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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!
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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
The problem of reconstructing the veracious version of Roman history

The amended chronology of Rome and Byzantium was presented in the works of A. T. Fomenko (see *Chron1* and *Chron2*). It is based on extensive computer calculations made in the course of analysing the entire volume of historical and chronological data available today from the natural scientific point of view. As it turns out, the history of the “ancient” Rome can be identified as the history of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire of the XIII-XVI century, whose Metropolitan centre was the area of the Russian cities Vladimir and Suzdal. The “ancient” Roman emperors are phantom reflections of the Russian Czars (or Khans of the Horde) from the XIV-XVI century. See our books “The Origins of Russia as the Horde” and “Regal Rome in Mesopotamia: between the Oka and the Volga” for more details.
1. The chronological structure of the modern “history textbook”

Let us recollect the primary result of the new chronology, which was initially formulated by A. T. Fomenko (see *Chron1* and *Chron2*). It can be related in brief as follows.

1. The consensual version of the global ancient and mediaeval chronology is apparently incorrect. It was first presented in the works of the scholastic chronologists of the XVI-XVII century, J. Scaliger and D. Petavius. Most professional historians of our epoch do not dispute this version, although its veracity was put to doubt by a number of scientists.

2. The historical and chronological version of Scaliger and Petavius contains a number of phantom duplicates, or repeated rendition of the same historical events that are presented as different ones and dated to different historical epochs, which are often separated by centuries and even millennia.

3. All the events dated to the epochs that precede 1000 A.D. in the version of Scaliger and Petavius are phantoms that reflect more recent events in reality. Therefore, the veracious documented history begins around 1000 A.D. the earliest. We are by no means trying to imply that there had been “no history” prior to that – all we are saying is that no records of earlier events have reached our time. They were replaced by phantom duplicates of later events in the chronological version of Scaliger and Petavius.

4. Events dated to the period between 1000 and 1300 A.D. can be divided into two layers, the first one corresponding to the events that received correct datings in Scaligerian version, or the real historical
layer of that epoch. The second layer corresponds to the events that were dated incorrectly and reflect later events of the XIII-XVII century. This is the phantom layer of the epoch of the X-XIII century, which consists of the events that became misplaced on the time axis. Their correct chronological position corresponds to the epoch of the XIV-XVI century. In other words, the period between 1000 and 1300 A.D. as reflected in the consensual chronological version is a bizarre mixture of real events with correct datings and phantom events whose real datings pertain to later epochs.

5. As for the historical period that postdates 1300 A.D., the chronological version of Scaliger and Petavius reflects it correctly for the most part, although in certain cases the chronological shift of 100 years manifests after 1300. Chronological duplicates only disappear from the Scaligerian version completely starting with the XVI century. In other words, the chronology outlined in the Scaligerian history textbook can only be trusted from the XVII century the earliest. We shall withhold from criticising the Scaligerian version presently – the critical part has a long history of its own, which is related in detail in Chron1 by A. T. Fomenko. It contains an analysis of the global chronology according to the “history textbook” based on the new empirico-statistical methods developed for this particular purpose; they made it possible to locate the parts of the “history textbook” that duplicate each other. It turned out that the general system of chronological duplicates is rather simple – basically, the modern “consensual history textbook” is a collation of the same chronicle in four copies, shifted in relation to each other by 333, 720, 1053 and 1800 years, respectively.

This is the general construction of the erroneous chronological version insisted upon by Scaliger and Petavius. However, when studied more attentively, the scheme gets more complex, since every single epoch in ancient and mediaeval history contains minor phantoms of its own, as well as distortions, gaps and erroneous insets. The works of the authors (see
Chron1, Chron2 and Chron3) suggest the application of several new empirico-statistical methods that allow for more detailed chronological analysis and more effective duplicate location.
2. The problem of chronological result interpretation in the reconstruction of the true ancient history

Unfortunately, the structure of chronological duplicates per se is insufficient for the unambiguous reconstruction of the ancient and mediaeval history. The matter is that the New Chronology can be interpreted in a number of ways.

Indeed, let us assume that a mathematical and statistical research discovered that the sections, or chapters, $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X^n$ of the erroneous “history textbooks” that correspond to the different epochs $T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_n$ are in fact duplicates of each other and all relate the same events. How can this formal result be conceptualised with the use of familiar historical images? How can we approach such questions as, “When did Julius Caesar live?” and “What language did he speak?” In other words, how do we write a single veracious chapter instead of several unveracious ones? First and foremost, we must answer the following question: Which ones of the chapters or chronicles ($X_1, \ldots, X_n$) can be considered “original events”.

It is only after this location of original events and their dating that we can enquire about the chronological and geographical origins of Julius Caesar, for instance. The answers to such questions shall also be rather complex, along the lines of: “The biography of Julius Caesar is a collation of several historical biographies of different persons, their epoch and geographical location being such-and-such”. We shall have to extract these biographies from the very same “history textbook”, doing our best to cleanse them from fictional elements and facts transplanted from the biographies of other historical personalities. This cannot always be done unambiguously.

Our guiding principles shall be as follows.
3.
The principle of the veracity of the “general concepts” as related in the ancient documents

3.1. Traces of the true history and the original chronological tradition

It would be natural to assume that Scaliger, Petavius and other chronologists of the XVI-XVII century had based their construction of a global chronology upon some initially correct historical concept that had reached them as a tradition, based upon commonly known facts that weren’t estimated in the course of their research. After all, they couldn’t have constructed a whole new history and chronology from scratch – it is obvious that the chronologists needed to adhere to some general historical concepts prevalent in their epoch to some extent, otherwise nobody would have believed them, and their chronological constructions would have been wiped out of existence promptly.

Traces of the old tradition that appears to have been veracious must inevitably be present in the Scaligerian version of history. Such traces can occasionally be identified in sources and separated from later layers.

The remains of the old tradition usually look like simple and stable formulae, or general concepts related in more or less the same words by different sources. These solidified remnants of the ancient tradition turn out to be mines of valuable information. The principle of the correctness of these general concepts requires the reconstructed version of history to correspond with the remnants of the old chronological tradition of the XIV-XVI century, which can be procured from some of the documents that have survived until our days. We are unlikely to find traces of any older tradition, since they have become completely obliterated from the documented history of humankind.
The principle formulated above is based on the research results of A. T. Fomenko as related in *Chron1*, claiming that the texts that have survived until our time only describe the historical period starting with the XI century A.D. and on, with more or less detailed accounts of events appearing around 1300 A.D. the earliest.

Therefore, the historical tradition of the XIV-XVI century had been chronologically close to the initial period of documented history. One may therefore assume this tradition to have possessed correct historical data. However, it was destroyed in the XVII-XVIII century. This process is described in *Chron6*, as well as the motivation behind it. The erroneous alternative historical and chronological tradition of Scaliger and Petavius was introduced XVI-XVIII century; first it spread across the Western Europe, and then took over the entire world. Critical analysis of this system’s chronological foundation must have been implicitly tabooed in historical science all along. The taboo is still very much alive, which is why the issue in question is never discussed by anyone.

Let us ponder the historical information that could have survived the gap in written tradition, remaining firmly recorded in human memory by the XVII-XVIII century. It shall obviously have the appearance of general and rough historical concepts, which were easy to formulate and learn and hard to forget. Indeed, some such concepts have survived as rigidified formulae and general ideas scattered across the surviving texts of the XVII-XVIII century. As a rule, these formulae are absent from the texts of more recent authors.

The Scaligerites treat these remnants of the old tradition with utter contempt, believing them to be “mediaeval myths” that contradict the “obvious historical reality”.

3.2. The mediaeval concept of three kingdoms put in a sequence

Let us cite an example. Each and every mediaeval chronologist including
Scaliger had adhered to a single concept of dynastic changes inherent in history, namely, that a certain centre of world domination had existed ever since the earliest days of human history – the capital of the Emperor. This centre moved its location a number of times, which divides history into three epochs with three regnant dynasties:

1. *The Babylonian monarchy*, originally Assyrian and Chaldaean, then Persian and Median, with Babylon as its capital.
2. *The Greek or Macedonian monarchy* with its capital in Alexandria. This city is believed to have been founded and made capital by Alexander the Great.
3. *The Roman monarchy* with its capital in Rome. The Scaligerian version of history considers Rome to have been the last monarchy to span the world. It was followed by the division into the Eastern and Western Roman Empire; those two states, in turn, became fragmented even further, forming a multitude of independent kingdoms and principalities.

This division of the world history into three epochs was supported by many authors as late as in the XVIII century. Then the false Scaligerian chronology of the “ancient” Egypt was introduced, one that was stretched into many millennia. Another “leap into the antiquity” was made, and the old theory of the three successive kingdoms was forgotten. Nevertheless, traces of this old theory remain in the modern “history textbook” – this is, however, largely de-emphasised nowadays.

Moreover, other terminology is used – this process is called “civilization succession”. The area between Tigris and Euphrates, or the Babylonian kingdom, is presumed to be the cradle of civilization. Then the balance of cultural and political domination had shifted towards the “ancient” Greece, and finally to Rome in Italy.

The old concept of three successive kingdoms is obviously present in the Scaligerian version of Roman history. Indeed, we see the foundation of the Greek Kingdom in the alleged IV century A.D. according to the
Scaligerian history, its capital being in New Rome, or Constantinople, which is where Constantine the Great had transferred his capital. Constantinople remains the capital of the world in Scaligerian history up until the end of the VIII century (formally at least). This is the epoch when the new Western Roman Empire is founded in Europe by Charlemagne – it does not recognise the authority of Constantinople anymore.

The Lutheran Chronograph of 1680, for instance ([940]), which reflects the German Protestant tradition of the XVII century, based on the actual works of Scaliger, Calvisius, Petavius and other chronologists of that epoch, divides the final Roman monarchy into the following separate periods: “This monarchy can also be divided into the following three primary epoch:

1. The Italian or Latin Caesars up until Constantine the Great [we see Italy identified as Latinia once again – TL and LT unvocalized – Auth.]
2. The epoch of the Greek Kings of Constantinople up until Carolus Magnus [the Greek kingdom is once again identified as Byzantium and Constantinople – Auth.] 
3. The epoch of the German kings” ([940]).
4.
The geographic localisation principle as applied to the ancient historical events and based on the maps of the XVII-XVIII century

Apparently, one must search the “ancient” geographical names as mentioned in the ancient sources in the maps of the XVII-XVIII century first and foremost. This search often proves successful, and we learn the correct localisations of certain “ancient” events. It turns out that many “ancient” geographic names exist until the present day; however, Scaligerian history locates them differently. We shall cite a number of examples.

*Macedonia* – a historical region and a modern country located in the Slavic Balkans and not anywhere in the “ancient” Greece.

*France*, or *Francia* – a modern state in the Western Europe. The name Franks as encountered in mediaeval sources may have referred to the Balkan Thracians and not just the French – this may have led to confusion, and apparently did.

*Bythynia* (*Bethyl*, or *Bethlehem*) – a region in Asia Minor, near Constantinople (Istanbul). The famous ancient city of Nicaea is located here; presumably – the modern Turkish city of Iznik ([85], Volume 29, page 618).

Also, bear in mind the fact that traditional Byzantine and Russian iconography stipulates the representations of the cross to be accompanied by the work NIKA (Nicaea?) For instance, on the reverse of the famous icon known as “Our Lady of Vladimir” we find a cross with just two inscriptions – “IC XC” (Jesus Christ) and “NIKA” ([80], page 82; see figs. 19.1 and 19.2).
Fig. 19.1. The reverse of the famous icon known as “Our Lady of Vladimir”. The only lettering we see next to the cross reads as “IC” and “NIKA” – Jesus Christ and Nika (Nike). Taken from [80], page 85.

Fig. 19.2. The reverse of “Our Lady of Vladimir”: close-in of the fragment with the lettering. Taken from [80], page 85.

Gaul – the historical name of France; possibly identifies as the Evangelical Galilee. Also, Gaul (or Galilee) might be identified as the Galitsk and Volynsk regions of Russia, or Galich near Yaroslavl, the capital of the ancient Galitskoye (Galichskoye) Principality.

Cannes – a city in France (Gaul), near Nice. It may have become reflected in the Gospels as Canaan in Galilee, a town that exists until the present day. Its name could have stood for “Khan” initially. Or, alternatively, Galich near Yaroslavl (the city of the Khans in the Galitsk
and Volynsk regions of Russia).

*Babylon* – the mediaeval name of Cairo or some other city in the vicinity of Cairo ([1268], page 145); also a name of Baghdad.

*Jerusalem* (the Kingdom of Jerusalem) – the mediaeval name of the state located on the Isle of Cyprus. It must be pointed out that the historical name of the city known as Jerusalem today is really Al-Quds – there were other Jerusalems, qv in *Chron6*. 
5. The principle of estimating the age of a given text by the time of its first mass publication

5.1. The epoch when a text was published in a large number of copies must be close to the epoch of said text’s creation

Let us assume that we have two sources at our disposal, which are known to describe the same events. Which of the two should we consider to be more realistic and informative than the other?

The information obliteration principle as formulated by A. T. Fomenko in *Chron1* postulates that information is forgotten more or less evenly and monotonously. As a rule, it is never recollected upon its obliteration from human memory. The implication is that the older the source, the more veracious information it contains. But how does one estimate the age of a text?

It would make sense to assume that the earlier the text became published in a multitude of copies, the older and the more informative it is. For example, it could have been printed or copied by hand in a large number of identical copies, many of which have reached our age. Only mass copying can guarantee that the source in question did not undergo a tendentious editing at a latter point, since the destruction of every old copy is next to impossible. It is therefore a sound idea to compare the age of sources, or, rather, their surviving editions, by comparing the time that the documents in question came out in a large number of copies.

This is the actual principle of estimating the epoch when a given text was written from the epoch when it had first entered mass circulation. The principle is doubtlessly rather rough; however, it often proves useful.

5.2. Comparing the respective ages of the New Testament and
Let us turn to the Bible, for example. We have been taught to believe its very first books to be the oldest, with the Old Testament predating the New in general and relating events of more ancient epochs. However, according to the results of statistical chronology, qv in *Chron1*, both the Old and the New Testament describe mediaeval events, starting with the XI century and on. Hence the great significance of the question of their respective chronological priority. If we are to follow the principle of estimating the age of a text by ascribing it to the epoch when it had first entered wide circulation, the answer will be perfectly unambiguous – the books of the New Testament are older. At the very least, the Gospels and the Apostles predate the books of the Old Testament, excluding the Psalms. The three books mentioned above appear to be the oldest ones in the entire canon of the Bible.

Indeed, these are the only books that were published as a multitude of standardised handwritten copies in the XIV-XVI century, and many of them have survived until our day. This must have been the very first attempt to mass-produce a text before the invention of the printed press. The necessity for such a great number of copies is explained by the use of these particular books of the Bible during ecclesiastical services – every church needed a copy. Let us also remind the readers that Sunday service took place simultaneously in every church. A. V. Kartashov points out that these books are the only ones that weren’t edited during the preparation of the first printed editions of the Bible in the XVI-XVII century, since they were “too common and recognised by everybody”, and therefore impossible to edit without anyone noticing ([372], Volume 1, page 602).

The situation with the books of the Old Testament is radically different. It is known well to the specialists that the books of the Old Testament had been edited over and over again up until the XVII century. Their final edition is believed to have been canonised in the West as late as in the end of the XVI century (at the Trident Council in Italy). Such late canonisation
may be partially explained by numerous discrepancies between different manuscripts of the Old Testament.

It is very important that the books included in the Old Testament had not been in wide circulation before the XVII-XVIII century. Moreover, “The papal bull issued by Gregory IX in 1231 forbade to read it [the Old Testament of the Bible – Auth.]; the ban was only lifted formally at the Second Vatican Council [already in the XX century! – Auth.]” ([205], page 67). As for the Oriental Church, it hadn’t used any of the Old Testament books for just a few exceptions up until the end of the XVI-XVII century. Those were replaced by the Palaion, which relates the same events as the Old Testament, but in a perfectly different key (see Chron6 for more details).

The Slavic Bible know to us today was first printed by Ivan Fyodorov in 1581 after a Greek manuscript sent from Constantinople. In his foreword he says that he finds the available Slavic manuscripts incorrect in many instances (see fig. 19.3). The Greek Bible was only published in the XVIII century – in Russia. One cannot fail but notice the chronological coincidence between the canonisation of the Bible at the Trident Council and the publication of the first Slavic bible (see Chron6).
Fig. 19.3. A page from the Ostrog Bible dating from 1582 ([621]), although the date in question strikes us as dubious. This page contains a fragment of Ivan Fyodorov’s foreword, wherein he relates the history of his attempts to publish the Bible. Ivan Fyodorov complains about having been unable to find a single complete handwritten Bible in Slavonic. It took him a lot of effort to get hold of a complete Slavonic Bible, which was translated “in the reign of Vladimir the Great, who had baptised the Russian land”. However, it turned out that the Bible in question had differed from all the other Bibles rather drastically, which made it unfit for publication, much to the confusion of Ivan Fyodorov, as he tells us. The old Muscovite Bible of Vladimir the Holy seen by Ivan Fyodorov disappeared. See *Chron6* for more details.
Therefore, a rough estimate of the Old Testament’s age as obtained from the datings of the oldest editions available to date shall leave us with the late XVI century as the time of its creation. A similar estimate of the Gospels, the Apostles and the Psalms shall date them to the XIV century. Apparently, no earlier texts have survived.
PART TWO

The Great War, the Great Empire and the Great Crusades
6.

World wars before the XVII century

6.1. The “Great Exodus” reflected ten or thirteen times in the Scaliger-Petavius history textbook

Let us briefly recollect the construction of the “consensual history textbook”, which reflects the Scaligerian version. According to one of the primary results of A. T. Fomenko’s statistical chronology, this “textbook” can be decomposed into a series of relatively brief epochs, which duplicate one another and serve as a skeleton of the entire global chronology. These duplicate epochs are accompanied by descriptions of a great war, which usually ends with an “exodus” of the defeated party, a trinity of great rulers, or both. The global chronological map by A. T. Fomenko in Chron1 uses the term “Gothic and Trojan Wars” for referring to this series of duplicates, since it comprises the famous Gothic War and Trojan War.

The accounts of both wars are intertwined with the motif of a great exile, or exodus, considered extremely important by the mediaeval chroniclers. Even the relatively recent chronicles that date from the end of the XVII century often use the “Great Exodus” as the primary historical watershed. The Lutheran Chronograph of 1680, for instance, suggests dividing the entire history starting with the days of Adam into ten “exoduses”.

It is most significant that the methods of statistical chronology as related in Chron1 and Chron2 revealed thirteen historical epochs, or blocks, which appear to be the chronological duplicates of the Gothic and the Trojan War, as well as the exodus. In other words, the “consensual history textbook” contains a total of thirteen exoduses; two of the duplicate pairs are in immediate proximity to each other. This is why we see ten or eleven exoduses.
Could there have been several “exoduses” in real history? If so, we are instantly confronted with the issues of their exact number, correct dating and geographical localisation. The mediaeval “exodus theory” is explained well by the results of the statistical chronology. They fall over the very places of the Scaligerian history textbooks where one finds the collation points between the duplicate chronicles – mediaeval chronologists usually placed descriptions of great wars and exoduses here.

In other words, the great wars, or the exoduses, divide the Scaligerian textbook into more or less homogeneous duplicate blocks, marking the collation points between them. It goes without saying that the latter have been diligently concealed under many layers of plaster – owing to the efforts of the XIX century for the most part. It is extremely difficult to see them using conventional observation methods – however, those offered by statistical chronology revealed these points to us.

A series of great wars, or exoduses, divides the “consensual textbook” into several sequences of stable imperial reigns, each of them equalling 200 to 400 years. In *Chron1* and *Chron2* we demonstrate that all these “imperial periods” in the ancient and mediaeval history duplicate each other. They are based on just two originals – some ancient empire of the XI-XIII century and the Great = “Mongolian” Empire of the XIV-XVI century. In the “Occidental” version, the “Mongolian” Empire must have become reflected as the Hohenstaufen Empire of the alleged XI-XIII century and the “Western” Habsburg Empire of the XIII-XVI century.

6.2. The first and oldest possible original of the great wars, or exoduses

Thus, most of the events that predate 1000 A.D., as well as a number of events between 1000 and 1600 A.D. need to be re-dated to a more recent epoch, qv in *Chron1* and *Chron2*. Let us use these results as starting points in our attempts to find the originals of the great wars, or exoduses – the ones that mark break points in consensual chronology and have
spawned a multitude of duplicates in “distant past”, in the epoch that postdates 1000 A.D. First of all, let us briefly formulate our primary hypothesis, giving a list of the four possible originals.

The first original: the epoch of Christ, or the XII century.

This may be the very epoch of the First Crusade (allegedly the end of the XI century) = Fourth Crusade (the beginning of the XIII century), and also the epoch of the ancient Empire, which was the predecessor of the Great = "Mongolian" Empire, whose imperial dynasty had later ruled as the Czars of the Russian Great (“Mongolian”) Empire of the XIV-XVI century. These monarchs must have indeed traced their lineage all the way up to Jesus Christ, or at least considered themselves to be his kin. The royal dynasty of the Great Empire perished during the Great Strife and the dissolution of the Empire in the XVII century.

The XI century is the oldest epoch in the documented history of humankind, and the entire volume of information pertaining thereto available to us today is very meagre indeed.

6.3. The second possible original of the great wars, or exoduses

The second original is the world war of the XIII century, also known as the Trojan War; it was fought for the city of Czar-Grad, or the capital of the ancient Empire.

The Fourth Crusade of 1203-1204, the conquest of Constantinople by the crusaders and the division of the formerly united Empire into the Nicaean and Latin part all appear to pertain to the history of the Trojan War, as well as the ensuing conquest of Constantinople by Michael Palaiologos, Emperor of Nicaea, in 1261, followed by the banishment of the Latin emperors.

The war fought in Italy around the middle of the XIII century is part of the same Trojan War, as well as the exile of the Hohenstaufen dynasty from Italy by Charles of Anjou in 1266.
We have to point out the following duplicates of this great war in the phantom Scaligerian history of the “antiquity”:

1. The Trojan War of the alleged XIII century B.C.
2. The division of the “ancient” Roman Empire into the Eastern and Western parts in the alleged IV century A.D. under Emperor Arcadius.
3. The division of the Kingdom of Israel as described in the Bible (in the books of Kings and Chronicles) into Israel and Judea in the reign of the Biblical kings Jeroboam and Rehoboam.
4. The conquest and pillaging of the “ancient” Rome by the barbarians in the alleged V century A.D.
5. The Gothic War and the exile of the Goths from Italy in the alleged VI century A.D. by the Byzantine troops of Emperor Justinian I.

6.4. The third possible original of the great wars, or exoduses
The third original may be identified as the Great = “Mongolian” conquest of the XIV century and the foundation of the “Mongolian” Empire with its centre in the Vladimir and Suzdal Russia, or Novgorod the Great as described in the chronicles (see Part 1 and Chron5, where this topic is related in greater detail).

6.5. The fourth possible original of the great wars, or exoduses
This original might identify as the Ottoman (Ataman) conquest of the XV century, qv in Chron6. A propos, even as recently as in the XVIII century some of the Russian authors had used the term “Ataman” instead of “Ottoman”, which is a direct indication of the Ataman origins of the Ottoman empire. For instance, Andrei Lyzlov, a prominent historian of the XVIII century and the author of the Scythian History ([497]) relates the history of the Ottoman Empire in detail, using both forms – Ataman and Ottoman. For instance, he refers to “The Ataman, or the forefather of the Turkish sultans” ([497], page 283).
7.
What we know about the XI century, or the epoch of Christ, today

7.1. Christ and the “Judean War” of Joseph Flavius

The oldest layer of events in the series of the great wars, or exoduses, is that of the XII century A.D. In particular, the XII century appears to be the correct dating of the Nativity of Christ (a more likely dating of his crucifixion being 1185 A.D.), qv in the “King of the Slavs”.

The XII century A.D. is very close to the threshold of 1000 A.D. as discovered by A. T. Fomenko. All the epochs located beyond this threshold in the Scaligerian version are inhabited by phantom reflections of later mediaeval events.

We shall turn to the mediaeval ecclesiastical tradition, which appears to be the most stable source of information that we have today. The reason is that introducing changes into the ecclesiastical tradition is a very hard task indeed, despite the fact that some changes did occur – major ones at times. Let us point out that the greater part of the old ecclesiastical tradition, the Church Slavonic one in particular, is considered apocryphal, or “incorrect”, nowadays. However, “apocryphal” is a much later label that was introduced in the XVII century the earliest. In many cases it only goes to say that yet another mediaeval text fails to concur with the Scaligerian version of history. Christians had used no such term before the XVII century. Moreover, it is known that the “apocryphal” texts that enraged modern commentators had been perceived as regular ecclesiastical texts by the mediaeval Christians. They were freely read, copied and included into various collections (see more on the subject in Chron6).

Let us turn to the mediaeval “Passions of Christ”, for example (they include the famous “Epistle of Pilate to Tiberius”, among other things –
see [307], page 444). This work had been an integral part of the mediaeval Christian literature, but later became declared a “forgery” ([307], page 443). In particular, the modern scientific publication entitled *Jesus Christ in Historical Documents* ([307]), which contains many mediaeval works that were later declared erroneous, omits the “Passions” altogether, despite mentioning them as an apocryphal document ([307], page 443). However, this document bears direct relevance to the topic of the compilation. We have used a handwritten Church Slavonic compilation ([772]), which contains the “Passions of Christ” in particular.

The “Passions” claim that after the crucifixion of Christ the city of Jerusalem was taken by the Roman troops on the orders of “Tiberius, son of Augustus, Lord and Ruler of the Whole World” ([772]). The conquest was led by “Great Prince Licinius” personally, who is also called “Czar and Supreme Ruler of the Orient” ([772]; see figs. 20.1-20.4). This conquest of Jerusalem is described as a great war whose itinerary and ideology liken it to a crusade. Bear in mind that the “Passions” also use the term “Judean Rome” for referring to Jerusalem (figs. 20.1 and 20.3). This is in good correspondence with our hypothesis that Jerusalem from the Gospels is the very same city as New Rome on the Bosporus, or Constantinople (Istanbul).
Fig. 20.1. Pages from a mediaeval Evangelical work entitled “The Passions of Our Lord” with the account of Jerusalem (“Judean Rome”) conquered by the troops of “Great Prince Licinius”. According to the “Passions”, the troops were sent towards Jerusalem by Emperor Tiberius as a punitive measure after the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. Apparently, what we have before us is a description of the First Crusade of 1096.

Fig. 20.2. Close-in of a page fragment from the previous illustration.
Fig. 20.3. Pages from the mediaeval work entitled “The Passions of Our Lord” with the account of the conquest of Jerusalem (“Judean Rome”) by the troops of “Great Prince Licinius”.
Quite obviously, the Scaligerites believe the data related in the “Passions” to be tall tales told by “the mediaeval ignoramuses”, since they follow Scaliger in his belief that the siege and the conquest of Constantinople postdate the Crucifixion by some 40 years, dating them to the alleged year 70 A.D., or the reign of Titus Vespasian and the so-called Judean War ([877], pages 22-23). They are also of the opinion that the Judean War has nothing to do with Christ ([877], page 21).

Nevertheless, a careful study demonstrates that Scaligerian history contains a very vague reference to the pillaging of Jerusalem in the epoch of the Crucifixion by none other but Licinius. Presumably, “Marcus Licinius Crassus, member of the first triumvirate who had been given Syria as his domain had de facto pillaged Judea and even looted the Jerusalem Temple” ([877], page 10). However, there are no reports of any war or military campaign anywhere (ibid). Apart from that, Scaligerian chronology claims Licinius to have ruled over Syria in the alleged years 54-53 B.C., a long time before Tiberius ([877], page 511). The “Passions” obviously fail to fit into the framework of the Scaligerian chronology, which is why they were declared a “forgery”. However, in the present case the mediaeval source is apparently correct; the Scaligerian version is errant.

7.2. The First Crusade. Alexandria in the XI century as the Old Rome in Egypt. Jerusalem = Troy = Ilion as Czar-Grad, or the New Rome

We know little of the First Crusade of the alleged year 1096 (which also identifies as the Fourth Crusade of the XIII century, as per our reconstruction) nowadays – as a rule, the renditions we find in textbooks are all based on the Western European sources, which only describe the itinerary of the Western crusader troops. Only a number of special works
report that the campaign was started in the East, and that the Western European crusaders arrived a while later, when the combatants had already engaged in battle (see [287], for instance). The general belief is that the crusaders came to assist the “Byzantine” emperor, who was fighting a holy war against the “infidels”, having heeded the proclamation of the Pope ([287]). Scaligerites are of the opinion that the residence of the Pope had been in Italian Rome. However, the New Chronology claims that no such city had yet existed in Italy back then.

Let us ask a simple question. Who were the “infidels” fought by the participants of the First Crusade (= Fourth Crusade)? Scaligerian historians believe the “infidels” in question to be Muslim. However, Islam had not yet existed as a separate religion in the XII century, according to our reconstruction. According to the accounts of the crusade, the “infidels” can be identified as the Judeans, who were the very party that the crusaders had opposed ([287]).

This is in perfect correspondence with the fact that the First Crusade (= Fourth Crusade) began immediately after the Crucifixion in 1185 A.D. as its direct consequence. Moreover, this also concurs with the opinion of the crusaders themselves – it turns out that they believed they were waging war on the Judeans, or the actual tormentors of Christ ([217], pages 117-118).

Nowadays this belief shared by the crusaders of the First Crusade is believed to be a manifestation of their “mediaeval ignorance”. However, the theory voiced by the Scaligerian historians about the alleged ignorance of the mediaeval authors was created primarily for the end of concealing blatant contradictions between the Scaligerian version and the old historical tradition, as our research has shown.

**NB.** One must not identify the Judaism of the XII century, or the religion of Judea (the Balkans and Asia Minor with a capital in Constantinople) as per our reconstruction as modern Judaism.
7.3. The transfer of the old imperial capital from Alexandria, or the Old Rome, to Czar-Grad = Jerusalem = Troy = in the XI century

It is possible that the capital of the ancient “Byzantine” kingdom was transferred from the African Alexandria, or Old Rome, to Czar-Grad on the Bosporus, which eventually became known as Constantinople, or the New Rome, after the First Crusade. The name Constantinople, or “Constantine’s City”, is of a more recent origin. In the XI-XII century the city was known as Jerusalem, or Troy. Scaligerian chronology dates the transfer of the capital to Czar-Grad to the beginning of the alleged IV century A.D. Scaliger was some 700 years off the mark.

Vague memories of the fact that the imperial capital had once been the African city of Alexandria are still alive in Scaligerian history. We remember that Alexandria was the capital of Alexander’s empire. We are also told that, upon having settled in Alexandria, Alexander the Great had for some odd reason cast all of his “ancient” Greek customs aside, donned some “Persian” attire and started to behave like a real Pharaoh.

We have to recollect the hypothesis of N. A. Morozov in this respect, namely, that the Egyptian pyramids had been the sepulchres of the first Byzantine emperors ([544]). However, our reconstruction differs from Morozov’s. Morozov believed that the mummies of the emperors, or pharaohs, had always been taken to Egypt from Constantinople, and that Alexandria was merely the imperial graveyard and not the capital. We are of the opinion that the Egyptian Alexandria had once been a real capital, and that the first Roman = Greek = “Byzantine” emperors were all buried in the vicinity of their old capital.

However, after the transfer of the capital to Constantinople and then to Novgorod the Great, or the Vladimir and Suzdal Russia, the bodies of the deceased Emperors (Czars, or Khans of the Horde) must indeed have been embalmed and transported to the old dynastic graveyard in Egypt, Africa. We believe the “ancient” Greek legend of Charon, the boatman taking the
dead across a large and sombre river to Hades on his boat, to be a reflection of such voyages. The legend must be very old indeed – we believe it to date from the XI-XV century A.D.

7.4. The biography of Pope Hildebrand. The date when the Holy See was moved to Rome in Italy

Although the Scaligerian chronology had shifted almost all of the Evangelical events into the early A.D. epoch, many of their traces remained in the XI-XII century. One of the most vivid ones is the biography of Pope Gregory VII Hildebrand (see fig. 20.5). It goes without saying that the final edition or even the creation of this biography dates from the end of the XV century the earliest. It becomes obvious from the mere fact that the biography in question describes the great ecclesiastical schism, which is dated to the early XV century by the New Chronology, qv in *Chron5* and *Chron6*. As for the XI century, which is the epoch of Hildebrand, there could have been no popes anywhere in Italy, since the Italian city of Rome had not yet existed. As we mentioned already, the Holy See must have still been in Alexandria during that epoch – in the valley of the Nile, that is. Even in the XVI century the Patriarch of Alexandria bore the title of “The Pope, Judge of the Universe and the 13th Apostle” ([372], Volume 2, page 39). He retains the papal title until this day.
As for the city of Rome in Italy, our reconstruction implies that it was only built in the XIV century, which is also the epoch when the Holy See was moved to Italy. The reasons behind this, as well as why the mediaeval Italian popes had claimed secular power and not just ecclesiastical, are related in *Chron6*.

7.5. Had the Italian city of Rome been a capital in the antiquity?

Why does the Scaligerian version locate the “ancient” Rome in Italy? Possibly, due to the fact that the final version of European history was written in Italy for the most part, during the Reformation epoch of the XVI-XVII century. It had naturally pursued political goals. It must be noted that Rome in Italy had never been a strong citadel. Let us recollect the fortifications of the mediaeval cities that had once been capitals of large state. The sturdy walls of Constantinople, for instance, stand to this day. Apart from that, the hopeless military and geographical disposition of
Rome in Italy precludes it from ever having been a capital of a global empire, either in the antiquity or in the Middle Ages. This fact was pointed out by N. A. Morozov in [544]. We must also remind the readers that Italy has only existed as an independent state starting with the XIX century, when it had broken away from Austria. The legend of Italian Rome as the conqueror of many lands and the capital of the mighty Roman Emperor at some point in the “antiquity” is nothing but a work of fiction made up by the Scaligerite historians.

7.6. The Babylonian Kingdom replaced by the Greek

Let us return to the mediaeval concept of several kingdoms put in succession as mentioned above. The first change may date from the epoch of the XI century. The name of the Babylonian Kingdom could stem from that of the old imperial capital – the city of Babylon in Egypt. Bear in mind that certain mediaeval maps indicate Babylon as a city in the vicinity of Cairo, qv in figs. 18.6, 18.7 and 18.8. The new name (the Greek Kingdom) must be related to the new “Greek” faith, or Christianity. The word Greece is possibly a slightly corrupted version of the name Horus, or Christos, which transforms the ancient “Greek Kingdom” into a “Christian Kingdom”. That is to say, the word “Greek” had once been a synonym of the word “Christian”.

7.7. The beginning of the Christian era in the XII century as the dawn of the Greek Kingdom

There are several conspicuous circumstances that allow us to identify the beginning of the Christian era in the Empire as the dawn of the Greek Kingdom, or, possibly, the kingdom of Horus = Christ.

Firstly, it is assumed that the Gospels and other Christian books that comprise the New Testament were originally written in Greek: “As it is commonly known, the entire Holy Writ of the New Testament was written in Greek, with the exception of the Gospel according to Matthew, that
tradition claims to have been written in Aramaic initially. However, since the Aramaic text in question has not survived, the Greek text of Matthew is considered the original” ([589], “Foreword”, page 5*). In general, early Christian literature had been written in Greek exclusively. Another known fact is that during the first couple of centuries after the introduction of Christianity, Christian services were conducted in Greek – in the West as well as the East ([793] and [78]).

Secondly, the “Byzantine” = Roman Christian Empire was traditionally referred to as the Greek or Romean (Roman) Empire, and not Byzantium. Its emperors were known as Greek or Romean Emperors, and the Byzantines themselves called themselves Romans of Greeks. The word “Byzantium” must have been coined in the XIX century the earliest – apparently, around the time when the name Greece = Horus = Christ became rigidly affixed to modern Greece, which had then segregated from Turkey. Historians dislike the name “Romea” all the more that it resembles the name “Rome” too obviously.

Scaligerian historians have made a “toy model” of the entire Greek = Christian Empire and placed it on the territory of the modern Greece, which had occupied a tiny part of the mediaeval Greece, or Byzantium. The ancient Kingdom of Macedon also transformed into a Greek province. In reality, Macedon (or Macedonia) still exists in the Balkans as a Slavic state.

The modern Israel is another example of this sort, being a “scaled-down” model of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire. It turns out that Israel as mentioned in ecclesiastical sources had actually been this gigantic empire of the XIV-XVI century, modern Israel comprising but an infinitesimal portion thereof.
8.
A new point of view on a number of well-known concepts as suggested by our reconstruction

And so, we suggest the following identifications: \( a = b = c \).

1) Alexandria

\( a. \) The city of Alexandria (or, possibly, Cairo in Egypt).

\( b. \) The same city was known as the Old Rome, capital of the “Byzantine” Empire before the transfer of the capital to New Rome, or Constantinople.

\( c. \) It is also known as Babylon, the capital of the ancient Kingdom of Babylonia in the epoch of the XI century.

This famous ancient city exists until the present day – however, according to the New Chronology, the famous history of the “ancient” Egypt in its entirety falls over the epoch that postdates 900 A.D.

2) The Egyptian pyramids

The oldest pyramids are of a modest size; they are the graves of the first “Byzantine” Roman = Roman Emperors (or Pharaohs) of the X-XI century. The capital of the Roman = Roman Empire had still been in the Nile Valley in Egypt. After the transfer of the capital to New Rome on the Bosporus, the bodies of the deceased emperors, or pharaohs, were still transported to the Valley of the Dead and Luxor in Egypt – the old family burial ground. The bodies required embalming before transportation, which is how the custom of embalming the corpses of the pharaohs, or emperors, was introduced. This custom would be extraneous in Egypt, since a dead body buried in hot sand isn’t affected by putrefaction, as it
was pointed out by N. A. Morozov ([544]).

After the foundation of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire in the XIV-XVII century, the custom of embalming the Great Russian Czars, or Khans of the Horde, had still existed up until the Romanovian epoch, which is what we learn from the account of Isaac Massa, for instance, an eyewitness of the events that took place in Moscow in the early XVII century ([513]). He writes that after the incineration of the body of the so-called “Czar Dmitriy Ivanovich, the Impostor”, this act was largely criticised by the Muscovites, who “were saying that the body needed to be embalmed” ([513], page 132). In the epoch of the XIV-XVI century, when the “Mongolian” Empire had reached the peak of its power, the large Egyptian pyramids were built; these were made of concrete – a novelty in that epoch. The gigantic concrete blocks were cast one by one, right at the construction site – nobody transported them or hauled them all the way up to the top of the pyramid (see more on this in Chron5). It is possible that the largest pyramid (the Pyramid of Cheops) didn’t mark the grave of any Khan, but rather served as a symbolic grave, or temple, consecrated to Christ.

All the Egyptian pyramids were built in the X-XI century A.D. the earliest – some of them may have been built much later.

3) Jerusalem

a. Jerusalem.
   ■ b. The same city is known as Troy.
   ■ ■ c. Other names of the city include “Czar-Grad” and “Constantinople”.

The city in question identifies as the modern city of Istanbul. It had been the capital of the old Romean or “Byzantine” Empire of the XII-XIII century, the predecessor of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire. Therefore, the ancient city of Troy stands until this day and can be visited without any
complications whatsoever – it is known to us as Istanbul.

This is where Christ was crucified in the XII century A.D. The Golgotha also stands until this day – at its foot we find Beykos, a suburb of the modern Istanbul. The gigantic symbolical grave of “St. Yusha”, or Jesus, can still be found at the top of this hill. A photograph of the entrance to the territory of the “burial ground” can be seen in fig. 20.6, and in fig. 20.7 we see the view of the actual sepulchre. In fig. 20.8 one sees the “holy spring”, and in fig. 20.9 – a view over the Bosporus from the grave of “St. Yusha”. See more on the topic in Chron5 and Chron6.

Fig. 20.6. A plaque on the wall near the entrance to the “grave” of Jesus on Golgotha (Mount Beykos). This symbolic grave is surrounded by a metal grate and a stone wall with two entrances. The legend on the plaque translates from Turkish as “St. Jesus”. From a video recording of 1996.
Fig. 20.7. A view of the symbolic “grave” of Jesus on Golgotha (Mount Beykos). The actual “grave” is behind a tall wall in the back. In the foreground we see a short wall and a small graveyard adjacent to the stone wall surrounding the place of the Crucifixion, or the “grave” of Jesus. Photograph taken in 1996.

Fig. 20.8. The holy spring next to the symbolic “grave” of Jesus on Mount Golgotha, or Beykos. Photograph taken on a Sunday in May 1996.
Fig. 20.9. A view over the Bosporus (the Evangelical River Jordan) from the top of Golgotha, or Beykos. This is the highest hill in the vicinity of the Bosporus. On the slopes of the hill to the right one sees the ruins of an old Byzantine fortress. From a video recording of 1996.

4) The First Crusade

\[ a. \] The First Crusade of the XI century = the Fourth Crusade of 1203-1204.

\[ b. \] The same campaign is known as the Judean War of the alleged I century A.D.

It was the conquest of Jerusalem = Troy = New Rome = Constantinople-to-be right after the crucifixion of Christ, which had happened here.

5) The Jerusalem Temple of Solomon as described in the Bible.
The Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem (Troy) stands until this day – it is the famous Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. This temple was formerly known as “The Great Church” ([465], page 21; also page 175, comment 45).

Let us turn to “The Holy Places of Czar-Grad” of the alleged year 1200 A.D., written by Anthony, the Russian Archbishop of Novgorod, which has reached us as a XVI century copy ([399]; also [787], issue 7, page
120). It is most spectacular that Anthony describes the Hagia Sophia as the Biblical Temple of Solomon: “Among the halidoms of the Hagia Sophia we find the Tablets with the Law of Moses, as well as a receptacle with manna” ([399]; also [787], Issue 7, page 129). This vivid mediaeval report openly identifies the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople as the famous Biblical Temple of Solomon, and the Biblical Epoch – as the Middle Ages starting with 1200 the earliest! See Chron6 for more details concerning the Temple of Solomon in Istanbul. Thus, the famous temple of Solomon in Jerusalem, which the historians believe to have been destroyed some 2000 years ago, exists until the present day – the readers can go to Istanbul and visit it.

6) The Biblical Israel.
First we have the Roman (aka “Byzantine”) Empire of the XII-XIII century with its capital in New Rome on the Bosporus, also known as Jerusalem and Troy. Then, between the XIV and the XVII century, it pertains to the Great = “Mongolian” Empire with its capital in Novgorod the Great = Yaroslavl.

The places in question can all be identified as Asia Minor and the Balkans with a capital in Czar-Grad on the Bosporus. Other names of the capital are Jerusalem, Constantinople and Troy. The name Judea was primarily used in ecclesiastical sources – other names of Judea in mediaeval sources are Greece and Romea. Its Balkan part was known as Rumelia up until the XX century. Nowadays we use the arbitrary term “Byzantium” for referring to this territory as it had been in the Middle Ages.

The “ancient” Western European sources (whose contemporary editions all date from the XVI-XVII century) describe Romea (Judea, or “Byzantium”) as the “ancient Greece”. Apart from that, the “ancient” authors used the term “Israel” for referring to Russia, or the Horde, in the XV-XVII century, while the Ottoman = Ataman Empire was known as
According to our reconstruction, the Mediterranean region and the Western Europe had been the hotbed of the “ancient” culture in the XIV-XVI century. Numerous “ancient” cities were built here and proclaimed “classical” examples of the “ancient” architecture. Occidental European Christianity of the XIV-XV century took on the appearance of the “ancient” Bacchic cult – the “ancient” temples of Apollo, Jupiter and other gods were built. This “ancient” culture and religion perished after the Ottoman = Ataman conquest of the XV century, which had been launched from Russia, or the Horde (see Chron6 for more details). The numerous “ancient” city ruins in Turkey may well be considered artefacts of that epoch – according to our reconstruction, they were destroyed during the Ottoman = Ataman conquest, and their inhabitants evicted; these cities have remained desolate ever since (see figs. 20.10, 20.11 and 20.12).

Fig. 20.10. Byzantium (Turkey). Theatre ruins in Hierapolis. According to our reconstruction, these are the authentic “ancient” Graeco-Roman buildings. In reality, they date from the XIV-XVI century and not the very beginning of the new era. The destruction took place during the Ottoman conquest of the XV-XVI century. Taken from [1259], page 104.
Fig. 20.11. Byzantium (Turkey). The ruins of Trajan’s temple with “Corinthian” columns. According to our reconstruction, these are the authentic “ancient” Graeco-Roman buildings. In reality, they date from the XIV-XVI century and not the very beginning of the new era. The destruction took place during the Ottoman conquest of the XV-XVI century. Taken from [1259], page 69.
Fig. 20.12. Byzantium (Turkey). Ruins of and “ancient” city in Pergam. According to our reconstruction, this city, likewise numerous other destroyed “ancient” cities, was built in the XIV-XVI century and fell during the Ottoman conquest of the XV-XVI century. Taken from [1259], page 135.
Let us discuss the identification of Jerusalem as Troy and Constantinople made by our reconstruction at greater length. According to a popular mediaeval belief, the city of Jerusalem was located “at the centre of known world” (see the map of Rüst, for instance, as reproduced in Chapter 5 of *Chron1*). This opinion of the mediaeval geographers and cartographers does not concur with the geographical location of the city known as Jerusalem nowadays. By the way, this belief is common for all the mediaeval texts and had been shared by the crusaders.

“Augustus had believed Judea to be the centre of the Earth… Moreover, Jerusalem is located right at the crossroads of the East and the West, which puts it in the centre of the world as we know it” ([722], page 234).

This is what the crusaders had believed. Leo Deacon, the Byzantine historian, reports the following of Emperor Nicephor II Phocas:

“He had … gone to the blessed land at the centre of the Earth, also known as Palestine, which is where rivers of milk and honey run, according to the Holy Writ” ([465], page 40).

We are of the opinion that there is just one famous ancient city that fits this description – Constantinople, which is indeed located right at the centre of the “known world” as it had been in the Middle Ages. Indeed, Constantinople stands on the Bosporus Strait, which separates Europe from Africa and Asia – “halfway between the North and the South”, in other words. It also lays roughly halfway between the westernmost and the easternmost countries known in the Middle Ages (the British Isles and Indochina, respectively).
The environs of Constantinople in Asia Minor are presumed to be populated by the Turks. However, the word Turk is very similar to the words Trojan and Frank – we have the same unvocalized root of TRK and TRN. Moreover, mediaeval chronicles derive the word Turk from the name of the legendary chieftain Thiras (or Phiras, qv in [940], for instance). This brings the words Turk and Frank even closer to each other. Moreover, the area that lies to the north-west of Constantinople is called Thracia, and the name is present in the maps until the present day.

The name Thracia is almost identical to that of Francia (France), which confirms our hypothesis about Constantinople being the “ancient” Troy and the Turks identifiable as the “ancient” Trojans (in some of the mediaeval texts at least) once again.

The term “Franks” was naturally applied to the inhabitants of France as well; the words “France” and “Thracia” must be related. Mediaeval historians may have confused the Thracians with the Franks – hence the confusion in the geographical localisation of historical events.
10.
Egyptian hieroglyphs and the Hebraic language

10.1. Geographical names were subject to flexibility before the invention of the printing press

It turns out that many geographical names and concepts had changed their meaning greatly over the course of time – therefore, we cannot simply refer to “the city of Rome” in our analysis of the ancient history, but only to “the city of Rome in one century or another”. The chronological localisation of the city shall affect the geographical – in the X and the XI century it must have been Alexandria or Cairo in Egypt. Then, in the XII-XIII century, the name passed over to New Rome on the Bosporus, also known as Constantinople, Jerusalem and Troy. The “Third Rome”, also identified as the famous “ancient Rome”, was Russia, or the Horde, in the XIII-XVI century. Rome in Italy was only founded in the XIV century, after the Western expansion campaign of Ivan Kalita, aka Batu-Khan, and served the purpose of the imperial vicegerent’s European residence (see Chron6 for more details).

Therefore, the geographical localisation of names found in chronicles can be regarded as a time function. The names of countries, cities etc had “lived in time” and moved about in geographical space. This needs to be understood – at dawn of civilisation, a given geographical name wasn’t affixed to a single geographical location. After all, there had been no unified system of communication, some languages and alphabets had still been in stages of formation, and geographical names likewise. The latter were immobilised much later, when printed books and homogeneous geographical maps were introduced. However, this took place during a relatively recent epoch, which must always be borne in mind when we work with old sources.
Today’s names of the towns and cities do not drift across the maps anymore. However, this wasn’t the case in the past, which is very easy to explain. How could people record and share the information on the geography of the world around them? This requires some device that allows the manufacture of several dozen copies of a map or a manuscript – otherwise the information becomes subject to flux and quick alterations. Old localisations are forgotten and new ones introduced; this process is very difficult to control. Apparently, the migration of geographical names and the frequent alteration of their meaning have only stopped with the introduction of printed books, which enable rigid fixation of information and its propagation among the educated populace. Therefore, the names of towns and nations, as well as the meaning of these names, changed frequently before the invention of the printing press. The migration of names could be a result of emigration of some part of educated population from one place to another. For example, after the fall of Constantinople in the middle of the XV century, many representatives of the ruling class, the aristocracy and the intellectuals fled New Rome and emigrated to Europe and to Russia. They may have initiated the migration of several geographical names as well.

10.2. Egyptian hieroglyphs of the XI-XVI century as the “Hebraic” language of the ecclesiastical tradition

It is possible that the Egyptian hieroglyphs are the very Hebraic, or Aramaic, language, which is often mentioned in mediaeval texts. Let us emphasise that we are referring to the mediaeval term used in ecclesiastical Christian literature. The term “Hebraic” was used for the ancient language of the Bible before its translation into Greek.

Nowadays the Hebraic language of the Bible is believed to be the predecessor of the modern Hebrew. However, this appears to be incorrect. The meaning of the term “Hebraic” has been changing over the years, and could be interpreted differently during different epochs. This is another
manifestation of the mutability of the old names over the course of time. According to our hypothesis, the holy books of the Christian church were also written in the ancient Egyptian hieroglyphs, or in Hebraic.

10.3. The Hebraic, or Egyptian hieroglyphic script replaced by the Greek alphabet in the epoch of the XIII-XV century. The bilingual texts of Egypt

According to the ecclesiastical tradition as reflected in the Bible, initially the Holy Writ had been written in a single language – Hebraic, or, possibly, the language of the hieroglyphs. Other holy languages came into being later. In the Middle Ages it was assumed that there were three holy languages – Hebraic, Greek and Roman (presumably, Latin). Ecclesiastical literature was only written in these three languages.

What was implied under the distinction between several “holy languages” initially? Our hypothesis is that it marks the transition from hieroglyphic writing to alphabetic. More specifically, this hypothesis can be formulated as follows:

1. Hebraic as mentioned in ecclesiastical texts is simply the hieroglyphic transcription system – just that, and not an actual spoken language. The only thing that changed in the transition to Greek, or the Christian language, for instance, was the system of transcribing words – the spoken language remained the same.
2. A great many texts in “Hebraic” were carved in stone; they have survived until the present day. We are referring to the Egyptian hieroglyphs that cover vast spaces of the “ancient” Egyptian pyramids and temples, which were built in the XII-XVII century, according to our reconstruction. It is possible that the old texts of the Bible (the “tablets of stone”) still survive among them.
3. The translation of the holy texts from “Hebraic” to Greek did not affect the spoken language that they were read in – they had merely been transcribed into a new alphabet that came to replace the
Let us explain. The hieroglyphic system is doubtlessly cumbersome and
difficult in actual use – however, its concept is very simple. The words
are transcribed as pictures, or hieroglyphs. The simplicity of the concept
provides for greater accessibility – it is clear that the very first system of
writing had to be like this.

On the contrary, the concept of the alphabetical system is a lot more
complex than that of the hieroglyphic. It is ultimately a lot simpler and
easier to use. Nowadays it is this very system that we believe to be the
most natural and obvious. However, one must be aware that the
alphabetical system had required a large body of preliminary work. One
needed to disassemble spoken language into syllables, and those into
individual sounds, which were then categorised and ascribed to individual
symbols, with a special grammar system devised to control their use and
so on. It is for this reason that we remember the names of the inventors of
certain alphabets – Cyrillics, for instance.

The very conception of an alphabet is extremely non-trivial, unlike that
of hieroglyphic writing, and could only have come to existence as part of a
well-developed scientific school.

Apparently, the alphabetic system of writing was introduced in the
epoch of the Roman “Byzantine” Empire of the XII-XIII century, or even
later. It had eventually replaced the old hieroglyphic system. However, the
inhabitants of the old imperial capital and the family burial grounds of the
Czars, or the Khans, must have remained true to the old hieroglyphic
system of writing up until the XVII-XVIII century.

The new alphabetic system became known as the “Greek language” in
order to distinguish it from the “Hebraic” language of the hieroglyphs. The
actual holy language of the epoch had hardly undergone any changes. It
must have been the Greek, or Christian language of the mediaeval
“Byzantium”. It must be noted that most specimens of this medieval Greek
= Christian language defy interpretation nowadays – in many cases, even
specialists cannot read them, unlike the “ancient” Greek, which many people can read with ease.

We believe the “ancient” Greek to be a relatively recent language – one that must have come to existence in the XVI-XVII century. This is the language that the Scaligerian hoaxers had converted the old documents into, editing and changing them in any which way they wanted. The authentic old documents must have been destroyed afterwards. The authentic Greek (or Christian) language must be the almost completely forgotten language of mediaeval Greece, or “Byzantium”.

Later on, when other languages developed alphabets of their own, the term “Greek language” became applied to the spoken language of ecclesiastical service as opposed to the actual alphabetical system, which had initially been exclusively Greek, or Christian.

10.4. The reason why a great many inscriptions in Egyptian hieroglyphs remain beyond the attention scope of researchers and publishers

As we mentioned above, many hieroglyphic texts have survived until the present day in Egypt, carved into the stone walls of the ancient temples. The volume of this written information is truly mind-boggling. We shall just cite a number of examples after Y. P. Solovyov, a Professor of the Moscow State University, a prominent expert in Egyptian history, who shared all this information with us after his return from Egypt.

1. There is a Ptolemaic temple in the town of Edfu, to the north of Asuan – its condition is pretty good. The dimensions of the temple are roughly 35 metres by 100 metres, and its height equals some 15-20 metres; there are many columns and halls inside it. All the walls are covered in hieroglyphs and drawings, with abundant graphical information. If all of these texts were to be published, they would take up a volume of a thousand pages in a modern book by a very rough estimate.
2. The temple of Isis on the Isle of Phyla, upstream from Asuan. Its dimensions are roughly 70 by 100 metres, and its height equals some 30 metres. All the walls are covered in writing, from the inside and from the outside, including the walls of the internal rooms.

3. The temple of Dendera, with an area of approximately 100 by 50 metres and a height of about 30 metres. All covered in hieroglyphs on the inside. There are few inscriptions on the outside; however, this is compensated by a large volume of artwork.

4. The two famous gigantic temples in Luxor and Karnak. Their Cyclopean walls are completely covered in hieroglyphs. This gives us thousands of square metres of text, despite the dilapidated state of the temples.

5. The Ramessarium, or the funereal temple of the whole Ramses dynasty. Completely covered in writing. The temple of the wife of Thutmos III. Lettering all over. The walls of funereal mausoleums and chambers are all covered in hieroglyphs; some of them are larger than modern underground stations. Mere copying of these texts will take years.

A rough estimate of the entire volume of all these texts found on the walls of Egyptian temples claims them to equal some fifty thousand pages of a modern book at the very least – that is a multi-volume publication; a whole encyclopaedia, if you will. Thus, we are thinking of extremely interesting information in a large volume. The Egyptian temples are all a gigantic book carved in stone – the Biblical tablets, if you will. One such wall, which is in fact a whole page covered in hieroglyphs, can be seen in fig. 20.13.
Fig. 20.13. Walls of an underground chamber covered in “ancient” Egyptian hieroglyphs. It turns out that there’s a vast number of such “ancient” walls in Egypt. By the way, on the right, behind the sitting Arab, one can see that in this particular case the “ancient” hieroglyphs were drawn on plaster, which eventually started to peel off. Taken from [1282].
Readers might enquire about the actual meaning of these hieroglyphs. It is amazing, but, to the best of our awareness, the overwhelming majority of these texts have neither been deciphered, nor even published to this very date – all the above material requires a separate research. If we are to assume that the modern Egyptologists are capable of interpreting hieroglyphic texts, one should expect the hundreds and thousands of square metres of walls covered in hieroglyphic lettering to be copied, photographed, studied, restored, read, translated, commented and published – as a multi-volume publication available to specialists at the very least. We haven’t managed to find any such publication anywhere. Some individual texts were published, often without translations of any sort, but they don’t comprise a thousandth part of the whole volume of lettering found upon the walls of Egyptian temples. It is possible that we haven’t been exposed to the entire bulk of available materials, and will be happy to discover that somebody had conducted this work at some point; in this case, we would like to receive exact references to the author, the time and the place.

However, if the majority of the texts in question remain without translation until the present day, and haven’t even been copied, which is what we believe to be the case, we are confronted with a number of poignant question and hypotheses.

**Question 1.** Are the modern Egyptologists really capable of reading all the hieroglyphic writings carved on the walls of the Egyptian temples? What if they can only read a small part of these texts – namely, the ones similar to the bilingual stones and papyri, accompanied by their Greek translation.

**Question 2.** How do they interpret the Egyptian hieroglyphs that differ from the ones encountered in bilingual texts? After all, few such texts have survived until our day. Common sense suggests that the interpretation of a hieroglyph without any hints of any sort is a very
complex task – if not altogether impossible.

Our hypothesis is as follows:

1. Egyptologists are only capable of reading a small part of hieroglyphic inscriptions that have reached our day – namely, the ones found in the few bilingual texts that have reached our day. Hence the limited nature of their active vocabulary.

2. The meanings of most hieroglyphs are forgotten nowadays, which makes interpreting the major part of the surviving ones an all but impossible task.

3. This is the very reason that most “ancient” Egyptian texts haven’t been read until this day – nobody even bothered to copy them. Stone carvings are abandoned, and are gradually becoming destroyed. Each year, historical science loses hundreds of pages of authentic ancient chronicles.

It is possible that the “Hebraic” version of the Bible can be found among these hieroglyphs, since the very word Bible stems from the same root as the word Babylon, or Byblos. Let us remind the readers that the word Babylon had been used for referring to Cairo in the Middle Ages, qv above. Modern historians are errant when they think that the old texts were written in the “ancient” languages that they know – “ancient” Hebraic, “ancient” Greek and “ancient” Latin. All of them are in fact literary, or ecclesiastical, languages introduced in the XIV-XVII century. In the XVII-XVIII century, during the creation of the Scaligerian history, they were declared “ancient”. These are the languages of the “ancient sources”, still believed to serve as the ferroconcrete foundation of the Scaligerian version.

We believe that the hieroglyphic Egyptian writing spread across the entire continent in the XII-XVI century, together with the Christian faith. In particular, it had reached China. Chinese hieroglyphs appear to be but a modified version of the Egyptian ones. N. A. Morozov also pointed out the connexion between the Egyptian and Chinese hieroglyphic writing.
Therefore, the Oriental civilizations are of the same origin than the European civilization, and we shall return to this below.

10.5. The forgotten meaning of the Church Slavonic word for “Jew” (“Yevrey”)

The Russian word for “Jew”, which is “евреи” (pronounced “yevrey”), is presumed to be of Church Slavonic or Greek origin ([866], Volume 2, page 6). As the analysis of its use in mediaeval texts demonstrates, it had originally been a form of the Russian word for “priest” (“ierей”), neither referring to any ethnic group, nor indeed to a religion.

Let us remind the reader that the word “yevrey” had initially been spelt with the use of the letter izhitsa instead of vedi in Church Slavonic: “еvреи” (see [503], for instance). Both versions – “iepeи” and “еvреи” must be derived from the complete form “ievреи”, which still survives, and can be found in the Slavic Ostrog Bible of 1581 ([621], page 26 of the New Testament, foreword to the Gospel According to Luke. The full form of the word is obviously the predecessor of both words – “еvреи”, if we are to omit the first vowel “и”, and “iepeи”, if we omit the izhitsa.

It also has to be said that the Slavic letter izhitsa can be read in two ways: as V and as I, hence the higher possibility that the progenitors of the respective modern Russian words for “Jew” and “priest” had really been a single word. This observation is also confirmed by the fact that the mediaeval texts in Church Slavonic often use the words “yevrey” and “ioudей” (Judean) side by side, which would be odd if these words had indeed been synonymous. Nevertheless, we can encounter them both on the same page of a mediaeval text. Everything becomes clear if we distinguish between them in the manner suggested above.
11.
The Egyptian Alexandria as the old imperial capital

11.1. History of the XI-XII century: an approximated reconstruction

In the present stage of the research we can only reconstruct the ancient history of the XI-XII century in a very general and approximated fashion. We relate our reconstruction below.

Up until the end of the XI century, the capital of the state that later became known as the Roman Empire had apparently been in the valley of the Nile in Egypt. This makes the claim of modern historians about Egypt being the cradle of culture and civilization correct. In the X-XI century the inhabitants of this land learnt how to make weapons out of copper, and later steel. Around the end of the XI – beginning of the XII century, the capital is transferred to Czar-Grad on the Bosporus, also known as Jerusalem and Troy.

These are the origins of the ancient Rome, or the centre of the ancient “Byzantine” Empire. The Empire begins to colonise the Mediterranean region. It is obvious that the epoch’s primitive system of communications made the distant parts of the Empire virtually independent from the centre. Basically, this is how the modern history textbooks describe the Byzantine Empire of the X-XII century. The Egyptian, or “Byzantine” power in Europe appears to have been concentrated around a few harbours on the Mediterranean coast.

We are looking at the political naissance of the European civilization, or the roots of the secular and dynastic history of Europe and Asia, which turn out to be Egyptian.

On the other hand, the roots of the ecclesiastical history can be traced to the Balkans and to Asia Minor – an ancient region whose centre had been
in Jerusalem, also known as Troy, which eventually became known as Constantinople, and later Istanbul. The area around Constantinople, or Jerusalem, had been known as Troad, Thracia, Khan’s Land (or Canaan in the Bible), and also Judea. It is the birthplace of the ancient cult that later became Christianity.

It is possible that Judea had been subordinate to the Egyptian Rome, or Alexandria. The Roman Empire is called Israel in the Bible; the actual word “Israel” is translated as “Theomachist”, which is a synonym of the name “Ptolemy”. Bear in mind that the Ptolemaic dynasty had been regnant in Alexandria, which concurs well with the hypothesis that the capital of Israel had originally been in Alexandria.

11.2. Alexandria as the centre of Greek science

Alexandria is believed to have been the centre of the Greek (Christian, or Byzantine) science in the Middle Ages. For instance, Claudius Ptolemy, the author of the Greek Almagest, came from Alexandria. The city itself is often mentioned in the Almagest; even the name Ptolemy can be associated with Alexandria as the name of the dynasty that had reigned there.

Another example is the Orthodox Paschalia, or the set of rules for calculating the date of the Easter, including the table of the lunar phases and calendar tables. The Paschalia had been widely used in Byzantium, and was allegedly developed in Alexandria, which is why it is also widely known as the Alexandrian Paschalia.

Alexandria is also the city where the largest and most famous library of the antiquity had stood – the very Alexandrian Library that is nowadays believed to have perished in a blaze.

11.3. Alexandria as the obvious capital

The geographical location of the Egyptian Alexandria does in fact make it a likely capital of the ancient Empire, unlike the Italian city of Rome. Alexandria is a large seaport and it is located in the fertile valley of the
Nile. The Alexandrians had abundant copper mines at their disposal, which makes it possible that the industrial use of copper was invented in Alexandria and marks the beginning of the Copper Age in our civilization.

11.4. Several authors of the XVII century had believed the Egyptian pyramids to have been the sepulchres of Ptolemy = Israel and Alexander the Great

Let us cite an interesting piece of evidence contained in the Lutheran Chronograph of 1680 ([940]). This is what we learn about Emperor Octavian Augustus: “When Augustus came to Egypt, he was shown the bodies of Alexander the Great and Ptolemy, which had been kept in their sepulchres for a long time” ([940], page 101). Therefore, as recently as in the XVII century some chroniclers had been of the opinion that the rulers buried inside the Egyptian pyramids were the actual founders of the Greek = Christian Kingdom, Alexander the Great and Ptolemy, or Israel (Theomachist). We believe that they were correct. By the way, both Alexander and Ptolemy are believed to be Greek, and the very word “pharaoh” identifies as the Greek word “tyrant”, or “ruler”. However, the research related in Chron6 demonstrates that the Scaligerian descriptions of Alexander the Great and King Ptolemy contain a distinct layer of the Russian history of the Horde, which dates from the XV-XVI century.
12.
The wars fought for and around Constantinople (Jerusalem)

Let us briefly reiterate the primary conception of Roman History within the framework of the general reconstruction that we relate herein.

All the originals of the great wars, or exoduses, or global dynastic changes as reflected in the Scaligerian history textbook were really linked to one and the same focal event – changing ownership of Jerusalem = Troy = Constantinople. The city had changed a number of owners over the period of the X-XVI century, or the historical epoch that covers the entire real, or documented ancient history.

The first war in the series is likely to have been fought near the end of the XII – beginning XIII century, or the epoch of Christ. This war is known to us as the Fourth Crusade (= the First Crusade). Mediaeval chronologists have spawned numerous duplicates of this war in the “ancient” and mediaeval history; this fact is hardly surprising, considering as how the version of chronology known to us today was created by the mediaeval clergy, which had obviously regarded the events related to Christianity as the most important ones in history and analysed them with the utmost caution.

Nevertheless, somebody’s chronological error had separated the Evangelical events from the war of the XII century A.D. and ascribed them to the I century A.D. despite the direct indications of several ecclesiastical sources that the war began immediately after the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ. On the other hand, the actual war, or the Fourth (= the First) Crusade, remained in its correct chronological position (the XII century).

Let us attempt to imagine the implication of Christ’s lifetime misdated to
the I century A.D. instead of the XII. It is obvious that the mediaeval chronologists who had adhered to the erroneous dating of the I century A.D. must have meticulously removed all the obvious traces of the Evangelical events from the XII century chronicles. Indeed, they believed these events to be the most important in human history. Therefore, as soon as they noticed traces of these events in certain texts, they instantly dated them to the I century A.D., falsely believing it to be the epoch of Jesus Christ. Alternatively, they could edit the source, transforming the actual descriptions of events into the “recollections of the ancient author” and replacing accounts of real historical events by their presumed recapitulations.

This is why the surviving editions of mediaeval texts are structured in such a way that whenever the “ancient author” describes an epoch that duplicates the epoch of Christ, or the XII century, he usually begins to recollect historical events, and often mentions the names of Evangelical characters. We cannot find any real traces of the primary historical event of the XI century, or the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ, in any historical text – the only surviving accounts of this epoch known in Scaligerian history are the Gospels of the alleged I century A.D. Mediaeval chronologists of the XVI-XVII century had sought all such accounts out laboriously, and provided them with erroneous datings. As a result, the Evangelical tale of the “Passions of Christ” has virtually got no duplicates anywhere in the Scaligerian version, despite the incorrect dating of the crucifixion itself.

Nevertheless, the mediaeval chronologists had overlooked a number of minor details. Naturally, the latter could only pertain to substantially altered renditions that had little in common with the famous ecclesiastic accounts – otherwise the events in question would be identified as Evangelical and dated to the I century A.D. Traces of Evangelical events in the XII century A.D. are nothing but a collection of discombobulated legends and individual names.
The division of empires. Israel and the Nicaean Empire, Judea and the Latin Empire

The second original of the Great War is to follow – it marks the end of the ancient Roman Empire and the beginning of the new kingdom division, or the conquest of Constantinople by the crusaders during the Fourth Crusade in 1204. After that, the Roman “Byzantine” Empire fell apart into several kingdoms and principalities. Scaligerian history is of the opinion that the old royal “Byzantine” dynasty and the Roman aristocracy fled to the city of Nicaea in Asia Minor, which is where they founded the Nicaean Empire as the successor of the old Roman Empire, joined by the Patriarch of Constantinople, while the crusaders elected a new emperor from their own number and founded the Latin Empire with Constantinople as its capital. The Nicaean Empire in Asia Minor is believed to have struggled for the return of Constantinople; the struggle ended in the conquest of Constantinople by the army of Michael Palaiologos, Emperor of Nicaea, in 1261, and the exile of the Latin emperors from the city ([455]).

However, some sources of the XVI-XVII century had been of the opinion that after the fall of Constantinople in 1204 the Roman Emperor of “Byzantium” had fled to Russia and not to Asia Minor. For example, the eminent Polish historian of the XVI century, Matthew Stryjowski, writes the following in his book ([1429]; the chapter is entitled “On the Conquest of Constantinople, or Czar-Grad, the Most Glorious Capital of the Greek Caesars and Patriarchs by Mehmet II, King of the Turks, in the 1453rd Year of Our Lord, or the Year 6961 Since Adam, in the Reign of Kasimir, son of Jagiello, King of Poland and Great Prince of Lithuania”:

“And so it came to pass that in the 1200th year of Our Lord the Venetians and the French came from across the sea, and took over Constantinople. Ascarius, the
Greek Caesar, fled to Tersona and then to Galich, which the Greeks call Galatia. When he came to the capital of Russia, Roman, the Russian Prince and Monarch, received him with honours and consideration. This is how the Latins took over the glorious kingdom of Greece” ([1429]).

This report of Stryjkowski is in excellent correspondence with the history of Russia, or the Horde, in our reconstruction. It helps us with the understanding of the dynastic undercurrents of the Great = “Mongolian” Conquest of the XIV century. As we have seen, the conquest began some 100 years after the fall of Constantinople under the onslaught of the crusaders. The purpose of the conquest is perfectly clear – the restoration of the old Empire. If the old Roman, or “Byzantine” dynasty had indeed fled to Russia, as Stryjkowski is telling us, it becomes obvious just why the Great = “Mongolian” Conquest was launched from the Horde, or Russia, as well as the reason why the Western campaign of Ivan Kalita (Caliph), or Batu-Khan, had been among the first directions of the “Mongolian” expansion (see Part I). The grandiose restoration of the Empire began, started by the descendants of the old Roman dynasty of “Byzantium” who had fled to Russia after the fall of Constantinople. The restoration wasn’t merely a success – the “Mongolian” conquest of the XIV century resulted in the creation of a qualitatively new Empire, which was much larger and better centralised than the old Roman Kingdom, or “Byzantium”. Eventually, “Mongolia” conquered the entire Eurasia and North Africa, and later also gathered lands in America (in the XV-XVI century; see Chron5 and Chron6).

As we demonstrate in Chron1, Chron2 and Chron6, the Bible describes mediaeval European events of the XI-XVI century. It uses the word “Israel” for referring to the Christian Empire, namely, the ancient empire of the XI-XIII century, which we apparently know very little of today, and its successor, the Great = “Mongolian” Empire of the XIV-XVI century. How do we identify the Biblical Judea? One must bear in mind that the Bible uses the term “Judean Kingdom” for referring to a relatively small
part of Israel centred around Jerusalem, the old capital. Judea was populated by a maximum of two Biblical tribes (1 Kings 12:20). There were twelve tribes altogether. In European history Judea is the old centre of the empire, Czar-Grad and its environs, as well as the ancient Rumelia, or the Balkans.

The Biblical division of the kingdom into Israel and Judea must be a reflection of two events, the first being the fragmentation of the ancient “Byzantine” Empire of the XI-XIII century after the Trojan Wars of the XIII century. Scaligerian history of this epoch describes the conquest of Constantinople by the troops of the Horde, or Russia, and their numerous allies in 1204 and the foundation of the modestly sized Latin Empire around Constantinople, known as the Biblical Judea. The remaining part of the empire founded a new capital in the Biblical Shechem (1 Kings 12:25). The Scaligerian version believes that the old dynasty, which was banished from Czar-Grad by the crusaders, chose the city of Nicaea for its capital – allegedly, in Asia Minor. Historians suggest that Nicaea, or Shechem, can be identified as the modern city of Iznik ([85], Volume 29, page 618). However, our reconstruction deems it more likely that Shechem, the Biblical capital, or MCHSH in reverse, is Mosoch, or Moscow – not the modern city, which had not existed yet; one must remember that the name had once been used for referring to the entire Russia, or the Horde.

The second event that became reflected in the Biblical account of the division of the kingdom into Israel and Judea might identify as the division of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire into Russia, or the Horde, and Turkey, or Atamania, in the XV-XVI century. Israel shall therefore identify as Russia as the Horde, and Judea – as Turkey, or Atamania. The capital of Turkey, or Judea, identifies as Czar-Grad, the ancient capital of the “Byzantine” Empire, also known as the Biblical city of Jerusalem.

Furthermore, it is possible that the two Biblical kingdoms of Israel and Judea reflected the segregation of the Western Europe from the East, with the Western Europe identifying as Judea, and Russia, or the Horde – as
Israel, qv in *Chron6*. 
PART THREE

Ecclesiastical history
14. History of religions

According to our reconstruction, the Christian church had maintained its integrity within the Empire up until the XV century. Of course, religious tradition had varied between one distant part of the Empire and another – however, the formal schism between the churches must only date to the XV century. In the Scaligerian version, the epoch of Christianity as a single religion is dated to the pre-1054 epoch, which is the year that marks the schism between the Orthodox and the Catholic branches of the Christian Church. According to our reconstruction, this schism really dates from the XV-XVII century. Also, the Christian Church broke into four branches and not two – Orthodox, Catholic, Muslim and Judean.

It is known to us from the history of religion that the rites and the canons of the Christian Church in the first few centuries of Christianity, or the XI-XIV century, according to our reconstruction, had differed from the ones we’re accustomed today quite drastically. Also, it appears that Judaism had not finally crystallised as an independent religion.

Thus, according to our reconstruction, the epoch of the XV-XVII century marks the schism of the formerly united Christian church into four branches – Orthodox Christianity, Catholicism, Islam and Judaism. Furthermore, Islam became independent from the Orthodox tradition even later – at the end of the XVI-XVII century. Therefore, the mediaeval Western Sources that tell us about “Muslims”, “Agarians” and “Saracens” are often referring to the Orthodox Christians – Russians in particular, since Islam and Orthodox Christianity had still been a single religion.
Here’s a fragment from a modern textbook on history: “Christopher, Patriarch of Antiochia, baptised Isa at birth, was killed in Antiochia, during an anti-Byzantine uprising, on 22 May 967 A.D.” ([465], page 196). He was run through by a spear, likewise Christ, which is emphasised in a number of chronicles. Bear in mind that the spear that pierced the body of Christ on the cross was believed to be kept in Antiochia by the crusaders of the First Crusade.

Isa Christopher is very obviously a version of the name Jesus Christ. We shall obviously find no Evangelical accounts of crucifixion and resurrection in the biography of Isa Christopher, otherwise more recent editors and chronologists would instantly recognise him as Christ and date the events in question to the I century A.D. Nevertheless, many details of the Evangelical account are present here as well – for instance, the solar eclipse, which is presumed to have accompanied the crucifixion of Christ, according to the Gospels and a number of other ecclesiastical texts. A very fitting total eclipse of the sun is mentioned in the Byzantine chronicle under 968 – very close to the murder of Christopher ([465], page 187, Comment 72). We must emphasise that a total eclipse on the sun observable from a single populated location is a very rare event.

Moreover, as was the case with Christ, the “Christopher eclipse” was accompanied by a powerful earthquake and a rain that many believed to herald a new deluge: “A strange rain, which had made the Byzantines afraid that it might herald a new deluge, fell on 5 June 968” ([465], page 186, Comment 57; also page 39). The murder of Christopher was followed by a three-year siege of Antiochia by the Romean, or Byzantine, troops of Emperor Nicephorus (Victorious) Phocas. After the conquest of the city, a large number of holy objects were found there, all of them associated with
Leo Deacon, the Byzantine historian, tells us explicitly that Emperor Nicephorus had launched a military campaign to Palestine ([465], page 40). It is hard not to recognize this campaign as the one launched to Palestine by Emperor Tiberius right after the Crucifixion, which is recorded in a number of mediaeval ecclesiastical chronicles considered apocryphal today (see the “Letter of Pilate to Tiberius” in the “Passions of Christ”, for instance).

Let us quote the comment of a modern historian that concerns the data about the Palestinian campaign of Nicephorus:

“The troops of Nicephorus never reached Palestine; it might be mentioned in order to make the campaigns attain religious symbolism… Although the ideas of crusades weren’t all that popular in Byzantium, Nicephorus, for one, was affected by them greatly – a long time before the Western crusaders” ([465], page 186, comment 63).

There is also a strange account related by Leo Deacon in his description of the campaign of Nicephorus – it must be reflecting the actual crucifixion. Namely, he tells us that a certain Judaist from Antiochia had kept an icon that depicted crucified Christ in his household. One day, he became enflamed with hatred for that icon and pierced it with some sharp object (cf. the “Antiochian spear”). This was followed by a miracle that made him and the Judeans that surrounded him flee in terror ([465], pages 39-41).

This account is easy to recognise as a version of the famous Evangelical Crucifixion story. The storyline is virtually the same – Judeans hate Christ, crucify him and pierce his side with a spear, but the ensuing solar eclipse and earthquake made them scatter in fear, as it is described in the Gospels. This is an excellent example of how the Evangelical events got edited when they emerged in the wrong chronological locations. The original text got into the hands of some historian of the XVI-XVII century, who was diligent enough to keep the “dislocated” story of Christ intact, having merely altered the text in the simplest way he could think of, replacing
Christ with an icon of Christ, the Judean priests of Jerusalem with some nondescript Judaist etc.

The Scaligerian version of chronology erroneously dates the tale of Christopher to the X century.

At the end of the XI century, which is the epoch of the First Crusade, the Antiochian Spear emerges once again. The Crusaders were striving to lay their hands upon this holy relic during the whole long siege of Antiochia in 1098 ([287], pages 83-95). Modern historians are mistrustful of the belief shared by the crusaders, namely, that the spear that had pierced the side of Jesus was kept in the besieged Antiochia. Could the crusaders have been correct?

Antiochia is presumed to have been captured by the crusaders exclusively, without the participation of the Romean (or “Byzantine”) troops. However, there are historical records of the city of Tyre, which is right next to Antiochia, taken by Egyptian troops in 1094, also after a 3-year siege: “In 1094, the Fatymid army [Fatymids is the name that historians use for the dynasty that presumably ruled in Alexandria during that epoch; in reality, the army in question belonged to the Romean, or Roman Emperors, also known as Pharaohs – Auth.] marched to the North, laying this seaport [Tyre – Auth.] under siege and taking it by storm 3 years later, looting the city utterly” ([287], page 34). Let us also recollect the fact that “Tyre” translates as “Czar”, or “Czar-Grad”; therefore, Tyre had been a capital city, likewise Antiochia. Most probably, Antiochia and Tyre are but two different names of a single city – for example, Constantinople had also been known as Czar-Grad.

Most likely, the conquest of Constantinople in 1098 and the conquest of Tyre by the Egyptians in 1094 is the very same event dating to the epoch of the Fourth (which was also the First) Crusade of 1203-1204 A.D.
Reports of the XI century events as encountered in the Russian chronicles

The Scaligerian dating of the Baptism of Russia, or 989 A.D., according to the Russian chronicles, is very close to the Scaligerian dating of the Antiochian Evangelical events, the difference being a mere 20 years.

Russian chronicles mention a horrendous earthquake in Czar-Grad – so powerful that it is remembered in the Menaion (see under 26 October [Old Style], memory of Dmitriy of Solun). This earthquake was also described in Byzantine chronicles – historians date it to 989 A.D. ([465], pages 91 and 222).

Let us relate the account of this earthquake given by the Byzantine historian Leo Deacon:

“The comet-watchers were full of wonder… That which the people expected, came to pass… In the evening of the day when we remember St. Dimitriy the Martyr, a great earthquake to equal none that people had remembered, brought the spires of Byzantium down to the ground, destroyed many houses, which became graves for their inhabitants, and wiped out the neighbouring villages completely … having also shaken and destroyed the dome and the western wall of the great church… It was followed by a horrible famine, disease, droughts, floods and hurricanes… This is the very time that the column near Eutropius was destroyed by the waves, and the monk that had stood upon it met a dreadful fate in the raging sea. The infertility of the earth and all the other scourges took place after the falling of the star. However, future historians shall be able to explain it all” ([465], page 91).

When we read this account, we find it hard to chase away the thought that the initial edition of Leo Deacon’s “History”, the one that didn’t survive, had contained the well familiar Evangelical account of all the disasters that
had accompanied the crucifixion of Christ. It is only the edition that has reached our age, which, as we can understand, was compiled in the Western Europe in the XVI-XVII century, that is to blame for transforming the text of Leo Deacon into something else, more in line with the Scaligerian chronology. Nevertheless, we still see a direct reference to Jesus Christ!

The monk who had perished on top of his column as mentioned in [465], page 91, is most likely to be the replacement of the crucified Jesus Christ, which shall also identify the star mentioned by Deacon as the Star of Bethlehem. Also, the Greek Gospels do not refer to a “crucifixion”, but rather to a death on top of a pole, or column (see [123], column 1151). If we are to provide a literal translation of the Greek Gospels, we shall come up with a report of Christ dying on top of a column, which is precisely what we see in Deacon’s text.

Modern commentators are completely at a loss about the identity of the “monk” mentioned by Leo Deacon. He isn’t mentioned in any hagiography ([465], page 223, comment 75). And what of his mysterious reference to “future historians”, which seems to be completely out of context? See [465], page 223, comment 76).

However, if Deacon is referring to Jesus Christ, it is easy enough to understand what Deacon means – he alludes to the Second Coming in the usual mediaeval style.
According to our reconstruction, Christianity came to India, China and Japan during the Great = “Mongolian” conquest of the XIV-XV century. A propos, we have a few phonetic similarities here - Krishna and Christ, Delhi and Delphi etc.

Many experts in history of religion noted the parallels between Christianity and Buddhism, starting with the XIX century (see [918] and [919]).

The lifetime of the first Buddha, or the Indian Prince Sakyamuni, is dated to times immemorial by the historians of today. However, it has been known to us ever since the XIX century that his biography is almost a word-for-word rendition of the hagiography of St. Joasaph, the Prince of Great India (see the Menaion for 19 November, Old Style).

This amazing similarity has been discussed by many specialists, but never got a mention beyond special literature ([665]). Nevertheless, the hagiography of Joasaph, Prince of Great India, almost forgotten today, had been part of a very popular ecclesiastical literary work of the XV-XVI century, namely, “The Tale of Barlaam and Joasaph”. It suffices to say that the manuscripts of this oeuvre have reached us “in more than 30 European, Asian and African languages: one in Pehlevi, five in Arabic, one in Persian and one in Ouigour; two Georgian versions … a Greek version … two Latin versions, translations into Church Slavonic, Armenian and Ethiopian … nine Italian manuscripts, eight more in Old French, five in Spanish, more in Provencal, Rhaeto-Romance, Portuguese, German, Czech, Polish, English, Irish, Hungarian and Dutch” ([665], page 3).

Historians are of the opinion that the hagiography of St. Joasaph was first written in Greek in the XI century A.D. Moreover, “The Holy Relics
of the St. Prince Joasaph became known to the public in the XVI century. They had initially been kept in Venice; however, in 1571 Luigio Mocenigo, the Venetian Doge, gave them to Sebastian, King of Portugal, as a present” ([665], page 11).

Could the body of Christ have been taken away from Constantinople in 1204?

The title pages of most Greek manuscripts of the “Tale of Barlaam and Joasaph” (there are about 150 of them known to date) say that the story was “brought from India, a country in Ethiopia, to the Holy City of Jerusalem by John the Friar” ([665], page 7).

Let us also cite some evidence of a strange event dated to the alleged year 1122 in this respect.

“There is an anonymous report of a certain Indian Patriarch John visiting Rome that year… The Patriarch had initially come to the West to receive the Archbishop’s pallium in Byzantium in order to confirm his rank, which was conferred onto him after the death of his predecessor. However, the Byzantines told him that the capital of the world was in Rome” ([722], page 249).

What we see here is a trace of the disputes about the location of Rome, or the real capital of the world. Apparently, it had not been obvious to the people of that epoch, and required argumentation.

The mystical theory of metempsychosis, which is usually considered purely Oriental and inherent in the Buddhist tradition, had nevertheless been quite common for the Christian ecclesiastical tradition of the XIV-XVII century, a long time before the XIX century, which is when the Europeans made their first acquaintance of the Oriental religions.

The theory of metempsychosis was considered heretical; it was presumed to have originated in Greece and ascribed to Pythagoras. For instance, the oeuvre entitled “A Brief Revision of All Heresies by St. Epiphanos, Bishop of Crete”, which had even been included in the main ecclesiastical almanacs, mentions metempsychosis in the very beginning:
“The Pythagoreans, also known as the Peripathetics, reject the unity and the will of the Lord, and also forbid sacrifices to the gods. Pythagoras had preached that no living being could be eaten, and that one also needed to abstain from alcohol … [unclear place]… Pythagoras had also taught that the souls incarnated into the bodies of other living beings after leaving the dying bodies” (430).

This description could also be applied to the Buddhist tradition. This makes it likely that Buddhism had also been of a Byzantine origin.

Let us cite the “four primary heresies” as listed by Epiphanos:

1. Barbarism, or no religion tradition.
2. Scythian Heresy – worship of the ancestral and animistic spirits.

The odd thing about the list is that Epiphanos uses the terms for referring to religious confessions as opposed to ethnic groups, which is how we’re accustomed to treat them. The context of his work makes it obvious that he was describing contemporary religions, which makes the Barbarians, Hellenes and Scythians mediaeval religious groups.
18.
The creation of the Biblical canon and its chronology

18.1. The esoteric history of the Biblical canons

Bible is divided into two parts chronologically as a rule – the Old Testament, or the books written before Christ, and the New Testament, or the books written after Christ. Hence the opinion that Christ cannot be mentioned anywhere in the Old Testament, since the very concept of Christianity could not have existed in that epoch. Many Biblical examples expose this opinion as blatantly incorrect, as we shall mention below.

One of the main results of the statistical chronology (as related by A. T. Fomenko in Chron1 and Chron2) claims that the Old and the New Testament of the Bible refer to the same epoch chronologically. The two testaments reflect the two traditions that had coexisted and developed side by side. Moreover, they had remained the same tradition for a while before becoming split in two.

In Chron1 and Chron2 we demonstrate that the historical books of the Old Testament, such as the Books of Judges, Samuel, Kings and Chronicles refer to the European history of the XI-XVI century A.D.

It is common knowledge that the Bible consists of two parts – the Old and the New Testament. The Old Testament is presumed to have been created within the Judaic tradition, a long time before the new era, whereas the New Testament was allegedly written by the Christians after the advent of Christ. These two parts of the Bible are therefore separated by several centuries in consensual chronology.

This rather common conception of Biblical history is correct for the most part; however, it is erroneous chronologically. It is true that the available books included in the Old Testament were written within the Judaic tradition, whereas the New Testament was written by the Christians
– however, both traditions postdate the XII century, or the lifetime of Jesus Christ.

One cannot escape the following question. If the Old Testament was written after Christ, and then edited by the representatives of the Judaic tradition, considered hostile by the Christians, how could it have become part of the modern Christian Bible? The answer is simple – it had not been part of the Bible up until the end of the XVI century.

The modern canon of the Bible was compiled from individual books and canonised as such at the Trident Council of the Roman Catholic Church in the second half of the XVI century the earliest. This was the time when the chronological tradition of Scaliger had already become consensual in the West; this tradition had believed the Judaic Biblical Tradition and Christianity to be separated by a gap of several hundred years. Therefore, nobody believed this tradition to be hostile to Christianity or wondered about the possibility of including the Judaic canon into the Christian Bible.

Indeed, there isn’t a single complete Christian Bible in the modern meaning of the word that would be published before the Trident Council. It concerns the Greek and Church Slavonic Bibles as well as their Latin counterparts.

The famous specialist in ecclesiastical history, A. V. Kartashev, tells us the following:

“The Ostrog Bible of 1580-1581 is the first printed Bible in the entire Eastern Orthodox world, just as the first handwritten Bible in Russia had been the one … compiled in 1490 by Gennadiy, the Archbishop of Novgorod” ([372], Volume 1, page 600).

Moreover, it turns out that

“the first printed Greek Bible in folio was only published in Moscow in 1821 at the initiative of the Holy Synod; this publication was sponsored by two wealthy Greek patriots – the Zosimadas brothers… After this initiative, the Synod of the
Greek Church, which had re-emerged after the rebellion of 1821, decided to “copy” this Muscovite Bible in Greek, which was promptly done by the rich English publishing house of SPCK … in 1843-1850” ([372], Volume 1, page 600).

The few manuscripts of the Bible that are dated to the epochs that precede the Trident Council were only found in the XIX-XX century. Their datings are pure propaganda and have nothing to do with reality (see Chron6 for more details).

The editing of the Old Testament in order to make it closer to the Hebraic interpretation in the modern sense of the word continued well into the XIX century (see more on this in comments to [845]). A comparison of the Biblical texts of the XVI-XVII century to the modern Bible reveal the emphasis of the editors: in the Book of Psalms “Christ” is replaced by the “Anointed One”, a “bishop” becomes a “man of power”, an “altar”, a “davir” and so on. The editors were obviously removing Christian symbolism and terminology from the Old Testament.

As an example, let us compare the respective fragments that refer to the decorations of the Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem after the text of the Ostrog Bible, published by Ivan Fyodorov at the very end of the XVI century ([621]) and the modern Synodal translation. We see that the description given by the Ostrog Bible could also refer to the decorations of an orthodox Christian church. We see references to an altar, which is separated from the rest of the temple by a wall, also known as the iconostasis, the text describes a “kiot,” or the place where the most revered icons are kept in Orthodox temples. The temple itself is called a church. The authors of the Synodal translation have tried their best in order to make the description of Solomon’s temple resemble a Christian church as little as humanly possible. In general, the texts of both Bibles contain significant discrepancies. The fact that the more recent edition is also the most tendentious is perfectly obvious. See more about the editing of the Bible in the XVI-XVII century in Chron6.
18.2. Evangelical events reflected in the Old Testament

If we analyse the history of the Biblical canon’s publication and edition, we shall see why the references to Christ in the part of the Christian Bible known as the “Old Testament” are full of animosity, and were clearly made by the Judeans. If we are to bear this in mind, we shall instantly find several passages that mention Christ and Christianity in the Old Testament. Let us list a few of them.

18.2.1. The Nicaean Council in the Old Testament

The Biblical chronicles, or the books of Samuel, Kings and Chronicles, appear to contain a description of the Nicaean Council under Constantine the Great, who became reflected in the Bible as Rehoboam, King of Israel. As we should rightly expect, the Judaic author treats Constantine, or Jeroboam, and the Nicaean Council with the utmost contempt.

---

a. The Bible.

b. The Middle Ages.

---

1a. The Bible. “The king [Jeroboam] took counsel, and made two calves of gold, and said unto them, It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem: behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt” (I Kings 12:28).

1b. The Middle Ages. The Bible appears to be referring to the famous mediaeval dispute about the worship of icons. The text of the Bible reflects the Judean point of view, according to which the icons, usually painted against a golden field, could not be worshipped. These disputes had continued in Byzantium up until the alleged VII-IX century in Scaligerian chronology.

2a. The Bible. “And he set the one in Beth-el, and the other put he in Dan… And he made the house of high places, and made priests of the
lowest of the people, which were not of the sons of Levi” (I Kings, 12:29 and 12:31).

■ 2b. The Middle Ages. The Bible refers to the construction of Orthodox temples by Constantine the Great, or Alexei I – in Bythinia, or Beth-el, and in Dan, or the Balkans. Let us remind the reader that the Slavs were also known as “Dans” in the Middle Ages. The Nicaean Council revoked the necessity of a priest to be a Levite, which is precisely what the Bible tells us: “And he … made priests of the lowest of the people, which were not of the sons of Levi” (I Kings, 12:31).

3a. The Bible. “And Jeroboam ordained a feast in the eighth month, on the fifteenth day of the month, like unto the feast that is in Judah … even in the month which he had devised of his own heart” (I Kings, 12.32-33).

■ 3b. The Middle Ages. The Bible appears to be referring to the terms of celebrating Easter as devised by the Nicaean Council. It is known that the issue of estimating the correct date for the celebration of Easter and Passover had been extremely important in the mediaeval dispute between the Orthodox Church and the Judaists.

4a. The Bible. Jeroboam came from Egypt and transferred the capital from Jerusalem to Shechem (I Kings, 12:2 and 12:25). Shechem is right next to Beth-el (I Kings, 12:29 and 12:33). Jeroboam had united a large part of Israel under his power – eleven tribes out of twelve. However, he was forced to found a new capital.

■ 4b. The Middle Ages. Constantine the Great also makes a transfer of the capital – from Old Rome, allegedly in Italy (which is incorrect) to the New Rome on the Bosporus.

18.2.2. Christ and Elisha

Apparently, Christ became reflected in the Old Testament as the prophet
Elisha, which makes the Biblical prophet Elias identify as John the Baptist. Matthew directly calls John the Baptist Elias (Matthew 17:11-13).

The Bible also mentions the resurrection of Christ, but sceptically, as a Judaic source:

“And it came to pass, as they were burying a man, that, behold, they spied a band of men; and they cast the man into the sepulchre of Elisha: and when the man was let down, and touched the bones of Elisha, he revived, and stood up on his feet” (II Kings 13:21).

This is the transformation of the famous Christian story of Christ rising from the dead, which has transformed into a bizarre tail of how somebody has risen from the sepulchre of Elisha. The character in question is most likely to identify as Jesus Christ.

As one should rightly expect, the First Crusade follows the death of Elisha the prophet:

“And Elisha died, and they buried him. And the bands of the Moabites invaded the land at the coming in of the year… But Hazael king of Syria oppressed Israel all the days of Jehoahaz” (2 Kings 13:20 and 13:22).

The possibility of Elisha and Christ identifying as the same person was also pointed out by N. A. Morozov in [544].
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.
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. Nosovskiy. *Czar of the Slavs* (in Russian). St. Petersburg: Neva, 2004.). The historical Jesus is a composite figure and reflection of the Old Testament prophet Elisha (850-800 BC?), Pope Gregory VII (1020?-1085), Saint Basil of Caesarea (330-379), and even Li Yuanhao (also known as Emperor Jingzong, or “Son of Heaven”, emperor of Western Xia, who reigned in 1032-1048), Euclides, Bacchus and Dionysius. Fomenko explains the seemingly vast differences in the biographies of these figures as resulting from difference in languages, points of view and time frame of the authors of said accounts and biographies.

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

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

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

**Specific claims**

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

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

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

- Archaeological dating, dendrochronological dating, paleographical dating, numismatic dating, carbon dating, and other methods of dating of ancient sources and artifacts known today are erroneous, non-exact or dependent on traditional chronology.

- No single document in existence can be reliably dated earlier than the XI century. Most “ancient” artifacts may find other than consensual explanation.

- Histories of Ancient Rome, Greece and Egypt were crafted during the Renaissance by humanists and clergy - mostly on the basis of documents of their own making.
• The Old Testament represents a rendition of events of the XIV to XVI centuries AD in Europe and Byzantium, containing “prophecies” about “future” events related in the New Testament, a rendition of events of AD 1152 to 1185.
• The history of religions runs as follows: the pre-Christian period (before the XI century and the birth of Jesus), Bacchic Christianity (XI and XII centuries, before and after the life of Jesus), Christianity (XII to XVI centuries) and its subsequent mutations into Orthodox Christianity, Catholicism, Judaism, and Islam.
• The *Almagest* of Claudius Ptolemy, traditionally dated to around AD 150 and considered the cornerstone of classical history, was compiled in XVI and XVII centuries from astronomical data of the IX to XVI centuries.
• 37 complete Egyptian horoscopes found in Denderah, Esna, and other temples have unique valid astronomical solutions with dates ranging from AD 1000 and up to as late as AD 1700.
• The Book of Revelation, as we know it, contains a horoscope, dated to 25 September - 10 October 1486, compiled by cabbalist Johannes Reuchlin.
• The horoscopes found in Sumerian/Babylonian tablets do not contain sufficient astronomical data; consequently, they have solutions every 30–50 years on the time axis and are therefore useless for purposes of dating.
• The Chinese tables of eclipses are useless for dating, as they contain too many eclipses that did not take place astronomically. Chinese tables of comets, even if true, cannot be used for dating.
• All major inventions like powder and guns, paper and print occurred in Europe in the period between the X and the XVI centuries.
• Ancient Roman and Greek statues, showing perfect command of the human anatomy, are fakes crafted in the Renaissance, when artists attained such command for the first time.
• There was no such thing as the Tartar and Mongol invasion followed
by over two centuries of yoke and slavery, because the so-called “Tartars and Mongols” were the actual ancestors of the modern Russians, living in a bilingual state with Turkic spoken as freely as Russian. So, Russia and Turkey once formed parts of the same empire. This ancient Russian state was governed by a double structure of civil and military authorities and the hordes were actually professional armies with a tradition of lifelong conscription (the recruitment being the so-called “blood tax”). The Mongol “invasions” were punitive operations against the regions of the empire that attempted tax evasion. Tamerlane was probably a Russian warlord.

- Official Russian history is a blatant forgery concocted by a host of German scholars brought to Russia to legitimize the usurping Romanov dynasty (1613-1917).
- Moscow was founded as late as the mid-XIV century. The battle of Kulikovo took place in Moscow.
- The tsar Ivan the Terrible represents a collation of no fewer than four rulers, representing two rival dynasties: the legitimate Godunov rulers and the ambitious Romanov upstarts.
- English history of AD 640–1040 and Byzantine history of AD 378–830 are reflections of the same late-medieval original.

Fomenko’s methods

Statistical correlation of texts

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

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

**Statistical correlation of dynasties**

In a somewhat similar manner, Fomenko compares two dynasties of rulers using statistical methods. First, he creates a database of rulers, containing relevant information on each of them. Then, he creates “survey codes” for each pair of the rulers, which contain a number which describes degree of the match of each considered property of two rulers. For example, one of the properties is the way of death: if two rulers were both poisoned, they get value of +1 in their property of the way of death; if one ruler was poisoned and another killed in combat, they get -1; and if one was poisoned, and another died of illness, they get 0 (Fomenko claims there is possibility that chroniclers were not impartial and that different descriptions nonetheless describe the same person). An important property is the length of the rule. (Chron1, pp. 215–223.)
Fomenko lists a number of pairs of unrelated dynasties – for example, dynasties of kings of Israel and emperors of late Western Roman Empire (AD 300-476) – and claims that this method demonstrates correlations between their reigns. (Graphs which show just the length of the rule in the two dynasties are the most widely known; however, Fomenko’s conclusions are also based on other parameters, as described above.) He also claims that the regnal history from the XVII to XX centuries never shows correlation of “dynastic flows” with each other, therefore Fomenko
insists history was multiplied and outstretched into imaginary antiquity to justify this or other “royal” pretensions.

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

**Astronomical evidence**

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

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

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

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

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

**Rejection of common dating methods**

On archaeological dating methods, Fomenko claims:

> “Archaeological, dendrochronological, paleographical and carbon methods of dating of ancient sources and artifacts are both non-exact and contradictory, therefore there is not a single piece of firm written evidence or artifact that could be reliably and independently dated earlier than the XI century.” (*Chron1.*)
Dendrochronology is rejected with a claim that, for dating of objects much older than the oldest still living trees, it isn’t an absolute, but a relative dating method, and thus dependent on traditional chronology. Fomenko specifically points to a break of dendrochronological scales around AD 1000.

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

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

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

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

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

In 2004 Anatoly Fomenko with his coauthor Gleb Nosovksy 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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Separate books on the New Chronology

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

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

**• Book One. Introduction.**


- **Book two, part one: Methods-1.**


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


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

• **BOOK THREE: METHODS-3.**


• **Book Four: Russia, Britain and Rome.**


• **Book Five: The Empire.**


• **Book Six: The Biblical Russia.**


**Book Seven:** *Reconstruction.*


We have to point out that the publication of our books on the New Chronology has influenced a number of authors and their works where the new chronological concepts are discussed or developed. Some of these are: L. I. Bocharov, N. N. Yefimov, I. M. Chachukh, and I. Y. Chernyshov ([93]), Jordan Tabov ([827], [828]), A. Goutz ([220]), M. M. Postnikov ([680]), V. A. Nikerov ([579:1]), Heribert Illig ([1208]), Christian Blöss
Our research attracted sufficient attention to chronological issues for the Muscovite publishing house Kraft to print a new edition of the fundamental work of N. A. Morozov titled Christ, first published in 1924-1932.
Sources in Russian


[13]. Alexandrovsky, M. I. *A Historical Reference Book for the Churches of Moscow.*


[36]. The Chronicler of Archangelsk. A complete collection of Russian chronicles,


[46]. Balandin, R. K. *A Miracle or a Scientific Enigma? Science and Religion*


[50]. Baronius, C. The Ecclesiial and Secular Annals from the Birth of Christ and until the Year 1198. Typography of P. P. Ryabushinsky, from Baronius, Annales ecclesiastici a Christo nato ad annum 1198. Moscow, 1913.


[68]. The Bible. Books from the Old and the New Covenant in Russian Translation with Anagogues and Appendices. Moscow, Moscow Patriarchy Press, 1968. There are numerous re-editions in existence, for instance, the one published by the Russian Biblical Society in Moscow, 1995.


[70]. The Bible, or the Books of the Holy Writ from the Old and the New Covenant with Anagogues. 2nd edition. St. Petersburg, Synodal Typography, 1900. Reprinted by the Russian Biblical Society in Moscow, 1993. (This version of the Bible dates to
the 1st half of the XVIII century and is therefore occasionally called Elizabethan.)


[76]. Blair, J. Chronological Tables Spanning the Entire Global History, Containing Every Year since the Genesis and until the XIX Century, Published in English by G. Blair, a Member of the Royal Society, London. Vols. 1 and 2. Moscow University Press, 1808-1809. The English edition: Blair’s Chronological and Historical Tables, from the Creation to the Present Time, etc. London, G. Bell & Sons, 1882.

[77]. Bobrovnitskaya, T. A. The Royal Regalia of the Russian Rulers. The Kremlin in Moscow. Published to Commemorate the 500th Anniversary of the State Coat of Arms and the 450th Anniversary of the Inauguration of the First Russian Czar Ivan the Terrible. Moscow, The Moscow Kremlin State Museum and Reserve for History and Culture, 1997.


[80:1]. Boguslavskiy, V. V. The Slavic Encyclopaedia. Vols. 1 and 2. Moscow,


[86]. The Great Catechism. Moscow, 7135 (1627 ad). Reprinted by the Royal Grodno typography in 7291 (1683 AD).


[111]. Boutromeyev, V. *Global History in Individual Personalities. Late Middle Ages*. Moscow, Olma, 1999.


London, 1851.


[125]. Venelin, Y. News of the Varangians as Related by Arab Scribes; their Alleged Crimes as Seen by the Latter. The Imperial Moscow University Society for History and Russian Antiquities Readings, Book IV, Section V: 1-18. 1870.

[125:1]. Vereshchagin V. V. Vereschagin, the Artist. Napoleon I in Russia, 1812. Tver, the Sozvezdie Agency of Tver, 1993.


[130]. Widukind of Corvea. The Deeds of the Saxons. Moscow, Nauka, 1975. See also


[132]. *Byzantine Historians. Dexippos, Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Malchus, Peter the Patrician, Menander, Candides, Nonnos, Theophanes the Byzantine*. St. Petersburg, 1858.


[152]. *The Unified Library of Russia, or the Book Catalogue for an Exhaustive and Detailed Description of our Fatherland*. 2nd extended edition. Moscow, 1845.


[156]. Garkavi, A. Y. *The Accounts of the Slavs and the Russians as Given by Muslim Authors (from mid-VII century until the End of the X century AD)*. St. Petersburg, 1870 (1872).


[168]. Glazounov, I. Russia Crucified. The Our Contemporary magazine, Issues 1-5, 7-9, 11 (1996). This material was subsequently published as a book.


[175]. Goloubovsky, P. V. The Pechenegs, the Torks, and the Polovtsy before the Tartar Invasion. Kiev, 1884.


[189]. *The Ruler is a Friend of his Subjects, or Political Court Hortatives and Moralistic Speculations of Kan-Shi, Khan of Manchuria and China. Collected by his son, Khan Yun-Jin*. St. Petersburg, 1795.


[201]. Grigorovich, V. An Account of Travelling through European Russia. Moscow, 1877.


[212]. Gumilev, L. N. In Search of the Figmental Kingdom (the Legend of the Kingdom of Presbyter Johannes. Moscow, Tanais, 1994.


[255]. Ancient Russian Icon Art. Moscow, Kedr, 1993. From the collection of the
Tretyakovskaya Gallery.


[266]. *The Hebraic Text of the Old Testament (The Tanach)*. London, the British and
Foreign Bible Society, 1977.


[269]. Eutropius. *A Concise History Starting with the City’s Creation*. From the *Roman Historians of the IV century* series. Moscow, Russian Political Encyclopaedia, 1997.


Leningrad, Khudozhnik RSFSR, 1982.


[306:1]. *A Representation of the Terrestrial Globe*. Russian map from the *Rarities of Russian Cartography* series. (There is no compilation date anywhere on the map. The publishers date it to mid-XVIII century, q.v. in the annotation). Moscow, the Kartair Cartographical Association, 1996.


*Die Legende von den Heiligen Drei Königen.* Berlin, 1925.


[322]. *Historical Notes of Nicephorus Vriennius.* St. Petersburg, 1858.


[330:1]. *History of Moscow in the Documents of the XII-XVIII century from the Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts.* The Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts,


[384]. Kiriaku, Georgios P. *Cyprus in Colours*. Limassol, Cyprus, K. P. Kiriaku


[389]. Klassovsky, V. *A Systematic Description of Pompeii and the Artefacts Discovered There.* St. Petersburg, 1848.


[398]. *The Book of Cosmas Indicopleustes*. Published by V. S. Golyshenko and V. F. Doubrovina. RAS, the V. V. Vinogradov Institute of the Russian Language. Moscow, Indrik, 1997.


[422]. Kondrashina, V. A. The Savvino-Storozhevsky Monastery. 600 Years since the

[423]. Koniskiy, G. (The Archbishop of Byelorussia). The History of Russians, or the Lesser Russia. The Moscow University Typography, 1846.


[430]. The Ecclesial Law Book (Kormchaya) of 1620. 256/238, The Manuscript Fund of the Russian National Library (Moscow).


[440:1]. Krekshin, P. N. *A Criticism of the Freshly-Printed Book of 1761 about the Origins of Rome and the Actions of its People and Monarchs*. The reverse of the last sheet says: “Criticism by the Nobleman of the Great New Town Peter of Nicephor, son of Kreksha, in 1762, on the 30th day of September, St. Petersburg.” The manuscript is kept in the State Archive of the Yaroslavl Oblast as Manuscript #43 (431).


[454]. Koun, N. A. The Predecessors of Christianity. Moscow, 1922.


[477]. Lesnoy, Sergei. Russia, where are you from? Winnipeg, 1964.


[505]. Malinovskaya, L. N. *The Graveyard of the Khans (Mezarlyk).* Bakhchisaray, the State Historical and Cultural Reserve, 1991.


[521]. Mezentsev, M. T. *The Fate of Novels (Concerning the Discussion on the “Quiet flows the Don” Authorship Problem).* Samara, P. S. Press, 1994.


[530]. The World of the Bible. Magazine. 1993/1(1). Published by the Russian Society of Bible Studies.


[547]. Morozov, N. A. *On Russian History*. The manuscript of the 8th volume of the work *Christ*. Moscow, the RAS Archive. Published in Moscow by Kraft and Lean in the end of the year 2000, as *A New Point of View on Russian History*.


Moscow, Mysl, 1985.


[556]. *The Andrei Rublev Museum.* A brochure. Published by the Central Andrei Rublev Museum of Ancient Russian Culture and Art in Moscow, 10, Andronyevskaya Square. n.d.


[558]. Mouravyev, S. *History of the First Four Centuries of Christianity.* St. Petersburg, 1866.


[568]. Nazarevskiy, V. V. Selected Fragments of Muscovite History. 1147-1913. Moscow, Svarog, 1996.


[579]. Niese, B. A Description of the Roman History and Source Studies. German edition: Grundriss der römischen Geschichte nebst Quellenkunde. St. Petersburg,


[592]. Nosovskiy, G. V. *The True Dating of the Famous First Oecumenical Counsel*


Moscow, Faktorial, 2000.


[617]. Orbini, Mavro. *A Historiographical Book on the Origins of the Names, the Glory and the Expansion of the Slavs. Compiled from many Historical Books through the Office of Marourbin, the Archimandrite of Raguzha.* Translated into Russian from Italian. Typography of St. Petersburg, 1722.


[630]. *Artefacts of Diplomatic Relations with the Roman Empire.* Vol. 1. St Petersburg, 1851.


[635]. *Literary Artefacts of Ancient Russia. The XIV – mid-XV century.* Moscow,


[651]. The Correspondence of Ivan the Terrible and Andrei Kurbskiy. In Literary


[655]. Plan of the Imperial Capital City of Moscow, Created under the Supervision of Ivan Michurin, the Architect, in 1739. The First Geodetic Plan of Moscow. The General Council of Ministers, Department of Geodetics and Cartography (the Cartographer Cooperative). Published together with a calendar for 1989.


[700]. *Book of Psalms*. Moscow, 1657. (Private collection.)
[701]. The book of Psalms with Appendices. Published in the Great City of Moscow in the Year 7160 [1652 AD], in the Month of October, on the 1st Day. New edition: Moscow, The Vvedenskaya Church of St. Trinity Coreligionist Typography, 1867.


[727]. Rich, V. Was there a Dark Age? The Khimia i Zhizn (Chemistry and Life) magazine, No. 9 (1983): 84.


[734]. Rozanov, N. History of the Temple of Our Lady’s Birth in Staroye Simonovo, Moscow, Dedicated to its 500th Anniversary (1370-1870). Moscow, Synodal Typography on Nikolskaya Street, 1870.
[737]. Rossovskaia, V. A. The Calendarian Distance of Ages. Moscow, Ogiz, 1930.


[772:1]. *The Scythians, the Khazars and the Slavs. Ancient Russia. To the Centennary since the Birth of M. I. Artamonov*. Report theses for the international scientific conference. St. Petersburg, State Hermitage, the State University of St. Petersburg, the RAS Institute of Material Culture History.


[780]. Skrynnikov, R. G. *Russia before the “Age of Turmoil.”* Moscow, Mysl, 1981.


[795]. *A Collection of State Edicts and Covenants.* Moscow, 1894.

[796]. *The Soviet Encyclopaedic Dictionary.* Moscow, Sovetskaya Encyclopaedia,
1979.


[802]. The Reports of the Imperial Orthodox Society of Palestine. April 1894. St. Petersburg, 1894.


[809]. Spirina, L. M. The Treasures of the Sergiev Posad State Reserve Museum of


[813]. Sobolev, N. N., ed. The Old Moscow. Published by the Commission for the Studies of Old Moscow of the Imperial Archaeological Society of Russia. Issues 1, 2. Moscow, 1914 (Reprinted: Moscow, Stolitsa, 1993).


[816]. Stepanov, N. V. The New Style and the Orthodox Paschalia. Moscow, 1907.


[835]. *The Works of Nicephor, the Archbishop of Constantinople*. Moscow, 1904.


[844]. Tokmakov, I. F. *A Historical and Archaeological Description of the Moscow Stauropigial Monastery of St. Simon*. Issues 1 and 2, Moscow, 1892-1896.


[860]. Ousanovich, M. I. *The Scientific Foresight of N. A. Morozov. The Successes of


[871]. Fedorov-Davydov, G. A. Eight Centuries of Taciturnity. The Nauka i Zhizn (Science and Life) magazine, No. 9 (1966): 74-76.
[880]. Florinsky, V. M. *Primeval Slavs according to the Monuments of their Pre-Historic Life*. Tomsk, 1894.


[906]. Fomenko, A. T. *Global Chronology. (A Research of Classical and Mediaeval History. Mathematical Methods of Source Analysis.)* Moscow, MSU Department of


[957]. Chertkov, A. D. *A Description of Ancient Russian Coins*. Moscow, Selivanovsky Typography, 1834.


[967]. Shakhmatov, A. A. *Manuscript Description. The Radzivilovskaya Chronicle, or the Chronicle of Königsberg*. Vol. 2. Articles on the text and the miniatures of the manuscript. St. Petersburg, Imperial Antiquarian Bibliophile Society, CXVIII, 1902.


[979]. Schlezer, A. L. *Public and Private Life of Augustus Ludwig Schlezer as Related


[995]. *Yaroslavl. Map 0-37 (1:1,000,000)*. The General Council of Ministers, Department of Geodetics and Cartography, 1980.

Sources in foreign languages


Secrétariat Général. Musée de la Porte de Hal Bruxelles. 1937.


[1018]. Palairet, Jean. Atlas Méthodique, Composé pour l’usage de son altesse sérénissime monseigneur le prince d’Orange et de Nassau stadhoudier des sept provinces unies, etc. etc. etc. Se trouve à Londres, chez Mess. J. Nourse & P. Vaillant dans le Strand; J. Neaulme à Amsterdam & à Berlin; & P. Gosse à La Haye. 1755.


[1045]. Borman, Z. *Astra. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library)*. 1596.


[1050:2]. British Museum. A Guide to the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Egyptian Rooms and the Coptic Room. A series of Collections of Small Egyptian Antiquities, which illustrate the Manners and Customs, the Arts and Crafts, the Religion and Literature, and the Funerary Rites and Ceremonies of the Ancient Egyptians and their Descendants, the Copts, from about B.C. 4500 to A.D. 1000. With 7 plates and 157 illustrations in the text. British Museum, 1922.


Kremlin de Moscou, 1990.


Batavorum, 1967.


[1073]. *Claudii Ptolemaei Pelusiensis Alexandrini omnia quac extant opera. 1551.*


[1082]. Crowe, C. *Carbon-14 activity during the past 5000 years.* Nature, Volume


[1118]. *Encyclopaedia Britannica; or, a Dictionary of Arts and Sciences, compiled upon a new Plan. In which the different Sciences and Arts are digested into distinct Treatises or Systems; and the various Technical Terms, etc. are explained as they occur in the order of the Alphabet. Illustrated with one hundred and sixty copperplates. By a Society of Gentlemen in Scotland. In 3 volumes*. Edinburgh, A. Bell and C. Macfarquhar, 1771.


[1152]. Gassendi. *Nicolai Coppernici vita*. A supplement to the edition titled *Tycho Braise, equitis Mani, astronomorum copyrhaei vita*. XDCLV.


[1154]. Ginzel, F. K. *Spezieller Kanon der Sonnen- und Mondfinsternisse für das Ländergebiet der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften und den Zeitraum von 900 vor Chr. bis 600 nach Chr*. Berlin, Mayer & Müller, 1899.


[1162]. Grienberger, C. *Catalogus Veteres affixarum longitudiues et latitudines cum novis conferens*. Romæ apud B. Zannetum, 1612. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library.)


[1172:1]. *Haack Geographisch-Kartographischer Kalender*. Germany, Haack Gotha,


[1187]. Heintze, C. *Objects rituels, croyances et dieux de la Chine antique et de


[1209]. Isidori Junioris. *Hispalensis episcopi: De responsione mundi*. 1472. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library.)


[1247]. de Austria, Leopoldus. *Compilatio de Astrorum Scientia*, cut. 1489. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library.)


[1256]. Lubienietski, S. *Theatrum Cometicum, etc.* Amstelodami, 1666-1668. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library.)

[1257]. Lubienietski, S. *Historia universalis omnium Cometarum*. Lugduni Batavorum, 1681. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library.)


[1271]. *Germany*. Michelin et Cie, 1996.


L. Friederichsen, 1907.


[1283]. National Geographic, Volume 176, No. 4 (October 1989).


American Philosophical Society, 1959.


[1295]. Newcomb, S. *Tables of the Motion of the Earth on its Axis and around the Sun*. Astronomical Paper. V.VI, Pt.1. 1898.


[1301]. Newton, Isaac. *Abrégé de la chronologie des ancien royaumes*. Trad. Deel
Anglois de Mr. [Andrew] Reid. Geneve, 1743.


[1316]. Oppolzer, Th. Tafeln zur Berechnung der Mondfinsternisse. Wien, 1883.
[1318]. Orbini, Mauro. Origine de gli Slavi & progresso dell’Imperio loro. Pesaro, 1606.
[1319]. Orontij, Finai Delphinatus. Canonum Astronomicum. 1553. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library.)
[1320]. Orontii, Finaei Delphinatis. Fine Oronce, etc. 1551. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library.)
[1332]. Venetus, Paulus. Philisiphiae naturalis compendium clarissimi philosophi
Pauli Veneti: una libro de compositione mundi, etc. Paris, J. Lambert (s. d.), n.d.


[1354]. [Ptolemaeus, Claudius]. *Clavdii Ptolemaei Pelusiensis Alexandrini omnia quae extant opera, praeter Geographiam, etc*. Baseliae, 1551.


[1356]. Ptolemy, C. *Claudii Ptolemaei opera quae extant omnia*. Ed. J. L. Heiberg et al. 3 volumes. Leipzig, 1898-1903.,


[1363]. Ranson, C. L. *A Late Egyptian Sarcophagus*. Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. 9 (1914): 112-120.


[1377]. Roquebert, Michel. *L’épopée Cathare, 1209-1229. (On the Crusade against*


[1382]. Rundsicht der Stadt Wien zur Zeit der Türkenbelagerung, 1529, Niklas Meldemann, Nürnberg 1530. HM Inv. Nr. 48068. Faksimile 1994, Museen der Stadt Wien Druckerei Gert Herzig, Wien. (Mediaeval plan of Vienna of the XVI c. depicting the siege of Vienna by the Turks in 1529.)


[1396]. Schram, R. *Reductionstafeln für den Oppolzerischen Finsternis Kanon zum Übergang auf die Ginzelschen Correctionen*. Wien, 1889.


[1405:1]. Simon, J. L., P. Bretagnon, J. Chapront, M.,Chapront-Touze, G. Francou, and J. Laskar. Software for the calculation of heliocentric coordinates, radial vectors and immediate speeds for the 8 main planets of the Solar System (the PLANETAP


[1412]. Steeb, J. *Coelum sephiroticum Hebraeorum, etc.* (The Pulkovo Observatory Library). Mainz, 1679.


[1429]. Stryjkowski, Maciej. *O Poczatkach, wywodach.... Of the Beginnings, Sources, the Deeds of the Knights and the Home Affairs of the Glorious Peoples of Lithuania, Zhmuda, and Russia, an Original Tale Inspired by the Lord and the Author’s Own Experience*. Warszawa, 1978.


[1441]. Teutsch Astronomiei. *Astronomia*. Woodcuts, 1545. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library.)


[1449]. The English version of the polyglot Bible with a copies and original selection of references to parallel and illustrative passages. London, S. Bagster and Sons.

[1450]. The Holy Bible, containing Old and New Testaments: Translated out of the original tongues; and with the former translations diligently compared and revised, by His Majesty’s special command. Appointed to be read in Churches. London, British and Foreign Bible Society, Instituted in London in the Year 1804.

[1451]. The Holy Bible, containing Old and New Testaments: Translated out of the original tongues; and with the former translations diligently compared and revised, by His Majesty’s special command. Authorized King James version. Salt Lake City, Utah, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, 1992.


[1459]. The World Encompassed. An exhibition of the history of maps held at the


[1479]. Williams, John. Observations of Comets from B.C.611 A.D. to 1640, extracted from the Chinese Annals. 1871.


[1483]. Wolf, R. Handbuch der Astronomie, ihrer Geschichte und Literatur. Bd. II. Zürich, 1892.


1986.

