken from [425].

One must also mention the name Henry (or Heinrich) in this respect. There are many kings bearing that name in the mediaeval history of the Western Europe. It is possible that the name had once stood for Khan-Rex, or Khan and Czar. This may be the manner in which the chroniclers of the Western Europe used to address their faraway and powerful rulers – the Czars, or Khans, of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire, who had controlled nearly all of the Eurasian continent in the XIV-XVI century, according to our reconstruction. After the fragmentation of the Empire, the initial meaning of the title Khan-Rex was forgotten in Europe, and the former title transformed into the name Henry (Henri, or Heinrich).

28b. Byzantium. John III Duca Vatas, reigned for 32 years between 1222 and 1254 or 1256. His reflection in the phantom duplicate of Byzantium 2 is Leo VI the Philosopher, regnant for 26 years between 886 and 912.
**Commentary.** We must make the following observation that concerns the graphical representations of the mediaeval English kings. As we shall see below, many of the “royal portraits” shown to us today are of a very late origin. This is clearly visible from a perusal of [1221]. Authentic old portraits, such as the coarse “portrait” of Henry I as seen on one of his coins, are extremely scarce. There is also this tendency that whenever we are confronted with an authentic old inscription that accompanies such a portrait, it usually says something that radically differs from whatever modern historians suggest. It is little wonder that the representatives of the so-called historical science prefer to remain reticent about such inscriptions (declaring them “illegible”, for instance).

Thus, authentic old portraits of the English kings that predate the XV century are either altogether nonexistent, or of dubious origins.

---

29a. *England*. Stephen of Blois, 1135-1154, reigned for 19 years (see fig. 16.10). Stephen is the last representative of the Norman dynasty in England ([64], page 357). The next king, Henry II, is the founder of the new Anjou dynasty.
Fig. 16.10. Stained glass window with the alleged portrait of Stefan, King of England (the alleged years 1135-1154). Taken from [1221].

29b. Byzantium. Michael VIII, reigned for 23 years (from 1259 or 1260 until 1282 or 1283). His reflection in the phantom duplicate of Byzantium 2 is Roman I, regnant for 26 years between 919 and 945. Michael VIII is the founder of the new Byzantine dynasty – the Palaiologi (regnant in 1261-1453).

Thus, a rigid chronological shift that superimposes the respective historical periods in England and Byzantine history, the English dynasty of the Normans identifies as the Byzantine dynasty of Angeli. The Anjou dynasty that came in its wake can be identified as the Byzantine dynasty of Palaiologi.

30a. England. Henry II Plantagenet, reigned for 35 years between 1154 and 1189 (see fig. 16.11). One must point out the semantic identity
of the names Plantagenet and Porphyrogenetus – they both mean “born in a shirt,” which is a common medical term (see below).

Fig. 16.11. The sculpture that is presumed to represent Henry II, King of England (the alleged years 1154-1189). However, there is no old lettering to be seen anywhere. Taken from [1221].

■ 30b. Byzantium. Andronicus II Palaiologos, regnant for 46 years between 1282 or 1283. If we are to count the period between 1283 and 1320, when his co-ruler Andronicus III began his reign, we shall come up with a figure of 37 years. His duplicate in Byzantium 2 is Constantine VII Porphyrogenetus (910-959 or 912-959, regnant for 47 or 49 years).

Commentary. The name Porphyrogenetus translates as “porphyry-born” – “born in a royal attire”, in other words. This is apparently a reference to one of the rare cases when a child is born in a “shirt”, or wrapped up in the placental remains. “Planta” sounds similar to “placenta”. Such births were considered omens – good or bad, but at any rate a mark of a special destiny. The name we see in the English version is “Plantagenet”, which translates as “wrapped in a sheet at birth” ([237]) – obviously the same thing.
31a. England. Henry II is the founder of the famous House of Plantagenet, which ends in 1399 with Richard II (see fig. 16.12). This dynasty spans the period of 1154-1399 ([1447], page 346).

![Richard II](image)

Fig. 16.12. The Scaligerian history of England. This portrait is presumed to represent Richard II, King of England (the alleged years 1377-1399). The English king looks just like a Byzantine emperor, with an orb and a sceptre in his hands. From [1221].

31b. Byzantium. Michael VIII, the immediate predecessor of Andronicus II, is the founder of the famous Palaiologi dynasty, which spans the period between 1261 and 1453 and ends with the fall of Constantinople in 1453 ([1447], page 636).

Thus, the rigid chronological shift that we have discovered superimposes the two famous dynasties over one another – the Palaiologi and the House of Plantagenet. The reign of the Byzantine Palaiologi ends in 1453, and the English Plantagenet dynasty ends in 1399.

32a. England. Richard I Coeur de Lion, 1189-1199, reigned for 10 years (see fig. 16.13). The duration of his reign is close to 13 years, or
the duration of the individual reign of his Byzantine duplicate, q.v. above.

Fig. 16.13. The statue that is presumed to represent the English king Richard I Coeur de Lion (the alleged years 1189-1199). It is likely to be of a very recent origin. Taken from [1221].

32b. Byzantium. Andronicus III Palaiologos, 1320-1328-1341. Formally, his reign duration equals 21 years (1320-1341); however, his individual reign only lasted for 13 years (1328-1341). His co-ruler Andronicus II ceased to reign in 1328.

33a. England. John Sunter the Landless, 1199-1216, reigned for 17 years (see fig. 16.14).
Fig. 16.14. Painted sculpture presumed to represent King John (the alleged years 1199-1216). No old lettering anywhere. Taken from [1221].

33b. Byzantium. John VI Cantacusen, 1341-1355, reigned for 15 years.

34a. England. Henry III, 1216-1272, regnant for 56 years, q.v. in fig. 16.15. Henry III is the last representative of the Anjou dynasty in England. The Byzantine dynasty of Palaiologi remained regnant only marginally longer.
It would make sense to revert to the initial meaning of the name Henry. Above we have voiced the hypothesis that it had once stood for “Khan-Rex” (Khan-Czar). In fig. 16.16 we reproduce an ancient miniature from the manuscript of Matthew the Parisian ([1268], page 131). We see the Archbishop of Canterbury bless Henry III, King of England. The name Henry is transcribed without vocalisations, with nothing but three consonant Latin letters HNR (fig. 16.17). This transcription makes it even more obvious that the name Henry is a derivative of the title Khan-Rex.

Fig. 16.16. Old drawing from the manuscript of Matthew of Paris, allegedly dating from the XIII century. We see the Archbishop of Canterbury blessing the English King Henry III. The name Henry is transcribed as three consonants – HNR. Taken from [1268], page 131.

Fig. 16.17. Close-in of a fragment of the previous illustration with the name HNR. Taken from [1268], page 131.

34b. Byzantium. John V Palaiologos, 1341-1391, reigned for 50 years. His reflection in Byzantium 2 is Basil II, Scourge of the Bulgars, regnant for 49 or 50 years (975-1025 or 976-1025).

Fig. 16.18. Scaligerian history of England. Presumably, a portrait of Edward I (the alleged years of 1271-1307). Taken from [1221].

■ 35b. Byzantium. Manuel II Palaiologos, 1391-1425, reigned for 33 or 34 years.

36a. England. Edward II Caerwarven, 1307-1327, reigned for 20 years (see fig. 16.19).
Fig. 16.19. Painted sculpture presumed to represent Edward II (the alleged years 1307-1327). There is no old lettering to be seen anywhere. Taken from [1221].

36b. Byzantium. John VIII Palaiologos, 1424-1448, reigned for 23 or 24 years.

5.4. The end of the parallelism. The conquest of Constantinople by the Ottomans in 1453. The fall of Byzantium

In figs. 16.20-16.24 one sees the scheme of the parallelism that we discovered. Let us reiterate that such excellent concurrence is only possible after a rigid chronological shift. In other words, we shift the entire dynasty, without making any relative changes inside it. In fig. 16.25 the scheme of the parallelism is drawn differently, so as to allow for a visual estimate of the reign duration correlation. It turns out that the numeric value of this “distance” between the English and the Byzantine dynasties is very small, and falls into the range of values characteristic for the a priori dependent dynasties (see Chron1 and Chron2 for more detail). Let us remind the reader that under “dependent dynasties” we understand
different reflections of the same original.

Fig. 16.20. The dynastic parallelism between the English kings and the Byzantine emperors with a rigid chronological shift of 275 years. Beginning of the parallelism.
Fig. 16.21. The dynastic parallelism between the English kings and the Byzantine emperors with a rigid chronological shift of 275 years. Continued.
Fig. 16.22. The dynastic parallelism between the English kings and the Byzantine emperors with a rigid chronological shift of 275 years. The end of the parallelism.
Fig. 16.23. The Anglo-Byzantine dynastic parallelism. A general view. The initial phase.
Fig. 16.24. The Anglo-Byzantine dynastic parallelism. A general view. The final phase.
Fig. 16.25. A comparative reign duration graph for the mediaeval English kings and the mediaeval Byzantine emperors. These two dynastic currents prove mutually dependent. They are most likely to be duplicates of a single real dynasty dating from the epoch of the XIV-XVI century.
Thus, the English and Byzantine dynasties of the Middle Ages are dependent statistically. This brings us to the question about their original. What did mediaeval history look like in reality?
PART THREE

The abbreviation and saturation of English history
A preliminary answer is directly implied by the parallelism that we have discovered, as represented in figs. 15.2 and 15.3, as well as figs. 16.20-16.25.

It would be natural to assume a later epoch to be the original – one that is closer to us chronologically. This is obviously the Byzantine epoch of 1143-1453, or the epoch that we have called Byzantium 3. As it was discovered in Chron1, it is the original of every other phantom reflection – the ones indicated as Byzantium 0, Byzantium 1 and Byzantium 2 in fig. 15.3. To put it more generally, the entire Byzantine history known to us today is a collation of several duplicates of the same epoch – 1143-1453 A.D.

As we have discovered above, the entire English history as constructed around the skeleton of the dynastic current of its rulers duplicates the history of Byzantium and the Horde as a phantom reflection. The parallelism ends in 1327 – some 100 years before the end of the Byzantine epoch (1453). Therefore, the history of England duplicates that of Byzantium or the Great = “Mongolian” Empire of the XIV-XVI century.

Mediaeval English history up to 1327 comprises several duplicates of the Byzantine epoch of 1142-1453, or the “Mongolian” epoch of the XIV-XVI century. Let us formulate the following hypothesis to serve as the summary of our observations.

1) English history of the alleged years 1-400 in its Scaligerian version describes England as a Roman colony, and relates Roman events for the most part. As we demonstrated in Chron1, Roman history of this period reflects the real events that took place in the “Mongolian” Empire around the XIII-XVI century A.D.

2) Chronicles ascribed to the English history of the alleged years 400-
830 describe the phantom Rome and Byzantium 0, therefore reflecting the real Byzantine events of the XIII-XV century A.D., or the history of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire of the XIV-XVI century.

3) Chronicles ascribed to the English history of the alleged years 830-1040 describe the phantom Byzantium 1, acting as the reflection of real events that took place in Byzantium of the XIII-XV century, or the Great = “Mongolian” Empire of the XIV-XVI century.

4) Chronicles ascribed to the English history of the alleged years 1040-1327 A.D. describe Byzantium 3, which is also the phantom Byzantium 2. These chronicles reflect real Byzantine events of the XIII-XV century, or the history of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire of the XIV-XVI century. The name England (Anglia) is apparently derived from the name Angeli as borne by the representatives of the regnant Byzantine dynasty in 1185-1204 A.D.

5) Our hypothesis claims that the “ancient” and mediaeval English chronicles that we have at our disposal today describe real events that took place in Byzantium around the XII-XV century, as well as the Great = “Mongolian” Empire in the XIV-XVI century. Historians erroneously date these events to deep “antiquity”, or the epochs that predate the XII century A.D. Generally speaking, the “ancient” English chronicles are of Byzantine and “Mongolian” origin; they were transferred to the modern England in the epoch of its conquest by the Horde and then integrated into the actual history of the British Isles.

6) Real documented history of England, which refers to actual British events, is most likely to begin around the XI-XII century A.D. Whatever stray fragments of information we have at our disposal cover the interval between the XI and the XIII century very sparsely. This layer was then overdubbed by a second layer of chronicles relating the history of Byzantium and the Great = “Mongolian” Empire. Modern textbook history of Britain in the XI-XVI century is thus a collation of the actual British history and the Mongolian/Byzantine layer.

7) English history as we know it today only begins to reflect the actual
events that took place in Great Britain starting with the XVI-XVII century, without any Byzantine or “Mongolian” elements. That is to say, the Scaligerian history of England is more or less correct starting with the XVI-XVII century. A schematic representation of our hypothesis can be seen in fig. 17.1.

Fig. 17.1. A general scheme of English history in our reconstruction. History of England begins with several duplicates of Byzantine history. The events that took place on the British Isles are only known to us starting with the XIV century and on. It is possible that some records have survived from the epoch of the XI-XIII century, but there are very few of those.
If we are to disregard the picture painted by the Scaligerian chronology, the answer will be simple enough.

Starting with the XIII century, waves of crusades sweep over Byzantium. The crusaders were avenging the crucifixion of Andronicus, or Christ, in Czar-Grad in 1185. Feudal crusader states of the XIII-XIV century are founded all across the territory of Byzantium and neighbouring regions. Their inhabitants are a mixture of the local populace and the crusaders from the Western Europe, Russia and Asia. Said regions develop a cultural life of their very own, likewise Byzantium – in particular, this manifests as the compilation of historical chronicles.

The early XIV century is the epoch of the Great = “Mongolian” conquest. In 1453, Constantinople falls under the onslaught of the Ottomans = Atamans, originally hailing from Russia, or the Horde. Byzantium is laid waste, and a large part of its population decides to emigrate. Many intellectuals and aristocrats flee to Europe and to lands more distant, including the British Isles. These refugees take the Byzantine historical chronicles with them as priceless mementoes of their past.

According to our reconstruction, the same epoch of the XIV century marks the conquest of many lands, including the Western Europe, by the Ottomans and the Horde. Britain appears to have been conquered around the same time (see Chron5). We see the foundation of the enormous Great = “Mongolian” Empire. The island of Great Britain becomes an imperial province of the Horde, whose local governors are subordinate to Russia, or the Horde, and the Ottomans. Chronicles written in Britain around this time reflect the life of the entire Empire and its faraway capital apart from
the local events, which were possibly de-emphasised.

After the passage of some time, the inhabitants of the insular Britain begin to write their own history. The “new” history of the “ancient” England gets written in the XVI-XVII century; this takes place in the course of the Reformation. After the fragmentation of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire in the XVI-XVII century, historians of the provinces that attain independence begin to write the “new ancient history” of their countries with great haste. In particular, they try to erase the very existence of the Great Empire from the annals of world history. According to the ploy of the rebellious rulers and their court historians, the Empire must be forgotten forever. See Chron6 for more on this “progressive Reformist programme”.

A campaign of re-writing and tendentious editing of the old chronicles is launched in England, as well as the Western Europe and the Romanovian Russia. Moreover, after the violent mutiny of the Reformation, many real events of the XIV-XVI were erased from historical memory forever, over the course of several generations. The English Scaligerites of the XVI-XVII century declare the old chronicles of Byzantium, the Horde and the Ottoman Empire, which they edited in accordance with their own agenda. These chronicles serve as basis for the “ancient” history of the actual British Isles.

Large parts of Byzantine and “Mongolian” history that had originally pertained to the vast territories of Europe and Asia become transferred (albeit on paper only, obviously enough) to the relatively small territory of the British Isles and their environs. This leads to the inevitable “shrinkage” of many major events. The great and powerful Czars, or Khans, of the Empire, transform into local rulers under the quill of the Scaligerite editors. This leads to a great distortion of historical proportions. The Great = “Mongolian” Empire vanishes from the pages of the “carefully edited” chronicles for centuries to come. Whatever information defies oblivion despite these efforts gets arbitrarily moved backwards in time with the aid of the erroneous chronology, transforming into “ancient myths”.

This results in the creation of such English chronicles as the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, *Historia Brittonum* by Nennius, and so on. A while later this recent version of the “ancient” British history rigidifies. Historical research of the XIX and XX century brings nothing but minor amendments, the addition of new data and new layers of varnish. Nowadays, having discovered strange and amazing duplicates inside the “English history textbook” with the aid of statistical methods, we are beginning to realise that the real English history had been a great deal shorter. Our objective can therefore be formulated as the location of Byzantine and “Mongolian” originals inside the Scaligerian version, and the restoration of their true chronological and geographical identity.
Despite the attempts of the XVII-XVIII century hoaxers, English chronicles retain a great deal of information concerning the real events of the XI-XVI century. England and Russia, or the Horde
8.
The “ancient” Roman consul Brutus as the first Roman conqueror of Britain and simultaneously the first “ancient” Trojan king of the Brits

Above we have given our analysis of the reign durations and periods, discovering the mutual superimposition of the English and Byzantine history. We are instantly confronted with the question of whether or not this corollary of ours receives any validation from the part of the “ancient” English chronicles. Let us attempt to read them from a new and unprejudiced viewpoint, casting away the false conception of their “great antiquity” that the modern textbooks insist upon.

We shall proceed to relate a number of well-known facts from the Scaligerian version of British history. Let us turn to the two works entitled Historia Brittonum written by Nennius and Galfridus Monemutensis, as well as the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

Galfridus claims the “ancient” Brutus to be the first king of the Brits ([155], page 5). The conquest of Britain is described as follows. After the end of the Trojan War and the fall of Troy, the ship of Aeneas arrives to the shores of Italy. Two or three generations later, his descendant Brutus is born ([155], pages 6-7). However, Nennius is of the opinion that the time interval between Aeneas and the “ancient” Brutus is substantially greater ([577], page 173). He claims the Trojan War to predate the birth of the “ancient” Brutus by several hundred years. However, these discrepancies are of no importance to us, since we already realise all these “ancient” dates to be the creation of the Scaligerian historians dating from the XVII-XVIII century. They have nothing in common with reality.

The “ancient” Trojan Brutus leaves Italy shortly afterwards and arrives in Greece, becoming the leader of the Trojan survivors. He gathers a large
fleet and departs from Greece, accompanied by a large army. A while later the Trojans disembark on an island, engage the locals in combat, defeat them and found the new kingdom – Britain.

According to Galfridus Monemutensis, the “ancient” Trojan Brutus is the first in the sequence of British rulers considered legendary today, since the Scaligerian chronology dated the events in question to a phantom antediluvian epoch.

Nennius tells a similar story of the “ancient” Brutus the Trojan, albeit more concisely. Nennius claims very explicitly that Brutus the Trojan “came to this island, which was named after him – Britain. He had sown his seed there, and made it his dwelling. Britain has been an inhabited land ever since” ([577], page 173). Thus, mediaeval authors had been convinced that the name Britain derives from that of the “ancient” Trojan Brutus.

Further on, Nennius tells us of the opinion shared by several chroniclers about the fact that “the Isle of Britain was named after Brittas, son of Isicion and grandson of Alan” ([577], page 172). However, the most popular and credible version, which Nennius proceeds to cite right away, insists that Britain was named after “Brutus, the Roman consul” (ibid.). We also find out that Brutus was of Alanian origin. We have already identified the Alanians as one of the Slavo-Scythian nations (see the table of mediaeval names above, for instance). In particular, “Alanians” happens to be an old name of the Polovtsy; the latter term stands for “Russian warriors fighting in the fields” (cf. “pole,” the Russian word for “field”). The very same nation was also described in a number of chronicles as the Polyane; the name “Poland” is another derivative (see Chron5 for more details). Isicion, the father of Brittas, or Brutus, is most likely to be IS-Khan – a distorted version of the name Jesus-Khan (the Christian Khan). Bear in mind that Genghis-Khan, also known as the Conqueror of the World, had founded the Great = “Mongolian” Empire in the XIV century.

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle reports the “first inhabitants of this land to have been Britons, who had come from Armenia [sic! – Auth]” ([1442],
The term Armenia is used for referring to Romania, or the Roman and Byzantine Empire, which was also known as Romea and Romania. We see this country associated with Britain once again.

This chronicle evidence is naturally declared erroneous today. The commentary of a modern historian is as follows: the incorrect name Armenia should be read as Armorica, or Brittany (ibid.). However, replacing Armenia by Armorica doesn’t alter anything substantially. Old English chronicles are therefore of the opinion that Britain had first been conquered by the “ancient” Trojan Brutus, and simultaneously name its conqueror a Roman, or Romean, character known as Consul Brutus, who is believed to have come here with his fleet, founding the British Kingdom and becoming the first king of the island.
9.

The “ancient” Brutus the Trojan from the English chronicles, the patriarch of the Brits, turns out to be a contemporary of Julius Caesar and Genghis-Khan, Conqueror of the World

Everything appears to be clear so far. The only thing that remains is the estimation of the epoch when this famous Roman Brutus had lived. The answer can be found in any Scaligerian textbook on world history – there was the famous Roman consul named Brutus, a friend and brother-in-arms of Julius Caesar, who had taken part in many of his expeditions; he is believed to have lived in the alleged I century B.C. Brutus eventually betrayed his protector; Caesar’s bitter words “And thou, Brutus!” are known to us from childhood – they were uttered when Brutus had perfidiously struck Caesar with his sword. 

A propos, the words of Caesar sound as “Tu quoque, Brute!” in the dignified “ancient” Latin. Apparently, this simply means “Ty kak, brate!” – the Slavic for “How could you, brother?” The possibility that the “ancient” Roman Julius Caesar could have spoken Slavic looks perfectly absurd from the consensual Scaligerian point of view. However, there is nothing surprising about it insofar as our reconstruction is concerned. Moreover, Julius Caesar (or Youri the Czar, considering the frequent flexion of L and R), appears to have been the Czar, or the Khan, of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire. He naturally spoke Slavic, likewise his brother, who transformed into “Brutus” on the pages of Scaligerian history. The “sweet-sounding” ancient Latin can be identified as Church Slavonic, deliberately mutilated to the point of being unrecognizable (see Chron5 and Chron6 for more details).

Let us however return to the “ancient” English chronicles. It is common
knowledge that the treacherous murder of Caesar figures as one of the brightest episodes in the biography of the “ancient Roman” Brutus. However, Old English chronicles refer to virtually the same episode, claiming that the “ancient” Trojan Brutus, the first king of the Brits, also killed his father – presumably accidentally, with an arrow that hit the Trojan “father of Brutus” by mistake ([577], page 173). This must be a somewhat distorted rendition of the legend about Brutus the “Roman” slaying Julius Caesar, his former friend and protector. In both versions, the English and the Roman, the people of the country banish Brutus as a result of this murder (or manslaughter).

Our simple and natural hypothesis that the legendary conquest of Britain was carried out by this very “Roman” Brutus, a contemporary of Caesar, is confirmed by the chronicles, although they do not make any direct references to Brutus the “Trojan” being either an ally or a foe of Caesar’s. Indeed, every English chronicle without exception claims Britain to have been conquered by Julius Caesar for the first time. Caesar arrived to the island with the Roman military fleet of 80 vessels ([1442], page 5). The conquest of the island required some effort, and so Caesar returned to Britain with a fleet that already counted 600 ships, no less. The natives were defeated as a result, and the Romans founded a kingdom in Britain. Moreover, Nennius claims that “Julius Caesar was the first Roman to have sailed towards the Isle of Britain; he had conquered the kingdom of the Brits and crushed the opposition of the natives” ([577], page 176). Thus, if Brutus was the first Roman to have landed on the island, and the same is also said about Caesar, the two must have been contemporaries and allies, who had conquered the island together. Let us present the summary as a table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. The “ancient” Trojan Brutus is the first king of the Brits.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Julius Caesar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1a. *Brutus* is the first Roman (and also Trojan) to arrive to the island, conquer it and found a kingdom there.

■ 1b. *Julius Caesar* is the first Roman who came to the island, conquered it and founded a kingdom.

2a. *Brutus* arrives in Britain accompanied by a large military fleet.

■ 2b. *Julius Caesar* invaded Britain as the leader of a large naval force.

3a. The “ancient” Trojan *Brutus* “accidentally” kills his father with an arrow.

■ 3b. The Roman *Brutus*, a friend and contemporary of *Julius Caesar*, perfidiously kills Caesar, “his fatherly protector.”

4a. The murder of *Brutus* the father by his son, Brutus the Trojan, was foretold by a seer ([577], page 173).

■ 4b. The murder of *Julius Caesar* by his friend Brutus the Roman was also foretold by a diviner (see Plutarch’s report in [660], for instance).

5a. The “ancient” Trojan *Brutus* was exiled from his homeland as the perpetrator of a major crime.

■ 5b. The people of Rome banish Brutus the Roman to punish him for the murder of *Julius Caesar*.

6a. The Roman consul *Brutus* stands at the very source of British history.

■ 6b. *Julius Caesar*, who lived in the alleged I century B.C., is the conqueror of Britain. Scaligerian history considers the “real” history of Britain to begin with this very epoch.
Common sense dictates that the epoch of the first conquest of Britain by Brutus the Trojan, which is presumed to have preceded the new era by many centuries, and the epoch when Britain was conquered by Julius Caesar (the alleged I century B.C.), need to be superimposed over each other. The chronological shift that separates these two renditions of the same events from each other in the Scaligerian textbooks equals some 700 or 800 years at least.

We therefore claim that the “ancient” Trojan and Roman consul Brutus, the forefather of the Brits and the key character to stand at the source of British history, to be the very same person as Brutus the Roman from the epoch of Julius Caesar (the alleged I century B.C.). The “duplication” only occurred in chronicles, brought to life by the quills of Scaligerite historians in the XVII-XVIII century.

Connoisseurs of the “ancient” history may recollect yet another Roman consul named Brutus – the third historical character to bear this name. His lifetime is dated to the alleged VI century B.C. He is believed to have banished the Roman kings from Rome and founded the Roman republic. According to our research, the epoch of Brutus the republican, or the alleged VI century B.C., is yet another phantom duplicate of Caesar’s epoch (see *Chron1* for more detail). We see “three Bruti” as a result, all of them phantom reflections of the same military leader, who must have lived in the XIV-XV century A.D. and conquered the British isles, founding a new province of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire here and naming it after himself alongside Czar Youri, who was transformed into Julius Caesar by the Scaligerite chroniclers. The island was named after the brother of Czar Youri. Bear in mind that, according to our reconstruction, the brother of Genghis-Khan identifies as Batu-Khan, aka Ivan Kalita, or Caliph.

The ideas that we voice and the facts listed above are completely at odds with the Scaligerian chronology, and not just the chronology of Britain. Modern historians try to work their way around the embarrassing evidence of Brutus the Trojan being a Roman consul as contained in the ancient
chronicles of Britain, likewise the fact that the “ancient” Brits had been the descendants of the “Roman” Brutus and the Romans. In particular, the modern commentators of Nennius and Galfridus (A. S. Bobovich and M. A. Bobovich) try to put the reader at ease in the following manner: “The idea to trace the lineage of the Brits to the Romans is hardly original: the Frankish rulers had already traced their genealogy to the Trojans in the VI century” ([155], page 270). We might add that they were perfectly justified in doing so, q.v. in Chron1. Further on, historians make the following cautious remark: “There are several Bruti known in Roman history” (ibid.). After placating us with this vague statement, they don’t ever return to the topic again. We are beginning to realise why – otherwise they would have to make the inevitable conclusion that the “ancient” Brutus the Trojan had been a contemporary of Julius Caesar, which contradicts the chronology of Scaliger and Petavius.

This instantly moves the so-called “ancient and legendary” history of Britain forward in time by more than two thousand years, which superimposes the epoch of the alleged XIII-I century B.C. over the epoch of the XIII-XVI century A.D. As we shall see below, none of these events could have predated the XIV century A.D.
10. Biblical events on the pages of the English chronicles

*Historia Brittonum* by Galfridus Monemutensis is based on the chronological foundation of Biblical history – Galfridus occasionally inserts phrases such as “Samuel the Prophet had ruled over Judea in that epoch” ([155], page 20). These occasional references are scattered all across the chronicle of Galfridus and form a rough skeleton of Biblical history, weaving the Biblical kings and prophets into the British historical fabric. However, Galfridus gives us no absolute datings; his entire chronology is of a relative character – all he tells us is the name of the Biblical king or prophet who had lived around the time when this or the other event took place in British history. Therefore, an unbiased analysis of the English chronology leads us to the necessity of delving into the Biblical chronology.

Our analysis of the Biblical chronology identifies the Biblical epoch as the XI-XVI century A.D., q.v. in *Chron1*, *Chron2* and *Chron6*. Therefore, the “ancient” history of Britain, which is linked to the events described in the Bible, is also moved forward in time – from the Scaligerian “chronological depths” to its proper place in the late Middle Ages.
11.
The location of the “ancient” Troy

The opinions of the modern historians and archaeologists on the real locations of certain famous “ancient” cities are often arbitrary and lack any kind of substantiation at all, q.v. in *Chron1*. For instance, the XIX century historians locate the famous Homer’s Troy at the southern end of the Hellespont straits, whose name apparently translates as “Sea of Helen” – “Helen” + “Pontus” (sea). Then H. Schliemann allegedly “proved” some nondescript settlement in these parts to have “really” been the famed and powerful Troy; however, his “proof” doesn’t hold water. Moreover, there are reasons for serious suspicions of forgery – we are referring to the so-called “gold of Priam” that is presumed to have remained buried on this site for over two millennia and found by Schliemann during excavations (see more details in [443]; also *Chron2*, Chapter 2:5.1.5.

Scaligerian chronology is of the opinion that Troy was destroyed in the XII-XIII century B.C. ([72]), and has never been rebuilt since then. However, certain mediaeval Byzantine authors mention Troy as an existing mediaeval city – Nicetas Aconiatus and Nicephorus Gregoras, for instance ([200], Volume 6, page 126). As we said in *Chron1*, the “ancient” Titus Livy indicates a place called Troy and a Trojan region in Italy. Certain mediaeval historians directly identify Troy as Jerusalem, for example, [10], pages 88, 235, 162 and 207. This cannot fail to confuse the historians of today.

Let us remind the readers of the other name of Troy – Ilion, whereas the alias of Jerusalem is Aelia Capitolina ([544], Volume 7). We can clearly see the similarity between the names Alia and Ilion.

In *Chron1* we cite data that lead us to the presumption that Homer’s Troy identifies as Constantinople, or New Rome, whereas the Trojan War is the very first world war in history. It took place in the XIII century
A.D., which postdates the Scaligerian dating by some 2600 years.

The identification of the Great Troy as Constantinople is de facto implied by the sources that tell us about the epoch of the crusades. Chronicler Robert de Clari reports the Great Troy to have stood next to the entrance to branchium Sancti Georgii ([286], page 210). The name is presumed to apply to the Dardanelles straits; however, it is common knowledge that Villehardouin, another famous chronicler of the Fourth Crusade, uses the name for referring to both the Dardanelles and the Bosporus. M. A. Zaborov also points out that “Villehardouin uses this name [the pass of St. George – Auth.] for referring to both the Dardanelles and the Bosporus” ([286], page 238).

Therefore, the Great Troy may have been located near the entrance to the Bosporus, which is exactly where we find Constantinople today.

Thus, there was absolutely no need for seeking the “remnants” of the Great Troy among the numerous Turkish settlements, all similar to one another, which is where Schliemann appears to have “discovered” his faux Troy. It shall suffice to point at the famous ancient city of Istanbul.

The famous mediaeval “Romain de Troie” by Benoit de Sainte-Maure was finished between the alleged years 1155 and 1160. “The oeuvre is based upon the ‘Legend of Troy’s Destruction” written by a certain Dares, allegedly a living witness of the Trojan War [apparently, one of the crusaders – Auth.], Benoit regards the antiquity through the prism of contemporaneity… He bases his narration to the heroic epos of the ancient Greece, whose characters are transformed into noble knights and fair ladies, whereas the Trojan War itself becomes a series of jousting tournaments… Medea figures as a court lady dressed in French attire of the middle of the XII century” ([517], page 235).

However, in this case the Trojan War becomes an event of the crusader epoch, according to Benoit de Sainte-Maure. As for the “prism of contemporaneity” applied to Sainte-Maure’s references to Troy, it is an attempt of making the ancient sources conform to their Scaligerian standards. Their descriptions of the “antiquity” are radically different from
those of the XVII-XVIII century.
12. The reason why Russia and Britain are both presumed to be insular states according to the English chronicles

The fact that Great Britain is an island should hardly surprise anyone – unlike Russia, which doesn’t remotely resemble an island geographically. Nevertheless, the *Chronicle of the Dukes of Normandy* written by the famous chronicler Benoit de Sainte-Maure in the alleged XII century A.D. ([1030]) claims the following to be true.

“They have an isle called Kansi, and I believe it to be Rosie [Russie in another copy – Auth.]. Its shores are washed by a vast salty sea. Like bees from hives, thousands of them swarm out into battle, full of rage, with their swords ready; moreover, this nation can attack large kingdoms and win great battles” ([1030], see Comment 5).

Russia is referred to as Rosie or Russie here ([517], page 240). If we turn to the table of mediaeval names cited above, we shall get additional proof to the fact that the country mentioned in this manner is indeed Russia. V. I. Matouzova, who had included this text into her book entitled “Mediaeval English sources,” comments this passage as follows: “Rosie – Russia. The presumed insular geography of the country resembles the reports…” ([517], page 244). V. I. Matouzova also mentions several other chroniclers who had believed Russia to be an island, in particular Arabs and Persians. One needn’t think that the “Arabs and Persians” in question wrote their book in modern Persia or the Middle East. As we demonstrate in *Chron1, Chron2* and *Chron6*, Persia is the name that the old chronicles had used for referring to P-Russia, or the White Russia (hence the name Prussia). Apart from the Middle East, Arabic was also used in Russia (see *Chron4*, Chapter 13).
The Isle of Kansi as mentioned in a number of old chronicles is Scandinavia. However, Scandinavia also isn’t an island. Could the name Kansi be a slight corruption of Khansi, or “khanskiy” (the khan’s)?

The Chronicle of St. Edmond’s Monastery, which dates from the alleged XIII century, reports the Tartars to have invaded Hungary coming from “the islands” ([1446]; also [517], pages 100-101).

What could be the matter here? The Tartars, or Cossacks, are known to have inhabited the continent and not any islands of any sort. The easiest we can do is accuse the old authors of total ignorance, which is the usual practise with the modern historians, who are only too glad to leave the problem well alone.

However, another explanation is possible. The English word “island” may have had a different meaning originally – possibly, a collation of “Asia” and “land,” or “Asian land.” Some country in Asia? Without vocalisations we shall come up with SLND in both cases, and the vowels were extremely impermanent before the invention of the printing press, changing all the time, q.v. in Chron1.

Everything becomes instantly clear. Russia could indeed have been considered a faraway Asian land by the Westerners; even today, a larger part of its territory is in Asia and not Europe. The English chroniclers of the Middle Ages were perfectly correct to call Russia an Asian land, which invalidates yet another reason to accuse them of ignorance.

If the Old English authors used the word Russia for referring to an Asian land, could “England the island” have indeed been a faraway land in Asia initially, transforming into the insular Great Britain somewhat later?

We have already discovered the parallelism between the English and the Byzantine, or Mongolian, history. Both Russia (aka the Horde) and Byzantium are Asian countries for any Western European chronicler.

Where had England, or Britain, really been located in the XI-XIV century A.D.? As we can see, the answer isn’t just far from obvious – it was extremely hard to find. Jumping ahead, let us merely indicate Byzantium, or a part of the “Mongolian” Empire.
The answer to the question formulated in the name of the section seems to be apparent – “ancient” Britain had been where it remains until this day. However, let us refrain from jumping to conclusions so far.

Bear in mind that after having “murdered his father involuntarily,” Brutus was exiled from Italy, and so he went to Greece ([155], page 7). However, the exact location of the country whence he was banished remains questionable, as well as the very fact of his exile. We shall refrain from giving any estimates presently.

It is presumed further that upon arriving to Greece and “reviving ancient ties of blood, Brutus found himself among the Trojans” ([155], page 7). Several wars break out in Greece and Italy. Galfridus pays a great deal of attention to these wars. Then Brutus assembles his army and heads off accompanied by a fleet. This fleet is presumed to have headed towards the modern British Isles via the Atlantic. Is this indeed the case? What if the chronicles really describe military operations in the Mediterranean and on the territory of Greece and Byzantium?

For instance, the army of Brutus comes to Sparatin. Modern commentary of historians: “Location unknown” ([155], page 230). Of course, if we are to presume that Brutus travelled at a distance from the Mediterranean, we shall find no such city anywhere. However, if the events took place in Greece, the city can be easily identified as the famous Sparta.

Further Galfridus describes the itinerary of Brutus’ fleet, which is presumed to “prove” the fact that Brutus had indeed travelled via Atlantic and arrived to the shorts of the British Isles. However, Galfridus
apparently “repeats the error contained in his source – the Historia brittonum of Nennius, who had, in turn, misinterpreted Orosius” ([155], page 231). Further we find out that “likewise Nennius, Galfridus erroneously places the Tyrrhenian Sea beyond the Herculean Columns. The Tyrrhenian Sea is the name used for the part of the Mediterranean that washes the western coast of Italy” ([155], page 231).

Galfridus didn’t make any mistakes of any sort – he is referring to complex military manoeuvres inside the Mediterranean (near the coast of Italy in particular, which is where we find the Tyrrhenian Sea). The fleet of Brutus must have remained in the Mediterranean; modern historian accuse Galfridus and other chroniclers of “mistakes” for the sole reason that they attempt to apply the modern Scaligerian ideas of the ancient history to authentic ancient texts. The numerous contradictions that emerge from this approach are immediately blamed on the ancient authors, whereas it should really be the other way round.

Further Galfridus describes a battle between the army of Brutus and the Greeks at River Akalon ([155], page 8). Modern commentary is as follows: “This name must be a fantasy of Galfridus… E. Faral’s book … voices the assumption that the description of the Trojan victory over the Greeks was borrowed by Galfridus from the story told by Etienne de Blois about the victory of the crusaders over the Turks at a river referred to as ‘Moskolo’ by the author, in March 1098” ([155], page 230).

Real events described by Galfridus slowly begin to emerge from underneath the thick coats of Scaligerian whitewash. The author describes the epoch of the crusades using some ancient documents as his source – Byzantium in the XI-XIII century A.D. It is also possible that the campaign of Brutus (“brother”), or the campaign of Julius Caesar (Youri the Czar) identifies as the Great = “Mongolian” Conquest of the XIV century started by Czar (Khan) Youri = Georgiy Danilovich = Genghis-Khan and continued by his brother Ivan Kalita = Caliph. This conquest had at some point reached the British Isles. See more in re the “Mongolian” conquest in Part 1 of the present book.
Thus, the conquest of Britain partially transfers into the XIV century A.D. from the I century B.C., being also a partial reflection of the Trojan War of the XIII century A.D., which was fought for Constantinople = Troy = Jerusalem = Czar-Grad.

A while later, the fleet of Brutus arrives to “the island known as Albion in those days” ([155], page 17). According to the modern commentary, “Albion (or Albania) is one of the oldest names used for Great Britain (or a part thereof) as registered in the ancient sources” ([155], page 232). Galfridus keeps using Albania as a synonym of Britain ([155], page 19).

We learn that Britain and Albania are two different names of a single country. Once we renounce the Scaligerian point of view, which stubbornly tries to identify Britain of the XI-XIII century as modern Britain, we shall recognize this “British Albania” as either the Balkan Albania, which had been a Byzantine province in the Middle Ages, or the White Russia (Alba). Thus, Galfridus explicitly locates mediaeval Britain in the “early days” in the vicinity of Byzantium.

Albion is still used as the old name of Britain. This results from the fact that the “ancient” history of Britain was based on Byzantine and “Mongolian” chronicles that wrote about the Balkan Albania as well. The name eventually transformed into “Albion.” Alternatively, the British Isles became named Albion as a result of the “Mongolian” conquest in the XIV-XV century, when the country was invaded by the troops of the White Horde (Alba = White).
Brutus has to fight against Gog and Magog during the conquest of Britain (aka the Tartars and Mongols or the Ten Tribes of Israel)

Having disembark on the shores of Albania, “Brutus named the island Britain after himself, while his companions became Brits” ([155], page 17). It is possible that Albania the Asian country became Albania the island due to the fact that Brutus had reached it by sea – the disembarkation in Byzantium transformed into the conquest of an island (or, alternatively, chronicles tell us about the Russian fleet invading the islands that shall eventually be known as the British Isles.

Who does Brutus encounter here? Giants, no less – apparently, a reference to the various nations that populated the territory of Byzantium and Russia (the Horde): “One of these giants was particularly repulsive; his name was Goemagog” ([155], pages 17-18). According to Galfridus, this giant was exceptionally strong and fearsome. The army of Brutus attacked the twelve giants with Goemagog among them. The Brits are pushed back initially, but finally “crush the giants completely, save for Goemagog” ([155], page 18). The battle against Goemagog continues, and finally the Brits manage to defeat him as well.

In fig. 18.1 we see an ancient miniature entitled “King Arthur Fights the Giant” ([155], pages 64-65). Over the head of the giant we see the name Gigas (or Gog, q.v. in fig. 18.2). As we shall demonstrate in further publications, Arthur’s battle with the giant reflects the Biblical battle between David and Goliath, or the battle between Dmitriy Donskoi and Mamai-Khan in 1380.
Fig. 18.1. Ancient miniature depicting the fight between King Arthur and a giant. We see the legend “Gigas” over the head of the latter – Gog, that is. Let us remind the reader that Gog and Magog were the names used for the “Mongols and the Tartars.” Taken from [155], page 64-65.

Fig. 18.2. A fragment of the previous illustration with the name “Gigas.”

What real events may Galfridus be describing in this poetic manner of his?

1. The victory of the Brits (“brothers”), or the crusaders, who managed to conquer Byzantium.
2. The fight against Goemagog, one of the most dangerous opponents.

Who is Goemagog? We have mentioned him briefly in Part 1. Let us now expound the manner at greater length.

The commentary of the modern historians is as follow: “Galfridus combines two names into one – Gog and Magog” ([155], page 232). The commentator of the chronicle points out further that Gog and Magog are mentioned frequently in the Bible – the Book of Revelations and the
prophecy of Ezekiel. Let us remind the reader what the Biblical book of Ezekiel tells us about these fearsome and mighty nations:

“Set thy face against Gog, the land of Magog, the chief prince of Rosh, Meshech and Tubal, and prophesy against him, and say, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I am against thee, O Gog, the chief prince of Rosh, Meshech and Tubal… Gog shall come against the land of Israel” (Ezekiel 38:2-3, 38:18 and on). The Biblical author believes these two nations to bring death and destruction.

The Book of Revelation also speaks of the armies of Gog and Magog with fear: “Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea” (Revelation 20:7).

According to the modern commentator, “Folk tradition eventually transformed Gog and Magog into malicious giants. Statues of Gog and Magog have stood in London ever since the Middle Ages (near the entry to the City, next to the modern city hall)” ([155], page 232).

These two mediaeval nations are quite famous; according to a number of chroniclers, they can be identified as the Goths and the Mongols. In the XIII century the Hungarians identified Gog and Magog as the Tartars ([517], page 174). This fact alone suffices to realise that the events described by Galfridus took place in Byzantium and Russia (Horde). In fig. 18.3 we reproduce an old illustration from the “Chronicle” by Matthew of Paris, which depicts the invasion of the Tartars. The mediaeval author of the miniature portrays the Tartars as Europeans that look distinctly Slavic – long fair hair et al, q.v. in fig. 18.4. This fact concurs perfectly well with our reconstruction, which claims that the “Tartar” invasion had really been Slavic.
We must also point out the following circumstance, which is of paramount importance. According to old folk tradition, that had been referenced in the Russian textbooks up until the XIX century, the Muscovite Kingdom “was found by Mosoch, the Biblical patriarch” – hence the Greek name of Moscow (Moska). Thus, the Biblical reference to the “prince of Rosh, Meshech and Tubal” is most likely to be telling us about the Russian Mosokh as well as Tubal (Tobol) in Siberia, q.v. above. But when did the foundation of Moscow really take place? Even in the Millerian and Romanovian history the first mention of Moscow dates from the XII century A.D. the earliest; in Part 1 we demonstrate that Moscow may have been founded even later. Even if we are to assume that the actual name Moscow might predate the foundation of the city by a few hundred years, we shall see that the mention of Gog, Magog and the Prince of Rosh,
Meshech and Tubal in the Old English manuscripts dates them to the epoch of the XII-XIII century A.D. the earliest.

In Chron6 we demonstrate that the Great = “Mongolian” Conquest of the XIV century and the Ottoman = Ataman conquest of the XV-XVI century that had followed it was described in the Bible as the conquest of the “Promised Land” by the tribes of Israel. Apparently, the very fact that the Tartars and the Mongols, or Gog and Magog, were identified as the tribes of Israel is referred to directly in the ancient chronicles; old maps also make it perfectly obvious ([953]).

Historians report the following: “The invasion of the Mongols and the Tartars … was considered to be an ‘omen’ of the imminent Apocalypse, and many have identified those nations as Gog and Magog, including Matthew of Paris” ([953], page 178). Several geographical maps of the Middle Ages “depict the nations Gog and Magog beyond the Caspian Sea, chased there by Alexander of Macedon. This is where the Tartars came from… Matthew writes about the Tartars and the Mongols who suddenly swarmed Europe from behind their mountains. He traces the lineage of the Tartars to the ten tribes of Israel pushed behind the mountains by Alexander of Macedon, thus fusing several myths into one, likewise Peter Camestor and other scientists – the myth of Gog and Magog as well as the one of the Ten Tribes” ([953], pages 180-181).

Let us also consider the ancient mediaeval map of the alleged XIII century as cited in [953], page 181 (number XIV.2.1, Cambridge, CCC, 26). The following is written there: “Closed-off area beyond the Caspian mountains. Here be the Jews that the Lord saved us from after the prayer of King Alexander; they shall come before the Judgement Day as the Lord’s scourge, and they shall herald the demise of all the other nations” ([953], page 182).

There is another ancient map with a similar inscription: “The Lord hath heard the prayer of King Alexander, and made the Jews dwell behind these mountains in reclusion. They shall break free before the Judgement Day and wipe out every nation to comply with the will of the Lord. The
mountains stand tall and strong; forbidden and impenetrable are the Caspian Mountains” ([953], page 182). Let us consider another old map (XIV, 2.3, London, BL, Royal 14 C. VII, f. 4v-5, allegedly dating from the XIII century). According to the quotation provided by L. S. Chekin, the following is written here: “Nine tribes remain here – Gog and Magog, confined by Alexander. This is where the Tartars came from – the ones who are said to have brought their armies here from behind the mountains of rock, conquering vast territories” ([953], page 183). In fig. 18.5 one sees an ancient miniature from the Book of Revelation (a copy dating from the second half of the XVII century). The miniature is entitled “The Nations of Gog and Magog Surrounding the Citadel of the Holy” ([623], page 70). We see numerous horsemen wearing helmets and shields, with chain mails over their shoulders. The XVII century authors must have still remembered that the Book of Revelation referred to the Cossack (or Tartar) cavalry, heavy and light.

Fig. 18.5. Miniature entitled “The Nations of Gog and Magog Surrounding the Camp of the Holy” from the Book of Revelations with comments by Andrew of Caesarea. Second half of the XVII Century. According to historians themselves ([953], pages 180-181), the riders depicted as the nations of Gog and Magog are in fact Israelites storming some city. Taken from [623], page 70.
This is the commentary of L. S. Chekin, a historian. “Gog and Magog… These nations were confined behind the Caspian (or Caucasus) Mountains by Alexander of Macedon, which is where they shall await the Judgement Day. Gog and Magog are mentioned in various versions of the legend of Alexander and a number of eschatological prophesies (pseudo-Methodius of Patar, the Words of the Sybil, etc.)… The new motifs – namely, identifying Gog and Magog as the ten ‘missing tribes’ of Israel, one of which, in turn, is revealed to be the Mongols and the Tartars, became reflected in the maps of the Middle East compiled by Matthew of Paris… According to the map XIV.2.3.1, now, after the Tartars had already ‘revealed themselves’, nine of the tribes remain, cloistered here by Alexander … The fictitious travel diary written by some author who had adopted the pseudonym of John Mandeville (circa 1360) discusses the possibility that Gog and Magog might choose a maritime escape route … whereas the Turkish traveller Evlia Celebi (circa 1650) mentions Gog and Magog, locked up somewhere near the Bosporus by Alexander, as well as iron ships of some sort, whose function remains unclear” ([953], pages 205-206).

Our reconstruction provides a perfect explanation for the numerous reports that mediaeval chronicles (some of which were quoted above) make about Gog and Magog = the Tartars = the Israelites (cf. the Russian word “kolen” used as a synonym of “tribe” in the present case and the word “column” in the meaning of a military formation). The realisation that dawns upon us is that the events discussed earlier all took place in Russia (the Horde) and the Ottoman = Ataman empire of the XIV-XVI century. Western Europeans of the XV-XVII century had referred to them as to Gog and Magog, or the Mongols and the Tartars, or the “tribes of Israel” (the Theomachists). This is why they dwell secluded in Russia (the Horde), on the territories “beyond the Caspian Sea and the Caucasus,” q.v. above. Everything is crystal clear – the Bosporus is where we find the famous Czar-Grad, or Istanbul, the capital of the Ottoman (Ataman) Empire, an ally of Russia (the Horde) in the XIV-XVI century. This was
whence the famous Ottoman fleet sailed forth into long voyages.

As we can see, certain mediaeval texts appear to reflect the grandiose trans-oceanic expeditions undertaken by Russia (the Horde) and the Ottoman (Ataman) Empire in the XV-XVI century – the American continent was conquered as a result of these ([953], pages 205-206). This is why the old maps and chronicles as quoted above (apparently dating from the XVI-XVII century) have preserved the memory of some “iron ships” built by Gog and Magog, although a vague one; it defies the understanding of modern historians who cannot operate outside the paradigm of Scaligerian history ([953], pages 205-206). Nevertheless, Scaligerian history has kept the memory of America colonised by the ten “missing tribes of Israel,” no less (see Chron6 for more details).

L. S. Chekin continues to emphasise that the Jews from the ten “missing tribes” of Israel “were occasionally believed to inhabit the Caucasus and Scythia; the Christian tradition … likened them to Gog and Magog. In particular, they were believed to have been driven beyond the Caspian Mountains by Alexander the Great and cloistered there… This gave new reasons for identifying the missing tribes of Israel as Gog and Magog… Both myths (of Gog and Magog as well as the missing tribes of Israel) were applied to the Mongols and the Tartars… The Jews were proclaimed the collaborators of the latter” ([953], page 209).

According to our reconstruction, all the various names listed above (the Mongols, the Tartars, the Ten Tribes of Israel and the nations of Gog and Magog) really refer to the same historical “character” – namely, the army of Russia (the Horde) and the Ottoman (Ataman) Empire, which had colonised vast lands in Eurasia and America around the XIV-XV century, founding the Great = “Mongolian” Empire.

Thus, we must draw an important conclusion once we return to the English chronicle of Galfridus. During their disembarkation in Byzantium (or England), in the epoch that cannot possibly predate the XIII century, the army of Brutus (Brother) ran into a number of large ethnic groups, among them the Goths = Cossacks = Russians = the Horde = the
“Mongols” (Great Ones). They had played a very important role in mediaeval Europe and Asia in the XIII-XIV century A.D.
Let us recollect that the epoch of Brutus (Brother) is also the epoch of Julius Caesar = Youri the Czar = King George. In this case, the military campaigns of Brutus must be somehow described in the texts that refer to the campaigns of Julius Caesar.

When Galfridus comes to the end of the Brutus section, he commences with his story of Julius Caesar, having presumably skipped several hundred years. As we understand today, he begins the same story “the second time over,” or comes back to the events of the same XIV-XV century, albeit related in a different manner.

According to Galfridus, “Roman history tells us that after the conquest of Gaul, Julius Caesar came to the Ruthenian coast. Having seen the Isle of Britain thence, he made an enquiry about this land and the people living there” ([155], page 37).

Scaligerian historians are of the opinion that the above passage is yet another demonstration of the author’s mediaeval ignorance. Modern commentary reads as follows: “The Ruthenians identify as a Gaulish tribe that had inhabited Aquitania (the South-East of Gaul). It is impossible to see Britain from there, and so Galfridus is making a mistake in his reference to the Ruthenians” ([155], page 238).

Who are the Ruthenians? Let us turn to the glossary that we have compiled from the materials of V. I. Matouzova ([517]); we shall find the answer immediately. The Ruthenians were Russians, and many mediaeval chronicles use this name for referring to them. The name may be a derivative of the word Horde (in its Slavic forms Orta, Ruta and Rat) – the Russian army, in other words.
It is common knowledge that the Russian army had waged many wars in Byzantium, attacking Czar-Grad (or Constantinople), among other things. Therefore, the Russians had indeed occupied certain Byzantine provinces in the Middle Ages, and it was easy to see Albania, or Byzantium, from one of the adjacent territories.

We therefore believe the Ruthenians as mentioned by the English chronicles in the context of Caesar’s conquest of Britain, or Albania, to be the same nation as the Russians in the XIII-XIV century A.D.

The Great = “Mongolian” conquest began in the XIV century; the Russians (or Ruthenians) came to France, known as Gaul in the Middle Ages, as a result of this military expansion, and not just Gaul, but Western Europe in general and beyond that, q.v. in Chron5. Galfridus is therefore perfectly correct to report that the Ruthenians had lived in Gaul. “Ruta” (or “Rutha”) translates as “Horde,” as simple as that.

Let us revert to the campaigns of Julius Caesar as described by Galfridus. Caesar invades into Albania, or Britain, assisted by a fleet. This is where he engages in combat with the Brits ([155], page 38), defeating them and conquering their country. Let us stop and reflect on the identity of the Brits in the XII-XIV century. The Scaligerian “explanation,” which calls them the “descendants of Brutus,” doesn’t really explain anything. Our experience in these matters leads us to the assumption that the Brits of the XIII-XIV century can be identified as some real Mediterranean nation.

Let us once again turn to the dictionary of mediaeval synonyms that we compiled after the book of V. I. Matouzova ([517], see above). We shall instantly see that mediaeval sources use the word “Pruten” for referring to the Prussians (PRTN). This may well be the mediaeval equivalent of BRT, or the Brits mentioned by Galfridus, and one can therefore assume that Caesar had fought the Prussians in the Middle Ages. Britain, or BRTN, as mentioned by the sources of this epoch, is most likely to identify as PRTN = Prutenia, or mediaeval Prussia. The name Prutenia may also have been used for the White Horde.

However, another answer is possible. According to the Anglo-Saxon
*Chronicle*, the language of the Brits was Welsh ([1442], page 3). However, the Welsh, or the Walachians, were already identified as the Turks, or the Ottomans (q.v. in the table of mediaeval synonyms referenced above). In this case, the Brits may have been identified as the Turks (or the Ottomans) – in some of the chronicles at least. This brings us back to the Byzantine or Russian (“Mongolian”) localisation of the early British history.
Many of the modern readers believe that the city known as London today had always been where we know it to be nowadays. However, let us see what the ancient British chronicles have to say on this matter.

For instance, Galfridus tell us the following: “Having finished with his division of the kingdom, Brutus found himself consumed with a burning desire to found a city… He did found one, instantly dubbing it New Troy [sic! – Auth.]. The newly founded town had borne this name for many centuries; eventually, the name transformed into Tronovant. However, later on Lud … who had fought against Caesar … gave orders to name the city Caer Lud after himself [the word Caer translates as ‘city’, cf. Cairo; more on the subject below – Auth.]. This had eventually led to a great fight between himself and his brother Nennius, who bitterly resented the fact that Lud wanted to obliterate the very name of Troy from the memory of their descendants” ([155], page 18).

This is what the chronicle tells us further on: “The name transformed into Caerludane, and then, after one language had replaced another, into Lundene, and finally Lundres” ([155], page 37). The modern commentary is as follows: “Trinovant – the old name of London” ([155], page 232). The name Londres exists until the present day – this is how the French and the Spanish transcribe the name London.

Thus, ancient English chronicles claim Lud, or London, to be the former Trinovant, or New Troy. What is New Troy? Most likely, the New Rome, or Constantinople, aka Czar-Grad. This corollary is in excellent correspondence with everything that we have discovered above, and also
suggests a Byzantine and “Mongolian” localization of the events pertaining to the early British history.

Galfridus appears to be telling us about some old military campaign of Brutus (Brother) that dates to the XI-XII century. This campaign had resulted in the foundation of New Troy, which later became known as Constantinople. Alternatively, he describes the “Mongolian” conquest of the British Isles in the XIV century by the brother of Genghis-Khan, which had resulted in the foundation of a city that became known as New Troy, or Czar-Grad. This city eventually became known as London.

Let us cite another typical fact and recollect the famous city of Tyrnovo in Bulgaria. The name resembles Trinovant and translates as “New Troy,” being a collation of “Troy” and “Nova” (Tyr + Novo). The name Trinovant may therefore be of Byzantine origin and come from the Balkans. The Russian word for “new” is “noviy” – cf. also the Latin “novus.” New Troy must have thus been used as the name of London once. This is precisely what we learn from the chronicle of Galfridus, which reports the transformation of the name New Troy into Trinovant. The “transformation” results from the two parts of the word changing order.

The City of Lud must simply mean “City of LD,” or “City of LT” – the city of the Latins, or the city of the “people” (lyudi) in Russian. A capital under this name may well have become reflected in British chronicles. Bear in mind the foundation of the Latin Empire in Byzantium around 1204 in Scaligerian chronology. Its capital may have been known as Caer Lud, or “Latin City.” According to Nennius, the word “caer” had once meant “city” in the language of the Brits ([577], page 190).

The name Caer (Cair) Lud also provides us with another reason to identify New Troy as Constantinople and thus also London of the XII-XIII century. The first consonant of the word “Caer” may have stood for “TS” as opposed to “K” – the two were frequently confused for each other. In this case CR means “Czar,” and Czar-Grad is another name of Constantinople.
Therefore, Caer Lud, or London as described in the ancient British chronicles, is most likely to be the City of the Latin Czars (CR LT, Czar-Grad or Constantinople). It may also have been known as “Czar of the People,” or “Sovereign of Nations,” bearing in mind the similarity between the words “Lud” and “lyudi” (people).

A propos, the Egyptian city of Cairo and the “ancient” city of Babylon, which Scaligerian historians locate between Tigris and Euphrates, also dating it to times immemorial, were depicted as two neighbouring cities on certain ancient maps – a fragment of one such map is reproduced in fig. 18.6. The modern commentary states that “Cairo and Babylon are depicted as neighbouring cities” ([1268], page 145).

Fig. 18.6. Fragment of an old map where Cairo and Babylon are drawn as neighbours. Taken from [1268], page 145.

The “ancient” city of Babylon is also depicted as standing right next to the Egyptian pyramids on an ancient map reproduced in fig. 18.7 (see [1177], Volume 1, page 245). We can see the Nile, large pyramids, and the city of Babylon, or Babylonia, near them – on top and to the right. The most interesting fact is that the compilers of this ancient map apparently believed Babylon to have been a Christian city. Indeed, at its very centre we see a tall tower topped by a cross (see fig. 18.8). The tower itself resembles a Muslim minaret – on its top we see something that resembles balconies used by muezzins when they call Muslims to congregate for their prayers.
Fig. 18.7. The city of Babylon is placed right next to the Egyptian pyramids in an old map from the manuscript entitled *Notitia Dignitatum*, which is supposed to date from the IV-V century A.D. The original is presumed to have perished – however, we have copies of the “Spirensis” codex allegedly dating from the X century. However, this codex also “disappeared in the XVI century,” according to [1177], page 244. Taken from [1177], page 245.

Fig. 18.8. Close in of a fragment of the previous illustration depicting the “ancient” city of Babylon. We see a tall tower in the centre of the city (a Muslim minaret?) with a Christian cross on its dome.

If this is the truth, we find another evidence of Christianity and Islam being two different offshoots of a formerly united religion. We shall
naturally find no Christian crosses upon modern minarets; however, we believe the schism between the two religions to date from a relatively recent epoch, namely, the XVI-XVII century.

Let us revert to the name “Caer,” or “Cair,” which had once stood for “city.” As we have seen above, nearly every ancient city founded by the Brits had this word as part of its name, which reflects a memory of its origin – the word Czar. For instance, the chronicle of Nennius tells us the following: “These are the names of all the British cities existing to date, 28 of them altogether: Caer Gwartigirn, Caer Gwyntgwick, Caer Myncip…” ([155], page 190). And so on, and so forth. The name of every British city begins with the word Caer.

It is easy enough to understand that the entire narration of Galfridus that concerns the toponymy of the name London is offhandedly declared erroneous by the representatives of the modern historical science. According to the learned historians, “The toponymy of the name London suggested by the author (namely, its derivation from the name Lud), is thoroughly inconsistent. Ancient authors (such as Tacitus and Ammianus Marcellinus) call the city Londinium or Lundinium. The real toponymy remains debatable” ([155], page 237).

Thus, after the crusades of the XI-XIII century certain chronicles began to use the name New Troy for referring to Czar-Grad, or New Rome. After the foundation of the Latin Empire around 1204, the capital of Byzantium was called the Latin City, or Caer Lud (Czar of the People), and, finally, London. This name was transported to the insular Britain when the ancient Byzantine and “Mongolian” chronicles ended up there.

Nennius lists 28 British cities in his chronicle, claiming the list to be exhaustive ([577], page 190). Caer was the word the Brits had used for “city” ([577], page 283). However, the ancient capital of Egypt in Africa is called Cairo. The word itself might be a derivative of “Czar.” Therefore, the word “caer” must be Eastern in origin, likewise the ancient history of Britain.

Galfridus proceeds to tell us that the city of New Troy, or London, had
been founded on River Thames ([155], page 18). We believe the name to have been a reference to the Bosporus initially, which is where we find Constantinople. This strait is very long and relatively narrow; it does look like a river on maps, and connects the Black Sea with the Sea of Marmara.

Let us also take a closer look and the word Thames. Bearing in mind the Oriental manner of reading words from the right to the left and the word “sound,” a synonym of the word “strait” ([23], page 941). Reversed and unvocalized, it looks as “DNS” – possibly, a version of TMS (Thames). The word may therefore have been used for referring to a strait in general before becoming an actual name of a river in England.

There is also some important evidence to the fact that many modern British names were imported from Byzantium in the Russian naval chart of 1750 as reproduced in the atlas entitled *Russian Naval Charts. Copies from Originals* ([73]). We believe the Czar-Grad, or Constantinople, to be the historical prototype of London; this city is located next to the Sound of St. George – a name used for referring to both the Bosporus and the Dardanelles in the Middle Ages, q.v. above. Is there anything of the kind anywhere in the vicinity of the British Isles? There is, in fact – the long and narrow strait between Ireland and Great Britain is referred to as the “Sound of St. George” in the map of 1750, q.v. in fig. 18.9.
Fig. 18.9. Fragment of a Russian military naval chart of 1750 where the strait between England and Ireland is called the Strait of St. George. Copy from the original that was kept in the study of Peter the Great. Apparently, the name “Strait of St. George” came from Byzantium together with the Byzantine chronicles. Taken from [73]. Alternatively, it may have been brought here during the “Mongolian” conquest, when the army of the Horde sent by Genghis=Khan, or Youri (George) came to the British Isles.

The name is most likely to have migrated to the British Isles as a result of the “import” of the old Byzantine and “Mongolian” chronicles. Alternatively, it is yet another trace of the Great = “Mongolian” Conquest, when the British Isles were conquered and populated by the army of Russia, formerly known as the Horde. This army had managed to conquer almost the entire world under the banners of their Great Czar, or Khan – Youri, also known as Julius Caesar, Gyurgiy, King George, Genghis-Khan and St. George the Victorious. It is perfectly natural that we should find his name upon the maps of the lands discovered and conquered by his army.
The old coat of arms of London and the English Kingdom of East Saxons depicts the Ottoman scimitars (or crescents)

The city of London on the British Isles is also most likely to have been founded by the “Mongols,” or the “Great Ones,” in the epoch of the Great Conquest instigated by the Horde and the Ottomans in the XIV-XV century. It would make sense to turn to the map of John Speede dating from 1611-1612 ([1160], pages 166-167). Here we see the city of London as part of the East Saxon Kingdom, q.v. in figs. 18.10. and 18.11. In the top part of fig. 18.11 we see the legend “East Saxons King Dome.” The second part of the word “kingdom” in its archaic transcription is written separately, at the bottom on the left – immediately above the name London. This might be a reference to the fact that London had been the capital of the East Saxon Kingdom.
Fig. 18.10. Fragment of a map by John Speede dating from 1611-1612. We see the East Saxons Kingdom indicated upon it, as well as its coat of arms (the House of London) with three sabres that look very much like the Ottoman scimitars and can be interpreted as Ottoman crescents. Taken from [1160], pages 166-167.

Fig. 18.11. Close-in of the East Saxon coat of arms (House of London) from the map of John Speede. Taken from [1160], pages 166-167.

Let us also point out the most significant fact that concerns this part of the
map. Next to London and the legend “East Saxons King Dome” we see a large coat of arms, which is of the utmost interest to us (see fig. 18.11). What we see is a military shield with three scimitars drawn upon a field of red – they look distinctly Ottoman, as professional weapons with wide and heavy front parts of the blade. Furthermore, the way the scimitars are drawn on the shield makes them resemble three Ottoman crescents. One must bear in mind that the map dates from the early XVII century, when the Reformation had already began, likewise the falsification of the ancient history. It is possible that the old crest of London and the East Saxon Kingdom had borne even more explicit scimitars, or crescents. Let us enquire about their possible origins, especially given that the mediaeval Saxons had never used anything remotely resembling these Turkish weapons (at the very least, Scaligerian history reports nothing of the kind).

Apparently, what we see is a very vivid trace of the “Mongolian,” or Ottoman conquest. The presence of the Ottoman scimitars, or crescents, on the crest of the East Saxon is explained well by our reconstruction, which claims the name London to have been transferred to the banks of the Thames by the Horde and the Ottomans, or the Atamans, in memory of the old London – Czar-Grad or Troy on the Bosporus, that is. The crescent is the ancient symbol of Czar-Grad, as we explain in *Chron6*. Later on, after the conquest of Constantinople by the Ottomans in 1453, the crescent became the imperial symbol of the Ottoman = Ataman Empire, which means there is nothing surprising about the fact that the capital of the British Isles founded by the “Mongols” and the Ottomans had once borne the symbol of Constantinople upon its crest – the crescent, or the Ottoman scimitar.

The military nature of this mediaeval coat of arms is emphasised by the fact that the three scimitars, or crescents, are drawn upon a shield, q.v. in fig. 18.11. It is a military crest. We see the same coat of arms on the map compiled by John Speede – in the symbol of the East Saxon Kingdom (fig. 18.12), as a figure of a warrior with a shield decorated by three scimitars, or crescents.
Fig. 18.12. Another representation of the crest of the East Saxons from the left part of John Speede’s map. Warrior with a shield with three Ottoman scimitars against a red field. Taken from [1160], page 166.

Fig. 18.13. Coat of arms of London from a map of London dating from 1700. There are no more Ottoman crescents, or scimitars – we see groups of three oddly elongated leonine shapes against a field of red – this is what the initial Ottoman crescents have transformed into. Taken from [1160], page 271.

One must point out that the plan of London compiled by Johannes de Ram a century later, in 1700, also depicts the London coat of arms ([1160], page 271). It is significant that there are no scimitars or crescents left anywhere anymore; the red field remains, though, q.v. in fig. 18.13. Instead of the crescents we see several triads of lions, their disposition being the same as
that of the initial symbols used by the East Saxons (crescents, or scimitars). Even the shape of the leonine bodies resembles a crescent to some extent. This may be a result of the editing campaign that had afflicted English history. Ottoman, or Ataman symbols weren’t welcome in the ancient history of the new, post-Reformist Britain. Crescents were replaced by lions or wiped out altogether. The red field was kept – obviously, nothing about it had struck the reformists as dangerous. We refer to similar “progressive activities” conducted in the course of the Romanovian reform that had concerned the ancient Russian coats of arms (the XVII-XVIII century; see Part I of the present book). Upon coming to power, the Romanovs commenced to wipe out the old Horde and Ottoman symbols from Russian coats of arms, works of art and so on – diligently and systematically. In particular, the Romanovian artists were known for transforming crescents present in many Russian coats of arms into boats and other curved figures, pursuing the objective of purging the old state symbolism of the “Mongolian” Empire from everyone’s memory. As a result, much of the authentic history of the XIV-XVI century was forgotten by the early XVIII century, or got disfigured beyond recognition.
The identity of the Scots and Scotland in the XIII-XIV century.

The names of Russia and Scotland appear in the mediaeval English maps around the XV-XVI century.

The name Scotland stands for “Land of the Scots,” and there is nothing new or surprising around this fact. However, few people know that the Scots had formerly been known as the Scythians, which is written explicitly in Manuscript F of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, for instance ([1442], page 3, Comment 4). The Scots are referred to as “SCITHI” here. This ancient English chronicle openly identifies the Scots as the Scythians, and Scotland as Scythia (Scyth-Land).

We discuss the identity of the Scythians at length in *Chron5*. The Scythians are mentioned by many mediaeval authors – they identify as the Slavic nations primarily. In *Chron5* we demonstrate that the word Scythian is likely to derive from the Slavic word “skitatsya” (to wander). The word “Kitay” (the Russian for “China”) must stem from the same root. During the Great = “Mongolian” Conquest, the Slavs, or the Scythians, had spread across the Western Europe in particular, having also given their name to Scotland when they populated it in the XIV-XV century.

Old maps of Scotland are of the utmost interest in this respect. In fig. 18.14 we reproduce a map of Scotland included in the “Chronicle” by Matthew of Paris, allegedly dating from the XIII century ([1268], page 7). We instantly notice that a large area in the north-west of Scotland is called Ros (see fig. 18.15). The name is definitely related to that of Russia, and must be another trace of the Great = “Mongolian” Conquest, which had resulted in the advent of the Russian settlers (or the Horde) to Scotland.
Fig. 18.14. Old map of Scotland from the Chronicle of Matthew of Paris allegedly dating from the XIII century. One cannot miss the large area in the Northwest of Scotland named “Ros” – apparently, the “Russian Land.” This must be a result of the Great = “Mongolian” Invasion, when the Scots (or the Scythians) settled all across Scotland. Taken from [1268], page 7.

Fig. 18.15. A close-in of a fragment of the previous illustration with the name Ros right next to Scocia. Taken from [1268], page 7.

Another map (the one compiled by John Speede in 1611-1612) calls the same region Kingdom of the Scots. A fragment of this map can be seen in
figs. 18.16 and 18.17. Also, let us ponder the word “kingdom,” which had formerly been written as “King Dome” (see fig. 18.11, for instance). This word is possibly a derivative of the Slavic “Khan-Dom,” or the House of the Khan. The Eastern “Mongolian” title Khan transformed into the word king, whereas the old Slavic word for “house” (dom) still means virtually the same thing in a number of Western European languages, albeit transcribed in Romanic characters.

Fig. 18.16. Fragment of John Speede’s map compiled in 1611-1612. The area formerly known as Ros is already referred to as “Kingdom of the Scots.” We see the Scots identified as the Russians (inhabitants of Ros). Taken from [1160], page 167.
Ros, the name of this Russian region, had remained on the maps of Scotland up until the XVIII century at least. In fig. 18.18 we cite a fragment of another such map dating from 1755, where this name is transcribed even more conspicuously – as Ross (see fig. 18.19). This rare map in its entirety can be seen in figs. 18.20-18.23.
Fig. 18.18. Map of Scotland dating from 1755 with a large area called Ross – possibly, the Russian area. Taken from [1018].

Fig. 18.19. Close-in of a fragment of the previous map with an area called Ross.
Fig. 18.20. Map of Scotland dating from 1755. Part one. Taken from [1018].

Fig. 18.21. Map of Scotland dating from 1755. Part two. Taken from [1018].
However, the most remarkable map in this respect is the map of the British Isles compiled by George Lily in the alleged year 1546 ([1459], map XLIV;
see fig. 18.24. We see the same region of Scotland named Rossia – Russia, in other words! See figs. 18.25 and 18.26. Thus, some XVI century maps of Britain depict a large area of Scotland under the name of Rossia. Modern British maps contain no such names, obviously enough – they must have vanished in the Reformation epoch (the XVI-XVII century), when all such Russian names got edited out so as to vanquish the very memory of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire.

Fig. 18.24. Map of the British Isles compiled by George Lilly, allegedly dating from 1546. We see a region in Scotland that is called Rossia, or Russia. Taken from [1459], map XLIV.
Fig. 18.25. Close-in of a fragment of George Lily’s map with the region of Rossia in Scotland and its environs. Incidentally, we find River Hispana (Spain?) right next to it.

Fig. 18.26. Close-in of a fragment of George Lily’s map where we see a region called Rossia.

A propos, the name Ros was also present in mediaeval maps of England – for instance, the very same map of George Lily indicates an area called Ros next to London and Gloucester (see fig. 18.27).
Fig. 18.27. Another fragment of George Lily’s map where we see the town of Ros near Glocestri – the name may also be related to the word “Russia.” Taken from [1459], map XLIV.

Another map of Britain (dating from 1754) uses the word Ecossa for referring to the area called Rossia elsewhere (see fig. 18.28). This word is very similar to the word Cossack – the Cossack region. The terms are synonymous, since the Russian Conquest was carried out in the XIV century by the army of the Horde, or the Cossack troops (see more on this in Chron5). Apparently, these parts of Scotland were populated by a large number of the Cossacks who came here as settlers from Russia, or the Horde, in the XIV-XV century.
Fig. 18.28. Map of Britain dating from 1754. Here we see the area formerly known as Ross called Ecosse – possibly, a derivative of the word “Cossack.” Taken from [1018].

The above explains another interesting old name of Scotland that we find in mediaeval maps – Scocia (see the same map by Matthew of Paris as partially reproduced in fig. 18.15). The name is written on the map rather clearly (the Romanic letter C resembles “q” to some extent). The entire Scotland is called Scocia on another old map that allegedly dates from 1493; its fragment is reproduced in figs. 18.29 and 18.30. As we are beginning to realise, the name might be derived from the Slavic word “skok,” roughly equivalent to “gallop.” Seeing as how the Cossack army of the Horde was extremely cavalry-oriented, it is perfectly natural that names containing the root “skok” would become associated with the Russian cavalry, becoming immortalised in geography and history wherever the mounted invaders chose to settle.
Fig. 18.29. Map of Scotland allegedly dating from 1493, where the entire Scotland is referred to as Scocia. Reproduced in “Liber Chronicarum” by H. Schedel of Nuremberg. Taken from [1218], map 2.

Fig. 18.30. Close-in of a fragment of the previous map with the legend “Scocia.”

Also, ancient maps of the XIV-XVI century use the name Scocia for referring to Scythia as well – Scythia Inferior was occasionally transcribed
as Scocia Inferior ([953], page 220). Historians couldn’t fail to notice this; they cautiously comment in the following manner: ‘The form ‘Scotia’, which was usually applied to Scotland, is also used for referring to Scythia here [on some of the ancient maps – Auth.]… The legend that claims the Irish and the Scottish to be of Scythian origin (both nations were known as ‘Scotti’ dates to the IX century at the very least” ([953], page 221).

By the way, certain mediaeval maps also indicate a Scythian Desert in African Egypt ([953], page 220). This is also perfectly in order, since our reconstruction claims Egypt in Africa to have been part of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire at some point.

Let us sum up. We have discovered the following synonyms of the name Scotland in a number of old maps: Ros, Ross, Rossia, Scotia, Ecossa and Scocia, all of them references to the Cossacks or to mounted warriors.

Now let us turn to the map of Britain ascribed to the “ancient” Ptolemy nowadays (the alleged II century A.D. – see fig. 18.31). This map was included in his Geography, which was published as late as in the XVI century (by Sebastian Munster – see [1353]). What does Ptolemy call the “Russian” part of Scotland that we discovered on other maps? His map has got the word “Albion” right at the centre; above it we see the name Orduices Parisi (see fig. 18.32). The name must translate as “P-Russians (White Russians) from the Horde.” Albion, which is the name of the entire island, also translates as “White” – possibly, in memory of the White Horde, whose army had settled in the British Isle during the invasion of the XIV-XV century. Also, Ptolemy’s map indicates the name of London in its old form – Trinoantes, or New Troy (see fig. 18.31).
Fig. 18.31. Map ascribed to the “ancient” Ptolemy nowadays, which was published as late as in the XVI century. In the centre of the map, over the word Albion, we see the legend “Orduices Parisi,” which may have once stood for “P-Russians (White Russians) from the Horde.” Taken from [1353].

Fig. 18.32. Fragment of a map of England ascribed to Ptolemy with the legend
The map of Ireland dating from 1754 is just as interesting (see fig. 18.33). Here we see the city and the area of Roscommon (fig. 18.34). The name may have initially stood for “Russian Commune” – alternatively, the second part may be a derivative of the Old Russian word for “horses” – “komoni.” Also, let us remind the reader that our reconstruction suggests the word “Irish” to be another form of the word “Russian.”
the Russians”; alternatively, it may be derived from Russ-Komoni, or “Russian horsemen” – the Cossacks once again. Taken from [1018].

Fig. 18.34. A close-in of a fragment of the previous map with the name Roscommon.

Also, let us recollect the ancient names of London. According to the ancient English chronicles, the city had been known under a variety of different names ([155]). Among them – New Troy, Trinovant, Caerlud, Caeludane, Londinium, Lundres and, finally, London ([155], pages 18, 37 and 232). As we mentioned above, the name Londres is used by the French until the present day, q.v. in the French map of 1754 referred to above (see fig. 18.28). A close-in with the name Londres can be seen in fig. 18.35. This leads us to the following hypothesis. Could the name Lond-Res have initially stood for “Land of the Russians”? The phonetic similarity is definitely there. Later on, in the epoch of the Reformation, many of the old names transformed into something else – for instance, the British Reformists were offended by such references to the old Imperial power, and replaced Londres by London, which is already harmless enough. The French, who had lived across the channel, were more concerned with problems of their own and less so with the ancient names of foreign lands, which might be why the word Londres has survived in French.
Thus, we see a large number of vivid “Russian traces” left by the Ottoman (Ataman) conquest of the XIV-XV century in certain maps of Britain up until the XVIII century. These “anachronisms” were eventually replaced with other names.

We have discussed the name of Scotland in the Middle Ages at length (Ros, Ross, Rossia and so on). There are other Slavic roots in the toponymy of the British Isles. Another good example is Moravia, q.v. on the old map in fig. 18.25. This area is adjacent to Ross, and its border is defined by River Ness. It is common knowledge that Moravia is a Slavic region of Europe – a part of the modern Czech Republic, to be more precise. The name must have also been brought to Britain by the “Mongolian” conquerors; however, it is absent from the modern maps of Britain. In the map of the XVIII century we see it transformed into Murray. This form doesn’t resemble “Moravia,” and shouldn’t provoke any unnecessary questions.

Let us return to the chronicle of Nennius, who reports the following in the chapter entitled “Adventures of the Scots and their Conquest of Hibernia.”

“If anyone wishes to know more about the times when… Hibernia had remained desolate and wasn’t inhabited by anyone, this is what I have learnt from the wisest of the Scots. When the Children of Israel were making their escape from the Egyptians across the Black Sea, the latter party was swallowed by the watery depths, according to the Holy Writ… There was a distinguished Scythian living in Egypt around this time, with a large kin and a great many servants, a refugee from his own land… The surviving Egyptians decided to banish him from Egypt, lest their entire country should fall under his rule” ([577], page 174).

The Scythians were banished as a result, sailing forth and conquering
Hibernia. Nennius describes this event as the conquest of Hibernia by the Scots ([577], page 175). The mediaeval Hibernia is identified as Ireland nowadays; however, it may well have been Spain (Iberia), or some other land. The Great = “Mongolian” Conquest had engulfed enormous parts of Europe, Asia, Africa and America. The descendants of the conquerors who had finally settled in England may have written about the conquest of other lands in their chronicles.

And so, the English chronicler Nennius traces the genealogy of the Scots to the Scythians. His legend of the Egyptian Scythian, who had conquered Britain when the Pharaoh drowned in the Black Sea, chasing the Biblical Moses, allows us to date the conquest of Britain. We shall come up with the XV century A.D. according to Chron6, which is a perfectly natural date for the colonisation of England by the Scythians, or the army of the Russians (the Horde) and the Ottomans. This expansion wave must have reached England in the XV century, followed by expeditions to America sailing across the Atlantic (see Chron6 for more details).

Let us revert to the book of Nennius. It is little wonder that the commentary of the modern historians is somewhat irate. They write the following: “Which Scythia does he mean? Bede the Venerable uses the name ‘Scythia’ for Scandinavia. The legend of the ‘Scythian’ origins of the Scots may owe its existence to the phonetic similarity between the names Scythia and Scotia” ([577], page 272). For some reason, the modern commentator doesn’t mention the fact that the name “Scots” is transcribed as “Scythi” (Scythians) in certain British chronicles ([1442]). Nothing is gained from the replacement of Scythia by Scandinavia – as we discuss it above, some of the old British chronicles identify Scandinavia (Cansi) as Russia: “Cansi, which I believe to be Rosie [Russie in another copy – Auth.]” ([1030]). Let us reiterate that Cansi must be derived from the word Khan, which leaves us with “Khan’s Russia.”

If Scythia was known as Scotland at some point, the following issue becomes all the more important to us. We have seen that the Russian Czar Yaroslav the Wise became reflected in British chronicles as Malescoldus.
Therefore, his full title must ring as “Malescoldus, King of Scotland.” Scaligerian history is aware of several such kings – could one of them identify as Yaroslav or one of his ancestors who had wound up in “insular Scotland” after a chronological and geographical shift?
19.
The five primordial languages of the ancient Britain. The nations that spoke them and the territories they inhabited in the XI-XIV century

We find some important information on the very first page of the Anglo-Saxon chronicle: “Five languages were spoken on this island [Great Britain – Auth.]:

- English,
- British or Welsh,
- Irish,
- Pictish,
- Latin.

… The Picts came from Scythia in the south on battleships; their numbers were few. They had initially disembarked in Northern Ireland and asked the Scots whether they could settle there… The Picts asked the Scots to provide them with wives… Some of the Scots came to Britain from Ireland” ([1442], page 3; see Comment 7).

Does this information contradict the superimposition of the events in question over the epoch of the crusades to Byzantium (the XIII century), or the epoch of the “Mongolian” conquest? It does not; moreover, we find facts to confirm our reconstruction.

1) The name of the Angles (who spoke English) as manifest in the ancient history of Britain reflects that of the Byzantine imperial dynasty – the Angeli.

2) The name Latin must be a reference to the Latin Empire of the XIII century; alternatively, it may be derived from the Slavic word for “people” – “lyud” or “lyudi.”
3a) The name “British” and its equivalent “Welsh” can also be found in the Byzantine and “Mongolian” history of the Middle Ages. It is a trace of the word Brutus (Brother?), and possibly also a reflection of the name Prutenians, or White Russians, q.v. above.

3b) The English term “Welsh” was also known well in mediaeval Byzantium – it suffices to turn to the table that we have compiled after the book of V. I. Matouzova ([517]) in order to get an answer: the Welsh, or the Wlachians, are identified as the Turks.

In general, the term Wlachian (Wolochian) was common for the mediaeval European discourse. The Wlachians had lived in Romania starting with the alleged IX century A.D. ([334], page 352). They founded the Walachian Principality. It is very significant that another name of Walachia had been Czara Romynyanska, or the Romanian Kingdom ([334], page 354). Walachia had reached its peak in the XIV century; its history is closely linked to the history of Turkey. Mediaeval Walachia had waged violent wars against the Ottoman Empire, which were occasionally successful. In the late XIV – early XV century the rulers of Walachia were forced to become vassals of the Ottoman = Ataman Empire ([334], page 356). Thus, the name of Walachia is closely linked to that of the Ottoman Empire.

Moreover, the name Wlachian is also known to us from the actual history of Constantinople. One of the emperor’s primary residences had been the Wlachern Palace ([286], pages 226-229). “The palace had been a residence favoured by the Comneni” ([729], page 137). The Greeks called it Wlachernes.

“Walachia (transcribed as “Blakie”) is a geographical term frequently used by Robert de Clary (as well as Geoffroi de Villehardouin) for referring to some part of the Eastern Balkans, as it is believed” ([729], page 135). Byzantine authors called this territory the Great Wlachia; in other words, the principality had been located on the territory of the modern Bulgaria.

Thus, the Old English term Welsh originally referred to the Balkan
Walachia of the XI-XV century, or, alternatively, to Byzantium and the Ottoman Empire of the XV-XVI century.

4) We needn’t look long to find the prototype of the English Picts in the East. It is common knowledge that the old name of Egypt is Copt, or Gypt ([99]). Therefore, the Picts of the ancient English chronicles are most likely to identify as the Gypts or the Copts – Egyptians or Kipchaks, in other words.

A propos, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is perfectly correct when it tells us that “the Picts came from Scythia in the South” ([1442], page 3). Indeed, according to our reconstruction as presented in Chron6, the Biblical Egypt can be identified as Russia, or the Horde, whose southern regions had been inhabited by the Kipchaks. African Egypt is also a southern country in relation to Scythia.

5) Finally, how can we identify the Irish language? The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle tells us that some of the Scots came from Ireland ([1442], page 3). Moreover, during some historical periods at least, “the term Scots was used for referring to the Scots of Ireland and to the Irish Kingdom of Argyll” ([1442], page 3, Commentary 5; see also Comment 8). Therefore, Ireland had once been inhabited by the Scots. The fact that we managed to identify the Scots of the XII-XV century as the Scythians must also imply that the term “Irish” had been synonymous to the term “Russian” in the epoch in question (RSS or RSH = Russia sans vocalizations); the name “Ireland” may also have referred to Russia once.

The fact that we identify mediaeval Ireland during a certain historical period as Russia (and Scotland, as Scythia) may be perceived as irritating by some of the readers who were raised on Scaligerian history. Nevertheless, this is precisely what the ancient English chronicles are telling us.

Galfridus names the Normans, the Brits, the Saxons, the Picts and the Scots among the nations that had inhabited Britain initially ([155], page 6). We have already mentioned the Brits, the Picts and the Scots; let us now consider the Normans and the Saxons.
6) The Normans did play an important role in mediaeval Byzantium and took part in crusades. However, it is possible that the name is another variation of “Roman” (same old Romans, aka, Romanians, aka Romeans). We already mentioned the fact that in Europe and Asia the word commonly used for “Norman” had been “Rus” (Russian) – in Arabic and in Greek, for instance, q.v. in [866], Volume 3, page 522). Furthermore, Mauro Orbini, a XVI century historian, believe the Normans to be of a Slavic origin (see [617], page 111; also Chron5).

7) This is what historians tell us about the Saxons: “The Saxons were German tribes who had lived in the North of Europe – primarily, in the territories adjacent to the North Sea. In the V-VI century Britain was conquered by the Germanic tribes… Most often, Galfridus uses the term “Saxons” for referring to all these Germanic conquerors, although he occasionally mentions the Angles separately” ([155], pages 229-230).

According to N. M. Karamzin, “Herodotus reports that the Scythians, whom the Persians called Sacs, called themselves Scolots [or Scots – Auth.]” ([362], Volume 1, Comment 1). Furthermore, the same author tells us that “Menander calls the Turks ‘Sacs’, and Theophanops uses the term Massagets” ([362], Volume 1, Comment 51). Thus, the mediaeval Saxons, or Sacs, can be identified as the Scythians, or the Turks. It also becomes clear why Theophanops also used the term “Massagets” – it can be interpreted as “Muscovite Goths,” since they had been Slavs and originated from Russia, or the Horde. The European origins of the Turks also become obvious from the following passage of Karamzin: “Oriental historians claim Japheth’s oldest son to have been called Turk, and the patriarch of said nation … which is of the same root as the Tartars” ([362], Volume 1, Comment 51). Mediaeval chroniclers classified all Europeans as descendants of Japheth – see the “Lavrentyevskaya Chronicle,” for instance ([460], columns 3-4).

Therefore, the ancient English chronicles aren’t referring to hypothetical minor nations that had inhabited the modern British Isles in times immemorial, but rather gigantic mediaeval nations and kingdoms that had
played important roles in European and Asian history of the XI-XVI century. This history was localised and compressed much later, when the Byzantine and “Mongolian” chronicles were transferred to the British Isles, giving birth to local history, compressed geographically and expanded chronologically.
20.
The location of the six initial British kingdoms: East Anglia, Kent, Sussex, Wessex, Essex and Mercia

The answer to the question formulated in the name of the section was de facto given to us in the previous section.

East Anglia, Kent, Sussex, Wessex, Essex and Mercia can be identified as mediaeval European nations of the XIII-XV century that took part in the conquest of Byzantium and the Great = “Mongolian” Invasion, namely:

1) East Anglia is most likely to identify as White Russia (cf. Albion) – also known as Prutenia and Prussia (cf. Britannia), or the White Horde. In fig. 18.36 we reproduce a fragment of an old map that allegedly dates from 1501, where the name “White Russia” is transcribed as RVSIA ALBA SIVE MOSCKOVIA ([1218], Map 4). In other words, White Russia or Moscovia. Apparently, the name Alba was transferred here after the Great = “Mongolian” Conquest of the British Isles, being the name of the white horde – hence Albion.
2) The inhabitants of Kent identify as the Saxons according to J. Blair ([76]). A part of Germany is still known as Saxony. As we explain above, mediaeval Saxons can be identified as the Scythians, the Russians and the Turks, all of them being different names of a single nation.

3) Sussex, the land of the South Saxons, identifies as the Southern Saxony or Southern Scythia, q.v. above.

4) Wessex, the kingdom of the West Saxons as described in the old English chronicles, identifies as Western Saxony or West Scythia, q.v. above.

5) Essex as described by the old English chronicles identifies as East Saxony or East Scythia, q.v. above.

6) Mercia from the old English chronicles. The picture isn’t quite clear
here; we can suggest several variants. For instance, it might identify as Germany (from its mediaeval name Moesia, q.v. in the table of mediaeval synonyms above). The city of Marburg, for instance, was formerly known as Merseburg ([517], page 263). Alternatively, ancient British chronicles may have used the name Mercia for referring to Turkey (one might recollect the city of Mersin in Turkey). Marseilles in France comes to mind as well.

At any rate, we see all of the “ancient Saxon kingdoms” can be located in the XIII-XVI century Europe – it wasn’t until much later that their names were transplanted to the insular British soil. As a result, these territories have “shrunk” and entered school textbooks as the first six kingdoms of England in this shape (dated to the alleged V-VIII century A.D.)
The famous King Arthur as a legendary reflection of the Horde that had invaded the British Isles in the XIV-XVI century

Some of the readers may be unaware of the fact that the legendary English King Arthur, who is considered one of the greatest rulers of the “ancient” England and whose lifetime is dated to roughly the V century A.D. (q.v. in [564], page 835) had maintained relations with the Russian Czar. One of King Arthur’s companions refers to “the King of Russia, the most austere of knights …” This fact is reported by Liamon, the author of the poem cycle entitled “Brutus, or a Chronicle of Britain” ([1239]). His lifetime is dated to the beginning of the alleged XIII century (see also [517], pages 247-248). It is believed that a Russian princess or queen was stolen away from Russia and taken to Britain under King Arthur ([517], page 248).

In fig. 18.37 we reproduce a drawn copy of the cross upon the grave attributed to King Arthur nowadays ([155], pages 64-65). The lettering upon it is of the utmost interest to us. It can be interpreted as Latin (“Here lies …”, etc.). On the other hand, the first word may be read as the Greek word Nicia (see fig. 18.37) – Nicaea or Nike, in other words, which translates from the Greek as “victor.” Also, the representation of Arthur’s name is extremely interesting – we see it transcribed as Rex Artu Rius (Rex Horde Rus, in other words, or the King of the Russian Horde. Mark the fact that “ARTU” and “RIUS” are written as two separate words; had the author of the lettering wanted to transcribe the name as a single word, he could have done it easily – there is plenty of space, q.v. in fig. 18.37. However, if the two words needed to be separated by some sign, the amount of space available would not have sufficed, which is why we see the word “Rius” written below “Artu.”
Later on the name of the king transformed into Arturus, which is also a collation of “Horde” and “Rus,” but less obviously so – this appears to have happened in the XVIII century, the objective being to make the Russian (Horde) origins of the title more vague.

It would also be expedient to note that in the Old English texts the name “Arthur” had been transcribed as “Ardur” ([517], page 247). This makes it sound even closer to the word “Horde” (“Orda,” or “Arda”). Moreover, some modern philologists point out that the name Arthur had initially been written as two words, AR + DU, the second one translating from the Celtic as “black”; they cite Celtic mythology as proof (see [564], page 835, Comment 5, for instance). In this case the name “Arthur” translates as “Black Horde.” Let us remind the reader that Russia had consisted of several Hordes (White, Blue, Golden, etc.). It is possible that the entire Horde had once been known as the “Black Horde” in the Western Europe, hence the name Arthur.

Therefore, what we learn from the ancient sources is that the legendary English King Arthur had in reality been a Czar of the Russian Horde. We encounter another trace of the Russian, or “Mongolian” conquest of the
XIV-XV century, whose waves had also reached the British Isles.

The legends about the Knights of the Round Table are very famous ([564], pages 135 and 573). It is presumed that the knights had formed a state council of sorts, presided by King Arthur, and occupied themselves with the affairs of the state. We are beginning to realise that this English legend must carry an echo of the Horde Council, also known as the Cossack Circle (hence the round shape of the English “Council Table”). In Ukrainian, the State Council is still called “rada,” or “Horde.”

The Russian word for “artillery weapon” (“орудие”) may be derived from the word “Horde” (“orda”), likewise the word artillery. Let us also discuss the possible etymology of the English word “cannon,” which may be derived from the Russian word “samopal” (transcribing as “самопал”). It had been used for referring to firearms up until the XVII century ([187], page 154). If a foreigner attempts to read the Cyrillic word “самопал” as though it were set in Romanic characters, he shall come up with the word CANNON, seeing how M had occasionally been transcribed as two letters N collated into one (this is still visible in case of “m” and “nn”). The Russian letter п could have been read as “n.” This is how the Russian word “самопал” (“samopal”) transformed into the English word “cannon.”

It is most likely that Arthur had never been a local English king; the legend of King Arthur reflects the memories of Russia, or the Horde, which had once conquered the British Isles. This is why the Scaligerian history of Britain cannot find a proper place for King Arthur – his reign is dated to the dark ages these days, an epoch we know nothing of, and one that can house virtually anything. Starting with the XVII-XVIII century and on, Arthur has been regarded as a legendary character for the most part. For instance, we encounter the following words in William Caxton’s preface to Thomas Malory’s Le Morte Darthur:

“Then all these things considered, there can no man reasonably gainsay but there was a king of this land named Arthur. For in all places, Christian and heathen, he is
reputed and taken for one of the nine worthy, and the first of the three Christian men. And also, he is more spoken of beyond the sea, more books made of his noble acts, than there be in England, as well in Dutch, Italian, Spanish, and Greekish, as in French… Then all these things aforesaid alleged, I could not well deny but that there was such a noble king named Arthur” ([564], page 9).

This preface was presumably written to the 1485 edition of “Le Morte Darthur”; in reality, the text cannot predate the XVII century. As we shall demonstrate in further publications, King Arthur is a composite character comprising the three following layers: Emperor Andronicus, or Christ (XII century), Khan (Emperor) Dmitriy Donskoi (XIV century) and the Ottoman = Ataman conquest of the XV-XVI century.
22.
William I the Conqueror and the Battle of Hastings dated to the alleged year 1066. The Fourth Crusade of 1204

22.1. A mutual superimposition of two famous wars in England and in Byzantium

Below we provide an example of English and Byzantine historical events identified as one and the same, respectively. Namely, we shall compare the Scaligerian version of the famous war waged by William I the Conqueror around the alleged year 1066 to its duplicate – the famous Fourth Crusade of circa 1204.

As we have seen in fig. 15.3, which is a scheme of the dynastical superimposition of Byzantine history over its British double, the epoch of the Fourth Crusade falls right over the epoch of William I.

22.2. The English version of William’s biography

In brief, the biography of William in its Scaligerian rendition is as follows (see [64], page 343, for instance). His full name reads as follows: Duke William I of Normandy, also known as the Conqueror and the Bastard ([1442], page 197; also [64]). An old portrait of this monarch can be seen in fig. 16.6.

Edward the Confessor died heirless in 1066. The crown went to one of his dukes, a very powerful figure – Harold II Godwinson, King of Norway and England, without any claims for the throne made by any party ([1442], pages 196 and 197). However, a short while after the ascension of Harold to the throne, William the Bastard, Duke of Normandy, came up with a claim for the kingdom. William declared that Edward had singled him out
as his heir on his deathbed; then he turned to the Pope for help, and managed to make him an ally. Next he sent embassies to Germany and France with pleas for help. William had gathered “a large army of adventurers who came from France, Flanders, Brittany, Aquitania, Burgundy, Apulia and Sicily – a whole horde of swashbucklers ready to loot and pillage England” ([64], page 343). William gathered a huge fleet to invade England. It is interesting that a gigantic old carpet still exists in Baille, 70 metres long and 50 centimetres wide – it is dated to the alleged XI century. The carpet depicts the fleet of William the Conqueror who raises his sails. There are at least 1255 faces and objects depicted on the carpet; some of its fragments can be seen in figs. 18.38-18.42.

Fig. 18.38. “The Conquest of England by the Normans. An XI century carpet from Baille” ([264], Volume 1, page 577). What we see is but a fragment of a truly enormous carpet. Taken from [264], Book 1, page 577.
Fig. 18.39. Fragment of the ancient carpet kept in the city library of Baille. Wool on linen. Manufactured around the alleged years 1073-1083 ([930], page 156). Taken from [930], page 155.

Fig. 18.40. Fragment of the ancient carpet from Baille. Taken from [1052], inset between pages 52 and 53.

Fig. 18.41. Fragment of the ancient carpet from Baille. Taken from [1052], inset between pages 100 and 101.
It turns out that the famed Bayeux Tapestry was made a great deal later. We have discovered a horoscope with a zodiac to be part of the artwork. In “The Baptism of Russia” we demonstrate that it transcribes the following date: 15 March 1495 A.D.

While William was waiting for a suitable wind, the Norwegians cast anchor in the Gamber estuary, led by the treacherous Tostig, brother of Harold.

Harold had turned his army against the enemy and defeated Tostig at York. However, the coast was left unprotected, and a host of Normans disembarked at Pevensey. In spite of his wounds, Harold hastened to drive his army back and to meet his enemy. He did not wait for reinforcements. A violent battle was fought at Senlac Hill near Hastings. Harold got killed, and his army was crushed. “The victory at Senlac Hill was one of the most decisive ones in history; the entire England fell in the hands of the Norman duke, who got crowned in London” ([64], page 344).

William became the lawful monarch of England after his inauguration. He had launched a wave of terror; many Englishmen were declared traitors, and their estates were confiscated. This had provoked a series of rebellions, which were suppressed with great cruelty and savoir-faire. His reign is considered a breakpoint in English history; many pages of the English chronicles are dedicated to his biography – the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, in particular. William is the founder of the Norman dynasty, which had lasted until the alleged year 1154 and was later replaced by the
Anjou dynasty.

### 22.3. The Conquest of Constantinople: Byzantine version

Now let us give a brief synopsis of the conquest of Czar-Grad, or Constantinople, in its Scaligerian version, using [334] for reference. The Fourth Crusade of 1202-1204 was a brainchild of Pope Innocent III. The crusade ended with the conquest of Constantinople and a change of dynasty in the Byzantine Empire. This crusade is presumed to be the most famous in European history. There are many sources in existence that relate this campaign, presumably written by its actual participants. As we demonstrated earlier, the crusades of the early XIII century were reflected in history as “the ancient Trojan War.” See “The Origins of Russia as the Horde” for more details. It is possible that the campaign of 1203-1204 is also a partial reflection of the Great = Mongolian conquest of the early XIV century, which ended up in the XIII century as a result of a chronological error. See more on Innocent II above (Chapter 13, section 23).

The Crusaders requested ships from Venice. Soon, a large fleet set forth towards Constantinople with an army of crusaders. “The plea for help addressed to the Pope and the German king by Prince Alexis, son of the Byzantine emperor Isaac II Angelus, deposed in 1195, served as the casus belli” ([334], page 209). The crusaders were supported by the affluent citizens of France and the German Empire. The Pope also supported the crusaders, albeit having formally “forbidden” them to harm the Christian lands. “Thus, all the most influential political forces of Europe were urging the crusaders to invade Byzantium” ([334], page 209). The crusaders were led by a special council of high-ranking leaders. Boniface of Montferrat was appointed the formal leader of the crusade; however, the military council of the crusaders was presided by Geoffroi de Villehardouin, the famous Marshal of Champagne. He was “an eminent crusader politician and took part in every important diplomatic transaction” ([729], page 125).
There is another reason why Villehardouin’s name is associated with the Fourth Crusade the most often – he is considered the author of the famous book of memoirs entitled “The Conquest of Constantinople” ([1471]; see [286] for more details). Presumably, he had dictated them at the very end of his life.

Scaligerian history proceeds to tell us the following. Having besieged Constantinople in the alleged year 1203, the crusaders restored the power of Emperor Isaac II Angelus. However, he didn’t manage to pay them the entire sum that he had initially promised. The infuriated crusaders took Constantinople by storm in 1204 and pillaged it mercilessly. Whole quarters of the city were burnt to the ground; the famous Temple of Hagia Sophia was looted, and its great treasures disappeared without a trace. The crusaders founded a new state in Byzantium – the Latin Empire (1204-1261). 1204 marks the beginning of the last period in Byzantine history (Byzantium 3, q.v. above). The new Greek dynasty of Byzantium begins with Theodore I Lascaris (1204-1222). His ascension to power is a direct result of the Fourth Crusade, the war against Byzantium and the conquest of Constantinople.

22.4. The parallelism between the events related in the English and the Byzantine chronicles

| b. Byzantium of circa 1204. |


1b. Byzantium. The famous war known as the Fourth Crusade of 1202-1204. Considered a breakpoint in Byzantine history ([287]).

2a. England. The Norman dynasty comes to power in England in
1066; it remains regnant until 1154.

2b. Byzantium. In 1204 the new Latin Empire emerges on Byzantine territory, likewise the Nicaean Empire.


3b. Byzantium. The Latin Empire ceases to exist in 1261, after 60 years of existence.

The scheme in 15.3 superimposes both these dynasties, or empires, over each other, with a rigid shift of some 100-120 years. The Byzantine epoch of 1204-1453 becomes superimposed over the English epoch of the alleged years 1066-1327.


4b. Byzantium. The events are centred around Constantinople, the capital of Byzantium, and its environs.

We have already identified London of the XII-XIV century as Constantinople. Therefore, both capitals become superimposed over each other within the framework of the parallelism in question yet again, confirming the correctness of prior identifications.

5a. England. Harold II is the King of England, regnant as a lawful heir. Harold is considered to have been an Anglo-Saxon king ([334], page 244).

5b. Byzantium. Isaac II Angelus is the emperor of Byzantium and a lawful ruler.

The previous ruler named Harold was Harold the Dane (regnant in 1036-1039). The reign durations of Harold II and Isaac II coincide and equal 1 year in both cases.

■ 6b. Byzantium. Isaac II remains regnant for about 1 year in 1203-1204. This is his second reign; the first one dates from 1185-1195. As we have mentioned above, his first reign must have become reflected in English history as the reign of Harold I.

7a. England. Let us point out the number II in the title of Harold II.

■ 7b. Byzantium. Similarly, we have II in the title of Isaac II.

8a. England. “Anglo-Saxon” sounds similar to Angelus KS.

■ 8b. Byzantium. “Angelus” followed by the unvocalized version of the name Isaac shall sound like Angelus SK. We see similar terms as parts of royal titles in England and Byzantium. We shall voice our considerations in re the name Harold below.


■ 9b. Byzantium. Theodore (Tudor?) I Lascaris, 1204-1222. Byzantine emperor; regnant for 18 years, also a founder of a new dynasty. Some sources indicate 1208 as the beginning of his reign.

Let us point out that the English name Tudor is obviously a version of the Byzantine name Theodor. William comes to power after a war. The biography of Theodore Lascaris is similar – he becomes enthroned after the turmoil of the Fourth Crusade. The “early biography of William” was also affected by the actions of another prominent political figure of the crusade epoch – de Villehardouin, who had contributed to the early political biography of Theodore Lascaris.

10b. *Byzantium*. Villehardouin, the leader of the crusaders, acts as the chief rival of Emperor Isaac II Angelus. Villehardouin comes to Byzantium from abroad as a conqueror, being among the leaders of a large army.

Let us comment the possible similarities between the names of the characters listed above. It is obvious that the names are not and cannot be fully identical. Had this been the case, historians would have noticed it a long time ago and studied the sources with the utmost diligence, possibly discovering the parallelism as a result. However, it is perfectly clear that we are comparing two different groups of sources written in different languages and by representatives of different historical schools, who may also have resided in different countries. The authors of both descriptions are most likely to have lived in the XVI-XVII century, and therefore weren’t actual eyewitnesses of the events in question. Each author, or group of authors, was using ancient documents of the distant XIII century for reference.

These texts were laconic, written in an obscure language and very difficult to decipher. The chronicles were trying to reconstruct a more or less coherent picture of past events, fishing for facts in the murky waters of the past. Fragments of different names may have got shuffled as a result, and passed from character to character.

What we have in the present case is this: William the Conqueror and the Anglo-Saxon King Harold II in the English version versus Villehardouin and Isaac II Angelus in the Byzantine version. The name William may be a derivative of “Ville,” whereas the name Harold may be derived from “Hardouin.” We shall come up with the following table of
correspondences:

1. William = Ville; the second part of Villehardouin’s name may simply translate as “Horde” (“Hardou”). The name Villehardouin must therefore translate as William of the Horde. This is what we get as a result.

2. Conqueror = Conqueror.

3. Normandy = Roman (?)


5. Anglo-Saxon = Angelus + Isaac.

We must be looking at the same names filtered through the chronicles written by different scribes in different languages. Phonetic parallels of this sort are by no means considered valid scientific argumentation; nevertheless, similar names emerging in the English and the Byzantine history simultaneously deserve a closer study, since we are comparing two lengthy dynastic currents, superimposed over each other by a rigid chronological shift that makes the parallelism cover a period of several hundred years.

11a. England. The war begins with the invasion of a large military fleet that disembarked on the English coast.

■ 11b. Byzantium. The crusaders come to Byzantium with a huge military fleet and disembark on the coast of the Byzantine Empire.


■ 12b. Byzantium. The crusade was sanctioned by the Pope, who had nevertheless “begged to have mercy on the Christian halidoms.”

13a. England. William addresses several European monarchs with a request of military assistance, which results in a motley army that represented a great variety of nations.

■ 13b. Byzantium. Villehardouin addresses the envoys of different
European countries with the suggestion to launch a crusade ([286], page 160).

**Commentary.** A propos, mediaeval sources that describe the Fourth Crusade keep talking about the “march to Babylon.” However, according to the Scaligerian version, Babylon had been destroyed many centuries before the crusade epoch and never rebuilt. This is how the modern commentators try to reconcile the embarrassing situation: “The city in question is Cairo in Egypt, which was known as Babylon in the west” ([286], page 161). On the other hand, we already know “Caer,” or “Cairo” to be the British word for “city.” Also, the Fourth Crusade had Czar-Grad as its primary target; “Czar” and “Caer” are the same word. The mediaeval authors who wrote about this crusade must have referred to Czar-Grad as to Babylon.


■ 14b. Byzantium. Isaac II Angelus is killed in the course of the war ([729], page 164).

We can sum up as follows: the written history of the British Isles does not begin with local history, but rather the Trojan War fought at the walls of Czar-Grad in the XIII century A.D. – an event of paramount importance for global history. Byzantine chronicles got included in the local history of the British Isles by mistakes. The chroniclers of the XVI-XVII century mistook the imported old “Mongolian” and Byzantine chronicles for descriptions of ancient events pertaining to the islands.
23.
Mediaeval Russia, or the Horde, as reflected in later English chronicles. The identity of the Galatians, who had received an epistle of Paul the Apostle, and the dating of this event

The results related above lead us to an important corollary. We must thoroughly reconsider the role of the mediaeval Russia, or the Horde, in European and Asian history. After the restoration of the events described in the old English chronicles to their proper chronological place, the epoch of the XI-XVI century, from “deep antiquity,” we discover that these chronicles constantly refer to ancient Russia and the Russians, or the Scythians. Ancient Russian history becomes complemented with a great deal of new information, formerly misdated and misplaced geographically.

The Russian chronicles of the Horde that related the history of Russia and Byzantium wound up in different European, Asian, Northern African and even American countries as a result of the Great = “Mongolian” Conquest. They frequently became part of the “ancient” history in its local versions, which had spawned a great many duplicates of important historical events that took place within the actual Empire – in Byzantium and Russia (the Horde). These duplicates have been part of the “ancient” history of different nations ever since – the “ancient” history of England, for example. Nowadays we are capable of discovering them with the use of formal methods enabling us to tell between various historical duplicates.

It is therefore little wonder that our analysis of the English history gives us a great many new facts to confirm the conception of Russian history related above.

Let us briefly remind the reader that the primary idea voiced in the
course of our reconstruction of the Russian history was that the so-called invasion of the Tartars and the Mongols, interpreted by modern historians as a period of slavery when Russia had been conquered by a hostile foreign force of the Tartars and the Mongols, is really a special period within the actual history of Russia. This was the reign of the Russian Horde dynasty, the Horde being the regular Cossack army responsible for guarding the borders of the country and maintaining order within the Empire. Apart from the horde, there was the civil administration of the princes, whose power had rested on the Horde as a military power and the foundation of peace and order. The name Mongolia must be a corrupted version of the Russian words for “many” and “power” (“mnogo” and “moshch,” respectively) – hence the Greek word for “great,” “Megalion.”

The old Russian and Cossack dynasty of the Horde was deposed in the epoch of the Great Strife (the XVI – early XVII century), and the Great = “Mongolian” Empire fell apart into a multitude of independent states (see Chron6 for more details). The dynasty of the Romanovs became installed in Russia, the centre of the Empire. Their reign was based on altogether different principles. The previous epochs in Russian history were misrepresented by the Romanovian historians in order to justify the usurpation of power by the dynasty in question. In particular, the epoch of the Horde dynasty was declared the “epoch of foreign invasion,” when the country had allegedly been conquered by “malicious invaders” – the Tartars and the Mongols.

We come to the conclusion that the references to the Tartars and the Mongols made by the Western European chroniclers really apply to the ancient Russian kingdom and its regular army, which had conquered the Western Europe and many other lands to boot.

We have pointed out that Western chronicles (English ones in particular) describe Russia under the names of Ruthenia or Rusia (q.v. in the glossary of mediaeval synonyms above). According to V. I. Matouzova, “the fact that the English were interested in Russian history is also explained by the event that had shook the mediaeval Europe thoroughly – the invasion of
the nomadic hordes of the Tartars and the Mongols… The reports of some foreign nation, wild and godless, whose very name was interpreted as “Hordes from Tartar,” had made the mediaeval chroniclers consider them to be the manifestation of divine retribution for human sins” ([517], page 10).

Nowadays it is presumed that the “Mongol and Tartar yoke had severed the ties between Russia and the rest of Europe for a long time. The relations between Russia and England were only resumed in the XVI century – both nations were “rediscovering” each other, in a way… Nearly all the information about Russia accumulated in the British written sources by the end of the XIII century was forgotten… The geographical tractate of Roger Barlow that dates from circa 1540-1541 is rather vague when it locates Russia somewhere in the vicinity of the ‘Sarmatian’ and ‘Gyrcanian’ mountains” ([517], page 12). The latter name might be a reflection of “Georgiy the Khan.”

It is perfectly fascinating that a work written in the XVI century still describes Russia as a mysterious and distant land. However, it is presumed that English embassies had already existed in Russia, likewise the embassies of Austria and other nations. Russia was visited by many foreigners. However, none of it had sufficed for giving the Westerners a correct view of Russia.

We believe this “wall of silence” to date from the XVII century, when the Empire became fragmented. Every independent nation that came to be as a result had tried its best to forget about having been formerly subordinate to the Russian Empire, or the Horde. Ancient documents, maps, etc., were destroyed and replace by freshly-made falsified “ancient sources.” These were conspicuously silent and vague in referring to the land of their former masters so as not to awaken any dangerous memories. This is the very epoch when the tales of the Western chroniclers about the “vicious Tartars and the Mongols” were written – the presumed conquerors of Russia and a menace to the West. All of this was written in the XVII-XVIII century. This epoch also gave birth to the false concept of
the reign of the Russian dynasty as a “harsh foreign yoke over Russia.”

Let us see what the mediaeval English chronicles have to say about Russia. Bartholomaeus Anglicus reports the following, for instance: “Ruthia [the Horde – Auth.], also known as Ruthena, a province of Maesia, is located at the borders of Asia Minor, bordering with the Roman territories in the East, Gothia in the North, Pannonia in the West and Greece in the South. The land is vast; the language spoken here is the one spoken by the Bohemians and the Slavs. A part of this land is called Galatia, and its denizens were formerly known as Galatians. Paul the Apostle is believed to have sent them an epistle” ([1026]; see also [517], page 85, and Comment 9).

Many historians commented on this famous mediaeval text. Maesia is believed to be the old name of Germany ([517], page 93), while Ruthia, or Rutena, identifies as Russia, q.v. above. Moreover, “under Galatia Bartholomaeus Anglicus understands the Galitzk and Volynsk Russia” ([517], page 91). However, as one may expect, modern historians declare the reference to the epistle sent by Paul the Apostle to the Russians erroneous. Indeed – Scaligerian chronology separates the epoch of Paul the Apostle from the events related here by a thousand years at least. The commentary of modern historians to this passage is rather austere: “The Epistle to Galatians written by Paul the Apostle is included in the canon of the New Testament; it obviously bears no relation to the Galitzk and Volynsk Russia” ([517], page 93).

However, the New Chronology gives us no reason to doubt the report of Bartholomaeus, since the epoch of Jesus Christ identifies as the XII century of the new era; thus, the Galatians mentioned in the New Testament as the addressees of Paul the Apostle must have indeed lived in Galitzk and Volynsk.

Another report dates from the alleged XIII century. We find it in the *Annals of the Melrose Monastery* (“Annales Melrosenes”), South Scotland. The correct dating according to the New Chronology is the XIV century – about a century later. This report is presumably the earliest
reference to the “Tartar and Mongol invasion” contained in British sources: “This is when we have first heard of the iniquitous hordes of the Tartars that had lain many a land waste” ([1121]; see also [517], page 98, and Comment 10).

Once again we see that certain English chronicles of the alleged XIII century (the Chronica Monasterii Sancti Edmundi, for instance) consider Russia an island for some reason: “A tribe of great vileness known as the Tartarins came forth from the islands in great multitudes, wreaking havoc upon Hungary and the adjacent lands” ([1446] as well as [517], page 101). However, we have already explained it to the readers that the word “island” must be read as “Asian land” – Russia can indeed be considered one (see Comment 11).

Another possible explanation to the presumed insular nature of Russia is that the old Russian word “ostrov” had other meanings besides “island,” one of them being “forest.” I. Y. Zabelin reports this in particular ([283], page 55). This interpretation leads us to a natural reconstruction – the initial reference had been to a “land of forests.” The scribes eventually forgot the meaning of the Russian word “ostrov” and translated it as “island.” A propos, a part of Moscow is called “Losiny Ostrov” – literally, “Elk Island”; however, there isn’t any water anywhere around it – the area in question is in fact a forest.

Let us also consider the aliases of the famous Genghis-Khan used in the Russian and the European chronicles: “The name Cliyrcam … is another alias of Genghis-Khan, known as Chanogiz and Chigizakon in the Russian chronicles. Other European sources call him Gurgatan, Cecarcarus, Zingiton, Ingischam, Tharsis, David, Presbyter Johannes, etc.” ([517], page 185).

We find the above in the “Annales de Burton” dating from the end of the alleged XIII century. Thus, the Western Europeans had called Genghis-Khan Gurgatan, or Georgiy (Gyurgiy), as well as Caesar the Cyr (Cecarcarus), Tharsis (Persian or P-Russian – White Russian), David and Presbyter Johannes.
Presbyter Johannes can therefore be identified as Genghis-Khan, according to the Western European chronicles. The Westerners must have identified Russia, or the Horde, as the Kingdom of Presbyter Johannes. We must recollect a very interesting statement made by the English chronicles in this respect, namely, that “their leader [leader of the Tartars – Auth.] is St. John the Baptist” (quotation given according to [517], page 152). We see that some of the English chroniclers identified Genghis-Khan the conqueror as the Evangelical John the Baptist. See more on Presbyter Johannes in *Chron5*.

There are many other mediaeval chroniclers that refer to the Tartar and Mongol Horde swarming Europe as a mortal peril; we cannot quote all of them here (see [517], for example). This Horde can be identified as the Russian Army, according to our reconstruction.

Let us conclude with the following fragment. Ethicus Istricus, who had lived in the alleged III century A.D., according to the modern historians, “tells of a vile nation, the descendants of Gog and Magog, which had once confronted Alexander the Great. Ethicus prophesises dramatically that this nation ‘shall bring great devastation in the times of the Antichrist, proclaiming him the Lord of Lords’” ([517], page 221). Ethicus claimed this nation to be “locked away behind the Caspian gates” (Die Kosmographie, page 19).

What epoch did Ethicus Istricus really live in? The III century A.D.? How about Alexander of Macedon, who had fought against Gog and Magog, or the Tartars and the Mongols? We realise that the epoch in question is really the XIV-XVI century A.D. See *Chron6* for more details.
The Great = “Mongolian” Empire fell apart in the XVI-XVII century. A “history rectification campaign” began in the epoch of the mutinous Reformation. The attitude to the “Tartars and the Mongols” changed drastically – they became heavily demonised. In fig. 18.43 we see an illustration to the Chronicle of Matthew of Paris, who had lived in the alleged XIII century. We see the “Tartars and the Mongols” enjoy a quiet meal; the legend underneath the illustration tells us that “the Tartars eat human flesh.” We see a roasting human carcass (fig. 18.44) with severed human heads and limbs piled up nearby. A very vivid illustration to the customs of the Tartars – savages and cannibals that have got nothing in common with the enlightened West Europeans.

Fig. 18.43. Ancient illustration from the Chronicle of Matthew of Paris depicting the “Tartars and Mongols” having lunch. The commentary is authoritative enough: “Tartars
eating human flesh.” This is how they started to portray warriors of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire a posteriori, in the XVI-XVII century, after the victory of the mutinous Reformers in the Western Europe. Taken from [1268], page 14.

Fig. 18.44. Fragment of the previous illustration: a close-in. Such visual aids were used in the XVII-XVIII century in order to make the Tartars and the Mongols look disgusting and ugly to the Western Europeans.

Similar tales were told about the Scythians. Solinus, for instance, is very confident when he tells us about “the Scythians from the inland regions who live in caves like savages… They rejoice in battles and drink the blood from the wounds of the slain. Their glory grows as they kill more people; it is a disgrace not to kill anyone” (quotation given according to [953], page 219).

Another outburst of similar sentiments comes from Ethicus Istricus, who addresses the North-East in the following manner: “O Aquilon, thou mother of dragons, cradle of scorpions, nest of snakes and hotbed of demons!” (quotation given in accordance with [953], page 20).

All of the above horror stories are nothing but Western European agitprop of the Reformation epoch (the XVI-XVIII century). Another vivid image they used was that of the vicious Russian bear looming over Europe. Modern historian tell us the following about the “Ursus,” or the bear as depicted in the mediaeval maps: “The bear in the North-East of Europe. The Hereford map might shed some light over the origins of the
‘Russian Bear’ as an English stereotype that became common in the Elizabethan epoch… There were attempts to trace the origins of this Elizabethan stereotype to the early Christian symbolism, where both the North and the bear were considered symbols of evil forces… Finally, both unclean animals [the bear and the ape – Auth.] were included in the diet of the “Turks of the Gog and Magog genus” ([953], page 230. The very Latin word for “bear,” “ursus,” might be another version of the word Russian.

Let us also consider “an engraving that depicts the Goths entitled ‘On the Goths and their Cruelty’ from the “Cosmography” of Sebastian Munster published in the alleged year 1550 ([578], Book 1, page 71, ill. 61; see fig. 18.45). We see the Goths (or the Cossacks). The fourth one from the left has the head of a bird of prey with a large beak – it is obvious that the characters in question are extremely malicious and evil, isn’t it?

Fig. 18.45. Ancient engraving from Sebastian Munster’s “Cosmography,” allegedly dating from 1550. The French inscription on top translates as follows: “The Goths and their Cruelty.” This is a typical example of what the Reformation epoch agitprop had looked like. This is how the Goths, or the Cossacks, have been portrayed since the XVII-XVIII century. Taken from [578], Volume 1, page 71, illustration 61.

Let us conclude with the following curious detail. In fig. 18.46 we reproduce “The Map of Great Britain by Matthew of Paris.” Historians call it “a famous map known in four versions” ([1177], Volume 1, map 29). Nowadays it is dated to the XIII century, or the presumed lifetime of Matthew of Paris. Historians are very fond of including this map into
various publications as an example of the cartographic art of the XIII century. It is treated very reverently these days. The map is a real work of art, accurately and lavishly coloured. A fragment of the same map in a different version was reproduced above in fig. 18.14.

Fig. 18.46. The famous map of Britain ascribed to Matthew of Paris nowadays. (He is presumed to have lived in the XIII century. However, it is most likely to be a recent forgery dating to the XVII-XVIII century the earliest.) Taken from [1177], Volume 1,
Fig. 18.47. Fragment of the map drawn by Matthew of Paris: a close-in. We don’t see the name Ros (or Rossia) applied to any part of Scotland. Taken from [1177], Volume 1, map 39.

However, a detailed study of the “famous ancient map” by Matthew of Paris, q.v. in fig. 18.46, leaves us confused. For instance, we notice that the area of Scotland called Ros or Ross has disappeared without a trace (see fig. 18.47). We have however seen that this name had been present on the map of Scotland up until the XVIII century (q.v. in the fragment of a map dating from 1755 reproduced in fig. 18.18, for example). It wasn’t until much later that the “dangerous” name had disappeared from the map of Britain. As we can see, somebody had also removed it from the “famous ancient map” compiled by Matthew of Paris, whose portrait can be seen in fig. 18.46. However, another version of the same map as reproduced in fig. 18.14 above retains the name Ros as part of the Scottish geography. This version appears to be older – it must have escaped the clutches of the XVIII-XIX century historians. Possibly, it was edited less fastidiously.

It is therefore likely that the “famous ancient version” of Matthew’s map as reproduced in fig. 18.46 was created by hoaxers in the XVII-XVIII century the earliest as a “visual aid” to the Scaligerian history, which was introduced around this time. The map was made to look “ancient” –
however, it was done way too accurately. It is obvious that all the old names had been edited tendentiously. In particular, this “ancient” map refers to the capital of England as to London, which is a modern term. We have already mentioned the fact that several ancient English chronicles trace the name “Britain” to Brutus – possibly, a brother of Julius Caesar, or Youri the Czar. Some of these maps transcribe “Britannicus” as “Brita Nikus” – two separate words (see a fragment of a map compiled by Jean-Baptiste Wrientz in 1606 reproduced in fig. 18.48). The two words must have once stood for “Brutus the Nicaean,” or “Victory of Brutus,” or “Brutus the Victor,” bearing in mind the Greek word for Victory, “nike.”

Fig. 18.48. Fragment of a map dating from 1606 where the word “Britannicus” is transcribed as two words – “Brita Nicus” – Brutus the Victor, or the Victory of Brutus (Brother?). Taken from [1160], page 105, map 4.18.

Another map, compiled by George Lily in the alleged year 1526, contains the name “Mare Britanicum” – “Sea of Brutus the Victor,” in other words. A fragment of the map can be seen in fig. 18.49.
Fig. 18.49. Fragment of George Lily’s map allegedly compiled in Venice in 1526. The sea is called Mare Britanicum, or Sea of Brutus the Victor. Taken from [1160], page 161, map 5.43.

The name “Germany” may also bear relation to the word “brat,” or “brother” – Brutenia, Pruthenia and so on. The fact that the Spanish word for “brother” is “hermano” is hardly a chance occurrence. The name “Germany” may have been synonymous to “Britain,” translating as “Brotherly Nation.” One must also note the phonetic similarity between the word “Britannia” and the Slavic word “brataniye,” “brotherhood.”
Comments

Comment 1. “The question of provenance and interdependence of the various versions [of the Chronicle] are so complicated that any discussion soon assumes the appearance of an essay in higher mathematics” ([1442], page xxxi).

Comment 2. “Any account of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is necessarily based on Charles Plummer’s revision of the edition of John Earle (1865) which was published in two volumes by the Oxford University Press in 1892-9… Plummers’ edition … gives prominence on opposite pages to manuscripts A and E, associated respectively with the names of Archbishop Parker (1504-75) and Archbishop Laud (1573-1645)… The other manuscripts were once in the possession of Sir Robert Cotton (1571-1631), and are to be found in the Cottonian collection of manuscripts in the British Museum” ([1442], page xxxi).

Comment 3. “Thanks to the example of Bede, the Chronicle is the first history written in English to use his mastery innovation of reckoning years as from the Incarnation of Our Lord – ‘Years of Grace’ as they were called in England” ([1442], page xxiv).

Comment 4. “In this year the city of Romans was taken by assault by the Goths, eleven hundred and ten years after it was built. Afterwards, beyond that, the kings of the Romans ruled no longer in Britain; in all they had reigned there four hundred and seventy years since Julius Caesar first came to the country” ([1442], page 11).

Comment 5. “Une isle i a par non Cancie [Canzie in manuscript B, q.v. in [517], page 240, - Auth.] e si crei bien que c’est Rosie [Russie in
manuscript B, q.v. in [517], page 240 – Auth.] qui est de la grant mer salee
de totes parz avironnee. Dunc autresi com les euetes de lor diverses
maisonnetes de ceus qui sunt irie’ sunt en estor glaive sachie’, tost e isnel
d’ire esbrasez, trestot eissi e plus assez seuct icil poples fors eissir por les
granz rennes envair e por faire les granz ocises, les granz gaaiz e les
conquises.”

Comment 6. “The first inhabitants of this land were the Britons, who
came from Armenia” ([1442], page 3).

Comment 7. “Here in this island are five languages: English, British or
Welsh, Irish, Pictish, and Latin… Picts came from the south from Scythia
with warships, not many, and landed at first in northern Ireland, and there
asked the Scots if they might dwell there… And the Picts asked the Scots
for wives… A part of Scots went from Ireland into Britain” (ibid.).

Comment 8. “Down to the time of Alfred this term Scottas refers either
to the Scots of Ireland or of the Irish kingdom of Argyll” ([1442], page 3,
Comment 5).

Comment 9. “Ruthia, sive Ruthena, quae et Mesiae est provincia, in
Minoris Asiae confinio constituta Romanorum terminos est habens ab
oriente, Gothiam a septentrione, Pannoniam ab occidente, Graeciam vero a
meridie. Terra quidem est maxima concordans cum Bohemis et Sclavis in
ideomate et lingua. Haec autem quadam parte sui Galacia est vocata et eius
incolae quandam Galathae vocabantur, quibus dicitur Paulus Apostolus
direxisse epistolam. Quaere supra Galacia” ([1026]; also [517], page 77).

Comment 10. “Hic primo auditur in terra nostra, quod nefandus
exercitus Tartareorum multas terras vastavit” ([1121]; also [517], pages 98
—99).
Comment 11. “Gens nafanda dicta Tartarins que nuper de insulis ebulliens superficiem terre impleuerat Hungariam cum adiacentibus regionibus devastat” ([1446]; also [517], page 101).
What mainstream historians say about the New Chronology?

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 Polyane, 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.
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 mis dated 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.)
Sample Fomenko parallelism.

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. *(Chron 1, 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)

Afterword from the publisher

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

- radiocarbon dating methods pass the black box tests, or
- astronomy refutes their results on ancient eclipses, or
- US astrophysicist Robert Newton was proved wrong to accuse Ptolemy of his crime.

At present, historians do not, can not, and will not comply. The radiocarbon dating labs run their very costly tests only if the sample to be dated is accompanied with an 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.
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inevitable in the publication of separate books. All of this resulted in the inclusion of a great number of additional material in the current edition – including previously unpublished data. The reader shall find a systematic rendition of detailed criticisms of the consensual (Scaligerian) chronology, the descriptions of the methods offered by mathematical statistics and natural sciences that the authors have discovered and researched, as well as the new hypothetical reconstruction of global history up until the XVIII century. Our previous books on the subject of chronology were created in the period of naissance and rather turbulent infancy of the new paradigm, full of complications and involved issues, which often resulted in the formulation of multi-optional hypotheses. The present edition pioneers in formulating a consecutive unified concept of the reconstruction of ancient history – one that apparently is supported by a truly immense body of evidence. Nevertheless, it is understandable that its elements may occasionally be in need of revision or elaboration.
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